

The University Senate met in the Little Theatre February 13, President McVey presiding.

The minutes of January 16 were read and approved.

The following recommendations from the Rules Committee were approved:

1. "The present rule on probation reads:

A student is placed on probation when his standing upon his entire schedule for his preceding semester is less than 1. If at the end of his semester of probation his standing is less than .7, he is automatically dropped for one semester. (Rules page 36)

2. The Committee on Rules recommends the following new reading in order to adapt the rule to summer school:

A student is placed on probation when his standing upon his entire schedule for his preceding semester is less than 1. If a student carries at least 9 credits during the summer session (in the College of Law 8 credits), his standing will be based on his work of the summer session. If he carries less than 9 credits, (or less than eight in Law) his standing will be based on the preceding semester. If at the end of his semester or summer session of probation, his standing is less than .7, he is automatically dropped for one semester. (Underscored words indicate new material).

3. The first paragraph of the present rule governing participation in public activities reads as follows:

"To be eligible to participate in extra-curricula activities, such as extra-mural athletics, public speaking, dramatics, membership on staffs of University publications, class offices, sponsorships, a student must have met the full entrance requirements and must, except in cases of students registered for the first time, have carried during the preceding semester at least 12 credit hours and must be carrying a schedule of at least 12 credit hours, and must not be on probation.

(Rules, p. 42).

4. The Committee recommends that the paragraph be made to read as follows:

"To be eligible to participate in extra-curricular activities, such as extra-mural athletics, public speaking, dramatics, membership on staffs of University publications, class offices sponsorships, a student must have met the full entrance requirements and must, except in case of students registered for the first time, have carried during the preceding semester at least 12 credits (or 9 credits in the summer session, except in the college of Law where the limit is 8 credits) and must be carrying a schedule of at least 12 credit hours, and must not be on probation. If the student carries less than 9 credits in the



summer session (or less than 8 in the College of Law), his eligibility will be based on his record of the preceding semester."

(Underscored words indicate new material).

The Committee on Courses of Study presented the following report to the Senate:

"The Committee on Courses of Study was created in the Spring of 1926 chiefly to eliminate duplication of courses between colleges. The Committee is composed of the Registrar and one representative from each college, except the College of Arts and Sciences, which has two representatives. As initially created the committee was empowered to scrutinize new courses offered for the purpose of eliminating the duplication of courses between the various colleges of the University. In the exercise of this function certain problems have arisen, and in considering courses referred to the committee many irregularities have appeared so that at certain times, with the tacit or express consent of the Senate, the Committee has extended its jurisdiction, where duplication between colleges was not involved. In fact, in many cases the committee was referred to as a Committee on Courses of Study rather than as a Committee on Duplication of Courses, and is so entitled in the latest University catalog. As a result there has apparently prevailed among some of the members of the Senate the belief that the Committee has been empowered to scrutinize all new courses. This has been the opinion of certain members of the committee and has been accentuated by the fact that this Committee has been called upon to consider every new course which has been offered to the Senate, although it was obvious that no duplication was involved.

The procedure of the Committee has been as follows: When new courses have been approved by the individual college faculties they have been referred to this Committee for consideration. The Committee has required every statement concerning a new course to be accompanied by an outline of its contents and a statement of the credits offered. When the Committee has approved the courses they have been referred to the Senate for action -- that is, for approval with the recommendation of the Committee. When courses have been disapproved, or temporarily postponed, they have been referred back to the colleges from which they came, or to the departments involved. This has been the procedure regardless of whether the objection to the courses has been one of duplication, failure to furnish adequate syllabus, or the appearance of obvious defects, such as excess credit or duplication of courses within the department concerned. In nearly every case, by means of conferences and the reconsideration of courses, the difficulties have been removed and course difficulties remedied. In no case has the committee brought to the Senate a recommendation that given courses be not approved without first referring the courses back to the college from which they came.

In the exercise of its duties the Committee has sought to deal impartially and intelligently with the problems presented. In many cases after the Committee has acted upon its best judgment in cases which seemed to it were within its jurisdiction it has been subsequently informed by parties interested in the courses, that the Committee has exceeded its authority. In other cases, courses have been offered for credit in the University before they have been referred to the Committee.



and before they have been acted upon by the Senate. The result is that the Committee is stripped of any power in such cases and the Senate is completely ignored. In case such courses involve duplication, how can the Committee act? Can it recommend that the course be not given? Can it recommend that it be given in another college? Can it recommend that students who have registered in good faith and who are in no wise responsible for the situation be given no credit? What can it do? It may be pointed out that no courses can be given in the University until they are first approved by the Senate, yet in the cases referred to above neither the Committee nor the Senate has had the opportunity to express itself upon these courses. They are clearly outside the pale of University rules, yet they are given. During the present year this situation developed and involved a number of courses. If courses are given before the Committee and the Senate have had the opportunity to consider them, clearly the Committee is useless and the Senate is stripped of its power to approve or disapprove of the courses in the curriculum of the University. The Committee wishes to be advised by the Senate as to what it should do in such cases.

It should be clear to the members of the Senate that the Committee on Courses of Study is a Senate Committee and that it is only seeking to discharge the will of that body. Moreover, the Committee is not asking for power to decide anything, but is only seeking to find out what it is that the Senate desires the Committee to consider. Nor is the Committee asking the Senate to delegate to it any powers of decision. All that the Committee desires is that it may know what it may inquire into for the purpose of making intelligent recommendations to the Senate. In short, the question is simply "Does the Senate want this to be a Committee on Courses of Study, or does it want the Committee to deal solely and only with the duplication between colleges?"

Another problem has arisen in the past year which has been the source of considerable embarrassment to the Committee. The issue is one of principles rather than one between parties so that no reference to specific cases are made. Let us suppose that some department or college decides to offer a new degree and presents to the Senate a curriculum leading up to that degree. The Senate approves this curriculum which contains several new courses, the outlines of which have never been submitted to the Committee on Courses of Study. In the course of time these new courses are sent to the Committee and the Committee refuses to recommend one such course for adoption by the Senate. The question now arises, did the action of the Senate in approving the granting of the above degree, approve ipso facto all new courses in the curriculum submitted, or did the Senate only approve the granting of the degree conditional upon the later approval of new courses? It is to be remembered that if the approval of the new degree carried with it also the approval of new courses, an effective way has been found to pass courses in the Senate without submitting them to the Senate Committee on Courses of Study.

In endeavoring to prevent duplication of courses it has appeared to the Committee that it should aim to prevent duplication within a single college and within a single department, as well as between the various colleges. Certain new courses which have been offered to the Committee have appeared to duplicate courses formerly given or now being given in the same department. The Committee does not feel that such new courses should not be approved but does feel that very often full credit should not be given to students who take two such courses. Shall the Committee be able to recommend to the Senate that such duplication of work or of credit be corrected, or shall the Committee be limited in its jurisdiction to only duplication between colleges?



Similarly, in the examination of course outlines the Committee has discovered cases where the credit to be given for a course appeared to be excessive. In one such case the department in question agreed that excessive credit had been asked and subsequently reduced the number of credit-hours for the course-- in which form it was approved by both the Senate and its Committees. Was this a proper action on the part of the Committee, or should the Committee have been bound by the action of the College Faculty, which had approved the excess credit, no duplication of credit between colleges being involved? This case was amicably settled to the satisfaction of all parties. Suppose, however, that a course outline shows that there is insufficient content for, say, a three hour course and the parties interested are unable to convince the Senate that three hours credit should be allowed, does the Senate desire the Committee on Courses of Study to report that fact, or does it want the Committee merely to report that there is no duplication of work between other colleges? It is the experience of the committee that the question of adequacy of credit often does not appear until the course outlines submitted are carefully examined.

Closely allied to the subject of credit and duplication is the question of course sequences. It has happened that one college has given an undergraduate course in one subject, while another college has given a substantially similar course for graduate students. The same problem has arisen between departments in the same college. In order to distinguish the level of courses a definite numbering system has been developed, but the meaning of these course numbers has by no means been clear. The Committee would like the Senate to define the meaning of courses of "less than 100", or "100" courses, and of "200" courses. The Committee would also like to know if there should be prerequisites for these courses, and if so, what should be the nature of the prerequisites?

These are some of the problems which have arisen in the work of the Committee on Courses of Study. Some of the members of the faculty and a part of the administrative officials are of the opinion that all of these problems are within the province of the Committee and are problems which the Committee was created to solve, quite apart from questions involving duplication of work. Other members of the faculty and administrative staff feel that these problems are entirely outside of the province of the Committee and constitute a usurpation of the sovereignty of the College and of the prerogatives of the dean. The Committee has in the past been placed in the position of being forced to approve some courses which have received the sanction of given faculties. The circumstances of some of the cases have been such as to create in the minds of the members of the Committee the feeling that they were being forced to "rubber stamp" something which on its face appeared to be wrong. It is the desire of the Committee that any doubt as to its status and duties be removed and it is therefore, asking the Senate to decide upon the following questions:

Questions for Senate to Decide

1. Does the Senate desire to take any steps to prevent courses from being given before they are referred to the Committee on Courses of Study or to the Senate?
2. Does the Senate desire to say that no course shall be considered as having been approved by the Senate which has not been first submitted to the Committee on Courses of Study? (The purpose of this is to prevent the indirect



approval of new courses when degrees or other subjects are being directly considered).

3. Does the Senate believe that the Committee on Courses of Study should seek to eliminate (in new courses) duplication of work within the same college and within the same departments, as well as between the colleges?
4. Does the Senate desire the Committee on Courses of Study to make recommendations concerning the adequacy or inadequacy of credit?
5. What does the Senate consider the following courses to mean:
  - (a) Courses of "less than 100"?
  - (b) "100 courses"?
  - (c) "200 courses"?

Which of these courses shall have prerequisites and what should be the nature of the prerequisites?

6. Does the Senate desire that this Committee shall be a Committee on Duplication of Courses between colleges merely, or shall it be a Committee on Courses of Study making reports on all matters pertaining to new courses to the University Senate?

Signed - COMMITTEE ON COURSES OF STUDY

After discussion of this report the following resolution was approved:

"It is the sense of this body that the Committee on Courses of Study shall confine itself to the duties for which it was originally appointed, namely:

1. Duplication of courses by different colleges and allocation of courses or fields of study to the proper colleges, because "It was not understood that the committee would be censors on all courses offered by the different colleges."
2. When courses are presented to this committee it shall examine them and when it has made such examination shall report to the Senate simply "We do, (or do not), find duplication in these courses."

The following resolution was approved: "That a committee be appointed to make a survey of courses now being offered by the University. The following were appointed on the committee: Messrs. P. P. Boyd (Chairman), George Roberts, W. E. Freeman, Edward Wiest, Dale Russell.

The Senate approved the following recommendations from the College of Arts and Sciences:

1. That the rules governing eligibility to Independent Work Courses in this college be modified to conform to the provisions holding for Special Honors courses. That is to say, any junior or senior may in the future be admitted to an Independent Work Course if in the judgment of the Head of the Department and the Dean his particular excellence in the department warrants admission."



2. That the following courses and changes in courses be approved:

Anatomy and Physiology 105a and 105b. Human Osteology. Recitation 1 hour, laboratory four hours a week. Three credits per semester. These courses are intended to take the place of A. & P. 101a and 101b which are two credit courses.

Anatomy and Physiology 107a and 107b. Advanced Anatomy. Recitation 1 hour, laboratory four hours a week. Three credits per semester.

Hygiene 111a and 111b. Independent Work in Hygiene. Three credits per semester.

President McVey called the attention of the Senate to the prevalence of cheating in examinations and quizzes and suggested that a committee should be appointed to study the situation and make some recommendation to the Senate. The Senate approved the appointment of such a committee by President McVey. The following were appointed: Messrs. W. S. Webb (Chairman), J. B. Miner, M. Scherago, L. J. Horlacher, D. V. Terrell, C. C. Ross, Mrs. J. M. Server.

There was some discussion concerning the organization of the Faculty Club of the University. It was decided that this question should be brought up at the next meeting of the University Assembly.

The Senate then adjourned.

*Dr. Apple Moore*  
Acting Secretary

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE MARCH 12, 1928

The University Senate met in the Little Theatre Monday, March 12, President McVey presiding.

The minutes of February 13 were read and approved.

*The following recommendations of the Rules Committee were approved:*

1. That for seminar courses and independent or individual work courses where more than two semesters' work is assigned, letters c, d, etc., may be used after the course number in the same way that the letters a and b are now used.

2. That the rule on "dropping a subject" (Rules, p. 36) be amended to read as follows:

"A student who drops a subject without permission of his Dean shall be given a semester grade of E in that subject. During the first two weeks of the semester, a student may be dropped from a subject with or without a grade of E at the discretion of his dean. If a student is dropped from a subject later than the third Monday of the semester, he will be marked a grade of E for that course, unless he is excused by the Committee on Scholarship and Attendance. A student who drops out of the University before the end of the semester shall be marked E for the semester in those subjects in which he is reported as failing at the time he leaves. (Underscored represents new material)