

## MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, OCTOBER 9, 1967

The University Senate met in regular session at 4:00 p.m., Monday, October 9, 1967, in the Court Room of the Law Building. Chairman Sears presided. Members absent: A. D. Albright, Charles E. Barnhart, Harold R. Binkley\*, Harry M. Bohannon, Peter Bosomworth\*, Thomas D. Brower, Lester Bryant, Cecil C. Carpenter, Gordon J. Christensen, Virgil L. Christian, Jr., David Clark\*, Lewis W. Cochran, Steven Cook\*, Emmett R. Costich, Glenwood L. Creech, Marcia Dake, George W. Denemark, Kurt W. Deuschle, Robert O. Evans\*, Stuart Forth\*, James E. Funk, Michael L. Furcolow, Wesley P. Garrigus, Richard D. Gilliam, Harold D. Gordon\*, Charles P. Graves\*, John W. Greene, Jr., Ward Griffen, Joseph Hamburg, Bobby Ott Hardin, Ellis Hartford, Thomas L. Hayden\*, Charles F. Haywood, Roberta B. Hill\*, John L. Howieson, W. M. Insko, Jr.\*, Harris Isbell, Raymon D. Johnson, Robert L. Johnson, Robert F. Kerley, Charles T. Lesshafft, Jr., William L. Matthews, Jr., M. J. McNamara, Eugene F. Mooney, Alvin L. Morris, Dean H. Morrow, Paul C. Nagel, James P. Noffsinger, John W. Oswald, James Prestridge\*, William R. Proffit, John L. Ragland, J. G. Rodriguez\*, Dorothy Salmon\*, William A. Seay, Dallas M. Shuffett\*, Gerard E. Silberstein\*, Joseph V. Swintosky, W. C. Templeton, William J. Tisdall, Lee H. Townsend\*, David R. Wekstein\*, Raymond A. Wilkie, William R. Willard\*, D. J. Wood\*.

The minutes of September 11, 1967 were approved as circulated.

The Secretary, University Senate, read the following letter which had been received from Mrs. Stanley Zyzniewski:

Dear Dr. Ockerman:

Please understand that I am very much appreciative of the Resolution adopted pertinent to Stan's being a member of the University Senate.

I can say without reservation that while Stan sometimes felt as though he might be regarded as a devil's advocate, his comments at Senate meetings were always directed toward what he evaluated to be to the best interests of a developing University.

I also know that one of the nicest bits of news while we were in Finland in 64-65 was that of having been elected to the Senate. Stan felt it a privilege and responsibility to represent his colleagues and actually considered this assignment as one of his priority tasks.

I personally very much appreciate the thoughtful note.

Sincerely,

Celia K. Zyzniewski

May 10  
1967

The Secretary, University Senate, presented the proposed University Calendar for the 1970-71 academic year which had been prepared within the framework of guidelines set down by the University Senate and circulated to the faculty of the University under date of September 15, 1967 and recommended its approval. The Senate approved the 1970-71 University Calendar as circulated.

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR

1970 Fall Semester

1970

July 29 Wednesday - Last day to submit all required documents to Registrar's Office for admission to the 1970 Fall Semester

August 31 - Sept 1 Monday & Tuesday - Classification, registration, and orientation for students not pre-registered

September 2 Wednesday - Class work begins

September 7 Monday - Labor Day - Academic Holiday

September 8 Tuesday - Last day to enter an organized class for the Fall Semester

September 14 Monday - Last day to drop a course without a grade

September 15, 16 Tuesday & Wednesday - Last days for filing application for a December degree in College Dean's Office

October 22 Thursday - Undergraduate mid-term grades due in Registrar's Office by 4:00 p.m.

November 10 Tuesday - Last day to withdraw from a class before finals

November 26, 27, 28 Thursday, Friday, Saturday - Thanksgiving Holidays Academic Holidays

December 11 Friday - Last day to submit all required documents to Registrar's Office for admission to the 1971 Spring Semester

December 15 Tuesday - Class work ends

December 17-23 Thursday through Wednesday - Final examinations

December 23 Wednesday - End of Fall Semester

December 28 Monday - All grades due in Registrar's Office by 4:00 p.m.

Summary of Teaching Days, Fall Semester, 1970

	<u>Mon</u>	<u>Tues</u>	<u>Wed</u>	<u>Thurs</u>	<u>Fri</u>	<u>Sat</u>	<u>Teaching Days</u>
September	3	4	5	4	4	4	September 24
October	4	4	4	5	5	5	October 27
November	5	4	4	3	3	3	November 22
December	2	3	3	2	2	2	December 14
TOTALS	14	15	16	14	14	14	87

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR

1971 Spring Semester

1971

January 11, 12 Monday & Tuesday - Classification, registration and orientation for students not pre-registered

January 13 Wednesday - Class work begins

January 19 Tuesday - Last day to enter an organized class for the Spring Semester

January 25 Monday - Last day to drop a course without a grade

January 25, 26 Monday & Tuesday - Last days for filing application for a May degree in College Dean's Office

March 4 Thursday - Undergraduate mid-term grades due in Registrar's Office by 4:00 p.m.

March 13-21 Saturday through Sunday - Spring vacation

March 29 Monday - Last day to withdraw from a class before finals

April 1 Thursday - Last day for out-of-state freshmen to submit all required documents to Registrar's Office for admission to the 1971 Fall Semester

May 1 Saturday - End of class work

May 3-8 Monday through Saturday - Final examinations

May 8 Saturday - End of Spring Semester

May 9 Sunday - Baccalaureate-Vesper Services

May 10 Monday - 104th Annual Commencement

May 12 Wednesday - All grades due in Registrar's Office by 4:00 p.m.

May 17 Monday - Last day to submit all required documents to Registrar's Office for admission to the 1971 Summer Session

Summary of Teaching Days, Spring Semester, 1971

<u>January</u>	<u>Mon</u>	<u>Tues</u>	<u>Wed</u>	<u>Thurs</u>	<u>Fri</u>	<u>Sat</u>	<u>Teaching Days</u>
January	2	2	3	3	3	3	January 16
February	4	4	4	4	4	4	February 24
March	4	4	4	3	3	3	March 21
April	4	4	4	5	5	4	April 26
May	0	0	0	0	0	1	May 1
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>88</b>

## Minutes of the University Senate, October 9, 1967 (con't)

## UNIVERSITY CALENDAR

1971 Summer Session1971

June 14, 15	Monday & Tuesday - Registration
June 16	Wednesday - Class work begins
June 21	Monday - Last day to enter an organized class for the Summer Session
June 28	Monday - Last day to drop a course without a grade
June 28, 29	Monday & Tuesday - Last days for filing applications for an August degree in College Dean's Office
July 5	Monday - Independence Day - Academic Holiday
July 28	Wednesday - Last day to withdraw from a class before end of Summer Session
July 30	Monday - Last day to submit all required documents to Registrar's Office for admission to the 1971 Fall Semester
August 11	Wednesday - End of 1971 Summer Session
August 13	Friday - All grades due in Registrar's Office by 4:00 p.m.

Summary of Teaching Days, Summer Session 1971

	<u>Mon</u>	<u>Tues</u>	<u>Wed</u>	<u>Thurs</u>	<u>Fri</u>	<u>Sat</u>	<u>Teaching Days</u>
June	2	2	3	2	2	2	June 13
July	3	4	4	5	5	5	July 26
August	2	2	2	1	1	1	August 9
TOTALS	7	8	9	8	8	8	48

Dr. Cierley, Chairman of the University Senate Program Committee, announced that the November meeting of the Senate would contain a report by the Committee which the Senate had appointed to study the size and composition of the Senate plus the matter of voting referred to it by the President. Dr. Cierley urged the Senate to forward to the Program Committee any suggestions for programs which it would like to have presented at future meetings.

Dean Drennon chaired a panel on student advising consisting of the following panel members: Dr. Lyman V. Ginger, Dr. J. W. Gladden, Dr. Michael P. McQuillen, Dr. Stanley Wall and Professor Warren Walton.

Dr. McQuillen, speaking for the faculty of the Medical Center, presented a brief presentation of their advising system. He stated that the three levels of advising involved (1) pre-medical and pre-dental counseling; (2) the initial two years of Medical or Dental School, during which most students took essentially the same courses; in the Dental School each student, identified in interview prior to admission by the Admissions Committee, is assigned a

given advisor, and remains with that advisor for the four years of Dental School with the option (after six months and anytime thereafter) of selecting a new advisor; in the Medical School, the student is not assigned to a particular advisor, but rather seeks direction from individual instructors or the office of student services (this office makes use of a pool of advisors for the year I and II students, as well); and (3) the third and fourth years of Medical School; presently each student is allowed to select an advisor at the end of the second year; no advisor has more than four to six students to advise; he meets with them at times and in a manner that seems most appropriate for the individual student and will, during this year, select with the student the pathway the student will follow in his fourth year. Dr. McQuillen stated that one of the benefits of the change in curriculum (making more elective courses available and changing the grading system) has been to cause the student to seek more advice to determine exactly how he is doing. This has resulted in much more opportunity for counseling, both by the counselors and by the Office of Student Services. Finally, a good liason with the psychiatric services in Student Health obtains for serious problems at all levels.

Dr. Gladden, in his role, gave particular emphasis to a description of some of the contradictions, difficulties, and choices that must be made in terms of the oldest teacher or scholar as advisor. He referred to the "ideal" as related by Dr. McQuillen, and the "real", that of a radical increase over a decade in the Department of Sociology from 40 majors and some 30 persons to almost 200 majors and 50 or more persons who are directed to them for counseling; he stated that in earlier years four of the faculty in that department acted as advisors--two for the freshmen and sophomores--two for the juniors and seniors--and they were able at that time to do a fairly good job because of the small number of persons they had to counsel. He stated that they now have almost twice as many graduate students to counsel and advise. The old pattern in that department, which he felt pervaded the College, was for those who were willing to advise to do so and the others were free to devote their time to research and/or teaching; thus the individuals who advised had the responsibility of carrying their students through the year. He stated that the present pattern in the department involved all of the faculty being assigned a certain number of advisees--between 10 and 20 undergraduate majors and 5 to 10 graduate students; that there are four formal contacts and there should be many more; that for those really committed to advising there are as many as 8 or 10 contacts.

He stated that the new policy of the University requires, through its merit system, that all faculty personnel conduct research as well as teach and that the younger men are especially under pressure to be productive; that they are also likely to have the highest teaching load and to be asked to assume the advisory role as well; that this last, because it carries so little recognition has been given the least attention, thus causing the faculty member who is most interested in advising having students seek him out, since the students know the faculty members who are interested. He stated that the advisory and the counseling role was too important to be relegated to the least position in the job description; that the best advising is done by those who are willing and interested in students, who teach regularly and know the curriculum, as well as the students, who are interested in the University and who are committed to stay here, who have been here long enough to know the changes that have taken place and the needs for new change, and whose morale is high; that morale is one of the weak

spots of the advisory system; and that those who are presently advising are not among the highest in morale. In summary, he stated that the students who do not have access to the kind of help they need are penalized; the younger faculty are penalized. They are not sure which they should do and shortly discover that advising is not that important. The faculty who are most interested in the students and in the University are penalized, and consequently the University itself is penalized.

Dean Ginger discussed some of the obstacles which impede good advising.

1. The excessive use of time required. He indicated that all of the advisor's spare time during the first two weeks of each semester is consumed in the drop/add process. All of his time for two weeks during pre-registration in the middle of the semester is consumed in advising. This means that one month of each semester or two months of each year is used by the instructor in working with students and if he has a heavy advising load, this consumes every moment of his spare time.
2. The job of the advisor. Dean Ginger stated that he believed that the job of the advisor had not been carefully delineated and analyzed for the advisor. He suggested that the advisor needs to know (1) the mechanical part of schedule making, (2) all of the details of the curriculum and to be able to impart this to the student and how to fit it into a logical sequence, and (3) how to be able to deal with the student's personal problems where referral to another service agency on campus is required--Medical Center, Psychiatric Services, Counseling Center, etc. Dean Ginger suggested that a systematic plan should be developed for orienting faculty members into these three aspects of advising.
3. The student's record and advising. For the first two years of a student's educational career, his record is in one college and the advising is done through another college. Dean Ginger explained that even though the Office of the College of Arts and Sciences has cooperated in every way, the fact still remains that students are being advised by faculty members in other colleges, without the record of the student being available. He stated that there are approximately 1600 students enrolled in the College of Education this semester whose records are in the College. There are perhaps 1200 students enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences who have indicated that they plan to transfer to Education when they are juniors. Grades for some of these students have been sent to the College of Education. There is a third group of students who report to the College of Education for advisors but who have never indicated to Arts and Sciences that they plan to transfer. Dealing with three separate and distinct groups of students adds greatly to the job of the advisor and works to the disadvantage of the student. On the basis of this information, Dean Ginger suggested that perhaps the Senate would like to reconsider two questions. 1. What can be done to place advising in its proper perspective throughout the University? 2. Is any good purpose served by requiring a student at the freshman or sophomore level to register in the College of Arts and Sciences if he has already established the fact that he knows the college to which he expects to transfer? The curriculum for the first two years would be the same in either case.

Minutes of the University Senate, October 9, 1967. (con't)

Dean Walton discussed the necessity of a clear policy commitment on the role of advising, particularly the faculty-student relationship. He stated that during his 17 years with the University he had seen nothing that clearly defined the role of advisor. He gave his definition of a good advisor as one who looked after the student's best interests, who became his friend, who helped him learn how to study, to understand what alternatives he has, to help him make decisions, how to allot his time. He stated that he felt lack of faculty understanding of what is expected of them in the advising role was a serious problem; that clearly defined objectives of the advisory function need to be established and thoroughly communicated. He stressed the need for the University to recognize good advising financially when merit ratings are reviewed. He strongly urged that the University underscore and commit itself to good advising by making good advising an item on the rating sheet. He stated that he felt it unfair to ask a new staff member who has a tenure problem facing him, or a new senior professor who has just come on campus and does not know the University's idiosyncrasies, immediately to assume the advisory role. He referred to the large numbers of students with scores in the upper quarter percentile on the ACT Composite Score who have flunked out of the University before there was time to straighten them out; and of studies which had been done on the personality test--the conformists and non-conformists--which showed that some very bright students who had scored as non-conformists had not lasted long enough to find out what it was all about; that he saw no way of correcting these tragedies except through good advising. In summation, he stated that he hoped the University would describe the role and function of an advisor and would underscore it with the dollars and cents mark at the appropriate time.

Dr. Wall discussed some alternatives or possible improvements in the advisory role which might be considered. He mentioned the plan which was implemented two years ago whereby some of the faculty who were on ten months' salary and had been assisting in advising were selected to help in the Summer Orientation Program and were paid the equivalent of one month's salary.

One alternative which he mentioned as being used by some colleges and universities was that of a central advising office--where a few people are trained in the field of advising and counseling--to which all students are sent.

An additional approach mentioned was selection of those faculty members who wish to take advising as an extra assignment for which they are given additional financial remuneration but in which there would be no evaluation of advising as a part of the merit evaluation for the total job.

An alternative, which he favored, was that of selecting those faculty who have an interest and concern for good advising, making this a part of their total load, establishing a weighted scale to balance advising a certain number of students with teaching a three or two-hour course, and providing some scale to recognize good advising on the same level as good teaching or good research in the merit evaluation review.

Some instruments which Dr. Wall mentioned might add additional impetus to establishment of such a program were:

1. a workshop, made up of those faculty interested in advising, which would attempt to identify advisory commitment and means of overcoming the obstacles which have been raised;
2. the use being made of the American College Test. He stated that the University is requiring high school graduates to spend upwards of \$30,000 a year for completion of the ACT, a requirement for admission to the University, and he questioned whether the manner in which it is being used by the University (that of looking at the percentile rank for purpose of placement) is worth the \$4.50 each student must pay to take the test. He pointed out that there is a great deal of information on the card which could be of inestimable benefit in the advising role;
3. the opportunity which is available through the General Studies Program to help the student plan the first two years at the University, by using a plan form, a copy of which plan could be given to the student;
4. some type of permanent record card that would move with the student as he moves from one advisor to the other or from one college to the other, such card to contain a minimum amount of information but enough to give a record of what each advisor has tried to do to help that student.

In summation, he stated that he felt a decision must be made relative to the system of advising to be followed.

As presiding officer of the panel discussion Dean Drennon added some remarks to what had been presented. He stated that since assuming his present role in the College of Arts and Sciences he had become intensely aware that a good many thousand parents send their sons and daughters to us for us to do something with them and that many of them are intensely dissatisfied with what we do or don't do; that sometimes they are misled by what the student tells them of the advisor's instructions, but that all too often the student relates quite accurately what the advisor told him. He said he felt that perhaps the deans were making a mistake in shielding the advisors from the parents; that if the advisor had to sit with families, many of whom are in tears as they see their hopes and dreams of a lifetime disintegrate, he would realize the importance of good advising.

He pointed out what a mistake in advising can do to a student, that of slowing him down in his educational experience for a semester or year, and the cost in loss of income. He stated that the College of Arts and Sciences registers about 3,000 new freshmen in the fall and that at the end of the first semester 40% of that number are on probation; that all of these students are not dullards; and of how much disappointment, grief, and waste this represents

He stated further that at the end of the Spring Semester last year they dropped some 750 students, many of whom had every right to expect that they could graduate and make a major contribution to our society; that, in addition, 400 were placed on probation; that these figures represent young people who are in serious trouble, whose families have invested thousands of dollars and a lifetime of dreams and hopes; and that in too many instances the source of the student's downfall occurred on the advisory level.



Minutes of the University Senate, October 9, 1967 (con't)

In the question and answer period that followed the Senate raised a number of questions, one of which was "What happens now to advising?"

Dean Drennon replied that the panel did not anticipate the total answer to the problem would evolve from this discussion; that rather what it hoped to achieve was to make the Senate members more aware of the nature of the problem, its seriousness; and to instill in them an urgency to begin preparing the entire University community for making some concrete commitments; e.g., to see that the advisory role becomes a matter of institutional priority in terms of money, of what our students think, and of what the people of this Commonwealth think about the role we are playing.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Elbert W. Ockerman  
Secretary