

DOCUMENTS AND MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY
AND
DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of November 19, 1984, published below, have been prepared for the immediate use of the members of the University Council and are included in its Documents and Proceedings. They are also included in the Documents and Minutes of the General Faculty for the information of the members.

H. Paul Kelley
H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The General Faculty

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING OF NOVEMBER 19, 1984

The third regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1984-1985 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, November 19, 1984, at 2:15 p.m. In the absence of President Peter T. Flawn, Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies William S. Livingston presided.

ATTENDANCE.

Present: Simon J. Bernau, F. Stefan Bertram, Lowell J. Bethel, Julie H. Bichteler, Harold W. Billings, Shirley F. Binder, R. H. Bing, Allen H. Bizzell, David L. Bourell, J. Harold Box, Thomas D. Boyd, Robert E. Boyer, Billye J. Brown, Ronald M. Brown, Ben H. Caudle, Coby C. Chase, Kathleen F. Conlin, Wm. H. Cunningham, Wayne A. Danielson, James T. Doluisio, James Duban, Wm. C. Duesterhoeft, Jr., Betty S. Flowers, Gerhard J. Fonken, G. Charles Franklin, Diane M. Friday, Alan W. Friedman, Earnest F. Gloyna, Vickie L. Hampton, Thomas M. Hatfield, Ira Iscoe, Robert C. Jeffrey, H. Paul Kelley, Lorrin G. Kennamer, Robert D. King, George B. Kitto, J. Parker Lamb, Clarence G. Lasby, Joan I. Lidoff, William S. Livingston, Ernest L. Lundelius, Jr., Jane C. Marcus, Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr., Trey Monsour, Jack Otis, David M. Rabban, Alice R. Redland, Walter L. Reed, Bonnie Rickelman, Ramon Saldivar, Diane L. Schallert, Max R. Sherman, RoseAnn L. Shorey, Charles A. Sorber, Ron D. Stutes, H. Eldon Sutton, James W. Vick, Darren C. Walker, Elaine S. Waller, Claire E. Weinstein, Philip L. White, J. Robert Wills, Lewis R. Wiman, Robert E. Witt.

Absent: Edwin B. Allaire, Lear L. Ashmore (excused), Mark B. Baker, Gerard H. Behague (excused), Terrell Blodgett, Randall J. Charbeneau (excused), James H. Colvin, Peter T. Flawn (excused), Gaylord A. Jentz, Eleanor W. Jordan, Rodney L. Schlosser (excused), James H. Sledd (excused), Waneen W. Spirduso (excused), Kathleen J. Waddell (excused), Martha S. Williams, Ronald E. Wyllys (excused), Mark G. Yudof.

Total members present: 64 Total members absent: 17

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 17, 1984 (D&P 9802-9807; 15718-15723). (APPROVED)

The Minutes of the regular University Council meeting of September 17, 1984, (D&P 9802-9807; 15718-15723) were APPROVED as distributed.

(The regular meeting of October 15, 1984, was cancelled; hence there were no Minutes to be approved.)

II. SECRETARY'S REPORT (D&P 9824-9830).

Secretary H. Paul Kelley (Educational Psychology) had nothing to add to the already-circulated Secretary's Report.

III. DISCUSSION OF SECRETARY'S REPORT -- NONE.

IV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

Alan W. Friedman (English) had submitted in advance the following questions to the President:

More and more departments in the University are hiring faculty at the level of Lecturer or Specialist, positions that are defined by the Regents' Rules as "non-tenure accruing." This practice is now causing some confusion, for these two positions are used in markedly different and even conflicting ways by different departments, schools, and colleges. The name Lecturer, for instance, can mean someone who has a full-time job outside U.T. Austin but who is teaching a course in his or her professional speciality at the University; someone who has the doctorate, a master's degree, or no graduate degree at all; someone who is teaching lower-division courses part-time or someone who is teaching virtually the same courses as full-time Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors; someone who has been at the University only a short time and who does not expect to stay, or someone who has been at the University for six years or longer, and who expects to stay indefinitely.

I would very much appreciate your views regarding the situations in which the hiring of Lecturers may or may not be appropriate for U.T. Austin. Undoubtedly, the use of the Lecturer position is appropriate in some circumstances, but in what numbers should U.T. Austin make such appointments? In the U.T. Austin English Department, for instance, 40% of the faculty is Lecturers, and they teach 50% of all undergraduate courses. Although these percentages may not be replicated throughout the University, there is a large dependence on Lecturers in those fields that are already the most economically depressed -- namely, the humanities and the languages. Specifically, there does seem to be a danger, at least in certain departments, that Lecturers and Specialists are being used in positions that should be filled by tenured and tenure-track faculty. The danger could threaten the system of tenure and the academic freedom that is essential to the quality of intellectual life in the University. Do you have any specific plans that will address the continuing and increasing use of Lecturers at U.T. Austin? While a long-term solution is being sought, would you support a University-wide moratorium or "cap" on the number of Lecturers hired, so that at least the problem will not increase while we try to resolve it?

Vice President Livingston read President Flawn's statement in response to Mr. Friedman's questions:

We appoint Lecturers and Senior Lecturers to fill our needs for instructional service. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are hired for specific teaching assignments. They are not expected to conduct research or scholarly work or to provide public service.

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are employed in almost every academic department on the campus. In Spring 1984, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers comprised approximately 16 percent of the faculty (headcount: 355 out of a total of 2,300; does not include TA's or AI's) and were employed in 57 different departments. As with all new faculty recruitment and hiring, the process to hire Lecturers and Senior Lecturers is initiated by the departmental faculty and is essentially a faculty and college/dean decision. In general, these non-tenure track faculty meet teaching requirements necessitated by enrollment increases, faculty leaves or other unanticipated faculty vacancies; or provide instruction in large service area courses or highly specialized areas where, in the judgment of the departmental faculty and the dean, Lecturers provide a useful dimension to departmental resources. In short, Lecturers are a way to meet changing instructional needs without making commitments that would diminish our capability to deal with change.

The appointment of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, as well as Specialists and other non-tenure track faculty, provides flexibility. These appointments do not represent any threat to the tenure system. While we monitor the number of new Lecturers and Senior Lecturers hired each year, as well as the number of new hires in all the other academic ranks, it should remain the primary responsibility of the faculties of the departments and the deans to make specific hiring decisions within their established resources. I have no plans to change this. Accordingly, I would not support a University-wide moratorium or cap on the number of new Lecturers or Senior Lecturers hired, just as I would not support a University-wide moratorium or cap on the number of Specialists, Visiting Professors, or Adjunct faculty hired.

There was no discussion of President Flawn's statement.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS -- NONE.

VI. PETITIONS -- NONE.

VII. OLD BUSINESS.

A. PROPOSAL TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY TO APPROVE 1984-1985 DEGREE CANDIDATES (D&P 9819). (APPROVED)

Secretary Kelley said that this was a routine annual motion which would have come before the Council at its October meeting had that meeting not been cancelled. He then MOVED that, in accordance with the rules approved by the Board of Regents, the authority of the faculty to approve degree candidates for the academic year September 1, 1984, to August 31, 1985, be delegated to the respective deans. The motion was seconded and APPROVED without discussion.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS.

A. RECOMMENDATIONS TO CHANGE THE GRADING SCALE AND GRADE-POINT SYSTEM (D&P 9809). (DEFEATED)

In the absence of Rodney Schlosser (Student Representative), President of the Students' Association, the following recommendations

were presented by Diane M. Friday (Student Representative, Students' Association):

Recommendation I: That the undergraduate system as currently defined by the 1984-1985 General Information Bulletin be amended to read: The grading system at The University of Texas at Austin is one in which the following grades and grade-point values are used:

A+=4.0 B+=3.3 C+=2.3 D+=1.3

A =4.0 B =3.0 C =2.0 D =1.0 F=0.0

A-=3.7 B-=2.7 C-=1.7 D-=0.7

Recommendation II: That the student's official academic record and official transcripts of that record show both letter grades and any plus or minus symbols which accompanied them on the official grade reports received by the Registrar.

Recommendation III: That the grade-point values approved in Recommendation I above for letter grades with plus and minus symbols be used in all grade-point average computations by U.T. Austin.

Recommendation IV: That the editor of Official Publications be authorized to change the wording of the General Information Bulletin and other official publications to conform in meaning with the recommendations approved above.

Recommendation V: That the effective date of these changes be the date of the next edition of the General Information Bulletin published after the final approval of these recommendations and the preparation of the procedures necessary to implement them.

[In November, 1984, the Students' Association had sent to each member of the University Council a detailed statement in support of the recommendations. A copy of that statement is reproduced as ATTACHMENT A to these Minutes (D&M 15744-15755; D&P 9861-9872).]

Ms. Friday noted that the recommendations were identical to the proposals that were approved by the Council in 1979 and subsequently vetoed by President Lorene Rogers. "In our most current efforts to pass these ideas, they have gone through the Student Senate, they received the unanimous approval of the Educational Policy Committee, and in a straw vote ... the Faculty Senate at the last meeting ... approved the proposal as well." Ms. Friday then MOVED the adoption of the five recommendations, and her motion was seconded.

Simon J. Bernau (Mathematics), confirmed "that the Educational Policy Committee, of which I am Chairman, has already seen this proposal, and after some discussion (which ranged from highly enthusiastic to, in one case, slightly negative) ... did endorse the concept of plus/minus grading."

Allen H. Bizzell (Business Administration) spoke against the proposal on both philosophical and operational grounds. "While I understand some of the reasons underlying the students' desire to pass this proposal, I do not believe it is the best alternative that they could have presented to us. In a way, it seems to lend precision to a process that is currently, I think, illogical -- certainly convoluted, if we consider what happens. I asked a large number of my colleagues how they go about the grading process, and invariably they start with a numeric

scale -- most of them 0-100 -- which they are forced to convert into a five-point alphabetic system without any standards as to what numbers equal what grades. Those letter grades are then converted back to a different numeric scale [0-4] by the University, which we in turn average to 3 decimal places.... Clearly the process does not have that precision because of how it starts.

"I think this proposal would increase the number of boundaries for differences without an increase in the precision of standards, and I think it would result in more points of contention between students and faculty.

"At the operational level I have two concerns: (1) As I understand it from discussions in the Faculty Senate and from discussions with students, the proposal would, in fact, be optional with the faculty member. If that is true, I believe that creates a dual grading system in the University, or at least a system within a system. I do not believe that is desirable; I believe it creates not only additional points of contention between students and faculty, but also perhaps among faculty. (2) In addition, I believe there has been incomplete articulation of the interface with other subsystems of the University that are driven by the grade-point [average]. For example, the standard of continuance at the University specifies that a 2.0 is [required] to be in good standing at the University. Under the proposal, a C- is less than 2.0, and a student [with a C- average] would be subject to dismissal. Similar contradictions occur, for example, if we look at the way transfer grades from other institutions are evaluated by [the Office of] Admissions; [that evaluation] is based on a 2.0 [or] 2.5 being acceptable, and in some cases students who have pluses and minuses at other schools might not be admissible here when they are admissible now.

"In summary, I would hope that other alternatives would be considered -- perhaps a strictly numeric grading system, and that at least we will not adopt this proposal until we have considered all the ramifications."

Jack Otis (Social Work) said that he already uses the proposed grading system, "so I have ... leaned in favor of the proposal from the student University Council delegates. Also I have been in favor of it, in part, because it seemed to me that the students were in favor of it. But this morning I received a communication from the Senior Cabinet (and I assume that all of the University Council members received that communication) in which they state that on November 8 the Senior Cabinet voted 16-1 against having their University Council delegates vote in favor of the proposal for plus/minus grading.... [They listed] about a page and a quarter of reasons for objecting to the recommendations. I would appreciate it if the student University Council delegates would comment on this apparent schism between the [Students' Association and the Senior Cabinet]."

Coby C. Chase (Student Representative), Chairman of the Senior Cabinet, stated that the Senior Cabinet, which consists of the presidents of all the College Councils, had not worked with the Students' Association to present the recommendations. When they were brought to the Cabinet, its members had voted 16-1 against approving them. On November 15, the Cabinet had sent to each University Council member a letter detailing the bases for the Cabinet's opposition. [A copy of that letter is reproduced as ATTACHMENT B to these Minutes (D&M 15756; D&P 9873).] In response to further questions from Mr. Otis, Mr. Chase indicated that, although there had been communication between the two groups, at the time the recommendations had been submitted to the University Council the Students' Association had not known about the Senior Cabinet opposition.

Trey Monsour (Student Representative), Vice President of the Students' Association, said that the members of the Senior Cabinet had

not consulted the College Councils before voting against the recommendations, hence the vote simply reflected the opinion of the members of the Cabinet who were present at the time of the vote. He thought that those members were merely a vocal minority, because a valid student survey had indicated that 54% of the students were in favor of plus/minus grading while only 38% were not in favor of it.

Dean Lorrin Kenamer (Education) spoke against the recommendations. He pointed out "that the letter grade A does not get the benefit of a plus.... But that is not the main reason I am against it. I am against it for all of those previous reasons mentioned and for the excellent presentation by the Senior Cabinet...."

Ernest L. Lundelius, Jr. (Geological Sciences) also spoke against the proposal. "I think the letter that was circulated by the Senior Cabinet is a pretty good statement of why this should not be adopted. I have not felt strongly about this until fairly recently, but I have enough trouble making breaks between A, B, C, D, and F, and I frankly would hate to subject myself to any more soul-searching to split it any finer. I think we are kidding ourselves if we think our grading is that precise. The other thing [is that there are] going to be even more points of contention between students and faculty. I think we have got enough now; I do not want to see any more. I tend not to give very much in these negotiations on grades, but I hate to just tell a student, 'No, I have made up my mind; you take it or leave it.' [The adoption of this proposal would] mean for me and for many students, I think, more time that is spent in negotiations which are not likely to be particularly fruitful...."

Ms. Friday responded to several issues raised in the Senior Cabinet's letter. "I fail to see how a plus/minus system discriminates against students who are on the G.I. Bill. Also, ... perhaps I just did not realize that the arbitrariness of our current grading is [intended] to allow students to slip through on bad semesters; I thought that grades were supposed to reflect their actual performance. I also think that it is an asset to the system that professors who find this system particularly distasteful are able to continue using a straight A, B, C, D system; I think that professors have their own methods of determining grades anyway, and that the fact that some people use pluses and minuses and some do not is really not going to make a whole lot of difference. With that in mind I [would like to add the following recommendation to the five that are included in my original motion]:

Recommendation VI: That faculty members may use the plus and minus symbols set forth in Recommendation I according to their discretion, and that faculty members have the option of maintaining a grading scale which does not incorporate plus and minus symbols.

"I hope that that allays some of your fears, perhaps, about faculty members who think that they are going to have more 'grade grubbing' or that ... do not think that their grading system conforms to a plus/minus system."

With the permission of the seconder, Recommendation VI was incorporated into Ms. Friday's motion.

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) spoke against the motion containing Recommendation VI. He believed that there should be one grading system University-wide. He also did not find a 54% student majority persuasive enough to change a whole grading system. Mr. Lundelius also spoke against a dual grading system; he believed that the system should be all one way or the other.

Wayne A. Danielson (Journalism) pointed out that "we have faculty now who do not use the grading system we have. Now ... some people ... are A, B, and C graders; some people are A, B, C, and D graders.... I do

not see anything really dangerous in that. The place where I think that this proposal could have some value, perhaps, will be in the graduate grades, where the present grades are so restricted; we almost see all the graduate grades coming out just A's and B's. A little more distinction on the record, although not in the grade-point average, on those transcripts might be of use to graduate studies committees."

Ms. Friday stated: "It was implicit when this motion was [initially proposed] that faculty members could choose to use it or not use it.... In my conversation with faculty members since the [last] Faculty Senate meeting, this was raised as a concern, though, and I wanted to [add Recommendation VI] to make sure that no faculty member could be penalized for not feeling that the pluses or minuses actually conformed to the way that he or she gave grades.

"I would like to present this ... in a ... different light. I think that [you tend] to take a new grading system and apply it to the grades that you have given in the past and say, 'What would those grades have been if I had given pluses and minuses?' I would prefer that you look at it as an incentive system for your students. If our foremost goal is to encourage education, you ought to establish a system that presents rewards for students for every level of achievement they attain.... If you have a plus and a minus [system], the student has an incentive to keep his performance up to the best that he can."

A vote was then taken on the original proposal as modified to include Recommendation VI. The motion was DEFEATED by a voice vote.

B. RESOLUTION CONCERNING DISTINGUISHED SPEAKERS/VISITORS (D&P 9814). (AUGMENTED AND APPROVED)

Darren C. Walker (Student Representative) had circulated in advance the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The presentation of distinguished speakers/visitors enhances the academic environment at The University of Texas at Austin, and

WHEREAS, Exposure to and interaction with distinguished speakers/visitors is critical to the intellectual growth of students, faculty and staff at The University of Texas at Austin, and

WHEREAS, The number of distinguished lecturers speaking on campus has decreased annually in recent years, and

WHEREAS, Speakers' fees and honoraria for distinguished lecturers have increased tremendously in recent years,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That this body charge the University Public Lectures Committee with:

- (1) Identifying new funding sources to increase the quantity and quality of speakers coming to U.T. Austin,
- (2) Evaluating the means by which the Public Lectures Committee publicizes its existence and purpose,
- (3) Evaluating the need for a more centralized process for choosing distinguished speakers/visitors, and
- (4) Identifying new means of coordinating publicity for distinguished speakers/visitors.

In support of the resolution, Mr. Walker said that there needed to be increased awareness of existing funds that go unused each year and that there needed to be a coordinated effort to acquire new funding sources. Mr. Walker then added into the resolution a section (5), as shown below:

- (5) The Chairman of the University Public Lectures Committee should report its findings to the University Council by March 18, 1985.

Mr. Walker then MOVED the adoption of the resolution as agumented, and it was seconded and APPROVED by voice vote without discussion. [A copy of the resolution as approved by the Council appears as ATTACHMENT C to these Minutes (D&M 15757; D&P 9874).]

C. PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR MEETINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL IN 1985-1986 (D&P 9815). (APPROVED)

Without discussion, the Council seconded and APPROVED the proposed 1985-1986 meeting schedule, shown below, which had been moved by Secretary Kelley:

The University Council will meet in Main Building, Room 212, on the following dates; all meetings will be at 2:15 p.m.:

*Monday, September 23, 1985	Monday, March 17, 1986
Monday, October 21, 1985	Monday, April 21, 1986
Monday, November 18, 1985	**Monday, May 12, 1986
**Monday, December 9, 1985	Monday, June 16, 1986
Monday, January 20, 1986	Monday, July 21, 1986
Monday, February 17, 1986	Monday, August 18, 1986

*This date is one week later than usual.

**This date is one week earlier than usual. (The Deans Council will meet at 10:00 a.m. in order to avoid conflict with the University Council meeting.)

D. REQUEST FOR AN INVESTIGATION AND REPORT BY THE PARKING AND TRAFFIC POLICIES COMMITTEE (D&P 9816). (AMENDED AND APPROVED)

Diane M. Friday (Student Representative) made the following motion:

The University Council requests that the Parking and Traffic Policies Committee investigate the following issues and report its findings to the Council by February, 1985:

1. Students are now required to remove their cars from University parking lots surrounding Memorial Stadium prior to home football games. The Committee is asked to examine the real advantages of that practice and the options that are available to reduce the logistical problems that this practice causes for students.

2. Students have been told that the number of "C" parking spaces will be maintained during the construction of the new University parking garage. The Committee is asked to verify that those spaces will be maintained and to identify and report their location.

Ms. Friday commented on the problems created for students by the policy which requires cars to be removed from parking lots near Memorial Stadium prior to home football games. "You can imagine the problems that presents for students when they have to move their cars on Saturday

morning and there is no transportation to get back to school. It also occurred to us that if they are moving their cars within walking distance of the University they are only displacing other parking spaces for people who are attending football games. We just want to look into the options. The other issue has to do with the construction of the new parking garage and maintaining the C spaces that students were assured would be done in the past; we want to make sure that that actually happens."

The motion was seconded.

Thomas D. Boyd (Art) noted that the parking lots in question include lots "other than those for C permits; I wonder if these parking lots should not also be placed under consideration. Students are not the only members of the University community who desire access to parking in this area of campus for non-football purposes on Saturdays." Mr. Boyd then MOVED that the motion be amended to extend the inquiry to all parking lots in proximity to Memorial Stadium. The amendment was seconded and then ADOPTED by voice vote without discussion.

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) said: "The second part [of the motion] suggests that the students had been told by someone, I am not sure by whom, that the spaces will be maintained during construction, and the committee [is being] asked to verify something that somebody told the students.... I do not think that the Parking Committee is responsible for seeing to it that whoever told the students that [the spaces will be maintained] keeps [his or her] word; I think that is an unfair burden to put on the Parking Committee." Mr. McDaniel then MOVED that Item 2 be deleted, and the motion to delete was seconded. Without further discussion the motion to delete was ADOPTED by voice vote.

The original motion, as amended, was then ADOPTED by a voice vote. [A copy of the motion as approved by the Council appears as ATTACHMENT D to these Minutes (D&M 15758; D&P 9875).]

E. AMENDMENTS TO THE PROVISIONAL ADMISSION PROGRAM SECTION OF THE GENERAL INFORMATION BULLETIN, 1984-1985 (D&P 9817-9818). (APPROVED)

As Chairman of the Educational Policy Committee, Simon J. Bernau (Mathematics) presented the following two proposals:

Proposal 1. Amend Item 2 of the Provisional admission program section on page 38 of the General Information Bulletin, 1984-1985, as indicated below:

2. Every student who enters the University under the provisional admission program will be required to register for four courses for a total of at least twelve semester hours.

~~[One of these courses must be English. The specific course will be determined by the Department of English on the basis of the student's performance on a placement examination.]~~

All students must register for English 306 unless they already have credit for English 306 or qualify for credit on the basis of a placement examination.

The remaining three or four courses must be chosen from at least three of the following four groups:

Group I	Foreign Language	
Group II	Mathematics	
Group III	Anthropology	History
	Classics	Linguistics
	Economics	Philosophy
	Geography	Psychology
	Government	Sociology
Group IV	Astronomy	Geology
	Biology	Microbiology
	Botany	Physics
	Chemistry	Zoology
	Computer Sciences	

A provisionally admitted student will be required to register according to the published schedule and to participate in an orientation program at the time of registration.

Proposal 2. Amend Item 4 of the Provisional admission program section on page 39 of the General Information Bulletin, 1984-1985, as indicated below:

4. The provisionally admitted student who achieves a grade-point average between 1.5 and 2.0 in twelve semester hours or more taken during the summer session (both summer terms) or spring semester will be allowed to continue for the next semester or summer session immediately following in order to attempt to achieve a cumulative grade-point average of 2.0; such a student must again select twelve semester hours of courses as provided in item 2 above. Repeating a course other than English 306 will require express written permission from the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Students who fail this second attempt to achieve a cumulative 2.0 grade-point average will be dismissed from the University and readmitted only on the basis of an acceptable transfer record from one or more other accredited colleges or universities.

Mr. Bernau said that the proposals were intended to tidy up the administration of the provisional admission program. With regard to Proposal 1, "currently students coming in under provisional admission have to register for four courses, a total of at least 12 hours. The description in the GIB simply requires that one course should be in English, and then goes on to say that the English Department will determine which course that should be. The current situation is that the only English course for which these students are now eligible is English 306, and we simply want to change the GIB to reflect that, so that they will in fact choose this course...." Mr. Bernau then MOVED that Proposal 1 be adopted, and his motion was seconded and ADOPTED unanimously by voice vote without discussion.

Mr. Bernau said: "Proposal 2 is to deal with students who fail to make the 2.0 GPA on their first try at provisional admission, but by virtue of making a 1.5 are entitled to a second shot at bringing their overall GPA up to a 2.0. The present policy ... does not allow a [provisional admission] student to repeat a course under any circumstances whatever, but ... the choice of courses must still conform to the [requirements]. For students who might be continuing [on provisional admission for a second semester and] who passed the English course, there is now no [second] English course available, so we need to allow such a student not to take an English course. And occasionally, when a student

has perhaps tried something a little bit less than minimal but only managed to make a D, it seems desirable to include the flexibility to allow the student to repeat [that] course. So the effect of the proposal is that ... a student continuing in this way [who has] not passed the English course will have to repeat it; if [a student has] passed the English course, then [he/she] will be in a situation of choosing four courses out of the other groups; and if the Dean [of the College of] Liberal Arts deems it appropriate, then a student may be allowed to repeat a course rather than have to take something different." Mr. Bernau then MOVED that Proposal 2 be approved, and the motion was seconded and ADOPTED unanimously by voice vote without discussion.

IX. REMAINING QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT -- NONE.

X. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m. The next meeting of the University Council is scheduled for Monday, December 10, 1984, at 10:00 a.m. in Main Building 212.