

## COMMITTEE ON STUDENT EVALUATION AND PROMOTION

## MINUTES

JULY 25, 1984

**Note:****Dr. Goodman was there from the very beginning.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Drs. Bergen, Cavanaugh, Golden, Khodadad, Kubicka, Lange, Rosen, Rovick, Schaffner, Slayton, Von Roenn, West, Mr. Kloep and Rogers

EX OFFICIOS PRESENT: **Drs. Goodman,** Schuytema, Mr. Eckenfels and Ms. Ragin

MEMBERS ABSENT: Drs. Bruce, Cazares

GUESTS: Dr. Cheifetz

- I. The meeting was called to order at 12:00 Noon.
- II. The minutes were approved, with a few typographic corrections, as submitted by the secretary.
- III. Drs. Rosen and Schaffner requested that the proposed scheduling of meetings on the third Wednesday of every month be changed to the fourth Wednesday because of a conflict with a university-wide clinical rounds series. All the members present agreed with the change.
- IV. Dr. Henry Russe, Dean of Rush Medical College, addressed the committee and recommended they retain Dr. Robert Slayton as chairman to maintain continuity in the work the committee had began last year under his chairmanship.

Dr. Allen Rovick nominated Dr. Slayton to continue as chair with Dr. Charles Dinsmore as vice chair and asked the committee to confirm the nomination by proclamation. In addition, Dr. Rovick declared thanks to Dr. Slayton on behalf of all the members and asked that this declaration be entered in the record. The committee unanimously approved the nomination of Dr. Slayton as chairman for the 1984-85 academic year.

V.

Dean Eckenfels informed the committee that erroneous data were given for two students who were presented at the previous meeting, #84-3 and #84-9. The Dean's office felt these students should be presented again for reevaluation by the committee.

**\* Note:**

Susan Crifase received an illegal immunity from going before COSEP with her multiple failures. Dr. Goodman knew of this and allowed her to escape and continue her education as if she failed nothing. Martin Lewis on the other hand was forced to go before COSEP when he never should have! Dr. Goodman "knew" fellow white student Susan Crifase should have been here because she received more make-up exam's than the Make-Up Policy allowed! This is the cheating scheme Dr. Goodman is involved in putting a black student in a wrongful place where a undeserving white student deserved to be via the school make-up policy!

**Dr. Goodman's illegal racial preference for white students only has undermined the Make-Up Policy at RUSH.**

MARTIN  
LEWIS

Student #84-3 was presented first. Dean Eckenfels indicated that what had been missing from the student's record was the fact that although he/she had failed 12 of 13 courses as reported at the previous meeting, the student had passed 6 of the 8 makeup examinations he/she was allowed to take. It was the student's contention that because he/she had demonstrated that he/she could pass the required material on the makeups it was unfair to require him/her to retake those courses passed next year. If the committee agreed the student would be required to repeat the fall and winter quarter of physiology; the fall and winter quarter of biochemistry; winter quarter of behavioral science; and the spring quarter of microbiology. If this schedule was approved, the student might be able to take immunology and/or psychopathology from the second year curriculum.

Dr. Kubicka asked if the student was petitioning the committee in this regard. Dean Eckenfels responded that this was not the case, the student was simply being presented again based on the correct information.

Dr. Rosen pointed out that regardless of the makeups passed, the student still had six outstanding failures.

Dr. Schaffner, a new member, asked why a student who hadn't passed first year would be allowed to take second year courses. Dean Eckenfels explained that the committee allowed students on a split year to take some second year courses to give them the fullest schedule possible.

Dr. Kubicka asked if this student had been given the option to split the year when he/she failed all the courses at the end of the fall quarter. Dean Eckenfels indicated that had been the case but the student had refused that option.

Dr. Kubicka felt that this new information had very little to add to the previous decision reached by the committee namely that the student be required to take the entire first year over again as an alternative to dismissal.

Both Drs. Golden and Rosen reminded the committee that the new information did not change the situation; the student was subject to dismissal based on the outstanding failures accrued by the end of the academic year.

Dr. Lange, another new member, said she thought that if a student passed a makeup then the student received credit for the course. Dean Eckenfels informed her that the committee had the discretion to require a student to retake as many courses they felt necessary to demonstrate that he/she had met the minimum requirement of the medical school.

Dr. Rosen moved that the student be placed on probation, be required to repeat the entire first year, and be monitored at the end of each quarter, and, if the student failed any courses, a subcommittee be appointed to evaluate the student for dismissal.

Dr. Slayton asked the committee to consider that the student not be punished for not having split the year when he/she had an opportunity to do it in January. Dr. Rosen stated that the student continued to fail courses and this was the major concern of many of the committee members.

Dr. Schaffner asked about the student's scores on makeup exam. Dr. Schuytema did not have the scores.

The student was brought in to be allowed to address the committee.

Dr. Slayton informed him/her that the committee had not been persuaded by the new information to change their original recommendation.

Dr. Rosen asked the student for his/her justification for not having to take the entire first year over again.

The student felt that he/she should not have to retake course that he/she passed on makeup exams.

Dr. Rosen asked if the student had had an opportunity to take a makeup exam in all of the courses in which the student currently had a grade of F.

The student replied that he had not been allowed to take a makeup in four of the six courses because of the policy of being able to take no more than two makeup exams per quarter. Again the student reiterated his/her contention that he/she should not be required to retake courses already passed.

Dr. Golden pointed out that the committee's major concern was for the student to demonstrate the competency required to become a qualified physician.

Dean Eckenfels also pointed out that the original deliberation was on the basis of the fact that the six outstanding failures made the student subject to dismissal and this was an important consideration in the committee's deliberations.

The student challenged the notion that these were outstanding failures because he/she had not been allowed to take a makeup in four of them. The student referred to p. 39 of the University Bulletin which states that an outstanding failure "... is a failure which remains after a student has not passed a course's single makeup examination."

Dean Eckenfels pointed out that according to the revised rules a failure that can not be made up because a student can only take two makeups is considered an outstanding failure at the end of the academic year.

The student referred to COSEP minutes that recommended that a student who was within 1.5 standard deviations of the mean would be given the opportunity to take a makeup.

Dean Eckenfels informed the student that recommendation had not, as yet, been approved by the Faculty Council.

The student informed the committee that most of these outstanding failures were within only a few points of the minimum pass level.

Dr. Schaffner asked what scores the student received on the makeups. The student did not have those scores.

The student's final comment pertained to taking second year courses while completing first year requirements which he/she felt he/she was entitled to.

The student also asked the committee to consider giving him/her an opportunity to take makeup courses over the summer.

After the student left, Dr. Rosen asked if students were given the option to do remedial work over the summer.

Dean Eckenfels indicated that the opportunity to take examinations over the summer was at the discretion of COSEP and was decided on an individual case basis.

Dr. Rosen asked if the student had actually failed 12 of 13 courses during the academic year. Dr. Schuytema confirmed that was the case.

Dr. Rovick read from the policy and procedures that Section 71 stated that remedial work was to be required on the basis of the seriousness of the situation and, "... such requirements may include, but need not be limited to:

- Summer tutorial study with reexamination.
- Participation in an approved summer course.
- Retaking failed courses during the next academic year.
- Retaking all courses including those satisfactorily passed.

In developing requirements, COSEP will consider the needs of the individual student and will endeavor to develop a program which, if successfully completed, will strengthen the student's prospects for successfully completing the remainder of his/her college program."

Dean Eckenfels restated for the record that the reason this student's case had been presented a second time was simply because all of the correct information hadn't been presented at the last meeting.

Dr. Slayton asked for the committee's vote on the motion for the student to repeat all the first year courses as proposed by Dr. Rosen.

The vote was 9 in favor and 5 opposed.

The next case was student #84-9 who also had incorrect information presented at the previous meeting.

TO: Committee on Student Evaluation  
and Promotion

DATE: July 24, 1985

FROM: Roger P. Zimmerman, Ph.D.  
James M. Kerns, Ph.D.  
Course Directors, Neurobiology 451

SUBJECT: Performance of  
Mr. Martin Lewis in  
Neurobiology 451, 1984-85

Mr. Lewis' grades are compared to the class average and standard deviation in the table below.

Comments:

1. The course grade is calculated as 60% of the final grade plus 40% of the midterm grade. The final is cumulative; both midterm and final exams include multiple choice and identification (fill-in-the-blank) questions.
2. Mr. Lewis' grades in both years reflect a consistent level of performance throughout the quarter.

TABLE I

	<u>Midterm 84</u>	<u>Final 84</u>	<u>Course 84</u>	<u>Midterm 85</u>	<u>Final 85</u>	<u>Course 85</u>
Mr. Lewis	66.0% (1.2SD below)	54.0% (1.3 SD below)	58.8% (1.36 SD below)	55.5% (2.2 SD below)	42.0% (2.4 SD below)	47.4% (2.63 SD below)
Class Average	81.0%	68.4%	73.4%	75.8%	68.9%	7.16%
Standard Deviation	12.4	11.1	10.7	9.2	11.09	9.2
Pass Level	-	-	57%	-	-	58%

3. Mr. Lewis' grades were passing, but barely, in 1984. His grades in 1985 were substantially below the pass level.
4. The tests used in 1984 and 1985 were similar. The easiest measures to compare are the class average, standard deviations and reliability of the multiple choice portions of the midterm and final exams.

TABLE II

	<u>Class average</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Reliability</u>
Midterm 1984	43.4 (79.0%)	6.05	0.79
Midterm 1985	38.8 (73.2%)	5.06	0.68
Final 1984	53.0 (66.3%)	9.15	0.82
Final 1985	55.2 (69.9%)	8.85	0.82

Conclusion: There were no obvious changes in exam reliability or overall student performance that might explain Mr. Lewis' consistently poorer performance in 1985.

5. Mr. Lewis has demonstrated, at best, marginal competence in Neurobiology 451. However, we feel that the Pass grade earned in 1984 should stand. If the sequence were reversed, with a failure in '84 and a marginal pass in '85, the outcome would be passing Neurobiology, based on the principle that a single pass grade, not best two out of three, is sufficient.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger P. Zimmerman



James M. Kerns



\* Note:

These two course directors thought it was wrong to have Martin Lewis' 1984 pass grade not count as passing. They wrote this letter to COSEP in support of Martin Lewis but Dr. Goodman being on the board of COSEP, had no problem allowing Martin to be dismissed in spite of passing grades and his teachers fighting to keep him in school.

Dr. Goodman "knew the truth" and didn't care then and "doesn't care now"!