

Evaluations Are Studied Again

By Cliff Eshbach
Staff Writer

At the end of each term, the students at Capitol Campus are asked to fill out a form and answer a few questions concerning the evaluation of their course and their instructor. However, in the past few months, a move to develop the evaluations into a University-wide form has been under study, according to Scott Deardorff, student government association president. Deardorff is chairman of the Council of Branch Campuses and he has appointed a committee to

investigate the possibility of a University wide evaluation form.

One of the advantages of such a form would be that administrators of the Commonwealth Campuses would be able to compare professors from one campus with professors from another.

Currently, the evaluations are being used by the administration concerning possible promotions, tenure and salary. The faculty uses the evaluations as a self-evaluation of their course

and themselves.

The evaluations are currently being run by the administration. In previous years, the evaluations were run first by the students, later by the faculty.

One of the proposals confronting the committee is the possibility of omitting two questions that appear on the form. The two questions are: the overall course rating and the overall instructor rating. Adding questions hasn't been considered, but the Engineering

Department has been adding questions concerning the engineering labs.

Possibly the most important questions the committee is faced with are whether the students are taking the evaluations seriously, and when is the proper time to administer the evaluations.

President Deardorff indicates that the most helpful questions on the evaluation are the essay questions at the end of the evaluation,

where the answers seem to provide the most constructive criticism.

Deardorff says he feels the students will accept the evaluations more seriously if members of the Student Government Association are asked to go into each of the classes and explain the reasons why the evaluations are vital to the University. After all, he says, this is one way students can voice their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a course or instructor.

The Capitol Campus Reader

Vol. 5 No. 6

Capitol Campus Penn State University

January 22, 1976

Eggs-tra! Co-op Progresses

By Virginia Lehman
Staff Writer

What happened to the Capitol Campus Co-op? Students around the campus may wonder what turn of events the co-op has been taking. The co-op is alive and ready to begin serving the campus by providing "good quality merchandise for cheaper prices". And that means eggs!

The co-op met with student resistance by charging a prepayment fee to join the co-op. Therefore, the decision was made to begin by selling large fresh eggs. The system to purchase the eggs would be setting up two separate times to order the eggs. On the pick-up day, once again, two time periods would be arranged.

After the co-op is able to collect some funds and gain student support, the itemized food list will be expanded. These products will be purchased from wholesalers enabling the co-op to sell groceries at cheaper prices than the local stores.

Time has been the major consequence of starting the Capitol Campus Co-Op. Concerned students donated their time and personal expenses in getting the co-op started in business. Contacting other co-ops and solving legal barriers has taken a term of hard work to solve these deterrents.

The Co-op was required to meet federal government requirements in relation to accepting food stamps. They also purchased a wholesale license and a cigarette license. The last item that will allow the co-op to begin business is insurance coverage. These requirements took a great deal of indepth research and seeking legal reference to begin the co-op within the limits of the law.



Dr. Susan Richman, assistant professor of mathematics, is chairman of the Faculty Council.

"Get Your Grades Up" Says Faculty Council

By John E. Stanchak, Assistant Editor

On January 14th, after a riproaring hour of debate, the Capitol Campus Faculty Council decided unanimously on a standard procedure for dropping grade-deficient students from the University.

The meeting was presided over by Prof. Susan Richman and attended by representatives of all the various academic programs here at Capitol.

Their action was taken at the request of the Special Senate Committee on Student Rules and R.E. Larson, University Provost.

This request was received by them through a memo from Larson which stated:

"I have received a memorandum from T.E. Daubert, Chairman of the Special Senate Committee on Student Rules. In the Memorandum, Professor Daubert indicates that the list of the differences and exceptions between the general Senate policies and those of Capitol Campus, as listed in my memorandum of July 18, 1975, to Sally S.

Small, are scheduled for presentation to the Senate in February or March. All of the changes except one have been incorporated in the Committee's final report.

I quote directly from Professor Daubert's memorandum to me:

'Rule P-24 states that academic warning is given for a deficiency of six (6) or more grade points while Rule N-4 defines grade point deficiency. In your letter of July 18 it is not clear how many unit-deficiencies would be necessary at Capitol Campus to constitute a warning. Since a unit is approximately four (4) credits, I would assume that a unit-deficiency of two (2) or more would be applicable (6 + 4 = 1.5---2.0). However we need to know the correct interpretation to complete our work. In addition, the definition of a unit should be included.'

I would appreciate your consulting with the Faculty Council and providing me with a response to Professor Daubert's inquiry as soon as possible."

After deciphering the memo, the council decided all students are to maintain a 2.0 overall cumulative grade average.

The first time the student's average falls below the 2.0 minimum, he or she will receive a letter warning of their precarious academic position.

If in a following semester the average again falls below 2.0, the student will receive another letter, worded more strongly.

This letter will state that if the student's average does not rise above the 2.0 mark soon, a meeting will be called to determine the wisdom of the student staying on at the Capitol Campus.

Although many students assumed these rules to be in effect previously, they had not in reality been official. And, in fact, according to Dr. Nancy Tischler there may have been one or two cases in the past were students had graduated from the Capitol Campus with less than the now official minimum average.

Penn PIRG Questions Answered

By John Lierzapf
Staff Writer

Two weeks ago, this reporter learned from several sources that Penn PIRG is about to try another organizational campaign at Penn State.

What is Penn PIRG? It stands for Public Interest Research Group. It will be used to investigate environmental, consumer and student issues. For example, the Minnesota PIRG has lobbied extensively for tighter control of pesticide use in the state.

Who runs Penn PIRG? Penn PIRG is run by students under the guidance of professional men and women paid for from organizational funds. Ralph Nader, founder of PIRG's, lends guidance to the organization.

WHO pays for Penn PIRG and how are its funds collected? Students will pay for it at a proposed rate of two dollars a term and the university will become the collection agency.

PIRG organizers propose a "negative check-off plan" to collect funds. Each student will pay the two dollar fee as part of the tuition, but you will be able to collect a refund if you do not wish to support the organization.

The university favors a "positive check-off plan". Under this plan the student decides whether the university will collect the two dollars.

Sometime in the near future, it is possible that Capitol Campus will be visited by a PIRG representative asking you to sign a petition of support. Think about it. Ask questions about what your money will be used for. Organizers of Penn PIRG expect to raise approximately \$270,000 dollars under its "negative check-off plan". That's a lot of money.