

# 'Kepros' marking system studied at SRC meeting

By DERWIN GOWAN

A lively discussion on the Kepros marking system was held at Monday night's SRC meeting. On hand to explain the system to councillors were H.A. Sharp, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Student Standings and Promotions; D.C. Blue, University Registrar, and Peter Kepros, who chaired the committee which had

the responsibility of examining different marking systems. Blue spoke first, explaining the markings of the proposed system, and how it came about. Blue said that, in 1971, the Faculty of Arts decided that a letter grading system was better than a percentage system. They also felt that "failed credits" averages should be instituted.

However, this was not accepted by the Senate, so a sub-committee was appointed, chaired by Kepros. This committee suggested a letter grade and grade-point system. There would be five letters, with a corresponding to what is now first division, B as second division, C as most of the third division, D as a borderline cases, and F for a failure. B and C would correspond to the average student.

The Faculty of Science went on record as wanting more points, suggesting A plus, A, A minus, B plus, etc.

Finally it was decided that the pluses and minuses would be shown, but would have no effect on the calculation of the grade-point average.

Blue said grade-points would be awarded on the basis of A equal 4, B equal 3, C equal 2, D equal 1, and F equal 0.

Credit hours would also be given for each course. Most courses would have either 3 or 6 credit hours. The total number of grade-points given for a course is the number of grade-points corresponding to a particular letter times the number of credit hours in the course. The grade-point average would be the number of grade points awarded divided by the number of credit hours attempted. Blue also said that credit hours and grade-points are carried over from one year to the next.

In taking the grade-point average to two decimal figures, some people have claimed too many significant figures have been used. However, Blue said that the grade-point average is a code or an index of a student's performance in terms of letters, and is not an average. He stated that two decimal places are needed to get a reasonably accurate indicator.

Blue said the reason for using letters as well as the digits was simply convention. He said most

other universities on this system were using letters and numbers both.

When Roy Neale contended that he had read articles where the movement is away from the grade-point system and "pass-fail" systems, Sharp contended that this was not a pass-fail system. Sharp also stated that the pass-fail system should not be instituted here, since we have a fairly open admission policy. He said that the pass-fail system was primarily used in highly specialized and technical schools where there are highly restrictive entrance requirements.

Kepros, Blue, and Sharp all contended that there is no movement from the grade-point system, but if anything, a movement towards it.

When Warren Mackenzie stated that Foresters are keeping a year system, rather than the credit system, and said that this could put them at a disadvantage, Sharp said that this report was for a uniform marking system, not uniform degree regulations. He said that this was up to individual faculties.

Blue said that a student repeating first year would still be required to reach the expected grade-point average for second year. When repeating, the student would be on "academic probation."

Frank Wilson, Dean of Students, said he fears the failure rate will be higher until the faculty understands the system. He said, in some cases, students know the system better than the faculty. He stated that better transitional provisions were needed.

Kepros said, "Faculties are making problems for themselves by the regulations they're making," and added, "These regulations were not the intentions of the committee I chaired."

He added that The Brunswickan knew about the regulations before he did.

Kepros mentioned that on examining various marking systems now in use in other universities, it was decided that it would be best not to integrate the percentage and the letter system.

In explaining the theory of the system, he said that when assigning things to categories, the greater the number of categories, the harder the job is. Kepros added

that the categorization is usually unreliable when there are more than seven categories. Therefore, when working with a percentage system with 100 points, there are far too many categories. He said this is the reason for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd divisions.

He also stated that there are as many marking systems as there are instructors. He said in some faculties and departments, for example, a student may never receive a mark above 80 percent. He said this mark should correspond to an A. However, in some other faculties, where marks of 90 percent to 95 percent can be attained, this should correspond to an A.

In the present system, where an 80 percent in one faculty and a 95 percent in another faculty both require the same level of performance, there is still fifteen marks difference.

After discussion had ended, the following motion was made: "Be it resolved that the proposed new marking system be accepted as presented." In the discussion, it was emphasized that Council was voting on the marking system before the Senate, which is not the same as the Kepros Report. The proposed marking system is the Senate's modification of the Kepros report, plus regulations for different faculties. It was also brought up that Council had

already accepted the principles of the Kepros Report. The motion was defeated.

A counter motion was then made, which would provide for an education program before implementing the program. This was moved by Chris Gilliss and was seconded by Valerie Jaeger.

In the discussion which followed, it was said that more study would have to be conducted before the system could be implemented.

Jaeger said, "Personally, I am against the whole scheme." Sharp said that, "if the proposals are rejected, there will have to be substantial revisions to the existing system."

Senator John Reid said, "People learn things when they affect them directly."

Therefore, he said "we should go directly into the system, along with a concentrated educational program on the subject."

Jaeger then withdrew her second.

The motion was remade by Gilliss, this time seconded by Neale.

In the ensuing debate, Barb Hill said Biology students are opposed to the system, and added, "You do not equate a 76 with a 96."

However, this motion passed with 10 in favor, 6 against, and no abstentions.

## WINTER SCENE

The undisturbed snow slopes down to the river that winds crystal clear through the trees. You're at peace in this winter scene, in harmony with the natural world around you.

You're the kind of girl who wants the simplest yet most dependable kind of sanitary protection—Tampax tampons. They're worn internally, so you don't worry about discomfort or unpleasant odor. You never feel them when they're in place, yet you're secure

NO FITS  
NO PAINS  
NO PADS  
NO ODDS



knowing how they expand softly to fit your inner contours. Tampax tampons help make possible the most active, vital lifestyle. Yet, in your quiet moments, you appreciate how their gentle, reliable protection helps simplify the natural process of menstruation.

The internal protection more women trust



MADE ONLY BY  
CANADIAN TAMPAX CORPORATION LTD.,  
BARRIE, ONTARIO

## Amphibious warfare discussed

By KIRK GORDON

A veteran of both WWII and Vietnam visited this university to speak on topics in military history.

Brigadier General Edwin Simmons, currently director of history for the U.S. Marine Corps, was a guest lecturer of the UNB History department on Tuesday afternoon.

General Simmons, now retired, has his B.A. and M.A. in journalism and a long active service record. He served in the Pacific in WWII; Korea; commanded a regiment in Viet Nam; was an assistant divisional commander in Viet Nam and has served as a U.S. Naval Attache to South America.

Simmons delivered his first lecture on the amphibious operations of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Amphibious operations had their beginning as far back as the Spanish-America war. From experiences up to WWI, especially at places like Gallipoli (an unsuccessful British assault on the Turks in WWI), it was decided that the amphibious assault of a defended beach was suicide and that special landing operations were necessary.

In 1933, the Fleet Marine Force was formed, which basically laid down the foundations for this. In 1934 a landing manual was developed (later to become the official field manual), which stressed command relations, naval firepower, aerial support, ship to shore movement, securing of the beachhead and combat loading and unloading as being the crucial components of a successful amphibious assault.

This was followed in 1935 by the implementation of annual fleet landing operations and with the development of amphibious vehicles, amphibious operations on a large scale were on their way.

In WWII, the Marines were first involved in the Pacific theatre. After Pearl Harbour, the battle at midway was the most major event of this period of the war.

"Heroic and necessary service rendered" by U.S. Marines during these early years, made midway a major turning point in the war. The role of the Marines here was primarily defensive with the establishment of advance base defenses of major importance.

Guadalcanal was the next major assault. The American strategic offensive of WWII began here. For six months the battle of the "American Gallipoli" continued the outcome unsure. For the Americans though, this first major test of amphibious doctrine was successful.

(Next: General Simmons lecture on U.S. Marine Corps operations in the Pacific: Guadalcanal to Okinawa.)

# Funny, you don't look like a priest.

Most of the time, we don't. Our work takes us deep into prisons and neighbourhood bars and wretched homes (both rich and poor). The black cloth might make the people we talk to feel awkward. Life is awkward enough for the con, the suburban boozier, the hooker, the just plain miserably.

Those are our people. We try to help them.

Come help us help others to help

themselves. You'll need intelligence, empathy, a tough and gentle spirit. A sense of humour. And to stand on, a rock-like faith in Christ.

Don't be surprised that the Redemptorists don't always look like priests. A fresh wind has blown through the corridors of the Church. The changes are many and all to the good. It's an extraordinary life for the right man.

Think about it. Then, if you'd like to talk, write or call us.

## THE REDEMPTORIST PRIESTS

Gerry Pettipas, C.S.S.R.  
426 St. Germain Avenue, Toronto  
M5M 1W7.  
(416) 466-9265