

# Engineering faculty and students against Kepros

By ANDREW STEEVES

There is a growing protest among Engineering professors and students against the proposed Kepros letter marking system.

The matter was brought to a head this past week by an in depth appraisal of the system in the last issue of the Engineering newspaper, the Godivan. The Godivan, in an

article by Dick Gamble, came down with both feet on the idea of acceptance of the Kepros system for Engineering students.

The Kepros system involves replacing percentage marks on courses with letters. These letters, A, B, C, D and E, would each have an assigned weight with the weights running from a four for an A and decreasing by one to a value of 0 for an E.

The system was developed by Dr. Kepros, Assistant Dean of Arts of Social Sciences with these objectives in mind:

- 1) to provide a common standard of performance between students of different faculties by having a uniform marking system.
- 2) to eliminate possible marking discrimination against students taking options in another department through marking differences.
- 3) to have a marking system that evaluates the work done in the course as well as marking performance.
- 4) to provide a simple and comprehensible marking system.
- 5) to provide consistency across and between departments in performance grading.

The result of the Kepros study was the letter marking system. This so-called Kepros system has been under Faculty Council study for some time now and recommendations on the system will come before the Senate this month.

There will be a strong argument from Engineering to keep the old system in their Faculty. The case

is a strong one based on a comparison of the present system versus the proposed system.

The argument is as follows: marking differences between faculties will not be changed by the new system; a ten question structural assignment cannot be marked the same as a five thousand word English essay. The very set up of engineering assignments and exams lends itself to a percentage mark because with so many questions on an assignment, each on a different aspect of a study, the assignment must be broken up into valued parts. Most Arts work is based on essays and reports and the exams are a series of essay questions. These are subjective with much of the courses' value coming from a professors estimate of the value and knowledge in an answer. Engineering marking is more objective as results are marked on the correctness of procedure and accuracy of results and ratings are based on a standard procedure and the closeness of an answer. Through a series of assignments and tests the engineering professor can safely give course marks which differ by one or two points between students. The fact of the matter is that engineering marks will still be calculated on a percentage basis. Under the Kepros system the professors would go a step further and assign a letter to the mark. This brings up the second point of the engineers case: the argument against the "courseness" of the marking. As mentioned, over a long term an engineering professor can safely give a student a mark that is 2 points higher than another student. However under the proposed system the extra work by the student might not receive any

credit at all. As a matter of fact it would be entirely possible for a student with a percentage mark of ten or even at times twenty marks higher than a classmate could receive the same course value. On the other hand the difference of one mark, say from a 64 to a 65 would cause a student to go into an entirely different class.

The crux of the matter is that a student who works hard and raises his average from a 66 to a 73 for instance will not have any means of showing his (or her) increased performance, under the new system both averages would warrant a "B".

The tendency of the new system is to clump or categorize the class in groups, A students, B students, C students and the unfortunates. The old system of grading a class from number 1 to number 30 in a class of thirty will be eliminated. Whether class competition is good or bad is not the point here, what the point is, is this - improvement in work will be ignored by the new system. It will be a case of 'once a C student, always a C student' even if a student's marks make a significant jump.

Feeling against the implementation of the system is strong. Organising a protest is difficult among the engineering students, broken up as they are into years and departments, but an effort is being made. A petition supporting the old system and rejecting the proposed system has been circulating among the classes. Support for the old system is very strong the petition has received over 80 percent class support from third and fourth year level engineering students. Professors and other concerned students in other faculties also support the petition.

**University of Toronto**

**Summer Language Programme**

This summer, the University of Toronto will offer a French Language Summer School at Saint-Pierre et Miquelon and an English Language Seminar School at Toronto.

Government-sponsored bursaries will be offered in connection with these programmes.



University of Toronto  
Division of University Extension  
Continuing Education Programme  
119 St. George Street  
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A9  
(416) 928-2400

**MAZZUCA'S variety store**

79 York Street  
Telephone 455-3484

FOR YOUR LOCAL AND  
OUT-OF-TOWN DAILY AND  
WEEKLY PAPERS.

OPEN MONDAY TO SATURDAY  
7:30 a.m. to 10:30 p.m.

Smoker's Supplies and Magazines  
of all Assorted Confectionary.

<b>SRC SPRING ELECTIONS SENATE ELECTIONS SAA ELECTIONS</b>		
<b>POLLING STATIONS</b>	McConnell Hall 12:00 - 1:30 Lady Dunn Hall 12:00 - 1:30 SUB (near coffee shop) 9:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m. Tilley Hall 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Head Hall 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 a.m. Ludlow Hall (sporadically) 10:00 a.m. - 12:30 a.m. STUD 10:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m. GYM 10:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.	4:30 - 6:00 p.m. 4:30 - 6:00 p.m.
<b>CANDIDATES for SRC SPRING ELECTIONS</b>		
President  Daryl John Hay — Sc. V David Kent — Arts III John Malcolm — BBA III Peter Galoska — Sc. III  Comptroller  Howard Pryde BBA III Christopher Gilliss BBA III	(1/2 term) Acclamation (full term) Acclamation Acclamation         Acclamation	Seats still open:  Science Rep. Rep. at Large Phys. Ed. Rep. Nursing Rep. Engineering Rep. School of Graduate Studies Rep. Education Rep.
Arts Representative — Keith Manuel Arts IV John MacPherson Arts III Derwin Gowan Arts I  Rep. at Large — Christopher A. Gallotti Moyra Barry BBA II  Business Rep. — Robert Tuck BBA III Terry Doherty BBA I  Law Rep. — Jim McAvity Law I	<b>GRADUATING CLASS CANDIDATES</b>  President Peter J. Asser BBA IV Stephen Mulholland BBA IV Gary Stairs Arts IV  Secretary  Michael P. Halley Ed. V Acclamation  Vice-President:  Deborah Hellyer Acclamation  Vaedictorian  Michael P. Richard Law III Maria J. Waver Sc. IV Pat Flanagan Arts IV	