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No direct answer or solution was given to the above topic by the group, there
being no one in the group with previous experience, but there was a discussion on
many topics relevant to the question of evaluation. These topics were considered
on the basis of whether or not a testing program—based on a national or regional
standard—could or would suffice. The topics under discussion with a brief concen-
sus of opinion by the group were as follows:

A. Differences between college biology courses that are in existence—The contrast
of a system which offers one "core" course for general education and another,
in the same curriculum, geared for pre-professional training versus a system
offering one general course geared for the non-science student and the science
major, whatever his specialization. Where two courses were given, the pre-
professional one was devoting more time to laboratory work.

B. Types of examination and relative value of each—It was agreed, on one hand,
that objective tests of all types (with less emphasis, if any, on true-false
types) proved most satisfactory or at least more widely used since time in re-
lation to large classes made it necessary. It was felt, by all, that subject-
ive testing was superior and that some such testing should be done somewhere
later in the program if not possible in the first year. The worth of oral ex-
aminations were applicable, was noted.

C. Grading systems—General use was made of the letter system with no indication
of rank within each letter. There seemed to be a general lack of uniformity
within school systems.

D. Grading of intangibles such as attitude, effort, etc.—These were felt to be im-
portant yet intangible and certainly must be handled by the individual instructors.

E. Preparation for potential graduate work in science—It was felt that a senior
competency test might be established for minimum essentials on a national basis—
specified tests for biology, physics, chemistry and general science. It was also
felt that such standard testing might be established for facets of the biological
program, beyond general biology such as in comparative anatomy or histology. It
was agreed that national standardization on the general biology level would not be
possible without first a standardization of such courses in relation to content,
method, emphasis, etc. If such standardization were possible, which is improbable,
would it not be undesirable?

The group would like to suggest that, as a group of biologists, we might profi-
ble at a future meeting, if we had as our guest a speaker whose specialization was in
evaluation from the standpoint of the topic considered.
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A. "Problem Research" for the undergraduate students. The discussion was concerned almost wholly with the problems faced by the "small" college.

I. Space is usually lacking, but commonly a desk, or a corner or section of a general laboratory, is assigned. Rarely are separate rooms available. Frequently faculty offices are shared with the junior-senior students who are carrying out the research.

II. Lack of separate or substantial budget for these problems requires ingenuity in acquiring equipment and materials to pursue them. It also serves to limit the kind of research which can be done.

III. Tight budgets also restrict the availability of literature for reference work. The college library must frequently be supplemented by the personal library of the biology instructor, including his collection of reprints.

The desirability of a research "problem" was not discussed, but appeared to be generally accepted. It was reported that at Monmouth, following the introduction of a "problem", the dropout rate of junior and senior biology students was substantially reduced; i.e., the problem was an interest-sustaining part of the program. It was also suggested that undergraduate research problems must be realistically considered, to be of smaller dimensions or of more limited scope than those entertained in