

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

4-2-1990

1990 April 2 - Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate, East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, East Tennessee State University, "1990 April 2 - Faculty Senate Minutes" (1990). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 362.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/362>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Agendas and Minutes at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April 2, 1990
(Informal Meeting)

CALL TO ORDER

Lacking a quorum, Dr. Hugh LaFollette, President of the Faculty Senate, suggested at 3:40 p.m. that those present informally discuss the matter of "Plus and Minus Grades" (included in the mailout for this meeting). Agreement to discuss this topic was indicated by an expression of interest by several senators.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Bill Fisher commented on (1) minutes of the October 14, 1989 meeting of the Tennessee Higher Education Faculty Assembly held at Middle Tennessee State University and (2) memorandum (dated February 5, 1989) from the Faculty Senate of Shelby State Community College to H. Arch Griffin concerning a "Job Satisfaction Survey." Copies of both were distributed at the meeting.

Informal Discussion: Plus and Minus Grades

Points discussed included the following:

1. Use of pluses and minuses versus use of pluses only

Some senators expressed the opinion that only pluses should be used since minuses have a negative connotation. Others felt that the increased accuracy afforded by use of both pluses and minuses is the more important factor to consider.

2. Use of numerical grades

Some senators expressed a preference for using numerical grades because of the increased accuracy which is possible. Several objections were expressed to this method of reporting grades, including (1) the suggestion that such grades are not appropriate in some subject areas due to the difficulty of grading to this level of precision and (2) the wide variation of numerical scales which are used in various courses.

3. Proposed conversion scale (grades to numerical GPA)

Some senators expressed an interest in using pluses (and possibly minuses), but did not agree with the following conversion scale which was included in the mailout:

| | | |
|----------|-------|----------|
| | A - 4 | A- - 3.7 |
| B+ - 3.3 | B - 3 | B- - 2.7 |
| C+ - 2.3 | C - 2 | C - 1.7 |
| D+ - 1.3 | D - 1 | |

For example, the suggestion was made that B+ might correspond to 3.5.

Following discussion, Dr. LaFollette asked for suggestions as to how this matter should be pursued. There seemed to be general agreement that the question should be formally considered by the Senate. Dr. LaFollette agreed to work on a resolution for consideration by the Senate, including suggestions for an ad hoc committee (including senators as well as student and administrative representation) to study the matter.

ADJOURNMENT

The informal meeting ended at 4:35 p.m.

Present

Bob Riser
Jim Pleasant
Suzanne Smith
Mark Holland
Scott Beck
Hugh LaFollette
Anne LeCroy
Alfonso Lucero
Charles Johnson
Bill Fisher
George Granger
Mary Nelson
Brad Arbogast
Margaret Hougland
Phil Scheuerman
Saralyn Gold
Gene McCoy
Marie Tedesco
Robert Davidson

Absent

Carroll Hyder
Lattie Collins
David Close
Christa Hungate - ex
Colin Baxter
Edwin Williams
Katie Dunn
Chris Ayres
Ernest Bentley - ex
Charles Beseda
Bill Campbell
Bob Acuff - ex
Sue McCoy - ex
Clark Gillett
William Stone
Carol Gordon
Virginia Adams
Rosemary Brown
Deborah Fortune
Richard Verhegge

Changes in the 4 point grading scale

At the last meeting we discussed possible changes in the four point grading scale. However, since there was no quorum, we could not take any action on the proposal. This is an attempt to summarize the sense of that discussion.

The Faculty Senate is convinced that the current four point grading scale does not permit faculty to make appropriate distinctions in grades. For instance, it is unfair to give the same grade to a student who barely misses an A and to another who barely made a B.

Although we are convinced we need to study the grading scale, we are not certain if and how it should be altered. Therefore, we hereby appoint an ad hoc committee to study the matter and offer its findings to the Senate early next fall. The committee shall include four Senators, two members appointed by the Student Government Association, and one member appointed by Academic Council.