

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

10-1-1990

1990 October 1 - Faculty Senate Agenda and 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 October 1 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (1990). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 364.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/364>

This Agendas and 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.

AGENDA

- 1) Approval of the September 17 minutes (enclosed).
- 2) Treasurer's report.
- 3) Announcements
 - a) Report on TBR meeting, 9/20-9/21 (enclosed)
 - b) Master Plan - Oct 4-5 visit of Sasaki Associates (enclosed)
 - c) Academic Council (enclosed)
- 4) Committee Reports
 - a) Academic Matters
 - (1) Grade appeal process (enclosed)
 - (2) Academic bankruptcy (enclosed)
 - b) Ad hoc committee on plus and minus grades (enclosed)
- 5) Unfinished business
- 6) New business
 - a) Grade change policy (enclosed)
- 7) Adjournment

Assistant Director of Reader Service:
Sherrod Library
Box 22, 450A
CAMPUS
SEP 27 1990

Minutes of the September 17, 1990 Faculty Senate Meeting

At 3:35 p.m., with a quorum present, President Bob Riser called the meeting to order. The senate approved the minutes as read. There was no treasurer's report.

Announcements. Riser had the following announcements: 1) the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will meet on September 21, at 3:15 in Meeting Room 5 of the Culp Center; 2) chairperson Hugh LaFollette asked that the Concerns and Grievances Committee meet briefly in the Forum after today's senate meeting; 3) chairperson Ed Williams asked that senators from Arts and Sciences meet in the Forum at the end of today's meeting to discuss their senate vacancy; 4) chairperson Dan Johnson set the next meeting of the Academic Matters Committee for September 24, 4 p.m. in Room 131 of the Science Building. Topics to be discussed are the academic bankruptcy policy and the grade appeals policy. Nancy Garland, Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs, will address the committee on these issues.

Bill Fisher introduced Mary Lou Gammo, the new senator from business. He also called attention to: (1) the Johnson City Press's series on the tenure of university president Ronald Beller and (2) the appointment of Dean Allen Spritzer to the TBR Committee on Finance and Business Operations.

NEW BUSINESS

Sally Thomas-Lee, Assistant Dean, Student Affairs, brought before the senate, for its endorsement, the Student Bill of Rights (included in mailout). The university's Student Life Committee devised this document, which received approval by the Student Government Association (SGA). Thomas-Lee pointed out that SGA's only amendment concerned right #1, section 3 (under East Tennessee State University grants . . .). In its original form right #1 stipulated that "classes meet and meet on time." The SGA amendment added: "and adjourn on time."

Discussion ensued on a number of points in the bill of rights. Senators voiced concern, for example, on right #4, section 3, the right to receive graded papers and tests in a timely manner. Did this mean that instructors had to return all tests and papers? Or could only test scores be given to students? Senators also discussed the questions of what students meant by the right to expect "knowledge of progress in course work". Before amendments could be entertained, however, a motion had to be made, and seconded, to accept the entire document. This being done, senators were free to propose amendments to the bill of rights. Al Lucero, business, then proposed to amend right #4, section 3, the right to expect "receipt of graded papers and tests in a timely manner," to: "expect results and opportunity to review tests in a timely manner." After Lucero's motion was seconded, further discussion followed. Senators from the College of Medicine expressed concern over right #4, especially since many tests given in the College of Medicine are externally-devised ones which cannot be returned to students. In light of such concern, Kenneth Ferslew, medicine, offered a friendly amendment to Lucero's amendment. Ferslew's revision read as follows: "receipt of paper grades and test results in a timely manner." After discussion of this revised amendment, the senate voted to accept the amendment.

Senators offered additional amendments. Charles Johnson, business, pointed out that since freedom of choice, as such, was not part of the state or federal constitution, that it should be deleted from right #1, section #1. The senate passed this amendment. The senate also passed an amendment offered by Jim Pleasant, applied science and technology. Pleasant proposed to amend stipulation #5, section 3 by changing "knowledge of course work," to "information about course work." Charles Johnson then moved that before a final version of the bill rights is completed, the grammar in the document should be checked and corrected, if necessary. This motion passed. Last, George Poole, mathematics, moved that right # 1, section 3, be amended to read "classes meet as scheduled; and begin and adjourn on time." The motion passed.

The Senate then voted to accept the Student Bill of Rights as amended.

Riser announced that the next senate meeting will be on October 1. The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

PRESENT		ABSENT	
Ken James	Mary Lou Gammo	Margaret Hougland	Charles Parker
Jim Pleasant	Charles Johnson	Sue McCoy	Mark Holland
Bob Riser	Al Lucero	Ahmad Wattad	Ernest Bentley
Scott Beck	Robert Davidson	Elizabeth Williams	Katie Dunn
David Close	Chris Ayres	Rosemary Brown	Rebecca Isbell
Christa Hungate	Bill Campbell	Carol Gordon	Virginia Adams
Dan Johnson	Mary Nelson	Saralyn Gold	Beth Smith
Hugh LaFollette	Marie Tedesco	Gene McCoy	Phil Scheuerman
George Poole	Brad Arbogast	Rebecca Nunley	
Ed Williams	Bob Acuff		
Bill Fisher	Kenneth Ferslew		

Implications of the change:

The literature suggests there are two significant side effects of this policy: a) a slight lowering of the overall grade point average, and b) an increase in the number of requests for changes of grade.

Although theoretically the inclusion of plus and minus grades will have no effect in the overall grade point average "In fact, it cannot be denied that it [plus-minus grading] has had an effect" [in curbing grade inflation].⁴ From our perspective, although this is a welcome result of the proposed change it is not a reason to adopt it. The primary reason for increasing the number of grades is that students will receive grades which more accurately reflect their relative performance.

Indications are that this change will also increase the requests in change of grades.⁵ Perhaps we will need to decide how we might curb these requests.

Remaining Questions:

- 1) Should we keep the D- grade? If so, how is it to be interpreted? Is it still a passing grade?
- 2) How, exactly, will this be applied in the graduate school. We assume D will still not be allowed; what about C-?
- 3) What, if anything, should we do to limit the expected increase in requests for changes of grade?

Grade Change Process

Two motions regarding the change of grade process were passed by the Faculty Senate on 4/16/90 and tabled by Academic Council for reconsideration in the Fall. The first motion, from the Academic Matters Committee, read:

In order to preserve the purpose and security of the present change-of-grade policy while removing unnecessary burdens it places on faculty, chairs, and deans, we recommend the following changes to the policy.

1. The only signature required on the Change-of-Grade form will be that of the faculty member making the change.
2. A faculty member making a grade change will submit the completed Change-of-Grade form to the Records Office.
3. The Records Office will send one copy of the Change-of-Grade form to the faculty member making the change and one copy to the departmental chair or school/college dean.

The second motion read:

WHEREAS, on January 19, 1990, the Registrar issued a new Change of Grade form to replace the existing form; and
WHEREAS, the revised form requires approval of the Chairman and Dean of the Faculty member making the grade change, and whereas formerly no such administrative approval was required; and
WHEREAS, the said change was made without consultation with or consent of the faculty;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate strongly objects to the revision of the grade change form because it now provides for the unwarranted intrusion of administrators into a faculty member's discretion and prerogative, and interferes with academic freedom.

⁴ Quaan, p. 9.

⁵ Ibid.

Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Plus and Minus Grades

Background:

ETSU currently has an A-F grading scale. Professors can assign students only one of four passing grades; according to local data, they typically use only three.

The Problem:

Under this scheme, the student who barely makes it into the B range receives the same grade as does the student who barely misses an A; likewise the student who just escapes making a D receives the same grade as does the student who is just shy of a B. The difference in performance between these hypothetical students is much greater than is the difference between the student who barely makes and the student who barely misses an A, yet the latter students end up with a point difference in grades.

Thus the 4 point grading scale fails to make the appropriate distinction between students: relatively slight differences in student performance lead to substantial differences in grades while significant differences in performance are ignored.

Relevant Literature:

A review of the literature suggests there is merit in increasing the range of available grades. "Measurement experts and other researchers contend that expanding the marking categories will result in more accuracy in grading while reducing grading errors due to grouping."¹ More specifically, some measurement theorists claim that evaluations are more accurate when there are 7 or more points on the scale.² The scale we propose has 11 grades altogether and 8 options in the A-C range.

Some people think the proposed scale will force professors to make too fine-grained distinctions. Doubtless professors may occasionally have trouble deciding whether to give a student a C+ or a B-. But one significant advantage of the proposed system: if the professor does make an "error," the error will be less than it will be under the present system. A student who gets a C instead of a B loses one quality point; the student who receives a C+ instead of a B- loses .4 of a point.

This information has led a number of schools to add plus-minus grading. In fact, one survey showed that nearly half of all four year private schools now have this grading option.³

The Proposal:	A - 4	Excellent	C - - 1.7	
	A - - 3.7		D+ - 1.3	
	B+ - 3.3		D - 1	
	B - 3		D - - 0.7	
	B - - 2.7		F - 0	Failing
	C+ - 2.3			
	C - 2	Average		

Note: If we included an A+ we would have to give 4.3 quality points for an A+ or give less than 4 quality points for an A. Both options are unacceptable.

¹ C. James Quaan, 1987. Plus-Minus Grading: A Case Study and National Implications. Monograph #32, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, p. 15.

² "Does Grade Inflation Decrease the Reliability of Grades," Royce Singleton Jr. and Elliot R. Smith. Journal of Educational Measurement, Vol. 15, No. 1 (1978)

³ Quaan, p. 10.

STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS
(as amended by Faculty Senate, September 17, 1990)

The student has certain rights guaranteed by the Federal and State constitutions including:

1. freedom of inquiry, freedom of speech, and freedom of expression insofar as these do not encroach upon the rights of others;
2. the right to peaceably assemble, in accordance with federal, state and local and ETSU regulations;
3. religious freedom and a clear division of church and state;
4. freedom from unreasonable search and/or seizure of person, residence, or personal property;
5. freedom from discrimination or harassment on the basis of sex, age, race, color, religion, national origin, or other protected status;
6. the right to privacy, including the maintenance of confidential records in accordance with provisions of the Family Educational Rights Act of 1974 and 1975;
7. the right to due process.

The Tennessee Board of Regents grants additional rights including:

1. the right to due process in disciplinary procedures of the University, including written notification of charges, an explanation of procedures, a hearing before an appropriate administrator or committee;
2. the right to expeditious review of disciplinary sanctions upon appeal;
3. the right to affiliate with officially registered student organizations if the membership requirements of those organizations have been met, and the right to seek to establish, through official procedures, additional student organizations of their choosing.

East Tennessee State University grants other rights including, the right to expect:

1. classes meet as scheduled; and begin and adjourn on time;
2. course requirements are clearly specified;
3. the instructor is prepared for class and possesses both oral and written communication skills;
4. receipt of paper grades and tests in a timely manner;
5. information about progress in course work;
6. an instructor qualified to teach the subject matter;

Additionally, students have the right to expect:

1. accurate information concerning institutional services, regulations, policies and procedures, in published form;

2. representation in University governance system;
3. sound and accurate academic advice, information regarding courses required for graduation and their schedule sequence;
4. advance notice of any changes in academic requirements or programs and assurance that such changes will not be made in a way that unduly impedes the academic progress of the student already enrolled;
5. flexibility in course scheduling (by dropping and adding) or withdrawing within University guidelines;
6. information about the various types of financial assistance available;
7. freedom to evaluate courses, programs and services and provide input to appropriate segments of the campus administration.

An appeal review or hearing is available if any of the rights referenced in this document are alleged to be violated.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

Tennessee Board of Regents, September 20,21

Items of interest:

- 1) Concern was expressed (at the meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations) that the TBR system serves more students than does the UT system but receives less state dollars.
- 2) ETSU budget items approved included pre-planning for the Sherrod Library addition, asbestos removal from Ellington and Powell residence halls, Memorial Center roof replacement, and replacement of underground fuel storage tanks.
- 3) ETSU academic program requests approved were:
 - a) termination of Art Studio and Art Education concentrations in B.S. Art program and establishment of Art Education concentration within B.A. Art program.
 - b) change on title of B.S. program from Criminal Justice to Criminal Justice and Criminology.
 - c) termination of A.A.S. program in Law Enforcement, B.S. program in English, B.S. program in Foreign Languages.
 - d) consolidation of four existing programs into B.M. in Music Education and Performance.
 - e) modification of requirements for admission to A.A.S. and B.S.N. in Nursing, and for M.A. and M.Ed. in Educational Administration and Supervision.
- 4) A revision of a number of Board policies was approved, the principal impact of which is to eliminate non-essential requirements for reports by institutions to the Board office.
- 5) Discussion was held regarding the work of the Joint Liaison Committee (comprised of TBR, UT, and THEC representatives). This committee was established in order to respond to a request by Governor McWherter that higher education should be engaged in serious planning efforts. The committee's report and recommendations will be presented at the December TBR meeting.

Master Plan

Sasaki Associates will be on campus on October 4-5 with the Campus Master Plan Phase II Report. This will be an opportunity to hear about their findings and preliminary recommendations. The consultants will be available for meeting with university personnel on Thursday morning, Oct 4, from 1:30 to 4:30 and on Friday morning, Oct 5, from 8:30 to 12:00.

Academic Council, September 6

The revised Student Assessment of Instruction was presented for information. The Faculty Senate was asked to work with Pat Shew and Computer Services on implementation details for the new form. The new form will be used beginning in the Spring '91 semester. (Saralyn Gold and Mark Holland will represent the Senate in this effort.)

Curriculum changes from the departments of Geography, Sociology, Psychology and from the College of Business were approved.

The Promotion and Tenure Procedures recommended by the Faculty Senate and reviewed and edited at a previous meeting were approved.

A proposal from Human Development and Learning for a new program leading to an Educational Specialist Degree with a major in School Psychology was tabled until additional discussion between the Department of Psychology and the Department of Human Development and Learning takes place.

Academic Council, September 20

The existing Promotion and Tenure Policies have been updated to reflect the recently approved recommendations. Their inclusion has raised several questions over the appeal process (item IV.A.). A review committee consisting of Deans Ostheimer and Spritzer and two Senators have been asked to review the revised documents. Anne Sherrill will coordinate the review. (Senators Saralyn Gold and Marie Tedesco will serve on the review committee).

Sally Thomas-Lee reported on changes in the Early Semester Progress Report.

Report of Academic Matters Committee

- 1) The Academic Matters Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate endorse the proposed policy on "Academic Bankruptcy" with the understanding that statement 2 under Eligibility will be modified to make it clear that this policy applies to undergraduate students.
(Nancy Garland, who drafted the policy, has agreed to the change.)
- 2) The Academic Matters Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate endorse the proposed changes in the "Grade Appeal Process for Students" with the understanding that a statement will be added between paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 that gives the student an option, during a conference with the dean, to request either that a review committee hear the appeal, or that the dean hear the appeal directly, without committee involvement.
(Nancy Garland, who drafted the policy, has agreed to the change.)

NOTE: The proposed Academic Bankruptcy Policy and the proposed Grade Appeal Process were included in the mailout for the August 27 Senate meeting.

ROSTER - FACULTY SENATE 1990-91

10/3/90

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>TRM</u>	<u>PO BOX</u>	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>COMMITTEE</u>
AS&T	Ken James	Home Economics	93	22,630A	4411	Acad Matters
	Charles Parker	Technology	91	19,060A	4473	Dev & Eval
	Jim Pleasant	Comp&Infor Sci	91	23,830A	6962	Research
	Bob Riser	Comp&Infor Sci	92	23,830A	4312	
A&S	Scott Beck	Sociology&Anthr	92	21,820A	6648	Conc & Griev
	David Close	Physics	91	22,060A	5646	Research
	Mark Holland	English	92	24,310A	926-4011	Dev & Eval
	Christa Hungate	Foreign Language	91	22,480A	6902	Acad Matters
	Dan Johnson	Biological Sci	93	23,590A	4359	*Acad Matters
	Hugh LaFollette	Phil&Humanities	91	22,180A	6625	*Conc & Griev
	Anne LeCroy	English	92	22,990A	5991	Committees
	George Poole	Mathematics	93	22,390A	4349	Dev & Eval
	Ed Williams	English	93	22,990A	6626	Elections
Bus	Bill Fisher	Mgmt & Mkting	93	24,471A	5304	Dev & Eval
	Mary Lou Gammo	Accountancy	93	23,800A	4599	Research
	Charles Johnson	Mgmt & Mkting	91	21,250A	5391	Conc & Griev
	Al Lucero	Office Mgmt	92	20,320A	6986	Acad Matters
Dev St	Robert Davidson	DevelopmentalMth	92	21,000A	6690	Elections
Educ	Chris Ayres	Phys Educ & Rec	92	22,120A	5259	Acad Matters
	Ernest Bentley	Educ Leadership	91	19,000A	6716	*Elections
	Bill Campbell	University Sch	93	21,460A	4333	Dev & Eval
	Katie Dunn	Curr & Instr	92	23,020A	5931	Research
	Rebecca Isbell	Hum Dev&Learning	93	18,940A	4196	Committees
	Mary Nelson	University Sch	91	21,460A	4333	Conc & Griev
Library	Marie Tedesco	Archives	91	22,450A	5339	Acad Matters
Medicine	Brad Arbogast	Internal Med	92	21,160A	6289	Research
	Bob Acuff	Surgery	91	19,750A	6257	*Research
	Kenneth Ferslew	Pharmacology	93	19,810A	6274	Committees
	Margaret Houglan	Anatomy	91	19,960A	6243	Dev & Eval
	Sue McCoy	Surgery	91	19,750A	6264	Acad Matters
	Ahmad Wattad	Pediatrics	92	19,840A	6222	Elections
	Eliz. Williams	Internal Med	93	21,160A	6381	Conc & Griev
Nursing	Virginia Adams	Family/Comm Nurs	92	22,780A	6830	Research
	Rosemary Brown	Profess Roles	91	22,240A	4377	Conc & Griev
	Carol Gordon	Adult Nursing	92	21,370A	4388	*Dev & Eval
	Beth Smith	Profess Roles	93	22,240A	4388	Acad Matters
P&AH	Saralyn Gold	Comm Disorders	91	21,790A	5252	Dev & Eval
	Gene McCoy	Health Sciences	91	22,690A	4490	Acad Matters
	Rebecca Nunley	Dental Hygiene	93	23,200A	4434	Conc & Griev
	Phil Scheuerman	Environ Health	92	22,960A	4408	Research

* - Committee Chair