

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
10 April 2012, Room 110, Cashion  
3:30 p.m.

Absent	<b>Senator-At-Large Past Chair</b>		<b>Term Expires</b>
	Cannon, Raymond	Mathematics	2012
<b>College of Arts and Sciences</b>		<b>17 members</b>	
	Allman, Dwight	Political Science	2014
	Baker, Lori	Anthropology, Forensic Science	2013
	Beck, Rosalie (chair)	Religion	2012
	Blackwell, Frieda	MFL -- Spanish and Portuguese	2012
	Coker, Joe	Religion	2013
	Cook, Garrett	Anthropology	2014
	Duhrkopf, Richard	Biology	2012
	Hanks, Tom [sub: Hope Johnston]	English	2013
	Long, Michael	Modern Foreign Languages	2013
A	Losey, Jay	English	2012
	Patton, Jim	Psychology and Neuroscience	2013
A	Shoaf, Mary Margaret	Mathematics	2013
	Supplee, Joan	History	2012
	Taylor, Mark	Biology	2014
	Toten-Beard, DeAnna	Theater Arts	2013
	Tsang, Jo-Ann	Psychology	2014
	Walter, Janelle	Family and Consumer Science	2014
<b>School of Business</b>		<b>5 members</b>	
	Burleson, Debra	Information Systems	2014
	Hurt, David	Accounting	2014
	Madden, Stan	Marketing	2012
	Neubert, Mitchell	Management	2012
	Riemenschneider, Cynthia	Information Systems	2014
<b>School of Education</b>		<b>3 members</b>	
A	Johnsen, Susan	Educational Psychology	2012
	Jordan, Mary Ann	Education Administration	2013
	Wood, Randy	Curriculum and Instruction	2014
<b>School of Music</b>		<b>2 members</b>	
	Claybrook, Doug	Music	2013
	McKinney, Tim	Academic Studies	2012
<b>School of Engineering/Computer Science</b>		<b>1 member</b>	
	Newberry, Byron	Mechanical Engineering	2014
<b>Honors College</b>		<b>1 member</b>	
	Harvey, Barry	Honors College/Great Texts	2014
<b>School of Law</b>		<b>1 member</b>	
	Beal, Ron	Law	2013
<b>Libraries</b>		<b>1 member</b>	
	Patteson, Rita	Libraries	2014
<b>School of Nursing</b>		<b>1 member</b>	
	Spies, Lori	Nursing	2012
		<b>1 member</b>	

**Truett Seminary**

	Still, Todd	Truett Seminary	2014
<b>School of Social Work</b>		<b>1 member</b>	
	Yancey, Gaynor	Social Work	2014
	Spain, Rufus	Director, Retired Professors Program	

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Beck called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**II. Invocation**

Senator Hope Johnston offered the invocation.

**III. Approval of Minutes: 7 March 2012**

Senator Supplee made a motion to accept the March minutes and Senator Blackwell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

**IV. Presentation**

**Susan Bratton, URSA**, spoke with the Senate regarding the conversion of URSA to a standing committee.

The Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Achievement Steering Committee (URSA) began as a proposal for a SACS Quality Enhancement Program (QEP). It was then combined with the Engaged Learning Group (ELG). The QEP ends this year and a final report is due in Fall 2012. The decision to place URSA in the Vice Provost for Research's Office was based on the advice of over 40 campus administrators and faculty consulted during the process of constructing the QEP proposal. The Steering Committee, appointed by the VPR, was a component of the original proposal and intentionally incorporated multiple schools. Under the QEP, the Steering Committee has served on three year terms, which can be renewed.

**Why convert URSA to a standing committee?**

Conversion to a standing committee supports continuation of the program and ensures that Baylor faculty will guide and govern the effort.

**How will the Steering Committee be appointed?**

- We are currently polling the 2011-2012 Steering Committee to determine who would like to continue at the end of the QEP. URSA prefers to continue experienced members if they are willing.
- We are constructing lists of faculty who have presented research with undergraduates multiple times in recent years to determine level of interest and experience as mentors.
- In addition, we hope to recruit faculty who have a strong desire to serve on this specific committee. URSA is interested in Steering Committee members who have indicated a high level of interest to the Committee on Committees. We need, however, to avoid over-representation of STEM fields. URSA has a need for faculty who meet the scholarly criteria for serving as reviewers of proposals and abstracts.
- The OVPR and the Steering Committee will continue to attempt to balance membership among schools and between STEM and non-STEM fields. The representation of the professional schools is particularly important.
- Jan Nimmo of OVPR will continue to serve ex officio. An additional administrator will also serve ex officio, and Betsy Vardaman from A&S wishes to continue in this role.
- The VPR will provide a list of potential members to the Committee on Committees. We hope the process will remain interactive and information will be shared on possible members. The OVPR has a long standing procedure where the VPR meets with the Chair of the Committees in order to determine the appropriate composition of committees with compliance or research based missions requiring specific expertise.

**What roles will faculty on the Steering Committee serve?**

Faculty will manage subcommittees and particular URSA functions. These may be modified in the future, while currently incorporating:

- Solicitation and review of small grant proposals of up to \$5000 – Dennis Johnston of STA is currently in charge of this function
- Management of research presentation events and awards, including Scholars Week
- Presenting opportunities for undergraduate research to students and parents
- Outreach to undergraduate organizations, including BURST and the honor societies
- Assembling data on undergraduate research participation
- Expanding and developing programs

**What has URSA achieved under the QEP?**

- Initiation of a small grant program for undergraduates
- Conversion of Scholars Day to an undergraduate Scholars Week
- Increased campus awareness of the importance of undergraduate research
- Between the Honors College and Scholars Week a seven-fold increase in undergraduate research presentation on campus between 2004 and 2011
- Participation by all the undergraduate schools and colleges
- Advertising off-campus opportunities, such as REUs (federally funded Research Experiences for Undergraduates)

**What challenges does URSA face for the future?**

- Currently about 10-12% of undergraduates have an opportunity to present research on campus, raising this to 30% or more would enhance student experience
- The QEP did not provide adequate funding to establish a proposed research “summer college”—improving summer opportunities remains a major goal of URSA
- Meeting increasing student demand for on-campus opportunities
- Building interest and programs outside the STEM fields, and increasing availability of research opportunities in the professional schools
- Participating in the next round of strategic-planning
- Encouraging more faculty to develop skills as mentors, and raising recognition for faculty who do a superior job in the role

**Garrett Cook, Academic Convocation**

Senator Cook: Academic Convocation is scheduled for August 17, 2012 at 10 am. The Provost requests that departmental meetings not be scheduled for that day so that faculty may participate. In addition, there is a need for an inspirational faculty keynote speaker. This would be a 6-8 minutes talk to the freshman. It needs to be an extremely dynamic and provocative talk. The Provost will invite this person based on the nominations by colleagues. Please send names to Garrett Cook.

Senator: It is important for faculty to participate in this, but how long will this last?

Senator Cook: It will last maybe an hour.

Chair Beck: The Chair of the Senate carries the mace in this ceremony. I attended last year carrying the mace. It was very thoughtful and important for the students, to remind them that this is an academic institution. If you do know of someone on campus that can give a provocative presentation that the students can carry away with them, please send an email to Garrett.

**V. Old Business:**

**A. Plus-minus Grading System  
Doug Henry and UCC**

Dr. Henry: When I met with you last month, you sent me back to the committee with an assignment. The committee was eager to take this back up and reached a unanimous recommendation.

Chair Beck: Does the Senate accept the minus system and do we accept the breakdown of the associate grading?

Senator: Did the Committee talk about the minimum GPA for graduation?

Dr. Henry: This would remain the same.

Senator: Did you discuss this?

Dr. Henry: Yes, we are aware that a C would not be 2.0 any longer.

Chair Beck: Also, would a C still be okay for retaining scholarships? There are some issues to consider.

Senator: In a walk-around poll I took, a majority of those said leave it alone, and then others said let's just put a grade to it, why are we going backwards? No one wanted minuses.

Senator: I found just the opposite response from my poll.

Senator: The Honors College is unanimously in favor of the minus option.

Senator: Truett already utilizes minuses and faculty like the precision with which they are able to mark the students.

Chair Beck: How many of you feel like you have had a good conversation about this?

Senator: In my area the majority would support getting rid of the pluses.

Senator: English is very much in favor of getting the minuses.

Senator: The Business School was a bit split. If we are going to do minuses, then do we go to D minus? Some said that if we do this we need to give some warning beforehand.

Senator: There is an even split in ECS.

Senator: In the grad school, they use these to fine tune grades. Would this be an option instead of a mandate? I thought it was a mandate?

Dr. Henry: In the Committee's discussion, if we have one option then we need to have both. Asymmetry doesn't make much sense. Some in the Committee favored an integer system, all agreed that the status quo is the least positive option, since we have pluses, it seems most viable to have minuses. The integer system seemed like a step backward.

Senator: Does anybody have any idea how the students will feel about this?

Chair Beck: In conversations with student body leaders, they don't like it because think it will lower their GPAs.

Senator: Is there a reason there is no A+ since we have an A-?

Dr. Henry: We had a conversation about the D- and it was split because some wanted to give the lowest grade without failing. An A+ would exceed the limit of the 4-point system. That is a twist that we didn't consider.

Senator: In high school, the A+ does not count for the GPA but multiplies for AP courses.

Senator: My department was all over the place. There is a fear of more of the "can't you just give me 2 more points..." I need to know what we will require for graduation before I can decide whether to recommend this.

Chair Beck: Dr. Henry, did you talk to the Provost's office about that?

Dr. Henry: No.

Chair Beck: I will do that.

Senator: The students will not like it for the first few semesters but we are supposed to be the big people here, the grown-ups. So, if we decide to do this, we should do it. It is not all negative, A- versus B+ in the era of grade inflation, this is a good thing.

Senator: I would disagree with my venerable colleague. It is an orthogonal problem. We are merely constructing a more finely defined assessment. If you get a 1.67 then you need to bring it up and if it affects graduation, then that is the way it is.

Senator: The graduate school already has different numbers. A B+ is 3.5 and in this recommendation it is 3.33. How do we make this consistent with the graduate school?

Dr. Henry: We only looked at the undergraduate and not graduate grading system. This is an artifact of tracking with the undergraduate policy that preceded it but is not based a particular foundation so you should make a recommendation for both undergrad and graduate.

Chair Beck: Do I hear a motion?

Senator Still: I move that we accept the recommendation of the committee.

Senator Blackwell: I second the motion.

Senator Patton: I move for an amendment that would still support a minimum GPA for graduation at 2.0.

Chair Beck: Would you do this later after the motion is voted on? Please vote by raising your name tag. The motion passed with some dissension and one abstention.

Chair Beck: Dr. Henry, will you tell us how the Committee came up with these numbers?

Dr. Henry: We moved the numbers a quarter up and down. C- and a C+ equal out. We didn't consider doing anything different with an A+. Texas Tech does award a plus grade and Missouri A+ but only award 4 grade points so the whole scale is different.

Chair Beck: Is there discussion of the grade breakdown?

Senator: One institution grandfathered in those already in the system? Would that be done?

Chair Beck: You are allowed to graduate under the catalogue that you entered or can matriculate under a new catalogue. That is a good question.

Dr. Henry: We did consider this. Texas Tech grandfathered in their system and the Registrar said they thought it was a monstrosity. Jonathan Helm hopes to avoid that and asks that we really consider it. He thinks Banner can handle it but it fosters incredible student confusion. The Committee was not keen on it.

Dr. Henry: In response to a Senator's question, are there any binders that would restrict this change? In the handbook it says we can change any policy at any time without notification to the students. So, whatever we may want to do as far as advanced notice or delayed implementation, there are no legal necessities. There is latitude to do what we decide.

Senator: I anticipated the C to be a 2.0 and I do not like that it is less. I am for the minus but not the number assigned to it. A C- should be the 2.0 and then up from there.

Senator: We want to attract students are high achieving and we do not want to penalize our students. I'm not saying give our students a better grade than they deserve. I would like those that teach students that are moving on, that have direct impact on their graduate school admissions to determine how this would impact them.

Senator: That is one of the reasons I was against this. The firms say Baylor students are better prepared but their GPAs are lower. We have a track record nationally. We are hampering our students.

Senator: Our students feel good with a 3.5 but it gets reduced to a 3.0 on their applications because we lack the minus grade so their pluses are taken out of their GPAs.

Senator: Do you think that it is important to let people know this is an option and not mandatory?

Dr. Henry: We have said that at every committee meeting. We have members who do not use the plus system now. It is left to the faculty to exercise appropriate judgment and to use sound pedagogy.

Senator: It is my suspicion that it won't change GPAs much in the middle but only at the ends. We will have a lot fewer 4.0 students.

Senator: I worry about the 2.0s. There are different ways to get a 1.8 which is a lot of Cs and a D-. It is very problematic the numbering that we have on here.

Chair Beck: Obviously there is a diversity of opinions here that reflect the diversity of the faculty. We may need to revisit this.

Senator: The interpretation that some faculty bring to this will leave some students at an advantage and some students at a great disadvantage. So we are giving faculty the choice and saying you can use the old one or the other old one and it depends on the faculty you have as to the grade you get.

Chair Beck: It is an issue that we already have. When I did advising, and students came with a "Do Take" and a "Don't Take" list and I loved it when they got it backwards. Oh yeah, you want Dr. Duhrkopf and Dr. Baldrige. I don't see it changing things. We have autonomy in assigning grades and it is a contract in the syllabus.

Senator: I think we need an A-.

Senator: It seems crazy to see a D+. There is something to be said for the B- and the A-. Why do you need to have the + or - for the Ds or even the Cs?

Senator: The law school, as a group thinks you are crazy to have all these different grading systems so we voted to all have the same. We have A- and B- only and C and above. You can't have C- because C is bottom adequate; there is no D- or D+. We thought our students were not going to like it but they loved it. I have trouble with all of the gradations but most faculty love it. This is a breakdown of those that are at least competent and higher. We didn't want to get into the game of classes with a GPA and an overall grade

Chair Beck: Do I hear a motion?

Senator Hurtt: I make a motion to do something like the law school which would accept the UUCG gradation recommendation without C-.

Senator Cannon: Seconded.

Chair Beck: Discussion. What did the committee consider?

Dr. Henry: We did discuss this some and did not like D- or D+ like here. Some wanted to keep it for symmetry. We didn't consider C- not being a part of the schema. We did the best we could to come up with a recommendation in the time we had and the discussion here mirrors ours.

Senator: For psychology and neuroscience there may be changes to requirements. I don't know the effect on students. I am in favor of leaving it as it is because I think I do have some D+ students. For graduate classes, when folks are doing work at that level, only Cs or Fs do work but for undergraduates, if we elect to make these recommendations, one of the issues is symmetry. Then I would elect to keep it the way it was recommended.

Senator: We have not considered how this will cash out long term. It could be that the overall GPA is helped by these distinctions.

Senator: In nursing, if you don't make a C then you have to take the course again. You can't distinguish between mediocre and really, really mediocre

Senator: Then you can reconsider where that is on the scale?

Senator: I do not think we will use this in the option.

Chair Beck: Is there any further discussion before we vote? Please vote by raising your hand.

VOTE: Without C-D+...favor of report 13

Not in favor of a revised committee report 20

Motion voted down

Senator Patton: I move that we adopt the report as recommended by the committee.

Senator Supplee: Seconded

Discussion:

Senator: This was not really discussed with our constituents with these options.

Senator: I don't see a need to discuss because it will be an endless discussion like today.

Senator: So everyone will have a choice. We are a body who can make a choice.

Senator: When would this go into effect?

Chair Beck: Fall 2013

Senator: Given the fact that some of our colleagues believe if they can make reliable judgments at this level, then I am inclined to believe they can. If I do not believe that I can make that judgment then I do not have to do that. An academic unit can decide if they want to make these judgments as a unit. We have the luxury of a fair amount of freedom that comes with a huge amount of responsibility.

Chair Beck: Jonathan Helm, the Registrar, will have the most amount of work.

Dr. Henry: My understanding is that this option would be available to everyone but you can just choose not to use them.

Senator: I don't know when this would go into effect because there is a lot of administrative approval that would be needed. I think this has opened up a sore point. Up to this point what would be C- would get you graduated but now will not. Changing the standard for graduation, changing what you think a person needs to do to graduate would be changed by this.

Senator: You can still make a 70% which is what you need to graduate.

Senator: Students take classes from a lot of people. Unless we move the GPA to 1.67 instead of 2.0, this is changing the standard for graduation.

Senator: It may make them aim for a middle C instead of just getting over the hurdle.

Senator: If you leave the GPA at 2.0 which is earned by C level work (average) which is the minimal acceptable grade. Now making differences between that and what is suitable for graduation.

Senator: I think I can still ask that question and determine if they have a minimal C work.

Senator: What is the C- is not trivial. I think we have to discuss this with our colleagues.

Chair Beck: We can vote yay or nay on accepting the report. Or another option is that we can ask to table this and, if this is what is done, I will let the Provost know that we will have further discussion.

Senator Neubert: I move that we table this.

Senator Beal: Seconded

Chair Beck: If you want to table this vote, say "Aye."

Voice vote passes to table the "minus" discussion and it will come up in the May meeting.

## **B. Senate Election report (Baker)**

Senator Baker: It is my pleasure to announce the new Senators along with those that will continue in their service.

For the College of Arts and Sciences:

- Michael Parrish, History
- Bob Baldrige, Biology
- Ann McGlashan, MFL



- Hope Johnston, English
- Ron Morgan, Mathematics

For the School of Business:

- Stan Madden, Marketing
- Mitch Neubert, Management and Entrepreneurship

For the School of Education:

- Margaret Wooddy, HHPR

For the School of Music:

- Tim McKinney, Academic Studies

For the School of Nursing:

- Lori Spies

## VI. Reports:

### A. Chair Report

Chair Beck: There will be a special ceremony on April 25 in the Baines room at 3:30 for retirees jointly sponsored by the Faculty Senate and Administration. Dr. Joyce Jones and Dr. Bill Hillis will be in conversation with Judge Starr.

The MCC Faculty Senate Chairman has requested a conversation on May 2<sup>nd</sup> with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to meet at MCC so we can get to know each other.

Staff council is having a drive for things to help the humane society, from pet food to cleaning supplies. Money donations are also helpful.

Early registration has been a problem. Our servers crash when registration starts. There are 3 servers devoted to registration. These will be upgraded in the summer which will make them slower. In the fall, there will be a gradation set-up in registration that is dependent upon the number of hours a student has. It will determine when they will register. They will also hold the numbers that are allowed to register at one time to 200-300. Also, release times each day will not be during classes so there will be no disruption. Lastly, there is now a process in place by which those with early registration will be highly vetted and next year, will review who has early registration.

- B. Academic Freedom (Tsang) No report.
- C. Enrollment Management (Still) No report.
- D. Student Life (Wood) No report.
- E. Liaison Reports
  - i. Council of Deans (Beck)

Chair Beck: I told them that we are considering the UUCC recommendation.

In addition, I explained that there is a growing faculty concern about how chairs are chosen and evaluated as well as about Dean evaluations. I have requested that Deans use consistency and transparency in the selection and evaluation process.

I also recommended that the Provost require management training for the Deans. Deans have little or no training for what they do, so I recommended that the Provost think seriously about putting new Deans through management training.

Lastly, I requested that all Deans go through conflict resolution training. Some Deans will ignore the desires of the faculty in order to avoid any conflict.

There will be some clarification of the tenure process especially for those who come in with tenure at other places. How long until incoming faculty may go up for tenure will depend on their scholarly productivity. Deans have been told not to make promises to incoming faculty regarding tenure.

- ii. Athletic Council (Blackwell) No report.
- iii. Personnel, Benefits, Compensation (Madden) No report.  
Executive Committee is received faculty worries about the CVS handling of prescription drug reimbursement and has recommended that we ask Regan to come and speak to the Executive Committee.
- iv. Personnel Policies (Beal) No report.
- v. Admission (Jordan)  
Senator Jordan: Available data cannot be emailed so I will hold this until the next meeting for the sake of time.
- vi. Staff Council (Patton)  
Senator Patton: We have met twice since last meeting. Please drop stuff in the boxes around campus for the humane society. There were new member elections to staff council. New Officers: Marylyn McKinney is the new Chair, Sue Koehler is the Chair Elect and Jan Holmes is the new Secretary.

The scholarship fund is \$1500 short of being sufficient to support the first scholarship for next fall. If we all give \$50 it could put that where it needs to be to get them over their minimal amount. As an appreciation for what they do for us, let's all give.

## **VII. New Business:**

### **A. Senate Officer Election Committee**

Chair Beck: The following senators are recommended as the Senate Officers' Nominating Committee:

Janelle Walter, chair; Ron Beal; Doug Claybrook; Barry Harvey; Mike Long; Rita Pattison; Joan Supplee

Chair Beck: I move that we accept the committee.

Senator Neubert: Seconded the motion.

Motion passed.

## **VIII. Adjournment**

Senator Supplee: I move that we adjourn the meeting.

Senator Walter: Second.

Chair Beck adjourned the meeting at 5:25 pm.