


F Book

F

AGENDA
Faculty Senate Meeting
February 15, 1984
3:45 p.m.
Moore Auditorium

- I. Approval of the minutes of the January 18, 1984 meeting
- II. Approval of the agenda for the February 15, 1984 meeting
- III. Report of the Steering Committee, Patricia Y. Martin
- IV. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Undergraduate Policy Committee, Elisabeth S. Muhlenfeld
 - b. Graduate Policy Committee, William F. Marzluff
- V. Unfinished Business
- VI. New Business
- VII. University Welfare
- VIII. Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers
- IX. Announcements of the President of the University


ANNOUNCEMENT: The University Womens' Club and the School of Nursing will host University Wednesday Social in the Faculty Lounge, 4th Floor, School of Nursing, immediately following the Senate meeting. There will be a charge of \$1.50.



DR DAISY P FLORY
3140 MES
VP-ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Boal

Faculty Senate Minutes
Moore Auditorium
February 15, 1984



I. Regular Session

The 1983-84 Faculty Senate met in regular session on Wednesday, February 15, 1984, at 3:45 p.m. in Moore Auditorium. Mr. Steve Edwards, Senate President presided.

The following members were absent. Alternates who were present are listed in parenthesis following the member they represent. Doris Abood, Craig Adcock, Burton Atkins, Jon Bailey, Jay Baker, Paul Beck, Neil Betten, George Blakely, Robert Clark, Edwin Cook, Galor Edgeworth(Carol Darling), Donna Fletcher, Leroy Gould, John Hills, Kurt Hofer, Katherine Hoffman(Ed Mellon), Frances James, John Kerr, Steven Klees, Curtis Krishef, Joseph Lannutti(Robert Kromhout), Fred Leysieffer, Claude Lilly, Wayne Minnick, Doron Nof, Barbara Palmer(Carolyn Schluck), Paul Piccard (Isaac Eberstein), Jon Piersol, Robert Reiser, Steve Rollin, Richard Rubino, Patricia Russo, Edwin Schroeder, William Shrode, John Simmons, Karen Singh, William Snyder, Fred Standley(Bonnie Braendlin), Jayne Alley Standley, Jack Taylor, Walter Taylor, Hollie Thomas, Allan Tucker, Glayde Whitney, Perrin Wright, William Young.

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of January 18, 1984, were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, Patricia Martin

In the past month, the Steering Committee pursued two primary issues. First, regarding the possibility that FSU might extend its unique pilot version of the early retirement plan, President Sliger reported that we are denied the request. The Board of Regents says that conditions of the collective bargaining agreement forbid FSU from having a different form of the plan. Second, the Steering Committee has communicated to University administration the concerns of faculty regarding summer support. The recent trend of compensating faculty primarily or only for classroom teaching in the summer is, we believe, contrary to the best interests of the University and militates against fulfillment of the University's fundamental mission of academic advisement and retention of outstanding undergraduate students and of research supervision and direction of graduate students.

A new service for students is offered as of this term through the Student Counseling Center in the form of seminars and drop-in workshops on study skills. A complete description of the service, its coordinators, times, and locations is contained in the attached announcement for inclusion in the minutes.



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Student Counseling Center

STUDY SKILLS SERVICES 1983-1984

The reason most frequently given to students who seek help at the Student Counseling Center is "Academic Difficulty." In response to this need, the Center has expanded its services in the area of study skills.

In addition to individual counseling, the Center now offers Seminars and "Drop-In" workshops to students with study skills deficits. The content of the seminars includes general study tips, time management principles, note-taking and text book reading skills, test preparation, anxiety management, and information on motivation, procrastination, and goal setting. These seminars are generally two hours in length and are offered upon request.

"Drop-In" workshops are offered every semester for students with more intense study skills deficits. These workshops deal in greater depth with the content of the Seminars and also focus heavily on personal needs and expectations. Drop-In workshops for the Spring semester are held:

<u>MONDAY</u>	3:00 - 4:30	330 Williams Building
<u>THURSDAY</u>	2:30 - 4:00	3rd Floor, Health Center

Short term individual counseling is offered to students who either have other personal concerns which interfere with their ability to study or who cannot attend the regularly scheduled workshops.

The coordinator of the study skills services at the Center is Ms. Judy Taps. Two peer facilitators, Chris Allers and Vivian Garcia, also provide services. They may be reached at 644-2003 for further information. Ms. Taps is also available to talk with groups of tutors, residence hall advisors, and/or members of student service organizations about techniques they can apply in working with students with study skills deficits.

Before calling upon Professor Muhlenfeld, President Edwards explained that because the reports of the Undergraduate and Graduate Policy Committees had not been received in time for distribution to Senators prior to the meeting or for summarization on the agenda as required by the Bylaws, he was ruling that these reports would only be presented for discussion today. They will be considered for possible action at the March 21 Senate meeting under Unfinished Business.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Undergraduate Policy Committee, Elisabeth S. Muhlenfeld

Ms. Muhlenfeld stated that if there were no objections the presentations would be as follows: Jeffrey Wool, student member of the UPC, the distribution of the UPC recommendations (attachment A), Bill Marzluff will present the GPC proposal (attachment B), then a maximum of six (6) students will be permitted to address the Senate. Hearing no objection this outline was followed.

Mr. Wool restated the platform of the Student Government that the +/- system would create a finer distinction to grades and give students the incentive to try harder the reach the next level.

The central objections of the UPC are threefold:

1. No A+ provision is in the present proposal.
2. C- falls below the 2.0 gpa.
3. There are numerous references in the catalog that would be affected.

Therefore, the UPC recommended the following:

1. The A+ should be added to reward the excellent student.
2. GPA's should stay as they are now.
3. Letter grades should mean 'letter-range' grades and changes needed will come from Colleges or Schools as they deem necessary.

Mr. Marzluff stated the the Graduate Policy Council generally agrees with the UPC and strongly supports the +/- grading system. However, they do not support the A+ grade as it was not in the original proposal.

Students permitted to address the Senate were Dominic Nozzi(against), Tom Abrams(for), Terry McDonald(against), Ed Brosman(for), Lynn Gerber(for). Another student was scheduled to speak against the proposed system, but failed to appear.

A

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senators

FROM: Elisabeth Muhlenfeld, Chairman, Undergraduate Policy Council

RE: Proposed Plus/Minus Grading System--FOR YOUR INFORMATION

By Student Senate Resolution #9, the Student Senate has requested the Faculty Senate to consider a Plus/Minus grading system proposed by the Executive Branch of Student Government. The plan, as it is presently proposed, is a modification of our present 4-point system designed to apply at both the graduate and undergraduate level as follows:

A	:	4.00	D+	:	1.25
A-	:	3.75	D	:	1.00
			D-	:	.75
B+	:	3.25			
B	:	3.00	F	:	0.00
B-	:	2.75			
C+	:	2.25			
C	:	2.00			
C-	:	1.75			

Similar 4-point plus/minus grading systems are currently used at such institutions as Harvard, University of California (Berkeley), University of Michigan and Vanderbilt.

Faculty should note that for any given student, the maximum difference the plan could make in a student's GPA for any given term, or in his or her overall GPA is ± 0.25 (+0.25 assuming that a student's grade in every course at FSU will be a "plus"; -0.25 assuming the student's grade in every course will be a "minus"). In practice, most students' GPA's would be affected minimally.

The plan's authors present the following arguments in its favor:

1. The proposed Plus/Minus modification allows professors to make finer distinctions within a given letter grade (B+, B or B-) and between two contiguous letter grades (A-/B+, B-/C+).
2. Therefore, the proposed modification will allow a more accurate representation of a student's university performance.
3. The proposed system would more clearly reflect the high achievement of competitive students, particularly those applying to graduate programs.
4. Such a system would have the effect of making all students' GPA's more precise and meaningful to admissions officers in graduate programs throughout the country.
5. The proposed plan would provide motivation for students to work to improve their GPA's. A student who, under the current system, forgoes no possibility of raising a C grade to a B grade may not strive to improve his or her performance; the proposed system gives such a student the motivation to work harder, inasmuch as he or she will be rewarded for improving from C to C+.

PROPOSED PLUS/MINUS GRADING SYSTEM:

Recommendations of the Undergraduate Policy Council

I. The Undergraduate Policy Council of the Florida State University recommends that the Faculty Senate endorse the plan presented by the Student Senate, with the following modification: we recommend that the plan include an A+ to be awarded the value of 4.25:

A+ : 4.25	B+ : 3.25	C+ : 2.25	D+ : 1.25	F : 0.00
A : 4.00	B : 3.00	C : 2.00	D : 1.00	
A- : 3.75	B- : 2.75	C- : 1.75	D- : .75	

II. This recommendation and the recommendations that follow are based on the premise that the grade range from plus to minus is considered to be equivalent to the current letter grade range. In other words, a student currently awarded a "C" in a course has, in fact, been awarded a grade in the "C range" which, under the proposed plus/minus plan would include "C-," "C," and "C+." See accompanying illustration.

III. Our recommendation pertains only to the grading scale. The Faculty Senate should understand that passing the new plus/minus scale will not affect any university requirements. All university regulations currently announced in the BULLETIN will be considered binding, to be interpreted as follows:

- A. All regulations currently tied to a specific GPA will remain exactly as they are (e.g., GPA of 2.0 required for undergraduate students to remain in good academic standing; 3.0 for graduate students to remain in good academic standing; 3.50 for cum laude, etc.).
- B. All regulations currently applicable on a course-by-course basis and currently tied to a specific letter grade would be interpreted to mean a specific letter grade range. Hence, if a student currently must achieve a "C" in one course in order to proceed to another course, under the proposed plus/minus system, that student would have to achieve a grade in the "C range," to include "C-."

NOTE: It follows from recommendation III.B. that in the case of "Gordon Rule" courses (and in the absence of any ruling by the Board of Regents), which currently do not fulfil the Gordon Rule word-count requirement unless the student achieves a C or better, the university will consider that a C- earned in a Gordon Rule course will constitute successful completion of the Gordon Rule word-count requirement for that particular course.


- C. All regulations currently tied to a specific grade average would be interpreted to mean the numerical average currently associated with that specific grade. Hence, the required "C average or better" on all Liberal Studies courses would be interpreted as "2.0 average or better."

IV. Each college and department will review its current regulations as stated in the BULLETIN and make any changes it deems necessary to clarify its program requirements in light of the plus/minus system.

RELATIONSHIP OF LETTER GRADES TO GRADE RANGES IN SELECTED GRADING SYSTEMS

FSU	LETTER GRADES	NUMERICAL EQUIVALENTS	CURVE	HYPOTHETICAL POINT VALUES	SAT'S
4.0 3.75	A A+	90-100	92-100	20 22 18	500
3.0 2.75	B B+	80-89	87-93	15 17 13	650
2.0 1.75	C C+	70-79	79-86	10 12 8	500
1.0 .75	D D+	60-69	70-78	5 7 3	350
0.0	F	below 60	below 70	0	200

ARBITRARY POINT VALUES



OTHER POSSIBLE ARBITRARY POINT VALUE SCALES

PROPOSED PLUS/MINUS GRADING SYSTEM

Recommendations of the Graduate Policy Committee

1. The Graduate Policy Committee supports a plus/minus grading system.
2. The GPC does not recommend the inclusion of an A+ grade.
3. The GPC voted to adopt recommendations III A and III C of the Undergraduate Policy Committee as they relate to graduate programs.
4. The GPC voted to adopt recommendation IV of the Undergraduate Policy Committee.
5. The GPC recommended that all grade requirements must be stated with a numerical equivalent. (This as a substitute recommendation for III B of the UPC).

February 13, 1984

A discussion resulted in questions such as effective dates and other grading proposals. Dr. Flory informed the Senate that the last change in the grading system was made during the 1950s when it was changed from a 3.00 system (with F assigned -1.00 quality point) to a 4.00 system. Also, some departments and schools have changed it in that they require gpa's of 2.25 or 2.50 for admission or graduation.

VI. Unfinished Business

Mr. Edwards stated that the Steering Committee knew of no unfinished business.

VII. New Business

No new business was brought to the Senate.

VIII. University Welfare

Mr. Roeder addressed the Senate on a previous Steering Committee report's concern over lack of attendance at the Senate meetings. Mr. Roeder felt that more information should be placed on the agenda. This would create more interest and open debate on proposals. Mr. Edwards agreed with Mr. Roeder and stated that proposals are not always received in time to be placed on the agenda.

Mr. Roeder also expressed concern over the recent announcement of reorganization in Academic Affairs. It was reported that no proposals had been finalized and Vice President Turnbull told the Senate that when such reorganization plans are made the Senate will be informed.

Concerns from Mr. DeVore expressed that he, too, wants Senate input into this reorganization.

Mr. Roeder stated that part of the reorganization involved the Dean of the Faculties which is a very closely affiliated administrative office of the Senate. Ms. Patricia Martin stated that Steering Committee, too, is concerned over changes in the Dean of the Faculties office and that the Steering Committee had met with Dr. Daisy Flory to discuss her recommendations. This item was inadvertently left out of the Steering Committee report.

Mr. Schendel is concerned about the summer program. The funding from two fiscal years seems to be imbalanced. Mr. Edwards stated that the man year concept has contributed to the problems along with unexpected budget constraints. One issue being examined closely is the possibility of changing to a semi-monthly payroll. Mr. Turnbull agreed with these remarks and further elucidated them.

Ms. Hendrickson thanked the Senators for being open with the administration with their concerns and thanked the administration for communicating their plans openly with the Faculty Senate. This type of communication sets FSU apart from other universities.

IX. Announcements of the President of the University


Dr. Sliger stated that he appreciated Ms. Hendrickson's remarks. The Senate and the administration share an openness that is unique, not only in Florida, but in other states.

Issues Dr. Sliger discussed were:

1. Reorganization - Dr. Turnbull and he have just started the reorganization plans for Academic Affairs. Nothing has been decided and rumors should be ignored.
2. Enrollment made significant progress. Dr. Sliger is visiting schools statewide to promote Florida State University.
3. Dr. Sliger reported good recruiting is taking place in the Merit Scholars Program.
4. Concerns raised by other SUS institutions about unequal distribution of funds in the SUS are being studied by our budget office and the the SUS Director of Budgets. President Sliger will ask Mr. Kreimer and Mr. Edwards to review the results of these investigations.
5. There is some progress in the money-raising projects going on now.
6. Promotion and Tenure results will be released in a few days.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.


Janis D. Sass
Secretary to the Faculty

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senators

FROM: Elisabeth Muhlenfeld, Chairman, Undergraduate Policy Council

RE: Proposed Plus/Minus Grading System--FOR YOUR INFORMATION

By Student Senate Resolution #9, the Student Senate has requested the Faculty Senate to consider a Plus/Minus grading system proposed by the Executive Branch of Student Government. The plan, as it is presently proposed, is a modification of our present 4-point system designed to apply at both the graduate and undergraduate level as follows:

A	:	4.00	D+	:	1.25
A-	:	3.75	D	:	1.00
B+	:	3.25	D-	:	.75
B	:	3.00	F	:	0.00
B-	:	2.75			
C+	:	2.25			
C	:	2.00			
C-	:	1.75			

Similar 4-point plus/minus grading systems are currently used at such institutions as Harvard, University of California (Berkeley), University of Michigan and Vanderbilt.

Faculty should note that for any given student, the maximum difference the plan could make in a student's GPA for any given term, or in his or her overall GPA is ± 0.25 (+0.25 assuming that a student's grade in every course at FSU will be a "plus"; -0.25 assuming the student's grade in every course will be a "minus"). In practice, most students' GPA's would be affected minimally.

The plan's authors present the following arguments in its favor:

1. The proposed Plus/Minus modification allows professors to make finer distinctions within a given letter grade (B+, B or B-) and between two contiguous letter grades (A-/B+, B-/C+).
2. Therefore, the proposed modification will allow a more accurate representation of a student's university performance.
3. The proposed system would more clearly reflect the high achievement of competitive students, particularly those applying to graduate programs.
4. Such a system would have the effect of making all students' GPA's more precise and meaningful to admissions officers in graduate programs throughout the country.
5. The proposed plan would provide motivation for students to work to improve their GPA's. A student who, under the current system, foresees no possibility of raising a C grade to a B grade may not strive to improve his or her performance; the proposed system gives such a student the motivation to work harder, inasmuch as he or she will be rewarded for improving from C to C+.