Faculty Meeting Minutes
September 12, 2008

I. Call to Order
Warren Rogers called the meeting to order at 3:32.

II. Faculty Devotional
Warren Rogers shared a devotional with the faculty.

III. New Faculty Introduction
a. Maurice Lee (Religious Studies) introduced himself to the faculty.

IV. Report from the President
a. Gayle Beebe offered some remarks to the faculty. He requested that when members of the faculty make direct contact with the Board of Trustees that he be notified.

Gayle discussed the search for a Vice President for Academics and Dean of Faculty, distributing several documents describing the position. Advertisements for the position will be posted October 1.

He also discussed Phase I Construction. Groundbreaking for the Adams Center should commence on October 23rd. Construction of the chapel will be delayed until later in Phase I.

V. Business of the Faculty
After a break, Lisa de Boer returned the meeting to order at 4:37pm

1. Approval of the Minutes from 4-18-08
   The minutes were approved as distributed.

   Steve Julio was recognized and thanked for his service as Secretary of the Faculty for the 2007-2008 school year.

2. Committee Membership
   1. Motion to suspend the handbook for a sabbatical replacement on the General Education Committee
      The handbook was suspended as requested by unanimous voice vote.

   2. Elections to Off Campus Program Committee, Institutional Review Board, and Admissions and Retention
      The committee ballot included the following nominations:
      Ron Enroth—Off Campus Program Committee (2010)
      John Carlander—Admissions and Retention Committee (2011)
      Beth Horvath—Institutional Review Committee (2012)
      Approval of their appointment was moved by Debora Dunn, seconded by Dave Newton, and then confirmed by faculty acclamation.

3. Business from Academic Senate: Resumption of Grade Definition Discussion
   This was postponed at our last faculty meeting. See point “F” in the minutes of our previous meeting for the state of conversation at that time.

   Discussion continued from the last faculty meeting regarding a proposed amendment to the revised grade descriptions—namely, to change the primary “C” grade description from “adequate” to “acceptable.” Ray Rosentrater called for the question on the proposed amendment. Move to end discussion approved unanimously by voice vote. Amendment voted down by unanimous voice vote.
Greg Spencer moved to strike the word “marginally” from the first bullet-point in the “C” description, Jeff Schoss seconded. This amendment was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Gayle Tucker called for the question; discussion was closed by unanimous voice vote. The revised grade definitions—as amended—were passed by unanimous voice vote (appended).

4. Presentation by Associate Academic Dean for Curriculum
Ray Rosentrater offered some comments to the faculty. He explained that the Academic Senate will be reviewing the learning outcomes of each of the different General Education requirements. Requirements that do not fall clearly under the purview of one particular department will be addressed directly by the Academic Senate. He also distributed a draft proposal for multidisciplinary first-year seminars.

5. Presentation by the Registrar
Bob Kuntz offered some comments to the faculty.
Wendy Wright explained how the new Application for Degree process will work. The program evaluation function on WebAdvisor will now serve as the application. Advisor(s) will sign at the end of the application, now printed from WebAdvisor.
Bob Kuntz accepted feedback and questions on WebAdvisor.

6. Report from Dean of Admissions
The Dean of Admissions was unable to attend.

VI. Dean’s Reflections
Warren Rogers mentioned that he will explore in the future keeping faculty accomplishments listed on the Provost’s web page and only announcing a few more notable accomplishments to the whole faculty. He mentioned several recent highlights in faculty scholarship and awards.
Warren reviewed several departmental searches and retirements. He mentioned that members of the faculty will be asked to serve on strategic planning task forces in the near future. He also announced that Carter Crockett has tendered his resignation and that his resignation has been accepted.

VII. Adjournment
Warren Rogers adjourned the meeting with prayer at 5:36.

Respectfully submitted by Jesse Covington
Definitions of Letter Grades (as amended and approved)

A. DEFINITION OF LETTER GRADES
The following describes the level of performance for each letter grade designation. Grades may be modified by plus (+) or minus (-).

Sound scholarship demands accuracy, clarity, precision, fairness in the use of sources, sensitivity to implications and competing points of view, an ability to distinguish the relevant from the irrelevant, and effectiveness in the use of language. An instructor may identify additional characteristics relevant to a particular discipline. The use of a rubric such as this is meant to produce greater consistency in grading across the curriculum.

A grade of A indicates superior scholastic performance. The student
• demonstrates distinctive understanding of course material by exhibiting the ability to analyze critically and synthesize creatively.
• applies sound techniques of scholarship in all projects.
• relates the course material to other areas of intellectual investigation in ways that show intellectual curiosity, imagination, and sound judgment.

A grade of B indicates good scholastic performance. The student
• exhibits broad understanding of course material by the ability to draw valid inferences and make sound generalizations.
• makes competent use of the techniques of sound scholarship.
• communicates ably and with sustained interest ideas and concepts which are part of the subject matter of the course.

A grade of C indicates adequate scholastic performance. The student
• shows acceptable understanding of course material as shown in committing few errors in fact and judgment when discussing the material.
• indicates limited familiarity with the techniques of sound scholarship.
• exhibits interest in the subject matter and some understanding of the concepts and ideas which are part of the subject matter of the course.

A grade of D indicates deficient scholastic performance. The student
• displays insufficient understanding of course material and an inability to recapitulate facts or make sound judgments.
• makes minimal or unsound use of the techniques of scholarship.
• reveals lack of breadth in knowledge and minimal interest in the subject matter even when engaging essential concepts and ideas.

A grade of F indicates unacceptable scholastic performance. The student
• fails to meet the standards and requirements of the course in preparation, outside reading, and class participation.
• reveals inadequate understanding of the course material by an excessive number of errors in fact and judgment when discussing the material.
• fails to use techniques of sound scholarship.
• shows little or no comprehension of the concepts and ideas which are part of the subject matter of the course.