

Office of the Provost
and Vice President for Academic Affairs
270-745-2296
FAX: 270-745-5442



Western Kentucky University
1906 College Heights Blvd #11008
Bowling Green, KY 42101-1008

The Spirit Makes the Master

May 3, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ms. Michelle Hollis
Chair University Senate

FROM: Barbara Burch
Provost and Vice President
For Academic Affairs

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B Burch', written in a cursive style.

SUBJECT: April 19, 2007 University Senate Minutes

I endorse without exception the actions of the University Senate at its April 19, 2007 meeting.

/lsw

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michelle Hollis', written in a cursive style. Below the signature, the date '5/8/07' is written in a similar cursive style.

Office of the Provost
and Vice President for Academic Affairs
270-745-2296
FAX: 270-745-5442



Western Kentucky University
1906 College Heights Blvd #11008
Bowling Green, KY 42101-1008

The Spirit Makes the Master

April 3, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ms. Michelle Hollis
Chair University Senate

FROM: Barbara Burch
Provost and Vice President
For Academic Affairs

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. Burch', is written over the printed name of Barbara Burch.

SUBJECT: March 22, 2007 University Senate Minutes

I endorse with exception to the plus-minus grading the actions of the University Senate at its March 22, 2007 meeting.

/lsw

WKU UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES

April 19, 2007

I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the WKU University Senate was called to order Thursday, April 19 2007, at 3:55 P.M. in the Garrett Ballroom by Chair Michelle Hollis. A quorum was present.

The following members were present: Mustafa Atici, Johnathon Boles, Charles Borders, Tim Brotherton, Barbara Burch, Mike Carini, Richard Dressler, Freda Embry, Tim Gilbert, Jerry Gotlieb, Deana Groves, Anthony Harkins, Joe Hardin, Michelle Hollis, Kate Hudepohl, Skylar Jordan (SGA), Kaveh Khatir, Scott Lasley, David Lee, Sherry Lovan, Terrence McCain, Andrew McMichael, Patricia Minter, Richard C. Miller, Roger Murphy, Dan Myers-0, John Musalia, Laurin Notheisen, Holly Payne, Katharine Pettit, Katrina Phelps, Keith Phillips, Heidi Pintner, Eric Reed, Julie Shadoan, Vernon Sheeley, Saundra Starks, Michelle Trawick, Judy Walker, Carol Watwood, Jeff Willis, Jacqueline Wofford, and Mary Wolinski.

Alternates present were: Denise Gravitt for Greg Arbuckle, Sylvia Gaiko for John Bonaguro, Hasan Palandoken for Stuart Burris, Jay Gabbard for Janice Chadha, Matt Pruitt for Jerry Daday, Rico Tyler for Judy Davison, Daniel Carter for Terry Dean, Rachel Neal for Karen Mason, Susann Davis for Laura McGeeIsabel Mukonyora for Jeffrey Samuels, Sharon Spall for Bud Schlinker, Tammie Stenger-Ramsey for Peter St. Pierre, Bob Reber for William J. Tallon, and Shannon R. Miller for Tom Tutino,.

The following members were absent: John All, Mike Binder, Scott Bonham, Robert Bowker, Marty Boman, Jeff Butterfield, Walter Collett, Eddy Cuisinier, Robert Dietle, Nancy English, Sam Evans, Janice Ferguson, Blaine Ferrell, James Gary, Jens Harlander, Kathleen Hennessey, Heather Johnson, Debbie Kreitzer, Dominic Lanphier, John Long, Cynthia Mason, Timothy Mullin, Thanh Lan Ngugen, Johnston Njoku, Gary Ransdell, Sherry Reid, Angela Robertson, Krist Schell, Peter Sepanski, Nevil Speer, Carol Stowe-Byrd, Don Swoboda, Samanta Thapa, and Stacy Wade.

The following newly elected 2007-2008 Senators were present: Kristina Arnold, Tim Brotherton, Michael Carini, Daniel Carter for Terry Dean, Uma Doraiswamy, Constance Edwards, Niko Endres, Michele Fiala, Douglas Fugate, Jim Fulkerson, Denise Gravitt, Michelle Hollis, Aaron Kindsvatter, Jim Lindsey, Sharon Mutter, Dan Myers, Steve Nagy, Rachel Neal for Karen Masonvv, Holly Payne, Saundra Starks, Tammie Stenger-Ramsey, Julie Shadoan, Louis Strolger, Luella Teuton, Rico Tyler, Carol Watwood, Zhonghang Xia.

II. Minutes

The Minutes of the March 22, 2007 meeting were approved as read with the following correction: Katrina Phelps was present (not absent). Dr. Burch endorsed

the minutes with exception to plus/minus grading, which she discussed later during the April 18th meeting.

III. Reports

a. Chair

Michelle Hollis, Chair of the Senate, reported that the Faculty Handbook Committee still needs representatives from Ogden and Gordon Ford. The Vice Chair and Faculty Regent do not have representation.

Michelle Hollis clarified that the new Senators are not allowed to sit at the table and are not allowed to vote on anything today unless they are representing a current senator. She also asked them to sign in and double check the spelling of their names.

b. Vice Chair

The Vice-Chair, John All, was not present. There was no report.

c. Faculty Regent

Dr. Dietle resigned at the previous meeting as Faculty Regent. Because of the concerns that were voiced regarding the recent Faculty Regent election, there was no Faculty Regent representation at this meeting. Therefore, no report took place.

d. Provost

The Provost, Barbara Burch, spoke to the Senate about her decision regarding the Plus/Minus Grading Resolution. She stated that she spent more time and more listening and more thinking on this issue than anything she can remember since she has been at WKU and that she believes without question that the right to decide methodology of grading belongs to the faculty. This does not mean that she is not sensitive to the issues that have been brought forth by students and many others. At the same time, she feels that there are some things as proposed (there is a practical side of implementation and a philosophical side to it) that raise some concerns. There is little question that pluses provide aspirational opportunities. Minuses create some interesting operational challenges. One of the things that she previously decided and still feels is that if it were to be implemented, it will be done so all or none because she feels that some students with plus/minus grading and some without is a totally unmanageable system. She said that she also went through a point of wondering why pluses on C's and B's and not on an A. Should we design a system that would encourage students to risk and try new learning opportunities even though they know that the course in which they are enrolled may be one that isn't their strongest suit? Many would be unwilling to try because it could lower their GPA. She said that she has listened to many talk about the fact that it should not be all about grades, and she agrees that it should not be all about grades, because the fact of the matter is that most of this discussion and even the analyses conducted have been on GPA and distribution of assigned grades. While those are very important issues, ultimately this is a measurement issue as well. The real question is whether or not methods used to measure student performance and to assign grades are precise enough to make the

finer distinctions that come with plus/minus grading, when in fact we don't seem to have an agreement or a definition on what plus means and what minus means. One might argue the same point for A-B-C-D-F, because we have such wide variations. She has some concern about moving to a grading system that has the appearance of greater precision of grades if it is not supported by the underlying measurement processes and practices that will truly provide accurate and equally precise indicators of student performance. As she looks at the studies that were done, and there was a survey study done by the Senate in February of 2005; the final study that was done was basically who participated and people's attitudes toward it. There were two dimensions to that survey. If you read the one about plus/minus and the one about traditional grades, you could flip-flop them and it would be hard to tell the difference; about the same number of faculty like one better than the other, although a great many faculty didn't care one way or the other. She stated again that she has had more emails on this topic than she could count; some were from students who said they didn't agree with the SGA position, and more from faculty who said they didn't agree with the position of going to plus/minus. She also found herself believing that the faculty voice is the Senate, and thus if faculty don't like the way the Senate voted, that seems to be a faculty problem to influence the Senate as their representatives. She kept listening and kept looking and then went back to the studies. What she found from the study that was done based on the three-semester participation was that it probably, while not being statistically significant in its measurement, but then it is statistically difficult to determine even participation (it is hard to know whether the same people participated or different people). It is clear that fewer people participated by the second and third semester than the first, but maybe it is because people felt it would not make a difference. At the bottom of that study, no matter how great the difference in numbers or how small, it hurts more students than it helps. It also affects while not many students, a 1% factor of students who would lose financial aid, and a 1% factor (almost) of athletes who would lose eligibility, is a sizeable number of students. Many people commented that if the system is going to be changed, try to figure out what is broken about it. One of the key questions she recalled from early discussions had to do with wanting to create a system that was more motivating to students that gave them a reason to aspire for a higher grade. She does agree that if a student is sitting on a low B, then there may not be much to drive the student to make it a higher one, although she also submits that the organization of a class and the pedagogy used and the nature of the assignments can often affect the degree to which students are motivated to do more. She does not find that making a decision to do plus/minus would be on the basis of what is a significant research-base. She thinks it is a philosophical question, and maybe a political question as well. She is convinced it is one that is really very unevenly embraced across the campus. Several departments told her that they would not use the system because they do not feel that it represents their best interests in terms of their particular professional program, or for other reasons. There can't ever be evenness; some faculty never give a D and some rarely give an A. Her sense is that faculty grading is a very individual thing and that at the end of the day, faculty do what they feel represents in their best judgment, the performance level of the student, whether it is with a plus, or whether it is with a minus. The other very difficult issue that was presented to her was

considering the implications for honors in the university. We have 33 students this year who will graduate with 4.0's. Some would say that is entirely high in number. It is the highest number we have ever had. To her, it says two things: it says that either students are working much harder to achieve that highest level of academic grade point average, or it says what they are having to do to achieve it may not be at the level that some would want it to be. Whichever it is, it is kind of a faculty decision in grading. But there is little if any in the studies to suggest that the plus/minus system does anything to address grade inflation, which was one of the reasons it was set forth, as well. As she looks at the end of the day as to where it is, and she looks at the unanswered questions that it has on enrollments, on scheduling, revisiting what constitutes college scholars, on the absence of the plus in the A and on the lack of definition of what it means, as well as looking at considerably strong effect of students having fear of the system, the fact that there were many students who signed on as opposed to it, it is significant that any time you get that many people to sign on, but she also suspects that many signed on who didn't have a good understanding one way or the other, but she does think the fact that many students perceive the system as a harmful one to them is a significant factor to consider. Right now, the evidence that came from the study that Institutional Research did for the Senate, suggests that about 2/3 of the grades went down (GPA's went down) and 1/3 went up. She stated that she is not sure whether that is a good outcome or not. What she does think is that perhaps going into a system that could have a fairly substantial impact on students and on their perception of what they feel is or isn't a grading system that is to their advantage, is something that needs to be addressed. If we were going to do plus/minus, we ought to be able to address this in a way that gives some level of assurance to students that they will not be harmed. She has also heard many people say that this isn't about grades, that we over-emphasize the importance of grades to students. She agrees that it should not be all about grades and it should be about student learning. However, we still live in an environment and in a culture where the grades do count. They do count, and whether they count as much as students think they do or not, is another question. There is a lot of research that says that a student who is heavily involved in many other kinds of things in their college career, to demonstrate other strengths that they have developed, probably has a better resume to present with a 3.9 or 3.6 or 3.1 than perhaps a 4.0 who has done nothing but focus on GPA. She is not sure if plus/minus will address that. This leaves her with three choices: (1) to simply say that we will go ahead with it and use the time between September 2008 to try to resolve the issues, but she does not know if that is the way to go; (2) she could say that we will put it on hold and still take another look at some of these problems that are still associated with it and come back in another month or two to make a final decision; or (3) or she could say that for right now she does not think it is in the best interest to approve the system for implementation and we are always open to come back and present it in a way that addresses some of the issues that putting it forth at this time has presented. She wants the faculty to know that she is genuinely not pleased with not being able to stand before the Senate and say that we will go forward with the system, period, because she really does believe that the Senate is the elected body to represent the faculty and she does think that grading is a faculty decision. What she is not convinced is that this is where the faculty is, and

she wishes that she knew that better. She is also not convinced that we don't have some problems to address and be able to set aside before we are ready to move on. So what she is saying for right now is that she is not going to agree on moving forward with a plus/minus system. She invites the Senate to bring it back to the table, having addressed some of the troublesome operational aspects of it in a way that we can show it doesn't do harm to students, and that it does in fact create a motivating and positive force for promoting student learning. Should the Senate decide to do that, she will not ask the Senate to do a pilot study, but she thinks it needs to be considered thoughtfully and the implementation considerations need to be worked out in a way that there could be a greater amount of support on the campus for the system. She does not think it is the right time to change the present system for one that may be as broken in the way that we implement it, or more broken, than the one we now have, if in fact the one we now have is broken. Hopefully at that time, it would be one that also would be able to help the students to understand that it is done in a way that promotes their best interest and supports their learning objectives, as opposed to one which they feel fearful of consequences, perhaps even to the point that WKU would not be their school of choice. For all of the tremendous reasons to choose WKU, at this point Dr. Burch would not want fear of a grading system to be one of them. She hopes that the Senate will know that she has truly stressed over this and is sorry that she could not find a way to come back and support exactly what the Senate proposed, but she thinks the best thing at this point is for her to tell the Senate with all of the other things on the agenda (Senate, and University, and Faculty as a whole), she is simply saying that she is not going to approve plus/minus system as proposed at this time. Should it come back again in the future, she hopes it will come back with some of the parameters addressed and included.

Eric Reed asked Dr. Burch to submit with as much detail her reasons for not approving it to the future Senate Chair. Dr. Burch said that she would do this in a faculty-all email as well as to the Senate. She feels that we deserve that and she does not have the documentation to say it is wrong and wants him to understand that. He said that he would like the same level of detail as she just explained in writing.

Andrew McMichael asked her to clarify whether she is not yet approving it or if she is specifically striking it. She stated that she is closing the door on it at this point and is taking it off the agenda so it does not sit there. When she gives her statement in writing, she will add several others and she thinks it will express the things that she thinks truly are barriers to it right now. Right now she is sending back her report as not approved. Andrew McMichael asked her to, for the moment reconsider that since many of those things might be taken care of, that instead of disapproving it, put it on hold. Dr. Burch responded that she has no problem that if those problems are addressed and brought back to the agenda, and those things can be addressed, we could still have an early implementation date. The things that would hold us up now are the things that she commented on. Several went to the trouble of presenting her with some fairly lengthy and expansive research studies analyzing the various sides of this issue. She has been well educated about it at this point and feels this would be of value to those who are still interested in it. For right now, she simply does not think it

is in the best interest to move ahead with all of those things on the table and she is impressed with the degree to which many Senators and many students have made an effort to look at those items. One of the goals that we have as an institution is to engage students, have them inquiring, and participating in things in an effort to affect their lives and that of others. We should feel proud of the degree to which students are involved in this. This is not to say that every point of view that the students brought forward was the right one, but it is to say that their participation is a compliment to them and a compliment to the Senate, to encourage it and include it in the discussion.

On another topic, Dr. Burch stated that some Summative Salary information will be distributed to Department Heads and Deans in the next few days and she thinks that one of the very positive things is that it was a good year for faculty salaries. Overall, the pools were greater than the 4% average and in the future year, the president's commitment for funding to address faculty salaries and benchmarking is a very positive one.

Michelle Hollis asked Dr. Burch to reconsider closing the door on the plus/minus issue, being that there is still one more Senate meeting for this term. This way, the people involved with plus/minus would have a chance to address some of the issues that she mentioned. This way it could be settled with the current Senate, rather than extending it over to another Senate. New Senators have been elected. Some of the current Senators who are strongly vested in plus/minus may not be on the Senate in years to come. She would rather not put this off and would like Dr. Burch to reconsider and allow the current Senate to address some of the issues that she just mentioned. Dr. Burch stated that she really does believe that one of the things that made it difficult was the amount of quality time and one-on-one time among the faculty and the students in looking at ways that this could or could not happen in a positive way. The Senate will be surprised at how many different models might be in the minds of some of their peers. That is something for the Senate to decide. She does not think that her closing it at this date is going to make a whole lot of difference because it would be really hard to get all of that done by then. This does not negate the future Senators from being able to come back to it again. Michelle Hollis stated that she does not want to be confrontational, but when she hears Dr. Burch say that, she feels that it underestimates the abilities of the current Senators. Dr. Burch said that if the current Senate wants to take a shot at it, they can, but it is going to be very, very difficult to do that during this time of the year. Michelle Hollis said that they would appreciate the opportunity.

IV. Standing Committee Reports

a. University Curriculum Committee

Julie Shadoan, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee, had two friendly amendments to the UCC proposal: (1) ELED 345 is on the agenda twice; the second one is the actual proposal; and (2) AMS 365 is renamed AMS 321. She then moved for approval of the consent agenda. The course proposals passed unanimously as presented without discussion.

b. General Education

Patricia Minter, Chair of the General Education Committee, stated that the General Education Committee had no report. She urged members of the "old" senate to attend the May meeting so that the proposals can go through in the fall.

c. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities

Nevil Speer, Chair of the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee, was not present. There was no report.

d. Committee on Academic Quality

The Chair of the Committee on Academic Quality, Andrew McMichael, stated that there was no report.

e. Graduate Council

Tim Gilbert, the Chair of the Graduate Council, made a motion for support and approval of the Graduate Council agenda items for University Senate consideration. The consent agenda passed unanimously with no discussion on the items.

V. Old Business

VI. New Business

Members of the Executive Committee made a motion for approval of the Senate to have the Executive Committee represent the Senate during the summer months. They must inform the Senate if they decide to take something up. Eric Reed clarified that it would only be provisionally approved until the full Senate could vote on it. This passed unanimously.

Dr. Burch presented her Critical Thinking Initiative to the Senate asking them to show support for and endorse it as something of value. This is an opportunity through the national center. It will be a strictly voluntary opportunity next year for faculty who want to participate in the critical thinking program that will be developed over a three-year period. The Senate Executive Committee and Council of Deans have endorsed it. In another week, they will check with department heads. They will be looking for a cohort of 100 faculty who want to pursue this program over three years and will be certified as critical thinking scholars. There will be some faculty support for those who want to participate over a three-year period. Those who do not want to attend all of the workshops can still participate. It will be a 2-day per semester commitment. This is an opportunity for the Senate to endorse something that could be a very exciting professional development opportunity on campus (not requiring travel). Katrina Phelps stated that she has used it in her class this semester and feels it is a valuable teaching tool. A vote in favor of endorsing this initiative passed unanimously.

Andrew McMichael brought new business from the floor, an environmental stewardship resolution, that asks President Ransdell to create a committee to make

policy recommendations only regarding some kind of comprehensive plan and initiatives for achieving climate neutrality on campus. This is a major incentive that goes on at campuses around the country to look into many different things (from how landscaping is done to courses, types of classroom activities that can be scaled to environmental stewardship). The committee will be comprised of faculty, students, and staff as appropriate to this area. This resolution would ask the President to create it in a way that he sees fit. This committee will not make policies but will make recommendations on ways that the university could become more environmentally friendly on short-term and long-range planning. The resolution passed unanimously as presented.

The recent Faculty Regent Special Election was held. We thought we had a new Regent. Someone voiced concerns, so the Executive Committee held a special three-hour meeting. One issue dealt with the time-line in which the election was presented because it violated what was written in the faculty handbook. The time line was violated in order to have a Regent in place prior to the April 27th Board of Regents Meeting. Even though this was a special election, the guidelines in the faculty handbook should have been followed. Everyone was given the same timeline and no one opposed this prior to the election taking place. Another issue was that the polls closed early in the College of Education; the polls closed at 3:00. The first email said the polls would close at 3:30, the second and third emails said 3:00. Errors happened on many different levels and this was not done to intentionally bias one candidate over another. Another major concern was the eligibility of voters. The list of eligibility was sent out to the deans in all of the colleges except for University College (its list got sent to Nathan Phelps, the director of University Experience). This list should have gone to Dr. Miller. Those with questions should have gone to departmental senators. This was an error on the part of the Executive Committee but it was not done to bias the election. One of the deans was out of town when the election occurred; that college had no list of eligibility at the time voting started. An office associate contacted Lou Stahl-White, who sent the list right away. Those who were inconvenienced were eventually able to vote. Another concern that was raised dealt with absentee ballots. According to the handbook, a provision should have been made for those on extended campus or people away from campus so they would have a chance to vote; this was not done. The faculty handbook states that extended campus should have been able to vote and this should have been sent to the college representative from their college's representative who serves on the Executive Committee prior to 8 AM the day before the election. The Faculty Handbook needs major revision in these areas to address these issues; Julie Shadoan is chairing the committee and stated that she will take personal responsibility for that part of the handbook. The Executive Committee presented the Faculty Regent Special Election Resolution, recommending that the election results be set aside, with a new election process that will take place on August 27, 2007. The newly-elected Chair of the Senate will represent the Senate as Regent until the new Regent election takes place and the seat is no longer vacant. Senator Wolinski clarified that the new process will commence on August 27 (not the election). She also asked who the Regent will be for the April 27th Board of Regents meeting. Eric Reed stated that he wanted to split

the question on the resolution. This proposal issue would ensure that the faculty has a voting representative at the April 27th meeting and the first meeting of the year (the new Senate Chair would be ineligible to vote). The proposal to split the question was seconded. Dr. Burch stated that she feels the recommendation to split the question is an important one because it makes a difference in having a voting representative during the period of time between elections. Eric Reed clarified that the reason Michelle Hollis is ineligible to vote is because our charter says so. A Senator cannot also be the Regent. The vote on the split of two questions as presented passed unanimously. Discussion on the first question centered followed. It was brought up that although to some extent the Executive Committee made some mistakes, it is also a mistake to overturn the results. Julie Shadoan stated that the Executive Committee consulted with the Parliamentarian (Joan Krenzin) on their decision and they were not just acting however they saw fit. Joan stated that she felt what was being discussed was more political than parliamentarian and she pulled out of the discussion. Dr. Burch stated that in the course of the issue, hurt has been brought to everyone involved. In consulting the Kentucky Revised Statute regulations on the election of Faculty Regent, it is very explicit. The Executive Committee discussed these Statutes. Any election to fill an unexpired term must be conducted in exactly the same way as the prior election was conducted to fill the prior term. This would mean that the guidelines in the Faculty Handbook are so explicit that there is no latitude for variation, and it is only written for the unexpired term. It also says that no one may vote in an election for Faculty Regent except for individuals on Assistant Professor and above who are regular faculty. This disenfranchises a significant number of faculty from voting in any election. No one at any campus has any option to vary from the KRS Regulations because those are in the state statutes. No matter what is done now, whatever is done in the future must have some way to find out what can be done on a campus that is unique in the state in having a community college. Many faculty members from the Community College would have their vote removed, and several other departments have faculty who are permanent and not Assistant Professors, so these departments would also lose eligible voters. Dr. Burch also stated that this is a serious issue that needs to be resolved. There is more to this than what happened with the last election, because it did not comply with KRS, and any subsequent election will be in the same boat. Denise Gravitt asked if there was any way that Dr. Dietle could stay as Regent for the April Board of Regents meeting and also if there is any way that the election could take place prior to the semester ending. Michelle Hollis responded that there are not 20 days left in the semester contract to hold an election. The August 27 date was chosen as the earliest start date because of this. Richard Weigel, the current head of the History Department, and David Lee, were consulted to see if there could be some "wiggle room" generated in Dr. Dietle's start date if he is interested in doing this. Eric Reed stated that we already have an elected regent, Dr. Minter, and since Dr. Dietle's resignation was on the election of the new regent, he would not be able to serve. Eric said that his understanding of Sturgis was as follows: the test for whether or not to overturn an election is if it is absolutely clear that the result would be different that there would be a new election. Joan stated that the Sturgis guidelines are overshadowed by KRS. When it comes to state statutes, it is another problem beyond Sturgis. Dr. Burch stated that this is not

about the candidates and not what has been done in the past. It is forcing the Senate to look at some things that would not have been otherwise looked at. The President will look to the Senate, the Executive Committee of the Senate, and the Chair of the Senate to certify the Candidate to be seated as the next Faculty Regent; one is not the new Regent until sworn in, so Dr. Dietle still is the Faculty Regent. Dr. Burch stated that whatever the Senate decides to do about the election results should be done confidently and that the Senate will need to address this for the future. Michelle Hollis sent the President an update after the Executive Committee met and sent him a copy of the resolution prior to sending to the Senate. He said that he has confidence in the Senate to handle the matter appropriately. More discussion followed, and the question was called. The vote to call the question passed unanimously. The vote on the first part of the resolution "the executive committee...recommends that the election results be set aside and a new election be held with the new process be commencing on August 27th, which allows the process to be completed without spanning the summer." 32 Senate members voted in favor of setting the election results aside and holding a new election; 4 Senators opposed and there were 3 abstentions. The second part of the resolution, "it is further recommended that the newly-elected chair of the University Senate represent the faculty at the Board of Regents while the Faculty Regent seat is vacant." The discussion centered around the fact that the chair would be non-voting. Denise Gravitt moved to have Dr. Dietle represent us. Eric Reed made a motion for an amendment that includes a plan "B" in the motion in case Dr. Dietle cannot do it. Since there is a meeting on April 27th, we would need to know soon who will be representing the Senate at the Regents meeting. The current proposal was reworded "it is further recommended that the Senate requests that Dr. Dietle retain his seat. Andrew McMichael stated that we need a voting member all summer long because of salary increases, new salary for the President (4% increase), and the new mission statement for the university. Someone stated that Dr. Dietle can in no way be the Regent after July 1st. Michelle Hollis stated that she heard that he could represent the Senate if his start date were after the July Board of Regents meeting. Andrew McMichael stated that this could be a legal issue; he would be paid as an administrator while acting as Regent. Dr. Burch wondered if rather than debating, the spirit of the motion was to request that Dr. Dietle remain on until the new Regent was seated through at least the July board meeting, and leave it up to the Department Head, the Deans, and Dr. Dietle to determine whether or not an acceptable solution can be found. Should Dr. Dietle not be inclined to do so, the seat will be filled by the newly-elected Chair of the University Senate. The amendment was seconded and the amendment to the resolution passed unanimously as read. All in favor of accepting the resolution as amended passed unanimously.

After the vote, Patricia Minter thanked the Senate for their support during the election and throughout the week, saying that it meant very much to her both personally and professionally. She said that it reminded her that this is a good place to be and that is one of the reasons that she ran to be the faculty's representative on the Board of Regents. She stated that she is a strong advocate for faculty governance and because of that, she accepts the decision of the Senate to hold a new election, because it is

vitaly important that we have an unchallengeable election this fall. Once this election takes place, there will be much work to do. She said she is very proud to be an advocate for strong faculty governance because there no cause that is more important to all of us, and this is a challenge before both the faculty and her. She thanked the Senate for their support and for their careful deliberation.

Dr. Schoenfelt was unable to attend and asked Michelle Hollis to express to the Senate that she would have liked to have been there but she had a prior commitment.

Elections for the 2007-2008 officers took place next. Anyone whose term as Senator expired was invited to leave at 5:20 PM. The newly-elected senators were invited to join the table and floor nominations for the 2007-2008 Senate officers were held. Julie Shadoan was elected by acclamation as Chair, Denise Gravitt as Vice Chair, and Heidi Pintner as Secretary. Each college then met individually to elect college representatives for the Executive Committee, General Education Committee, Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee, University Curriculum Committee, and Academic Quality Committee.

VII. Announcements

There were no announcements.

VIII. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was seconded. The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Heidi Pintner, Secretary