

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**March 15, 2007**

**Call to Order:**

Call to order: 4:12 pm; Riggle Room; ADUC.

Senators Absent: Pamela Colyer, Michael Fultz, Julia Ann Hypes, Wayne Isham, David Peyton, Michael Wallace, Greg Wing

Visitors Present: Dr. Michael Seelig, Dr. Debbie Abell, Dr. David Magrane, Dr. Ed Reeves, Dr. Dan Connell, Dr. Charles Patrick

Minutes: Senator Harford moved to approve the minutes of March 1, 2007 as submitted. Motion passed.

**Presentation on Admission Task Force Recommendations:**

Dr. Magrane and Dr. Reeves presented a slide presentation explaining the data which resulted in the recommendations of the Admissions Task Force. Dr. Lloyd Jaisingh assisted with the data evaluation. Dr. Magrane and Dr. Reeves answered questions from the Senate members.

**Presentation on Discovery College and Success Academy:**

Dr. Connell provided the members with handouts outlining the Discovery College and the Success Academy. Dr. Connell explained that the purpose of the Discovery College is to support students with developmental needs and who are at risk of non-success in the college experience. A Developmental Education Task Force with representatives from reading, writing, and math has been established to explore ways to provide assistance to developmental students. Dr. Connell answered questions and received comments and suggestions from Senate members.

**Presentation on the New Faculty Institute Proposal:**

Dr. Seelig provided the background information regarding the development of the New Faculty Institute Proposal. Senator Buck stated that it is unacceptable to implement the New Faculty Institute before the Faculty Senate has reviewed the proposal. In answer to a member question, Dr. Abell stated that the "course for credit" requirement has been removed from the proposal and there will be no evaluation or grading of the participants. A member stated that the proposal provided to the members contains reference to the pass/fail evaluation. Dr. Abell stated that the intent now is to provide an institute for new faculty and that it is an oversight if the proposal contains any reference to pass/fail evaluation. Dr. Abell and Dr. Patrick answered questions and received suggestions from the Senate members.

Senator Buck moved that whereas Section 2 of Article 3 of the Faculty Senate Constitution stipulates that "The Faculty Senate will recommend formulation or modification of policies and regulations concerning academic excellence..." and that "The Faculty Senate may review all initiatives and actions included in... academic policies and procedures" and "Faculty Responsibilities and Rights" and whereas the Faculty Senate Constitution, having been ratified by the Board of Regents represents official University policy, be it resolved that no action be taken to implement the Faculty Institute on either a mandatory or voluntary basis until the Faculty Senate has had time to thoroughly review and revise it. Senator Taylor seconded the motion.

A member made a point of parliamentary inquiry. The member stated the Senate was hearing a report from guests and not in new business, and asked the chair to rule if a motion in a report is in order. The chair stated he will accept the motion and allow debate to continue on the motion. Members asked for clarification of the motion.

Chair Lindell stated that there were four minutes until the Senate must either adjourn or vote to suspend the rules and continue discussion. Chair Lindell stated that there was a motion on the table that can either be voted on now or suspend the rules and continue discussion. Senator Klecker moved to suspend the rules and continue discussion. Senator Buck seconded the motion. Motion passed.

A number of Senators expressed that the concept of the New Faculty Institute was good, but the proposal needed revision. Dr. Abell stated that the proposal is malleable and needs input from the Senate and others. Senator Wymer asked that the motion be read again and called the question. The motion was read. Senator Buck was asked if he would accept a friendly amendment to add another whereas stating that "we think this idea is good in principle and that is why we want to look at it more closely". Senator Buck stated that he did not feel that it is necessary to add the friendly amendment. Senator Buck stated that with a lot of modification this would be a good idea. Chair Lindell asked the members to vote on whether or not they wanted to continue debate. The members voted to end debate and vote on the motion. Chair Lindell asked that the motion be read again. The motion was read: whereas Section 2 of Article 3 of the Faculty Senate Constitution stipulates that "The Faculty Senate will recommend formulation or modification of policies and regulations concerning academic excellence..." and that "The Faculty Senate may review all initiatives and actions included in... academic policies and procedures" and "Faculty Responsibilities and Rights" and whereas the Faculty Senate Constitution, having been ratified by the Board of Regents represents official University policy, be it resolved that no action be taken to implement the Faculty Institute on either a mandatory or voluntary basis until the Faculty Senate has had time to thoroughly review and revise it. Motion passed. The proposal will be sent to the Professional Policies Committee for review.

Adjournment: 6:07 p.m.