1. **Call to order and roll call.** President Bill Bulleit called the University Senate Meeting 531 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, March 27, 2013. The Senate Secretary Brian Barkdoll called roll. Absent were representatives of the Army/Air Force ROTC, Chemistry, Kinesiology and Integrative Physiology, Materials Science and Engineering, Academic Services A and B, and the Undergraduate Student Government.

**Recognition of visitors.** Guests included Max Seel (Provost’s Office), Tang Wang (School of Business and Economics), Michael Monette (Facilities), and Stephanie Marshall (Chemical Engineering).

2. **Approval of agenda.** Bulleit said Ellen Horsch could not be present for her scheduled presentation. He asked if there were any other changes; the agenda **PASSED** on a voice vote.

3. **Approval of minutes from Meeting 530.** Bulleit asked if there were any changes. There being no additional suggestions, the minutes were **APPROVED** on a voice vote.

4. Presentation: none.

5. Reports
   a. **Senate President**
      Bulleit said that Horsch is asking to present before the April 24th meeting and reviewed the remaining meetings. He proposed an additional meeting next week, which was **PASSED** by a show of hands. He also stated that the results of Fringe Benefits Survey may be discussed as well. Scarlett asked if we could invite constituents also, to which Bulleit stated that it would be.
      In addition, he reported that Proposal 18-13 was approved by the Administration and will go to BOC, and if it passes the BoC it will go to the AAOC for their June 6-7 meeting.
   b. **Senate Standing Committees**
      Caneba reported that the President and Executive Team Evaluations are ongoing and have a 37% response rate currently.

6. **Old Business:**
   Proposal 19-13: “Proposal for a Spin-Off from “B.S. in Management” to a B.S. in Management with a Concentration in Entrepreneurship” presented by Curricular Policy and Finance Committees (Voting Units: Academic)
   Mullins stated that the Finance Committee has no objections. He asked about tuition issues in relation to new programs and tuition in general and declining enrollment and that a School of Business tuition analysis should be done. Seel responded that things are being looked at. The proposal **PASSED** unopposed.

7. **New Business**
      Caneba reviewed aspects. Vable asked for friendly amendment regarding detail.
Hamlin summarized. Vable asked to start and end on a Wednesday to allow for Final Exam study days. It was brought up that this may interfere with K-Day and that attendance may suffer the first few days of the semester.

c. Proposal 21-13: “Audit Grades presented by Instructional Policy Committee” (Voting Units: Academic)
Hamlin summarized that students are auditing a course to avoid failing and that his proposal would eliminate that. Clarifying discussion ensued.

d. Proposal 22-13: “Proposal to Amend Teaching and Course Evaluations” presented by Instructional Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic)
Hamlin said the proposal’s intent is to collect and use data better. It includes the use of an electronic system, a student reflection portion, some university required questions, some department default questions, department-chosen questions, and instructor optional questions. He stated that Question 20 on the current paper form should not be the only question used and that appropriate technology should be employed. Mullins thought that questions should align with ABET outcomes. Hamlin stated that dissemination of results will be addressed later. Hungwe asked about electronic response rate. Hamlin said that students will respond if they feel their responses are important. Onder expressed concern about too much flexibility. Meyer stated that the university questions are the same for all departments and that online surveys typically will get more detailed feedback. Breffle said that we may only get responses from disgruntled students. Meyer said that is not shown to be true. Onder suggested keeping Question 20 so that we can compare the paper and electronic versions. Hamlin said we don’t want to rely only on Question 20. Riehl said that students can learn even with a bad instructor. It was suggested to incentivize responses by perhaps withholding the student’s grade until the survey was filled out. He also asked if CANVAS can be used to save on cost.

Gierke stated that this comes from MEEM to accommodate student interest and that it requires one new course. Mullins said that the Finance Committee approves. Riehl asked if should we have a whole degree, to which Vable stated that many other courses would be required.

f. Proposal 24-13: “Class Attendance Proposal” presented by Instructional Policy Committee” (Voting Units: Academic)
Hamlin stated that this was asked for by the Dean of Students.

Scarlett said that survey help for anyone from a resource group will be available next year.

8. Adjournment.
President Bulleit adjourned the meeting at 6:57pm.

Respectfully submitted
by Brian Barkdoll
Secretary of the University Senate