Call to order


II. Reports
   a. Chair
   b. Vice Chair
   c. Faculty Regent
   d. Provost

III. Standing Committee Reports
   a. UCC (pages 2-5)
   b. General Education (page 6)
   c. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities (page 7)
   d. Academic Quality
   e. Graduate Council (page 8)

IV. Old Business
   a. Second reading if the proposed charter change concerning a copy editor for the
      UCC. (page 9)
   b. Second reading of the proposed charter change concerning standing committee
      chairs. (page 10)

V. New Business
   a. Resolution of the Executive Committee concerning release of information. (page
      10)
   b. SGA resolution concerning evaluation of faculty (pages 11-18)

VI. Announcements

VII. Adjournment
TO: University Senate  
FR: University Curriculum Committee  
DT: November 7, 2004  
RE: Consent Agenda Items from Oct 23 & Nov 2, 2004

The University Curriculum Committee presents the following actions and motions from our Oct 23 and Nov. 2 meetings for approval by the University Senate. Proposals marked with asterisks were action items by the UCC.

BOWLING GREEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1. REVISION OF PROGRAMS  
   a. Healthcare Information Systems (Ref 261)*

2. REVISION OF COURSES  
   a. DMA 096C Intermediate Algebra*

3. NEW PROGRAMS  
   a. None

4. NEW COURSES  
   a. None

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

1. REVISION OF PROGRAMS  
   a. None

2. REVISION OF COURSES  
   a. PSY 443 Behavior Modification

3. NEW PROGRAMS  
   a. None

4. NEW COURSES  
   a. PSY 345 Psychology of Sexuality  
   b. PSY 475 Grant Writing  
   c. PSY 483 Evolutionary Psychology*

COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

1. REVISION OF PROGRAMS  
   a. None

2. REVISION OF COURSES  
   a. None

3. NEW PROGRAMS  
   a. REC 312 Introduction to Nonprofit Organizations  
   b. REC 314 American Humanics Management Institute
c. REC 418 American Humanities Internship

4. NEW COURSES
   a. GERO 100 Introduction to Gerontology*

GORDON FORD COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

1. REVISION OF PROGRAMS
   a. None

2. REVISION OF COURSES
   a. None

3. NEW PROGRAMS
   a. Computer Information Technology (CIT) (ref ??)*

4. NEW COURSES
   a. CIT 300 – On-Line Training Foundations*
   b. CIT 302 – Web Development*
   c. CIT 310 – Systems Architecture I*
   d. CIT 312 – Systems Architecture II*
   e. CIT 330 – Systems Development I*
   f. CIT 332 – Systems Development II*
   g. CIT 350 – Database Administration I*
   h. CIT 352 – Database Administration II*
   i. CIT 370 – Telecommunications I*
   j. CIT 372 – Telecommunications II*
   k. CIT 412 – Adv. Systems Architecture I*
   l. CIT 414 – Adv. Systems Architecture II*
   m. CIT 416 – Systems Administration I*
   n. CIT 418 – Systems Administration II*
   o. CIT 432 – Advanced Systems Development I*
   p. CIT 434 – Adv. Systems Development II*
   q. CIT 436 – Web Systems Development I*
   r. CIT 438 – Web Systems Development II*
   s. CIT 452 – Advanced Database Administration I*
   t. CIT 454 – Advanced Database Administration II*
   u. CIT 456 – Systems Analysis & Design I*
   v. CIT 458 – Systems Analysis & Design II*
   w. CIT 472 – Advanced Telecommunications I*
   x. CIT 474 – Advanced Telecommunications II*
   y. CIT 476 – Network Administration I*
   z. CIT 478 – Network Administration II*
   aa. CIT 482 – System Security I*
   bb. CIT 484 – System Security II*
   cc. CIT 486 – Knowledge Management*
   dd. CIT 492 – Technology Management I*
   ee. CIT 494 – Technology Management II*
   ff. CIT 496 – Technology Support Administration*
POTTER COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

1. REVISION OF PROGRAMS
   a. A.B. Studio Art (ref 509)*
   b. Bachelor of Fine Arts in Visual Arts (B.F.A.) (ref 514)*
   c. Major in Advertising (ref 727)*
   d. Major in Photojournalism (ref 750)*
   e. French Minor (ref 365)*

2. REVISION OF COURSES
   a. Change the following courses from THEA to PERF: 120, 121, 220, 221, 320,321, 420, 421, 369, 423, 445, 450, 261, 361, 461
   b. ENG 409 Practicum in One-to-One Writing Instruction
   c. Art 473 Cement Sculpture
   d. HIST 336 Europe Since 1945
   e. DANC 334 Pointe I
   f. HIST 335 Twentieth Century Europe*
   g. HIST 391 History of Sport*
   h. HIST 364 Colonial Latin America, 1400-1825*
   i. HIST 365 Modern Latin America, 1800-Present
   j. GERM 430 Advanced German Stylistics*

3. NEW PROGRAMS
   a. None

4. NEW COURSES
   a. RELS 418 Age of the Reformation
   b. PERF 105 Taiji
   c. HIST 402 Pirates in World History*
   d. HIST 420 History of Sexuality*
   e. MUS 119 Jazz Appreciation*
   f. THEA 372 Directing Lab*

OGDEN COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

1. REVISION OF PROGRAMS
   a. Construction Management (ref 533)*
   b. Industrial Sciences (ref 571)*
   c. Geology Minor (ref 377)*
   d. Minor in Astronomy (ref 318)*

2. REVISION OF COURSES
   a. AMS 202 Architectural Drafting
   b. AMS 325 Survey of Building Systems
   c. CE 461 Hydrology
   d. EE 101 Engineering Design I
   e. EE 471 Communications II
   f. EE 473 Introduction to Electromagnetic Fields and Waves
g. EE 480 Embedded Systems
h. CE 382 Structural Analysis
i. MATH 116 College Algebra
j. MATH 118 College Algebra and Trigonometry
k. GEOL 311 General Oceanography
l. AMS 360 Architectural Design Studio I*
m. EE 330 Introduction to Power Systems*
n. AMS 261 Construction Methods and Materials*
o. AMS 343 Automated Systems*
p. AMS 320 Architectural Documentation*
q. AMS 390 Project Management*
r. GEOL 111 The Earth*
s. GEOL 112 Geologic History of the Earth*
t. GEOL 113 The Earth Laboratory*
u. GEOL 114 Geologic History of the Earth Laboratory*
v. GEOL 380 Introductory Field Techniques*
w. GEOL 460 Sedimentation and Stratigraphy*
x. MATH 096 Intermediate Algebra*
y. PHYS 201 College Physics I*
z. PHYS 202 College Physics II*

3. **Course Suspensions**
a. PHYS 207 Laboratory for College Physics I
b. PHYS 208 Laboratory for College Physics II
c. PHYS 402 Applications of Modern Physics I Laboratory
d. PHYS 403 Applications of Modern Physics II Laboratory
e. PHYS 420 Applications of Modern Physics I
f. PHYS 430 Applications of Modern Physics II

4. **Course Reactivations**
a. PHYS 406 Solid State Physics Laboratory
b. PHYS 407 Nuclear Physics Laboratory
c. PHYS 460 Solid State Physics
d. PHYS 470 Nuclear Physics
e. ASTR 414 Introductory Astrophysics

5. **New Programs**
a. None

6. **New Courses**
a. CE 462 Hydraulic Engineering Systems*
b. GEOL 106 Geology and Cinema*
c. GEOL 107 Backyard Geology*
d. GEOL 270 Analytical Techniques in Geology*
e. GEOL 485 Geology of Fossil Fuels*
f. GEOL 499 Professional Preparation in Geology*
MEMORANDUM

TO: University Senate Executive Committee

FR: General Education Committee

DT: November 8, 2004

RE: Agenda Items

The General Education Committee moves approval for the following agenda items passed at its meeting on October 14, 2004 and November 4, 2004:

Modifications to Existing General Education Course:
   Geol 111 (delete corequisite and name change)

Modifications to Existing General Education Course:
   Geol 113 (name change)

Modifications to Existing General Education Course:
   Geol 112 (delete prerequisites and name change)

Modifications to Existing General Education Course:
   Geol 114 (name change)

Modifications to Existing General Education Course:
   Chem 105 (name change)

Modifications to Existing General Education Course:
   Chem 106 (name change)

Modifications to Existing General Education Course:
   HIST 463 (add prerequisite)

New General Education Course:
   MATH 117/117C (add to category D II)

Revisions to the Associates Degree in General Studies
Proposed revisions to the “Faculty Grievance Procedure” in the Faculty Handbook.

Nov. 18, 2004

p. 46 “A. Purpose – to provide an individual faculty member with a procedure for presenting a grievance, without fear of reprisal, and having it considered in an expeditious, unbiased, and orderly process. The procedure is advisory and not adjudicatory.”

p. 46 “B. Definition of Grievance – An allegation that there has been a violation, misrepresentation, or improper application of existing policies...”

p. 46 “C. Eligibility of Faculty – Full- and part-time faculty, current adjunct faculty, and retired faculty are eligible to file grievances using the Faculty Grievance Procedure. Eligible faculty include those associated with any University campus.”

p. 46-47 “DC. Appeal Through Administrative Channels – ... If the grievance cannot be resolved at the nearest administrative level, a faculty member may request review at successively higher administrative levels – college dean and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

p. 47 “ED. Appeal through Advisory Committee on Faculty Grievance – ...”

p. 47 “Establishment of Committee – The committee shall be drawn from the same pool chosen for the Advisory Committee on Faculty Continuance (see p. 3544)...”

p. 47 “FE. Annual Report – ...”
Report to the University Senate

Date: November 18, 2004
From: Graduate Council

The Graduate Council presents the following motions for approval by the University Senate. Proposals marked with asterisks were action items in the Graduate Council.

I. One-time only course offerings (Information only)

   JOUR 428G Newspaper Management
   PSY 475G Grant Writing
   ENVE 520 Intro to Environmental Education

II. Change in course prefix (Information only)

   MLIS 420G to MLNG 420G
   MLIS 480G to MLNG 480G

III. Creation of new course *

   NURS 540 Occupational Health Nursing Practicum I
   NURS 541 Occupational Health Nursing Practicum II
   NURS 542 Occupational Health Nursing Practicum III

IV. Revision of program *

   Master of Science in Nursing, Ref. # 149
Proposal to amend the charter concerning the copy editor position.

That the paragraph added to Section IV, Letter A, Number 2 be revised to read:

It is not the role or responsibility of the University Curriculum Committee to edit proposals for grammar and formatting rather than content during UCC. The members and chairs of the college curriculum committees shall be responsible for ensuring that proposals are free from grammatical errors and follow the formats and guidelines established by the UCC. If further editing should be required, the chair of the UCC shall have authority to edit proposals and at the same time gather from UCC members’ grammatical and formatting corrections prior to the meeting and then advise proponents to how to fix their proposals. Proposals that require substantial editing may be returned to the proponent at the discretion of the UCC chair.

PREVIOUS WORDING:

“It is not the role or responsibility of the University Curriculum Committee to edit proposals. Instead, a copy editor, who need not be a Senator, shall be appointed by the Chair of the University Senate in consultation with the Executive Committee. The copy editor shall be appointed for a two-year term. The copy editor is eligible for reappointment to a second consecutive term, but ineligible for further reelection until one year has elapsed. After the University Curriculum Committee approves new proposals the proposals will be sent to the copy editor. The copy editor will review proposals for wording and punctuation errors. In the event of wording changes, the copy editor will contact the primary author of the proposal and work with that individual to ensure that the proposal’s original intent is not lost through the change.”
Proposal to change Section IV, Letter B, Number 5 of the University Senate Charter to read:

5. Each committee, except the Executive Committee, shall elect its own chair. The chairs of all standing committees shall be members of the Senate, with the exception of the Graduate Council.

Proposed Senate Resolution regarding privacy of student names and grades

Whereas the Western Kentucky University Senate takes the position that:

1) Information about students is their own property, to give or to share at their own discretion.
2) Students have a basic right to confidentiality.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Western Kentucky University Senate opposes:

1) The release of student names and their grades by course and section number to any other organization, including but not limited to, the Council on PostSecondary Education
2) The release of personal student data without explicit understanding and consent on the purpose for which it is to be used.
Resolution 02-04-F
Faculty SITE Plus Evaluation

PURPOSE: For the Student Government Association of Western Kentucky University to request the University Senate’s consent in instituting six statements to be added to the SITE Evaluation and the establishment of a 2 year pilot program.

WHEREAS: Students who are empowered with fair and accurate information will be better prepared to make intelligent and informed decisions concerning their education, and

WHEREAS: The only resources commonly open to students are word of mouth and www.ProfEval.com, which are often extreme and unreliable, and

WHEREAS: The University possesses a reliable and valid system to evaluate instructors on core principles in the form of SITE Evaluations, and

WHEREAS: This would constitute a long term project of the Student Government Association which would include goals to improve the process in such ways as assessing the instructor’s teaching methods, polling the student’s attitude toward the class topic, and how well students felt prepared for the course.

THEREFORE: Be it resolved that the Student Government Association of Western Kentucky University does hereby petition the University Senate to endorse a SITE Plus Evaluation that will include the following statements:

1. My professor was available to meet with me during scheduled office hours or was available by appointment.

2. The instructor provided feedback in a timely manner regarding grades and questions.

3. My professor was in the classroom and ready to begin class at the appointed hour.

4. My professor answered phone or email questions concerning class assignments or projects.

5. I used the recommended textbook for class work.
6. My expected grade in this class is:

To keep the Student Government Association’s section of the survey similar to the University’s and to prevent confusion, responses will be measured on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being “strongly disagree” and 5 being “strongly agree”. Respondents will have the opportunity to respond with “N/A” or not applicable and “No basis for evaluation”. Responses for question six will be a range from 1 to 5, with 1 being “F” and 5 being “A”. These responses are to be published on a secure website (TOPNET) accessible to only Western students. This information would be organized by department-class-instructor. Each instructor’s section data would remain separate so that students may be able to recognize variance in schedules. The data would appear under a heading for each question; the data would be organized by the student’s expected grade and a detailed listing of the numerical responses to the question beside it. This data would be retained for two years.

In addition, a disclaimer would be placed before access to the data that would describe the limitations of the system. Such subjects include how skills and interests, which students bring to class, make a difference in their opinions. In addition, it would be said that while the teacher is supposed to show interest in the class he/she is teaching, students also bear responsibility in ensuring desirable outcomes.

A link would be created from TOPNET to the instructor’s webpage to permit the instructor to comment on the results from the questionnaire and to permit students to view the class syllabus. Other options would include a text field for professors to include their comments.

Finally, a committee would be established by the Student Government Association to manage the pilot program. The committee would consist of three representatives selected by the University Senate and three Student Government Association members; the committee chair would be the Academic Affairs Chair of the Senate of the Student Government Association. This committee would facilitate the research and analysis of collected data. After the pilot program’s completion, it will develop recommendations for the University Senate.

Attachment: Proposal for 2-year pilot program.

AUTHORS:
Joshua Collins
Morgan Phelps
Troy Ransdell
Research Plan to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Implementing the Faculty Evaluation System at Western Kentucky University

INTRODUCTION

At a meeting in October of 2004, the Student Government Association submitted a proposal for the University Senate to endorse a faculty evaluation system for the purpose of sharing results with the student body. While the wording of the final proposal focused on students’ needs as a rationale for implementation of the faculty evaluation proposal, discussion in the Executive Committee of the University Senate suggested expanding our focus to additional populations. This plan will concentrate on faculty evaluations’ three major effects: a) the effects on the student population, b) the effects on faculty, and c) the effects on university wide level. Therefore, we propose the following general research questions:

1. What impact does students’ access to faculty evaluations have on their choice of course?
2. What is the impact of faculty evaluations on the pace at which a course meets its capacity?
3. What is the impact of faculty evaluations on the average drop/add/withdraw rates?
4. Does the use of faculty evaluations in class choice affect faculty negatively?

Many factors influence a student's decision on which course to take. It is the Student Government Association's wish to implement a faculty evaluation system to improve the validity of a student's decision. As in the University Senate’s plus/minus research plan, we will triangulate our research methodologies. Methodology employed to evaluate the effect of faculty evaluations will include an overall research design (secondary data analysis, focus groups, and survey research methods); we will use the data from each method as delineated below:

RESEARCH DESIGN

Evaluation research is concerned with cause and effect relationships. In essence, does student access to a faculty’s evaluation improve the student's overall satisfaction with the course of his or her selection? In this pilot program, all students will have the opportunity to view S.G.A. faculty evaluations when they are selecting a course. Inherently some students will choose to use the website and some will not. This will give us an opportunity to view two different populations after implementation. In addition, during the period before posting the evaluations, we have an opportunity to view student and faculty opinion before they encounter the evaluation system.

We will collect data each semester about add/drop/withdraw rates, student sentiment, and faculty sentiment before and after the deadline. A long-term research design also allows us to use data already being collected by the university to evaluate changes caused, in part, by the faculty evaluation system.
Secondary Data Available from University

Secondary data analysis uses data already collected by Registrar and/or TOPNET to assess the effect of faculty evaluations. Through a time series analysis, examining add/drop/withdrawal rates before the implementation of a faculty evaluation system we will establish a baseline with which to measure post faculty evaluation numbers. This baseline would then be compared to numbers from the faculty evaluation period. To perform an extended time series analysis using secondary data, we would require access to data for every spring and fall semester preferably starting at the Fall 2002 semester. This data would also be collected up until Fall 2007. The data required for this secondary data analysis would include:

At the College Level:
* Number of Added Classes
* Number of Dropped Classes
* Number of Withdrawals
* Number of Students Using Faculty Evaluations

Surveys

Student Surveys

Methodology. The Student Government Association is interested in possible changes in student perceptions and student habits when selecting courses during the time of faculty evaluations. We would want to examine the habits of students before they have access to evaluations; before the end of the Fall 2006 semester, students would be surveyed. This data would be compared with data collected after the posting of evaluations.

Sampling. A random sample with a minimum of 400 students will indicate the effectiveness of the faculty evaluation system. This would allow us to assess whether or not individuals changed their behaviors after the implementation of the faculty evaluation system.

Faculty Surveys

Methodology. We will analyze faculty perceptions of perceived fairness of the faculty evaluation system, the effect it has on the students in the classroom, and whether the evaluation changed a professor's standard classroom procedures. No data has been collected previously at WKU concerning these issues, which limits the ability to fit the survey data into an extended time series analysis such as the secondary data. Instead, we would gather baseline data concerning faculty perceptions before the distribution of faculty evaluations in a manner similar to the student surveys. This baseline would then be compared with data collected in subsequent surveys at the end of the Spring 2007 semester.
According to our research plan, all faculty would be surveyed concerning:

* Department
* College
* Faculty Evaluation will/will not have a negative impact
* An adoption of site plus affects faculty recruitment
* Faculty evaluation has helped facilitate greater communication between a faculty and his students.

**Focus Groups**

**Methodology**

Researchers will conduct focus group interviews. These focus groups will collect more in-depth information and allow the researchers to better understand perceptions of the faculty evaluation system around our community. These focus groups will use a semi-structured interview guide.

**Sampling**

Sampling for a focus group must contain representatives from the population to be sampled but not increase the size of the groups to beyond nine or so participants. Additionally, half the focus groups will contain the same participants throughout the three semesters while the other half will be made up of a cross-section of university students.

**Interview Guide**

The interview guide for each focus group will include open-ended questions that will require participants to provide opinions and reflections upon the use, validity/accuracy, and impact of using the faculty evaluation system at Western. All groups will be asked questions regarding their perceptions of the implementation of the faculty evaluation system.

**Analysis of Focus Group Data**

It is anticipated that the focus group interviews will be recorded and transcribed for analysis using constant comparative method. As in the plus/minus study, we will analyze these conversations for emerging themes. These emerging themes are then categorized and the researchers then compare new information with these categories to see if they still hold or if they need to be modified. We hope to use the constant comparative method on analyzing the focus group responses to determine what are the categories of responses.

**Questions**
Listed below are potential questions for the faculty and student surveys.

Which college are you in?
What is your present overall GPA?

- 3.51 to 4.00
- 3.01 to 3.50
- 2.51 to 3.00
- Below 2.5

Are you using Professor Evaluation for any of your class selections?
Do professor evaluations decrease your time spent selecting classes?
Rate professor evaluations in terms of its performance:

- Excellent. I wouldn't change a thing.
- Good. Faculty Evaluations needs only some minor adjustments
- Fair. Faculty Evaluations needs major revision
- Poor. Faculty Evaluations has major flaws that make it difficult to use

If you marked Fair or Poor, what needs to be changed?
SGA Professor Evaluation is a good evaluation method
I would use this evaluation system if I were a student
I would like to study at a university that offers this system
WKU should not maintain this system
I would like WKU to have this system.
Use of Faculty Evaluations will usually result in better class selection for students.
What is your opinion of the overall value of the faculty evaluation system? (1 = very positive, 4 = indifferent, 7 = very negative)
This evaluation system is fair.
This is an evenhanded evaluation system.
This evaluation system is unjust.
This evaluation system does not treat all faculty fairly.
This evaluation system does not give all faculty the same chance to show that they deserve a good evaluation.
What do you believe will be the effect of the professor evaluations on the classroom atmosphere? (1 = significantly better, 4 = no change, 7 = significantly worse)
These evaluations ensure that each professor is evaluated by the same set of criteria.
SGA faculty evaluations are an accurate evaluation system.
Evaluations have a strong influence on my class selection
This evaluation system does not take into consideration the basic concerns, values, and outlook of students.
This evaluation system does not take into consideration the basic concerns, values, and outlook of professors.
The evaluations I received were based on my performance.
The evaluations I received were about what they ought to be based on my performance.
My evaluations were fair.
I received the evaluation I deserved
How fair were the evaluations you received? (Extremely unfair to Extremely fair.)
To what extent did you receive as high evaluations as you deserved? Not at all, little, moderately, somewhat, very much.
To what extent were the evaluations you received related to your performance?
To what extent were your evaluations higher than you deserved?
## Faculty Evaluation Study Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations before implementation</th>
<th>Evaluations Posted</th>
<th>Observations after implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Secondary Data**
  - Fall 2002: X
  - Spring 2003: X
  - Fall 2003: X
  - Spring 2004: X
  - Fall 2004: X
  - Spring 2005: X
  - Fall 2005: X
  - Spring 2006: X
  - Fall 2006: X
  - Spring 2007: X
  - Fall 2007: X

- **Surveys**
  - Spring 2006: X
  - Fall 2006: X
  - Spring 2007: X
  - Fall 2007: X

- **Focus Groups**
  - Spring 2006: X
  - Fall 2006: X
  - Spring 2007: X
  - Fall 2007: X

**Important Dates:**
- Fall 2004: Approved
- End Spring 2005: first semester evaluated
- Mid-Fall 2005: receive first evaluation data
- Mid to Late Fall 2005: data posted on Topnet
- Spring 2006: first opportunity for students to use evaluation data