

**MINUTES**  
**UNIVERSITY SENATE**  
**CALLED MEETING MAY 5, 2004 – 9:00 A.M.**  
**GARRETT BALLROOM**

Chair Doug Smith called the meeting to order at 9:00 A.M. **The following members were present:** Darlene Applegate, Jim Berger, Charles Borders, Christopher Brown, Barbara Burch, Suzie Cashwell, Robert Choate, Linda Coakley, Joshua Collins, Robert Dietle, Richard Dressler, Claus Ernst, Elmer Gray, Kacy Harris, Pamela Jukes, Danita Kelley, David Lee, Dana Lockhart, Andrew McMichael, Connie Mills, Patricia Minors, Patricia Minter, John Moore, Russell Moore, Sharon Mutter, Yvonne Petkus, Keith Phillips, Gary Ransdell, Troy Ransdell Jo-Anne Ryan, Roger Scott, Sherrie Serros, SGA Representative, Vernon Lee Sheeley, Nelda Sims, Bryon Sleugh, Douglas Smith, Brian Strow, Jue Wang, Richard Weigel, Mary Wolinski, Uta Ziegler **Alternate Members Present were:** Nedra Atwell for Jim Becker, Ray Blankenship for Kirk Atkinson, Donald Nims for Bill Greenwalt, Michael Carini for Richard Hackney, Bob Reber for Robert Jefferson, John Musalia for Matt Pruitt, Arvin Vos for Jeffrey Samuels. **Members absent without alternate representation were:** John All, Christopher Antonsen, Jim Becker, Michael Binder, John Bonaguro, John Bruni, Thad Crews II, Debra Crisp, Sam Evans, Blaine Ferrell, Bill Greenwalt, Jeffrey Hackett, Michelle Hollis, Robert Holman, William Howard, Dan Jackson, Lois Jircitano, Wilma King Jones, Bruce Kessler, Minwoo Lee, Cynthia Mason, George Musambira, Anne Onyekwuluje, Richard Parker, Sherry Powers, Eric Reed, Sherry Reid, Loren Ruff, Fred Siewers, Peter St. Pierre, Bill Tseng, Judy Walker, Edward Yager.

**Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of April 15, 2004 were approved as corrected.

**University Senate Action Approval**

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Barbara Burch, after clarification of proposals presented, endorsed without exception the actions of the University Senate at its February 19, 2004 meeting.

In another letter, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Barbara Burch endorsed without exception the actions of the University Senate at its April 15, 2004 meeting.

**NOTE:** Provost Burch is still holding her endorsement of the March 17, 2004 meeting, pending implementation issues of the Plus/Minus grading proposal.

**Report from the Chair**

Chair Doug Smith clarified an issue that had been brought to his attention regarding the Ad Hoc Committee appointed to develop an implementation plan for the investigation of the plus/minus pilot. At the time the Ad Hoc committee was appointed, the Provost's office did not have representation in Senate meetings. Provost Burch has since designated Bob Cobb. Institutional Research,

to serve on this Committee, and to be added to the list serve. With the implementation set to be in place by July 1, the project is slated to move forward.

Chair Smith announced that Dr. Ransdell would be addressing the Senate about the joint engineering program.

Following this announcement, Chair Doug Smith remarked that this would be his last report as the University Senate Chair. He will continue to serve throughout the summer until the new chair takes office. He will also continue updating the University Senate website, and will have the final draft of the Senate Charter and its recent changes posted for presentation at the Board of Regents July meeting.

### **Report from President Ransdell**

Dr. Gary Ransdell stated he wanted to respond to several items that have recently emerged regarding the joint engineering program. He exhorted the Senate members to understand that the WKU joint engineering program with the University of Kentucky was the only joint baccalaureate degree to have ever been developed anywhere, at anytime in the State of Kentucky. This in itself, while having been a “curious process” has been an important and significant achievement. For sound, valid, economic, and compelling reasons, WKU approved to pursue having a professional engineering program approximately three and one-half years ago, and the Senate body supported that plan. The concept was later approved by the CPE as a result of leadership from Lee Todd, who had a complete understanding of the needs of the state for professional engineers.

Western faced a situation in the recent weeks in having 17 students who have completed the requirements for graduation, but not having a fully approved program from which to be graduated because UK had not finalized its approval of the joint program.

Currently, WKU has over 300 students enrolled in three programs, mechanical, civil, and electrical engineering. Accreditation of its programs is scheduled for the coming fall. Over \$5 million has been raised to support the programs, and the campus is looking forward to the completion of its \$20 million engineering facility. But for the engineering programs to work, all the partners must be able to work together. The joint partner for electrical engineering is the University of Louisville, and WKU has not encountered any difficulties with this partnership. UK, on the other hand, has not been as agreeable in its interactions. Any joint program must have a home campus and the latitude to make curricular decisions that follow the accepted practices and policies of its own home institution. The program cannot be controlled from a distance by its joint partner and to have each curricular item proceed through its partners’ accepted practices and policies.

To end the impasse with UK, and to avoid a politically dependent solution calling for a stand-alone program at WKU (that ironically was tied to a budget bill that was not passed by the Kentucky General Assembly) both institutions – UK and

WKU – agreed to a joint faculty committee to make specific engineering curriculum decisions. The Committee agreed that all other curricular matters would go through the normal processes at WKU.

The 17 students will graduate, and everyone has the expectation that this will be a strong program. Dr. Ransdell reiterated the confidence of the Senate to handle matters of curriculum, and that there was never a question of chain of command.

Dr. Ransdell turned his attention to a resolution that is on today's agenda and expressed concerns for the terms used in it: One being, "We regret" and asked to whom are we regretful, and the other being, "the necessity of." He further asked that the Senate consider the resolution in the light of (possible) future joint baccalaureate programs. Dr. Ransdell then asked for questions from the Senate body regarding the engineering program.

To this, Faculty Regent Dr. Robert Dietle said the two items of Dr. Ransdell's concern, "We regret" and "the necessity of" both address the agreement to change our process, as in "We regret" that the Senate was not informed or not involved. The second item ("necessity of") involves the second item in the addendum, item number six, and that "other curricular matters may go through the Senate."

In response, Dr. Ransdell reiterated his concerns for the language. There was no intention to omit the Senate, but the process was tangled, and the CPE could be called to task by the lack of UK approval. Dr. Ransdell went on to explain that the agreement calls for a process for making decisions that was strange and uses the rules one would find in athletics. As an example, Dr. Ransdell described what occurred in the event of tie votes with using a coin toss. At this juncture, University Provost Dr. Barbara Burch reminded the Senate body that they had already approved the program and its processes. The problem has been the handful of faculty who would be approving the WKU engineering curriculum. She further related that the UK Senate approved WKU's process two and one-half years ago. Again the problem has been in the UK College of Engineering. University Curriculum Chair Darlene Applegate confirmed that the engineering courses would come through the UCC to the Senate as information only. Dr. Dietle said the addendum was presented to the UK Senate, and asked why it was not presented to the WKU Senate. Dr. Ransdell answered that the addendum should have been presented to the WKU Senate but that first, the Senate had already approved the program, and second there was not enough time. Dr. Burch added that the UK Senate had signed a waiver for review.

Dr. Ransdell distributed a packet with funding and Academic Quality information. He asked that the Senators review the information with him. He discussed the value of the recurring \$11 million for academic quality. President Ransdell said he wants to see a rebuilding of the campus assets but added that it was possible that the Board of Regents may need to revisit the 5 percent tuition increase depending on state funding.

### **Report from the Vice Chair**

Vice Chair Jim Berger announced that final At Large Elections are waiting for the Gordon College of Business while they finalize their reorganization. Dr. Berger announced that Dr. Barbara Brindle was elected At-Large Senator for the College of Health and Human Services.

### **Report from the Faculty Regent**

Faculty Regent Dietle has had discussions with Dr. Burch regarding the plus/minus grading system and that it will have a research based implementation plan. This was further discussed at the Senate Executive Meeting. Bob Cobb has been added to the committee. The research implementation plan will be finished by July 15, 2004. Dr. Dietle added that there has been an examination of the plus/minus grading issues from earlier minutes.

In other discussion with the Board of Regents regarding the performance evaluation for Dr. Ransdell, he and several other members of the Board of Regents agree that the current assessment process is not up to the standards that faculty are expected to meet. He and the other Regents express concern for the current lax process adding that it should be more rigorous and open. In answer to Senator Applegate question of, "if the implementation will require Senate approval," Dr. Dietle said that the Senate has already approved the implementation plan.

### **Report from the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs**

Dr. Burch announced that January is the new deadline for getting changes into the new catalog. Dr. Burch shared her thoughts regarding the funding for academic quality, and announced that SACS will be here on September 5. She said there may be requests for information sent out prior to the SACS's visit. Next, Dr. Burch further explained the delay of the plus/minus approval was related to the research design to ensure that good information will be provided. She said that all departments have been asked to review the guidelines for tenure and promotion and that she may be meeting with departments. She said that some departmental guidelines are very complete and consistent with university guidelines while others need work.

### **Standing Committee Reports**

#### **A. Report from the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee**

Chair Mary Wolinski presented the second reading, with a verbal description of the major changes, as amended of the "**General Recommendation Concerning Faculty Continuance and Tenure Policy and Procedure**"

Apr. 26, 2004 (Revisions in red.)

## General Recommendation Concerning Faculty Continuance and Tenure Policy and Procedure

**1. Provide training for department heads in the legal aspects of the continuance and tenure review process.**

**2. Make the Departmental Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion accessible through the Department's website. This is important since Section II, part A specifies that the faculty member is to be informed about departmental guidelines for tenure in the first year.**

## Recommendations for revisions to the Faculty Handbook Concerning Faculty Continuance and Tenure Policy and Appeals Process

### Section IV.C. p. 30

[replace with the following:] The department's Rank and Promotion Committee reviews all evaluation materials, votes on the candidate, and provides a written recommendation to the department head. This recommendation must include the actual vote count and may also provide additional information deemed relevant to the committee's decision. The department head also reviews all relevant evaluation materials and produces an individual written recommendation. The department head's recommendation, the Rank and Promotion Committee's recommendation, and all evaluation materials are forwarded to the college dean who, in turn, forwards an individual written recommendation, the recommendations of the department head and Rank and Promotion Committee, and all relevant evaluation materials to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs reviews these items and completes a written recommendation, which is forwarded along with all other written recommendations to the President. The President reviews these recommendations and forwards to the Board of Regents his or her recommendations for promotion. The decision of the Board of Regents is final.

### Section II .A. p. 32

[Add to the end of part A:] New faculty members will be informed about the tenure review process and the grievance appeal process **at the beginning of the first year. These processes are described at the university level in the Faculty Handbook, and in the guidelines for tenure and promotion issued by the faculty member's department**

### Section II.B. p. 32

[Add a new paragraph below Section B's heading "Policies...Recommendations"] The procedures to be followed in continuance and non-continuance recommendations are:

## Section II. B. p. 34

[Replace item 1:] The department head will be responsible for notifying probationary faculty of the date for consideration of mandatory tenure. A faculty member who has applied for tenure before the sixth year of service at Western may withdraw from the process at any time without prejudice. However, a tenure review must occur in the sixth year. A faculty member may withdraw a tenure application **at any stage of the review** during the review process **prior to final action by the Board of Regents**, but withdrawal of the application **at any point during the sixth-year review** constitutes a *de facto* resignation from Western, effective at the end of the academic year.

[Replace the last two sentences of item 3:] The chair of the tenure committee will confidentially apprise the members of the Tenure Committee of the results at the meeting. The written recommendation of the Tenure Committee to the department head must include the actual vote count and may include any additional information deemed relevant to this outcome. The department head will then notify the faculty candidate for tenure of the recommendation of the Tenure Committee. In the case of a negative recommendation by the Tenure Committee, the faculty member will have the option of withdrawing the application.

[Replace item 4:] By **November 1**, the department head will forward to the dean a written recommendation on each faculty member eligible for tenure as well as the written recommendation of the Tenure Committee. The department head will advise the candidate in writing of the department head's recommendation by **November 15**. If the department head concurs with a negative recommendation by the Tenure Committee, the faculty member may withdraw the application.

## Section II.B. p. 35

[add to end of item 5:] In the case of a negative recommendation by the college dean, the faculty member may withdraw the application.

## Section II.B. p. 35

[add to end of item 6:] In the case of a negative recommendation by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the faculty member may withdraw the application. Faculty members also have the option to file an appeal in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook, Section IV.

## Section III, p. 35 III. Advisory Committee on Faculty Continuance and Tenure

[Replace 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:] The President is authorized to establish an Advisory Committee on Faculty Continuance and Tenure. Its functions and duties shall be those outlined in the Procedure for Review of Non-Reappointment and Denial of Tenure Recommendations and the Procedure for Termination (see sections IV and V).

p. 36 IV. Procedure for Review of Non-Reappointment and Denial of Tenure Recommendations

Section IV [In an attempt to clarify the Review of Non-Reappointment Recommendations, add the following boldface headings to the beginnings of the paragraphs..]

p. 36 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: **A. Denial of Reappointment or Tenure.**

[Insert this new paragraph before 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph:] If a decision is made not to recommend tenure of a faculty member upon completion of the probationary period, the Provost and Vice President shall provide the affected faculty member official written notice **of the decision:**

P By **February 15** of the faculty member's **tenure review year.**

[Replace 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph:] The University is not obligated to furnish a written statement of reasons for the decision not to recommend reappointment of a faculty member for another term during the probationary period, and it is the policy of the University not to furnish a written statement of reasons for such a decision. It is the policy of the University that, upon request of the faculty member, the department head and dean of the college and Academic Vice President will arrange a conference with the faculty member to discuss informally the circumstances surrounding the non-reappointment. If this conference fails to satisfy the faculty member, the President will have a related conference with the faculty member upon request. **However, written reasons for denial of tenure will be furnished if the faculty member requests them in writing.**

**Section IV p. 36**

[Replace 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> paragraphs:] **B. Complaint Filed by Faculty Member.** If a non-tenured faculty member has received official notice of a decision not to recommend reappointment or tenure and the faculty member has factual information as grounds upon which it is claimed that the decision not to recommend reappointment or tenure was arbitrary or capricious, violated standards of academic freedom, or was based on considerations that violate constitutionally protected rights or interests (e.g., consideration of race, sex, national origin, exercise of free speech, association, etc.), a complaint may be filed with the department head or office to which the faculty member is assigned. Copies of the complaint are to be sent to the college dean, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President.

The complaint shall be in writing and be filed within thirty (30) days after receipt of official notice. It shall be accompanied by a written, signed statement that the faculty member agrees that the university representatives who made the decision not to recommend reappointment or tenure may present information in support of the decision for the purpose of confidential consideration by members of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Continuance and Tenure in the event the

complaint is referred to it. [Add the following sentence:] The university appeals process must continue even if outside legal action is undertaken by the faculty member appealing the tenure decision.

#### **Section IV, p. 36**

[Leave as it is in the Handbook:] **C. Advisory Committee on Faculty Continuance.** The President may cause the complaint to be set for formal evidentiary hearing. As an alternative, the President may refer the complaint to the Advisory Committee on Faculty Continuance and Tenure for preliminary inquiry, consultation, and its reasoned advice and recommendation. The committee will seek to settle the matter by an informal process of preliminary inquiry, consultation, discussion, and confidential negotiation and mediation.

p. 37, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: **D. Ad Hoc Committee on Continuance and Tenure.**

#### **Section IV, p. 37**

[Replace 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:] The ad hoc committee shall consist of five (5) members chosen by lot from the list of eligible individuals provided for in Part III. In addition, two alternates will be selected by lot to substitute for any Ad Hoc committee members who remove themselves if they deem themselves disqualified because of bias or interest. The alternates may not be from the same department as any of the five Ad Hoc committee members. None of the members will have served on the Advisory Committee that had earlier heard the case. In addition, each party shall have a maximum of two challenges with or without stated cause. If the list shall be exhausted before an acceptable committee has been obtained, supplementary list selections will be made following the initial procedure. The committee shall select its own chair. The committee will adhere to the following procedures:

#### **Section IV, p. 37**

[Replace penultimate item:] The findings of fact and the decision will be based on the hearing record, which will include documentary evidence submitted by the faculty member and the university, as well as testimony, by witnesses during the Committee's proceedings.

#### **Section IV, p. 37**

[Replace last paragraph:] Upon conclusion of the hearing, the committee must accept or reject the appeal by the faculty member. The Ad Hoc Committee must make a written recommendation to the President and provide recommendations on how to resolve the conflict, if necessary.

**E. The President.** The President must accept, reject or revise the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee.



**F. The Board of Regents.** The Board of Regents is charged with accepting or rejecting the appeal of the President's decision by the faculty member. Its decision is final.

**The following table summarizes the appeal process and Specifies the action to be taken when the President and Board of Regents accept or reject the recommendation presented to them.**

FACULTY MEMBER	AD HOC COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT ACCEPTS	PRESIDENT REJECTS RECOMMENDATION	BOARD OF REGENTS RECOMMENDATION
Faculty member appeals non-continuance or denial of tenure decision	President appoints Ad Hoc Committee. Ad Hoc Committee makes recommendation to the President to accept faculty member's appeal or reject faculty member's appeal	(1) Recommendation was to accept the faculty member's appeal. The faculty member's appeal is <u>accepted</u> and the case is closed.	(1) Recommendation was to reject the faculty member's appeal. The faculty member's appeal is <u>accepted</u> and the case is closed.	(1) Board of Regents accepts the President's decision to reject the faculty member's appeal. The appeal is rejected and the case is closed.
		(2) Recommendation was to reject the faculty member's appeal.	(2) Recommendation was to accept the faculty member's appeal. The faculty member <u>does not</u> request an appeal of the President's decision. The faculty member's appeal is <u>rejected</u> and the case is closed.	(2) Board of Regents rejects the President's decision to reject the faculty member's appeal. The appeal is accepted and the case is closed.
		The faculty member <u>does not</u> request an appeal of the Preside decision. The faculty member's appeal is <u>rejected</u> and the case closed.	The faculty member <u>does</u> request an appeal of the President's decision. The case is reviewed by the Board of Regents.	
		The faculty member <u>does</u> request an app of the President's decision. The case is reviewed by the Board of Regents.		

There was discussion regarding other changes to the document as presented. Dr. Burch and others had several suggestions. Discussions followed as to the most expedient way to bring Dr. Burch's suggestions forward for inclusion in the changes to the policy.

Senator Claus Ernst moved to table the current motion and conduct the voting by email. The motion was seconded, and discussion followed. Dr. Burch described several of the changes she wanted the committee to examine. First was the terminology of using the word 'negative' as opposed to the word 'denial.' She also pointed out that the written reasons for denial for the recommendation for tenure can be satisfied by a simple statement, such as: "The candidate did not meet the standards." Chair Wolinski indicated that she and the FWPR Committee could work with an electronic process for the voting.

The motion carried. Chair Smith reminded the Senate that they are in office and in charge until August at which time the new Senate members take over.

#### **B. Report from the University Curriculum Committee**

Senator Darlene Applegate moved approval of the consent agenda from the April 22, 2004 meeting of the University Curriculum Committee

The University Curriculum Committee presents the following motions for approval by the University Senate. Proposals marked with asterisks are UCC action items.

Chair Smith asked if any Senator would like to move any item from the consent agenda to the action agenda. No such requests were made.

### **UNDERGRADUATE MOTIONS**

#### **COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

##### **I. Revision of Courses**

NURS 315	Concepts in Pharmacology [prereqs] *
NURS 321	Transcultural Nursing [prereqs] *
NURS 326	Health Alterations I Across the Lifespan [prereqs] *
SWRK 315	Social Welfare Policy and Issues [number, prereqs] *
SWRK 379	Introduction to Social Work Communication Skills [prereqs]
SWRK 380	Social Work Practice I [number, prereqs] *

#### **COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES**

##### **I. One-Time-Only Course Offering [for information only]**

LME 318	Children's Literature, Fall 2004
---------	----------------------------------

## **II. Revision of Courses**

EDU 489	Student Teaching Seminar [prereqs]
ELED 345	Teaching Strategies for Elementary Teachers I [prereqs]
ELED 355	Student Diversity in the Classroom [prereqs]
ELED 365	Teaching Strategies for Elementary Teachers II [prereqs]
ELED 405	Teaching Mathematics in the Elementary School [prereqs] *
ELED 406	Teaching Science in the Elementary School [prereqs] *
ELED 407	Materials and Methods in Social Studies [prereqs] *
ELED 465	Senior Projects in Elementary Education [prereqs] *
ELED 490	Student Teaching [prereqs, hours] *
EXED 434	Student Teaching Seminar [prereqs] *
EXED 490	Student Teaching: Exceptional Education [prereqs] *
IECE 490	Student Teaching [prereqs] *
IECE 494	Advanced Curriculum Development for Young Children [catalog] *
LME 288	Children's Literature [number]
LTCY 420	Reading in the Primary Grades [prereqs]
<b>MGE 490</b>	<b>Student Teaching [prereqs] *</b>
	Student Teaching [prereqs, hours] *

## **III. Revise an Academic Policy \***

Admission Requirements to Teacher Education

## **IV. Create an Academic Policy \***

Transfer Credit for Teacher Education

## **BOWLING GREEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

### **I. Revision of Program \***

Ref. No. 265 Associate Degree in Paramedicine [drop ENG 200C, drop approved elective, add SOC 100C, add Category B Humanities elective]

## **POTTER COLLEGE OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES**

### **I. Revision of Courses**

ENG 380	Masterpieces of English Literature [prereqs]
ENG 385	World Literature [prereqs]
ENG 390	Masterpieces of American Literature [prereqs]
JOUR 334	Photojournalism [prereqs] *
JOUR 435	Picture Editing [prereqs] *

### **II. Deletion of Courses**

MUS 402 Counterpoint I  
MUS 403 Counterpoint II  
MUS 432 Research Techniques

**Creation of Courses \***

ENG 360 Gay and Lesbian Literature  
MUS 175 University Experience - Music Majors

**GORDON FORD COLLEGE OF BUSINESS**

**I. Suspension of Courses**

FIN 431 Case Problems in Finance  
FIN 442 Working Capital Management  
FIN 470 Real Estate Finance and Investment

**II. Revision of Course**

ACCT 460 CPA Problems [prereqs]

**Creation of Course \***

BA 175 University Experience - Business

**IV. Revision of Program \***

Ref. No. 357 Minor in Finance [drop ACCT 201, reduce hours from 24 to 21]

**OGDEN COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING**

**I. Deletion of Courses**

CS 101 Computer Science Freshman Seminar  
CS 326 Business Programming  
CS 460 Software Engineering II

**II. Suspension of Course**

CS 299 Introduction to Research in Computer Science

**III. Revision of Courses**

CS 240 Computer Science I [prereqs]  
CS 241 Computer Science II [prereqs]  
CS 242 Assembly Language Programming [prereqs]  
CS 245 Introduction to a Computer Programming Language [prereqs]

CS 338 Computer Science III [prereqs]  
CS 340 Computer Organization [prereqs]  
CS 349 Consulting Practicum in Computer Science [prereqs]  
CS 360 Software Engineering I [prereqs]  
CS 389 Practicum in Computer Science [prereqs]  
CS 405 Numerical Analysis [prereqs]  
CS 425 Operating Systems I [prereqs]  
CS 442 Data Structures [prereqs]  
CS 443 Database Management Systems [prereqs]  
CS 444 Programming Languages [prereqs]  
CS 445 Operating Systems II [prereqs]  
CS 446 Interactive Computer Graphics [prereqs]  
CS 450 Computer Networks [prereqs]  
CS 456 Artificial Intelligence [prereqs]  
CS 476 Research Methods and Projects in Computer Science [prereqs]

#### **IV. Creation of Courses \***

AMS 175      University Experience - Architectural & Manufacturing  
Sciences  
CM 362      Construction Scheduling

#### **V. Revision of Programs \***

Ref. No. 341   Minor in Computer Science [grades of “C” or better  
required in all courses]

Ref. No. 533   Construction Management [drop CE 370, CM 361; add CE  
370, CE 371, CM 362]

Ref. No. 629   Major in Computer Science [grades of “C” or better  
required in core courses]

Chair Smith called for a vote on the Undergraduate Consent Agenda. The motion carried.

Next Chair Smith asked if any Senator would like to move any item from the Graduate Consent Agenda to the Action Agenda. No such requests were made.

### **GRADUATE MOTIONS**

#### **GRADUATE COUNCIL**

##### **I. Revise Course Prefix [for information only]**

EHS 510, 577, 580 to PH 510, 577, 580

##### **II. Suspension of Courses**

ACCT 510	Advanced Accounting Systems & Controls
ACCT 550	Accounting for Non-Profit Organizations

### **III.    Reactivation of Course**

ANSC 533	Physiology of Lactation
----------	-------------------------

### **IV.    Deletion of Courses**

MUS 420G	Counterpoint I
MUS 403G	Counterpoint II
MUS 405G	Choral Arranging
MUS 407	Orchestration & Band Arranging
MUS 414 G	Choral Materials
MUS 415 G	Choral Methods
MUS 416 G	Instrumental Methods
MUS 417G	Marching Band Techniques
MUS 430G	Music Literature
MUS 432G	Research Techniques
MUS 451G	Applied Music Secondary
MUS 454G	Applied Music Principal
MUS 501	Analytical Techniques
MUS 510	Applied Music Pedagogy
MUS 515	Adm & Supv/Pub Sch Mus
MUS 556	Applied Music Major
MUS 557	Applied Music Minor
MUS 558	Applied Music Major
MUS 600	Maintaining Matriculation

### **V.     Revision of Courses \***

ELED 545	Investigations in Classroom Teaching [hours]
MGE 545	Investigations in Classroom Teaching [hours]
SEC 545	Investigations in Classroom Teaching [hours]
ELED 570	Workshop-Elementary Education [hours]
MGE 570	Workshop-Middle School Education [hours]
SEC 570	Workshop-Secondary Education [hours]
NURS 500	Advanced Physiological and Pathophysiological Concepts [hours]
NURS 515	Advanced Pharmacology [hours]
NURS 522	Teaching in Schools of Nursing Internship [hours]

### **VI.    Creation of Courses \***

NURS 509	Management for Adv Practice Nurses
PE 524	Applied Biomechanics
PH 548	Community Health Organization
PH 560	Environmental Management and Risk Assessment

PH 571	Air Quality Management
PH 595	Public Health Management of Disasters
CD 500	Research Methodology in Communication Sciences and Disorders

## **VII. Revision of Programs \***

Ref. No. 057 Master of Business Administration [admission requirements]

Ref. No. 149 Master of Science in Nursing [add NURS 509, drop EDFN 552, decrease credit hours allocated for non-thesis option from 6 to 3, increase credit hours in thesis option from 45 to 48]

Ref. No. 152 Master in Public Health (Public Health Option) [add PH 571, 595, 560;  
change prefix of EHS 510, 577, 580 to PH;  
move courses from required electives to electives; add core and specialization courses; decrease hours from 43 to 42]

Ref. No. 152 Master in Public Health (Environmental Health Option) [add PH 548, 595;  
move courses from required core to elective]

Chair Smith called for a vote on the Graduate portion of the UCC Consent Agenda. And noted this vote is **for Graduate Faculty** only. The motion carried.

Next, Senator Applegate moved approval of the following Resolution regarding the Joint-Engineering Program with Western Kentucky University and the University of Kentucky:

**BE IT RESOLVED:** The Western Kentucky University Senate regrets the necessity of placing the engineering program partially outside of the traditional faculty governance process of curriculum approvals. We encourage all parties to find a more appropriate curriculum approval process for future joint programs.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

An exchange of the wording of the Resolution ensued. Michael Carini moved to amend the Resolution by replacing the word “regret” to “acknowledge”

Arvin Vos moved to postpone indefinitely. The motion was seconded. The motion carried 26 to 11.

## **C. Report from the General Education Committee**

The General Education Committee presents the following agenda items for approval:

Chair Smith asked if any Senator would like to move any consent item to an action item. No such requests were made.

Senator Patricia Minter moved approval of the following:

Category B:

Moving Course to Category B-I from Category B-II:

SPAN 376 Literatures and Culture of Latin America

Revision of prerequisites for existing courses:

ENG 380 Masterpieces of English Literature

ENG 385 World Literature

ENG 390 Masterpieces of American Literature

Deletion of Course:

LAT 392 Mythology

Category F:

Inclusion of New Course:

ANSC 232 Basic Equitation

New Department Sections of University Experience:

CE 175 University Experience: Civil Engineering

EE 175 University Experience: Electrical Engineering

ME 175 University Experience: Mechanical Engineering

MUS 175 University Experience: Music

Finally, the General Education seeks approval for the following motion:

“The University Senate General Education Committee recommends that the new General Education Requirements for Associate Degrees go into effect on August 15, 2004. Any student filing a degree program after that date will have to adhere to the new requirements.”

The motion carried.



## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **I. Proposal to Revise the Composition of the University Curriculum Committee (second reading)**

**Whereas**, the appointment of additional faculty members by the executive committee unbalances representation on the committee;

**Whereas**, the inclusion of member of the College Curriculum committees currently constrains the meeting time of the University Curriculum Committee increasing the length of time for passage;

**Whereas**, there is currently a perception that course proposals take too long to make their way through the approval process;

**Whereas**, social science research on group size and decision-making processes shows that efficiency decreases as group size increases;

**Therefore be it resolved** that the following change be made to the Charter of the University Senate:

That Section IV, Letter A, Number 2, First Paragraph, be revised to read:

“The University Curriculum Committee shall consist of voting members and alternates. Voting Members will be selected as follows: One senate representative and one alternate from each college and the Library shall be selected by Senate colleagues from the same college. One student senator and one student alternate shall be selected by the Student Government Association to serve on the committee. The Registrar, a representative of the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the deans (or their representatives) of the undergraduate colleges, the Library, and Graduate Studies and Research shall be advisory members.”

### **Supported by the University Senate Executive Committee**

Chair Smith opened the floor for discussion. UCC Chair Applegate noted that the college representatives have important information for the committee’s considerations. In addition, they tend to have better attendance than do the regular members. After comment, a vote to change the composition such that the college representatives are eliminated was taken.

The motion failed.

## **II. Proposal to Create the Position of Copy Editor**

**Whereas**, there is a common perception that the University Curriculum Committee meetings take too long due to committee members copy editing proposals;

**Therefore be it resolved** that the following change be made to the Charter of the University Senate:

That a new paragraph be added to Section IV, Letter A, Number 2, which reads:

“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.”

### **Not Supported by the University Senate Executive Committee**

#### **Rationale for Not Supporting:**

The University Senate Executive Committee had some concerns about whether proposals should be sent to the copy editor before or after being read by the University Curriculum Committee. There was also concern as to whether the entire proposal was to be copy edited or only the portion of the proposal to be listed in the catalog.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion

UCC Chair Applegate moves to amend that new proposal will go to the copy editor before the UCC considers them rather than after. The rationale was that there should not be changes taking place to the documents that have been approved by the committee. The motion passed.

Jim Berger moved that the amendment be changed to address what would the copy editor edit, and Senator Vos said that the catalog is the base document. The amendment passed 26/1. The motion to approve copy editor was put to a vote. The motion carries (26/8).

The amended proposal now reads:

“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. Before the University Curriculum Committee approves new proposals the proposals will be sent to the copy editor. The copy editor will review those portions of proposals that will appear in the catalog 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."

## **NEW BUSINESS**

**Chair Smith announced the following changes would be treated as a consent agenda. Senators should pull those items from the consent needing further discussion.**

### **Graduate Council Policy Actions, Fall Semester, 2003**

<b>New Regulations (2003-05)</b>	<b>Old Regulations (2001-03)</b>
1. For students beginning the program in the fall of 2005 or later, no more than three courses or nine hours, whichever is the greater at the 400G-level may count toward the master's degree. Programs may appeal to the Graduate Council for an exception that would permit a maximum of 12 hours at the 400G-level. Note: Several departments, i.e., English, History, Mathematics, and Biology, have expressed interest in the exemption.	1. A maximum of 12 hours of 400G course work may be used on a master's degree program and no 400G courses may be applied to the specialist degree. (p. 17)  NOTE: The 2003-05 Graduate Catalog was not changed since the new regulation is not effective until Fall 2005.
2. A grade point average of 3.0 is necessary for candidacy and for graduation. Students who fall below an average of 3.0 are placed on probation for one semester. If the student's performance does not improve during that semester or summer term, the department involved will contact Graduate Studies to decide whether to dismiss the student or to allow the continuation of probation. If at the end of the second semester or summer term the grade point average is still below 3.0, the student may be advised to withdraw or face dismissal. A student must have a final semester or term of enrollment after obtaining a 3.0 and gaining admission to candidacy. A student on probation is ineligible for a graduate	2. No Regulation on Probation.  Admission to Candidacy: a. An approved program of study; b. Removal of any deficiencies or conditions for admission; c. Attainment of at least a 3.0 graduate GPA; d. Completion of a foreign language exam or research tool; and e. Approval of major advisor and Graduate Studies.

assistantship.	
<p>2. Students who qualify for graduate assistantships may qualify to become graduate teaching associates by meeting the following requirements:</p> <p>a. Completion of 18 hours of study in the major with a GPA of at least 3.0;</p> <p><b>b. Either (1) or (2) below:</b>  <b>(1) Completion of a full semester (for at least one graduate credit) course in teaching, or</b>  <b>(2) Attendance at six FaCET sessions (no more than two of which may be viewed on videotape)</b>  <b>AND participation in a departmental teaching seminar.</b></p>	<p>2. The following requirements must be met for approval:</p> <p>a. Successful completion of 18 graduate hours in the teaching discipline;</p> <p>b. Evidence in complete participation in six or more seminars on teaching as provided by FaCET, and/or other training approved by Graduate Studies (only one videotape is allowed in lieu of actual seminar).</p> <p>NOTE: New regulation is not printed in the catalog but will be noted when the new Graduate Assistant Handbook is printed.</p>
<p>3. Total number of credits students may apply to a degree program from credits earned prior to admission to the program (courses taken during the senior semester, unclassified student courses, transfer courses, previous master's courses, previous certificate courses) may not exceed twelve (12) hours. (p.13).</p>	<p>3. No Regulation for total number of credits, only for components.</p>
<p>Maximum of nine (9) hours taken in the unclassified admission status may be transferred, if appropriate, to a degree program. (p. 10)</p>	<p>4. Should the unclassified student later apply for and be granted admission into a degree program, no more than 12 hours taken while in the unclassified category may be used to fulfill degree requirements. (p. 16)</p>
<p>5. Seniors Enrolling for Graduate Credit</p> <p><b>a. Final semester Western seniors who lack no more than nine (9) hours to complete a bachelor's degree may enroll in a maximum of six (6) hours of graduate credit. A student lacking no more than twelve (12) hours may enroll in a maximum of three (3) hours of graduate credit.</b></p> <p>b. Maximum combined enrollment of undergraduate and graduate credits will not exceed fifteen (15) hours. Seniors enrolling in graduate courses must have met all admission requirements except completion of the bachelor's degree. (p.14)</p>	<p>5. Seniors at WKU or one of the cooperating consortium colleges may enroll in graduate course work during their final undergraduate semester provided they (1) meet admission requirements, (2) make formal application to graduate study, (3) carry a final semester course load of no more than 15 hours (combined graduate and undergraduate hours), and (4) do not, in any way, attempt to apply the graduate course(s) to the undergraduate degree. (p. 19)</p>

<p>6. Transfer Credits</p> <p>a. <b>For degree programs requiring 30-59 and 60 plus, the maximum transfer credits are 9 and 12, respectively.</b></p> <p>b. In cooperative or joint programs with other universities, credits earned in the program at these institutions are not considered transfer credits.</p>	<p>6. A maximum of 12 semester hours of graduate credit earned at another institution may be accepted toward meeting course requirements for the graduate program. (p. 17)</p>
<p>7. Previous Master's Course Work</p> <p>a. Maximum of <b>nine (9) hours</b> of credit from a previous Western master's program may be accepted toward a second master's degree.</p>	<p>7. No more than 12 hours of previous course work, whether transferred from another university or from the previous master's degree at WKU (or a combination of the two), may be used to fulfill program and research tool requirements. (p. 19)</p>

<p>8. Graduate Certificates</p> <p>a. Admission to a graduate certificate is based upon a bachelor's degree and adequate preparation in the area of study.</p> <p>b. Admission or completion of a graduate certificate does not guarantee admission to a graduate degree program.</p> <p>c. Maximum of nine (9) hours of certificate course work, if appropriate, may subsequently be applied toward graduate degree requirements.</p>	<p>8. No Regulation</p>
<p>9. GRE Analytical Writing Score</p> <p>a. Minimum score for degree program admission is 3.5.</p>	<p>9. No Regulation. The GRE General Test was changed in October 2001 to include Verbal and Quantitative sections and an Analytical Writing section.</p>
<p>10. If students have a master's degree from an accredited institution in a related field to their area of study, they may use this in place of the GRE General Test. Each department has the discretion to approve this exception to the GRE requirement. (p. 9)</p>	<p>10. No Regulation.</p>
<p>11. If a student has take the GRE a second time due to low scores in either the Verbal/Quantitative sections or the Analytical Writing section, the scores may not be split for</p>	<p>11. No Regulation. The GRE General Test was changed in October 2001 to include a separate score for analytical writing.</p>

students to gain admission into a program. The GRE must be passed in its entirety with a 2200 GAP score and 3.5 Analytical Writing score. (Not noted in the catalog)	
12. Program Residency Graduate Studies does not have a residency requirement for completing a master's/specialist degree. WKU courses offered by distance education are considered resident credit. (p. 11)	12. Specialist degree requirements included two periods, consisting of a minimum of six hours each, of on-campus course work. (p. 21)

Chair Smith opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Mutter asked that the “second #2” item, which should be #3, be pulled.

Senator Ernst asked to pull # 1 regarding 400G level courses.

Senator Ziegler asked that the “first # 2” item be pulled for the consideration of the implementation date.

Senator Cashwell asked that the items #3 and #4 be pulled.

Dr. Dietle speaking for Dr. Burch said that she took issue with items #4, #5, #6, #7, and #8 c.

Treating the remainder as a consent agenda (#10, #11, #12) with the above items being pulled, Chair Smith asked for the vote. The motion carries. (22/0)

Considerable discussion followed with votes being taken for each item at a time.

Discussion for item # 1, regarding 400G level courses. The vote to retain the proposed wording of item #1 fails (9/11).

Discussion for item # 2, regarding the implementation date. Senator Ziegler moved that this apply to new graduate students admitted Fall 2004 or later. The motion was seconded. The motion carried (16/0). The vote to approve item #2 passes (19/0).

Discussion for item second #2, regarding the training for teaching assistants. Dr. Gray clarified the need to make the graduate teaching assistants “teachers of record” for the lower division courses. Currently teaching associates are teachers of record, whereas teaching assistants are not. In answer to Senator Mutter’s question asking who would be providing the seminar, Dr. Gary said it would be either the department or college as most appropriate. The approval of this item carries (12/7).

Discussion for item #3, regarding transfer of credits. Senator Ziegler moved to

table this item definitely until May 13, and this was seconded. After brief discussion the motion to table fails (5/13). The vote to approve this item passes (18/0).

Discussion for item #4, regarding changing to 9 hours instead of 12 hours as unclassified. Senator McMichael moved to bundle the items #4, #5, #6, #7, and #8c. This was seconded. The motion to bundle these passed (15/0). Senator Cashwell moved to amend wording, and was seconded. In discussion, Dr. Gray clarified the number an undergraduate can take for graduate credit as and the number of hours the student must be within graduation to take the hours for credit toward the master's degree. The vote on the amendment as specified passed (17/0). The motion to approve 12 hours instead of 9 in the grouped items carries (19/0).

Discussion for item # 9, regarding the score of 3.5 required for the GRE Analytical Writing Score. Considerable discussion follows regarding the sample ETS used for the writing component and a comparable sample taken at WKU. Senator Cashwell asked for additional analysis of WKU data to which Dr. Gray responded that the analysis had not included an analysis of minority performance, and that likely the sample was not large enough to have permitted a more detailed analysis. The vote to approve the minimum score of 3.5 fails to pass (6/9). Item #9 is returned to committee.

The Graduate Proposal as revised now reads:

**Graduate Council Policy Actions,  
Fall Semester, 2003**

New Regulations (2003-05)	Old Regulations (2001-03)
	<p>1. A maximum of 12 hours of 400G course work may be used on a master's degree program and no 400G courses may be applied to the specialist degree. (p. 17)</p> <p>NOTE: The 2003-05 Graduate Catalog was not changed since the new regulation is not effective until Fall 2005.</p>
<p>2. A grade point average of 3.0 is necessary for candidacy and for graduation. Students who fall below an average of 3.0 are placed on probation for one semester. If the student's performance does not improve during that semester or summer term, the department involved will contact Graduate Studies to decide whether to dismiss the student or to allow the continuation of probation. If at the end of the second semester or summer term the grade point average is still below 3.0, the student may be advised to withdraw or face</p>	<p>2. No Regulation on Probation.</p> <p>Admission to Candidacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. An approved program of study;</li> <li>b. Removal of any deficiencies or conditions for admission;</li> <li>c. Attainment of at least a 3.0 graduate GPA;</li> <li>d. Completion of a foreign language exam or research tool; and</li> <li>e. Approval of major advisor and Graduate Studies.</li> </ul>

dismissal. A student must have a final semester or term of enrollment after obtaining a 3.0 and gaining admission to candidacy. A student on probation is ineligible for a graduate assistantship.	
<p>2. Students who qualify for graduate assistantships may qualify to become graduate teaching associates by meeting the following requirements:</p> <p>a. Completion of 18 hours of study in the major with a GPA of at least 3.0;</p> <p><b>b. Either (1) or (2) below:</b></p> <p><b>(1) Completion of a full semester (for at least one graduate credit) course in teaching, or</b></p> <p><b>(2) Attendance at six FaCET sessions (no more than two of which may be viewed on videotape)</b></p> <p><b>AND participation in a departmental teaching seminar.</b></p>	<p>2. The following requirements must be met for approval:</p> <p>a. Successful completion of 18 graduate hours in the teaching discipline;</p> <p>b. Evidence in complete participation in six or more seminars on teaching as provided by FaCET, and/or other training approved by Graduate Studies (only one videotape is allowed in lieu of actual seminar).</p> <p>NOTE: New regulation is not printed in the catalog but will be noted when the new Graduate Assistant Handbook is printed.</p>
3. Total number of credits students may apply to a degree program from credits earned prior to admission to the program (courses taken during the senior semester, unclassified student courses, transfer courses, previous master's courses, previous certificate courses) may not exceed twelve (12) hours. (p.13).	3. No Regulation for total number of credits, only for components.
4. Maximum of <b>twelve (12) hours</b> taken in the unclassified admission status may be transferred, if appropriate, to a degree program. (p. 10)	4. Should the unclassified student later apply for and be granted admission into a degree program, no more than 12 hours taken while in the unclassified category may be used to fulfill degree requirements. (p. 16)
	5. Seniors at WKU or one of the cooperating consortium colleges may enroll in graduate course work during their final undergraduate semester provided they (1) meet admission requirements, (2) make formal application to graduate study, (3) carry a final semester course load of no more than 15 hours (combined graduate and undergraduate hours), and (4) do not, in any way, attempt to apply the graduate course(s) to the undergraduate degree. (p. 19)
	6. A maximum of 12 semester hours of graduate credit earned at another institution may be accepted toward meeting course



	requirements for the graduate program. (p. 17)
	7. No more than 12 hours of previous course work, whether transferred from another university or from the previous master's degree at WKU (or a combination of the two), may be used to fulfill program and research tool requirements. (p. 19)

<p>8. Graduate Certificates</p> <p>a. Admission to a graduate certificate is based upon a bachelor's degree and adequate preparation in the area of study.</p> <p>b. Admission or completion of a graduate certificate does not guarantee admission to a graduate degree program.</p>	8. No Regulation
	9. No Regulation. The GRE General Test was changed in October 2001 to include Verbal and Quantitative sections and an Analytical Writing section.
10. If students have a master's degree from an accredited institution in a related field to their area of study, they may use this in place of the GRE General Test. Each department has the discretion to approve this exception to the GRE requirement. (p. 9)	10. No Regulation.
11. If a student has take the GRE a second time due to low scores in either the Verbal/Quantitative sections or the Analytical Writing section, the scores may not be split for students to gain admission into a program. The GRE must be passed in its entirety with a 2200 GAP score and 3.5 Analytical Writing score. (Not noted in the catalog)	11. No Regulation. The GRE General Test was changed in October 2001 to include a separate score for analytical writing.
<p>12. Program Residency</p> <p>Graduate Studies does not have a residency requirement for completing a master's/specialist degree. WKU courses offered by distance education are considered resident credit. (p. 11)</p>	12. Specialist degree requirements included two periods, consisting of a minimum of six hours each, of on-campus course work. (p. 21)

Senator Ziegler called for a count for a quorum present. A count determined there was not a quorum. The meeting was dismissed.

Chair Smith asked all newly elected at-large members to move forward so the elections of the 2004-05 Senate officers could be held. After a count of the new members, it was determined a quorum was not present.

The Executive Committee met immediately following the Senate meeting to discuss the next time the Senate could meet to hold elections for the 2004 – 20005 academic year. A meeting for Thursday, May 6, at 3:30 PM was decided. Chair Smith with Lou Stahl will arrange for reserving the meeting space (Garrett) and Chair Smith said he would issue the announcement for the elections.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 P.M

Respectfully submitted,

---

Patricia Minors, Secretary

---

Lou Stahl, Recorder