

**MINUTES
UNIVERSITY SENATE
MARCH 18, 2004
GARRETT BALLROOM**

Chair Doug Smith called the meeting to order at 3:30 P.M. **The following members were present:** Darlene Applegate, Jim Berger, Charles Borders, Christopher Brown, John Bruni, Barbara Burch, Linda Coakley, Debra Crisp, Robert Dietle, Richard Dressler, Claus Ernst, Elmer Gray, Bill Greenwalt, Kacy Harris, Michelle Hollis, William Howard, Lois Jircitano, Wilma King Jones, Pamela Jukes, Danita Kelley, Dana Lockhart, Cynthia Mason, Andrew McMichael, Connie Mills, Pat Minors, Patricia Minter, John Moore, Lora Moore, Russell Moore, George Musambira, Sharon Mutter, Anne Onyekwuluje, Yvonne Petkus, Keith Phillips, Matt Pruitt, Troy Ransdell, Eric Reed, Loren Ruff, Jo-Anne Ryan, Roger Scott, Sherrie Serros, Vernon Lee Sheeley, Nelda Sims, Douglas Smith, Brian Strow, Judy Walker, Richard Weigel, Mary Wolinski, Edward Yager, Uta Ziegler **Alternate members present were:** Robert Smith for Jim Becker, Kirk Atkinson for Ray Blankenship, Susan Wesley for Suzie Cashwell, SGA reps for Joshua Collins, Steve Haggbloom for Sam Evans, Andrew Ernest for Blaine Ferrell, Michael Carini for Richard Hackney, Larry Snyder for David Lee. **Members absent without alternate representation were:** John All, Christopher Antonsen, Michael Binder, John Bonaguro, Robert Choate, Thad Crews ii, Jeffrey Hackett, Robert Holman, Dan Jackson, Robert Jefferson, Bruce Kessler, Lee Minwoo, Richard Parker, Sherry Powers, Gary Ransdell, Sherry Reid, Jeffrey Samuels.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of February 2004 were not presented, and will be approved at the April Meeting.

Report from the Chair

1. Chair Smith said he has had two conversations with President Ransdell regarding University Senate matters, one he said Regent Dietle will address regarding benefits. Secondly, the Chair said he has met with Dean Gray about the Graduate Council and its relationship to the University Senate, which will come up under New Business of this meeting
2. Next Chair Smith said that he has received a letter dated March 10, 2004 from John Bradley, SGA President, concerning SGA receiving SITE evaluation. A Resolution from SGA will be presented to this body under today's New Business
3. Chair Smith said he has received six requests for an additional meeting this year to consider materials from the UCC, he said if he receives 10 requests the meeting will be held, or if the Senate Executive may call another meeting. Other matters may also be presented at this meeting.

REPORT FROM THE VICE CHAIR

Vice Chair Jim Berger reminded each Senator that the elections for At-Large Senators and Alternates should take place immediately. He that said up to three (3) members of each

department are submitted to their respective College Dean's office. After Spring break, the election will be held and members will be in place for the next academic year.

Report from the Faculty Regent

Regent Dietle said that on March 9th he and Chair Smith met with President Ransdell to clarify the agreement pertaining to start date for benefits for new faculty. President Ransdell confirmed that faculty benefits would begin with first date of employment, which is August 15, 2004. The President also confirmed that the financing for these two weeks of benefits would come from business monies budgeted for unfilled faculty lines. Dr. Dietle said he would meet with the President again to confirm that everyone including Human Resources understands this policy. Next Regent Dietle addressed the concerns from staff that the financing of these benefits will in no way be taken from a pool that would reduce staffing or cause loss of jobs. However, Regent Dietle said he and Chair Smith also made the point that they felt the staff should have the same treatment, but the staff will have to make their case, which will be, supported both him and Chair Smith. Regent Dietle said in conversations that he and other faculty have had with members of the staff many do not feel this is an important issue. However, he said if it does become an issue he will support that they have the same treatment.

Report from the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Provost Burch said considerable time is being spent on translating budget policies, and the ways they are implemented to avoid reduction of the academic programs. Provost Burch said that discussions with President Ransdell have been positive, and that the Budget Council has had two meetings and another is scheduled next week. Dr. Burch said, as most are aware, dollars coming in are less than those going out, which certainly causes concerns on what the outcome will be. The Provost did say however, that transferred funds from the Academic Quality Initiative are already in departments for operating needs for professional development, and these funds are also being used where special projects are needed. Dr. Burch said the good news is that every dollar possible has been put on improvements for faculty instructional space improvements. By the beginning of the fall semester there will not be a building on campus that has not had some instructional area(s) renovated and in some cases a significant amount of renovation has been done. We expect to continue to do this each year.

Standing Committee Reports

A. Report from the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee

The Chair of the Committee, Mary Wolinski reported on two reports (Copy attached to March agenda Packet)

1. University Senate Survey

This report will be published on a "to-be-announced website." This website will require a log in with a password, to prevent duplicate votes. Dr. Wolinski said the questions for the President's survey has been revised using the same heading that corresponds with the Board of Regents survey. Also, there is an enlarged survey regarding Faculty Worklife and Job

Satisfaction, also a survey asking for the hours those faculty members devote to teaching, research and service. The Faculty Salary will be on the website as well.

2. Dr. Wolinski moved approval of the first reading of the following proposal:

Report from the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee

Mar. 8, 2004

General Recommendation Concerning Faculty Continuance and Tenure Policy and Procedure

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

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 specifics of the tenure review process and the grievance appeal process at the beginning of the first year, both at the university level (in the orientation) and at the department level.

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 during the review process, but withdrawal of the application at this time 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 1st 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 2nd paragraph: **A. Denial of Reappointment or Tenure.**

[Insert this new paragraph before 3rd 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:

 P By **February 15** of the faculty member's sixth year, or the year of the tenure decision.

[Replace 3rd 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, or for the decision not to recommend tenure. Written reasons for non-continuance or denial of tenure will only be furnished if the faculty member requests them in writing. 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 or denial of tenure. If this conference fails to satisfy the faculty member, the President will have a related conference with the faculty member upon request.

Section IV p. 36

[Replace 4th and 5th 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

[Replace 6th paragraph:] **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. As part of the preliminary inquiry, the committee is charged to determine the truth of the reasons for non-continuance, if the reasons are related to the requirements of the position, and whether the review process has been followed correctly. The committee may examine the department head's annual evaluations, the candidate's professional activity reports, and other evidence as needed.

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

Section IV, p. 37

[Replace 2nd 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.

Dr. Wolinski went over proposals that are recommended that does not appear in the present Handbook: The first proposal presented which does not appear in the Handbook was a recommendation that all Department Heads receive training in the legal aspects of Continuance and Tenure Review Policies. Recommended as well are proposals concerning the Tenure Process and the Appeals Process. Dr. Wolinski said that first the Committee tried to make clear the differences in the review process and appeals process the difference in Continuance and Tenure issue. They specify that the departmental promotion and tenure committees will submit the vote count and written statement if it wishes, to the department head. Also recommended is that new faculty be informed about the specifics of the Continuance and Tenure process at both the department and college levels. Another change is to allow tenure candidates to withdraw the application for tenure in the 6th year, which would be a *de facto* resignation, this was a recommendation by department heads. Next, concerning the appeals process, **Paragraph at top of Page 3. This proposal was temporarily placed on hold.** Continuing, Dr. Wolinski said that also among the reasons a faculty member can file an appeal, the committee has been added to the reasons, "Violation of Standards of Academic Freedom." They have specified that the appeals process continues, even if outside legal action is undertaken, also specified for more clarity are the duties of the Advisory Committee. They clarified the constituency of an ad-hoc committee, as well as clarifying the route through which the appeals will proceed. After the ad-hoc committee finishes its work, it passes its recommendations to the President, the President decides and passes his decision to the Board of Regents. The faculty may appeal the President's recommendation to the Board of Regents. However, the Regent's decision is final. Therefore, the proposal does not allow for the appeal to be sent back to Committees.

Chair Smith opened the floor for discussion. After considerable discussion, Chair Smith declared this proposal for changes in the Faculty Handbook has had its first reading.

B. Report from the General Education Committee

Patricia Minter, Chair of the General Education Committee moved approval of the following proposal:

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

I. Proposal to add course to Category C:

PS 260 Comparative Politics

II. Proposal to revise existing course in Category D:

MATH 118 College Algebra and Trigonometry

III. Proposal to standardize General Education requirements for Associate Degree programs at South Campus:

Students in Associate Degree programs must take a minimum of 15 hours of General Education courses as outlined below.

Category AI: Organization and Communication of Ideas 3 hours
ENG 100/ENGL 100C Freshman English

Category B: Humanities 3 hours
Any class from section I (Literature) or section II (Electives)

Category C: Social and Behavioral Sciences 6 hours
Any two classes

Category D: Natural Sciences—Mathematics 3 hours
Any class from section I (Science) or section II (Mathematics)

The Chair asked if any Senator would like to move any of the Consent Items to the Action Agenda

Senator Uta Ziegler moved to place Item # 3 on the Action Agenda. The motion was seconded.

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

Action Agenda

The Chair opened the floor for discussion on the portion of the GenEd report that was moved to the action agenda:

Dr. Robert Dietle General Education Coordinator asked for a friendly amendment, by removing the word s “at South Campus”, there were no objections. Again the floor was opened for discussion.

This portion of the proposal as amended now reads:

Proposals to standardize General Education requirements for Associate Degree programs at ~~South Campus~~:

Students in Associate Degree programs must take a minimum of 15 hours of General Education courses as outlined below.

Category AI: Organization and Communication of Ideas. . . . 3 hours
ENG 100/ENGL 100C Freshman English

Category B: Humanities 3 hours
Any class from section I (Literature) or section II (Electives)

Category C: Social and Behavioral Sciences 6 hours
Any two classes

Category D: Natural Sciences—Mathematics 3 hours
Any class from section I (Science) or section II (Mathematics)

Senator Uta Ziegler moved and the motion was seconded to amend the proposal as follows:

- 1) Change the required courses in category C from 6 hours to 3 hours
- 2) Add a sentence: The remaining 3-hr requirement can be met with any course from category A, B, C or D.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion on the Ziegler amendment.

Senator John Moore moved to amend the amendment as follows: The motion was seconded.

Add category E as a requirements for all associate degrees seekers and another 3 hours in categories A,B,C,D, and/or F requirement with exception of Nursing which will be 6 hours in category C.

The floor was opened for discussion **on the amendment to the Ziegler amendment**. After discussion, The Chair called for a vote. **The motion failed.**

The Chair again opened the floor for discussion on the Ziegler amendment. After considerable discussion, **the amendment failed.**

Next the Chair called for a vote on the **original General Education motion, as presented.**
The motion carried.

C. Report from the Curriculum Committee

Senator Darlene Applegate moved approval of their consent agenda of items that were approved at the February 26, 2004 meeting. Senator Applegate said she would like to make one modification to the agenda, Page 4. The Graduate Council Proposal, Section 5, Creation of Courses: She would like to pull LME 527, for course revision not being received. **(NOTE:)** Later Senator Applegate moved approval to reinstate LME 527, (revision was given to her at this meeting). The motion was seconded. The motion carried.

Chair Douglas Smith asked if any Senator would like to move any of the consent items to an action agenda. Senator Applegate said she would like to move “The Creation of a Graduate Certificate Program, “Educational Technology Certificate” listed under the Graduate Council Report.

UNDERGRADUATE MOTIONS

BOWLING GREEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

I. Deletion of Courses

AG 101C	Science of Agriculture
AG 108C	Rural Sociology
AST 104C	Astronomy of the Solar System
CFSC 110C	Basic Design
CFSC 193C	Basic Curriculum Development for Young Children
CFSC 194C	Assessment of Young Children
CHM 102C	Lab for Introduction to Chemistry
CHM 105C	General Chemistry I
CHM 106C	Lab for General Chemistry I
CHM 107C	General Chemistry II
CHM 108C	Lab for General Chemistry II
CHM 118C	Preliminary to College Chemistry
COUN 101C	Education and Life Planning
EETC 111C	Electricity I
EETC 113C	Lab for Electricity I
ENGL 107C	Applied Writing
FT 130C	Fire Department Organization
FT 131 C	Fire Tactics & Strat I
FT 231C	Fire Tactics & Strat II
FT 232C	Fire Investigation
FT234C	Fire Prot Equip & Sys
FT 236C	Adm Mthd/Prac Fire Tech
GE 102C	Introduction to Geology
GEO 121C	Meteorology
HED 150C	Applied Health: Weight Control
JOUR 201C	Journalism and Society
MFGT 120C	Basic Electricity
MILS 101C	Mountaineering and Marksmanship
PHIL 115C	Elementary Logic
PY 101C	Concepts of Motion
PY 103C	Light, Color and Motion
SCWK 101C	Foundation of Human Services
SOC 230C	Deviant Behavior

II. Suspension of Course

PHIL 120C Introduction to Philosophy

III. Revision of Course *

NUR 230C Nursing Roles and Responsibilities [prereqs, credit hours]

IV. Creation of Courses *

NUR 100C Fundamentals of Nursing
NUR 110C Mental Health Nursing
NUR 111C Maternal/Newborn Nursing
NUR 112C Medical/Surgical Nursing I
NUR 201C Medical/Surgical Nursing II
NUR 250C Medical/Surgical Nursing III

V. Revision of Program *

Ref. No. 273 Associate Degree in Nursing [revise admission requirements, revise promotion and retention policy, change required General Education courses, increase nursing hours from 39 to 42, increase program hours from 69 to 72]

OGDEN COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

I. Revision of Courses

EE 420 Signals and Systems [prereqs/coreqs]
MATH 118 College Algebra and Trigonometry [prereqs]

II. Creation of Courses *

EE 175 University Experience – Electrical Engineering
ME 175 University Experience – Mechanical Engineering
ME 176 Mechanical Engineering Freshman Design
ME 496 WKU ME Selected Topics (Fall)
ME 497 WKU ME Selected Topics (Spring)
ME 498 UK ME Selected Topics (Fall)
ME 499 UK Me Selected Topics (Spring)
MATH 175 University Experience – Mathematics

GORDON FORD COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

I. Suspension of Course

ACCT 302 Intermediate Accounting III

II. Creation of Course *

ACCT 451 Advanced Auditing and Assurance Services

POTTER COLLEGE OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

I. Revision of Courses

JOUR 350 Public Relations Publications Design [course number]
JOUR 351 Fundamentals of Public Relations [course number]
JOUR 352 Public Relations Communication [course number]
JOUR 454 Public Relations Strategy and Planning [catalog listing]

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

I. One-Time-Only Course Offerings [for information only]

LME 318 Children's Literature (Fall 2004)

COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

I. One-Time-Only Course Offerings [for information only]

PH 405 Introduction to Ergonomics (Fall 2004)

GENERAL STUDIES

I. One-Time-Only Course Offerings [for information only]

UC 370 Seminar in Peer Mentoring (Spring 2004)
UC 371 Practicum in Peer Mentoring (Spring 2004)

II. Re-offer a One-Time-Only Course *

ESLI 049 Orientation to WKU for ESLI Students

GRADUATE PROPOSALS

GRADUATE COUNCIL

I. One-Time-Only Course Offerings [for information only]

ANTH 450G Modern Human Biological Variation (Spring 2004)
ADED 595 Readings or Research in Adult Education (Spring 2004)
LME 527 Thematic Young Adult Literature (Fall 2004)
LME 535 Survey of Educational Technology Practices (Fall 2004)
LME 537 Principles of Educational Technology Applications (Fall 2004)
HCA 574 Decision Making in Healthcare (Fall 2004)
ADED 611 Adult Development and Learning (Spring 2004)

II. Revise Course Prefix [for information only]

PSY 611 to ADED 611 Adult Development and Learning

III. Revision of Courses

LTCY 520 Clinical Diagnosis of Reading Variability [prereqs/coreqs]
LTCY 521 Reading Intervention [prereqs/coreqs]
CNS 590 Practicum [prereqs/coreqs]
SWRK 510 Human Behavior in the Social Environment [prereqs/coreqs]
SWRK 520 Generalist Social Work Practice [prereqs/coreqs]
SWRK 560 Foundation Field Practicum I * [prereqs/coreqs, credit hours]

IV. Deletion of Course

SWRK 500 Profession of Social Work

V. Creation of Courses *

LME 527 Thematic Approach to Young Adult Literature
LME 535 Survey of Educational Technology Practices
LME 537 Principles of Educational Technology Applications
ADED 540 Philosophy and History of Adult Education

VI. Creation of Graduate Certificate Program *

Educational Technology Certificate

VII. Revision of Programs *

- Ref. No. 157 Master of Social Work [revise program admission requirements, clarify policy about elective courses, establish comprehensive exam requirement, delete SWRK 500 (2 hours), increase SWRK 560 to 4 hours]
- Ref. No. 093 MAE Elementary Education: Reading/Writing Endorsement [add two courses to restricted electives]
- Ref. No. 094 MAE Secondary Education: Reading/Writing Endorsement [add two courses to restricted electives, substitute LME 527 for LME 407G in the Specialized Component]
- Ref. No. 155 Middle Grades Education: Reading/Writing Endorsement [add two courses to restricted electives, substitute LME 527 for LME 407G in the Specialized Component]
- Ref. No. 143 MAE Mental Health Counseling [change program title, revise title of Option I, add course to Option 1, delete elective from Option 1]

Chair Smith then called for a vote on the Undergraduate Consent Agenda: The motion carried. Next Chair Smith called for a vote by Graduate Faculty only, on the Graduate Consent Agenda, as amended. The motion carried.

Action Agenda

Certificate Program: Educational Technology Certificate

Senator Applegate, said that subsequent to UCC approval, it was noted that the word “Graduate” should be inserted in the program title. Therefore Senator said she would like to make a friendly to change the title of the certificate. The new title is now: **Graduate Educational Technology Certificate:**

The motion to amend was seconded. The motion carried.

The Chair called for a vote by the Graduate Faculty on the proposal as amended.

The motion was seconded. The motion carried.

Report from the Ad-Hoc Committee for Academic Quality

Committee Chair Senator Jim Berger said he would like to thank the members of the Ad Hoc-Committee on Academic Quality for their diligence and hard work. Members of the Committee serving with Senator Berger are: Joshua Collins and Troy Ransdell, SGA Representatives, Judy Byrd, Registrar’s Office, Cheryl Chambless, Academic Advising, Michelle Hollis, Academic Support, Danita Kelley, Consumer and Family Sciences, Patti Minter, History, Marleen Murphy, Registrar’s Office, Tom Richmond, Mathematics, Sherrie Serros, Mathematics, Nelda Sims, Library Technical Services, and Brian Strow, Economics and Marketing.

Senator Berger moved approval of the following amended proposal:

Proposal to Recommend Utilization of Plus/Minus Grading System

Whereas, grades are an important method of evaluating a student's performance in the class;

Whereas, the impacts of implementing the plus/minus system on faculty, students, and administration at WKU are unknown;

Whereas, a variety of research provides differing viewpoints on the effectiveness of the plus/minus grading system;

Therefore be it resolved that the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Quality recommend to University Senate to keep current grading system but place plusses and minuses, from A+ to C-, on the transcript but not to affect the student's Grade Point Average or Quality Points. Over the next two years, we will collect data for the purpose of assessing the grading system's impact on the university, faculty, and students. Because both grades are assigned equivalent quality points, C's and C-'s will fulfill requirements for programs in which students must earn a minimum grade of C in specified courses.

Next Chair Smith said the motion on the floor, does not need a second, and since this proposal has been read at two previous meetings, the proposal on the floor to “**Recommend Utilization of Plus/Minus Grading System**” requires only one reading.

Chair Smith opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Dana Lockhart moved to postpone the motion until the next meeting. The motion was seconded.

After discussion, the Lockhart motion to postpone was voted upon. The motion failed.

Considerable discussions continued after which Chair Smith called for a vote on the proposal that is on the floor “**Proposal to Recommend Utilization of Plus/Minus Grading System.**”

The motion carried.

NOTE: Chair Smith, said he has asked the Ad-Hoc Committee to postpone the two (2) remaining proposals which are attached to today's agenda, those being: Proposal to Recommend Suggestions to Improve Awareness of Policy and its Changes, as well as their Proposal to Recommend Suggestions to Improve Academic Quality in the Classroom.

OLD BUSINESS

The Chair noted that since the following proposals were presented at the last meeting, and since they are Charter changes, a two-thirds majority vote is required.

Chair Smith opened the floor for the Second Reading of the following proposal:

1. Proposal to Revise the Selection of At-Large Alternates – (Second Reading)
Proposal to Revise the Selection of At-Large Alternates

Whereas, the current system of at-large alternate selection has proven unwieldy and caused much rancor among senators;

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

1) That Section II, Letter A, Number 3, be revised by:

- Changing “alternates” to “representatives” in first sentence.
- Striking the last two sentences.
- Adding “At-large representatives shall select their own alternate to serve in their place if they are unable to attend a University Senate function. The designated alternate shall have the full rights and privileges of an elected senator.” to paragraph.

After the changes Section II, Letter A, Number 3, would read:

3. Each college and the library shall select as many at-large representatives as required so that the total of departmental and at-large representatives is equal to ten (10) percent (rounded to the nearest whole number) of the unit’s total faculty. At-large representatives shall select their own alternate to serve in their place if they are unable to attend a University Senate function. The designated alternate shall have the full rights and privileges of an elected senator.

2) That Section II, Letter C, Number 2, be revised by:

- Striking the last sentence.

After the changes Section II, Letter C, Number 2, would read:

Election of at-large members shall be conducted by the Vice-Chair of the Senate, assisted by College representatives on the Executive Committee. The election shall proceed as follows: in the first week of March each department may nominate up to three faculty members to a pool from which its college’s at-large representatives shall be chosen. (The same procedure shall be used by the library.) The list of nominees for each college shall be published and voting by ballot shall be in the offices of the college deans and/or other designated place at a time determined by each college. Each eligible voter shall be permitted to vote for as many persons as positions being filled. Those with the highest number of votes shall be declared elected. In the event of a tie, a

drawing to determine the winner shall be conducted by the Vice-Chair. The runners-up shall be placed in a pool from which replacements will be selected when vacancies occur. In each case, the person with the highest number of votes shall be selected.

3) That Section II, Letter C, Number 4, be revised by:

- Changing the second sentence to read: “If an at-large senator resigns, the first eligible runner-up from that unit’s at-large pool shall replace the resigning senator.”

After the changes Section II, Letter C, Number 4, shall read:

If a departmental senator resigns, then the department’s alternate shall become the department’s representative. If an at-large senator resigns, the first eligible runner-up from that unit’s at-large pool shall replace the resigning senator.

Supported by the University Senate Executive Committee

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

The Chair called for a vote. The motion carried.

NOTE: (The first and second reading approved pending approval of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, The President and The Board of Regents)

Next Chair Smith opened the floor for the Second reading on the following proposal:

2. Proposal to Create a Standing Committee on Academic Quality – Second Reading

Whereas, a number of academic quality issues have come before the University Senate such that the Senate has created an ad hoc Committee on Academic Quality;

Whereas, the ad hoc Committee on Academic Quality in all likelihood be unable to address all the issues on its docket by the end of the academic year;

Whereas, changes that are made because of recommendations by the Academic Quality Committee will need to be monitored;

Therefore be it resolved that the following changes be made to the Charter of the University Senate to create a Standing Committee on Academic Quality:

- 1) That the first paragraph of Section IV, Letter A be changed to read:

“The standing committees of the Senate are the following: the Executive Committee, the University Curriculum Committee, the General Education Committee, the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee and the Committee on Academic Quality. The composition and duties of the standing committees are as follows:”

2) That Section IV, Letter A be amended with Number 5 to read:

5. Committee on Academic Quality

The Committee on Academic Quality shall consist of voting members as well as non-voting advisory members. Voting members will be selected as follows: one senate representative from each college and the Library shall be selected by Senate colleagues from the same college. One student senator shall be selected by the Student Government Association senate delegation to serve on the committee. One representative from the Graduate Council shall be appointed as a voting member. In addition, a representative from the Registrar’s Office, a representative from the Academic Advising and Retention Center, and a representative of the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be advisory members.

The functions of the Committee on Academic Quality shall be:

- a. to study and monitor the changes to the grading system
- b. to study and monitor changes in the Drop/Add Policy
- c. to study and monitor changes in advising policies
- d. to explore additional ways to strengthen the academic culture at WKU
- e. to study matters assigned to it by the Executive Committee

3) That Section II, Letter A, Number 5 be changed to read:

“Student Membership: students selected by the Student Government Association shall be members of the University Senate. The number of representatives selected by the Student Government Association shall equal the number of standing committees of the senate. The student representatives and their alternates shall serve one year terms.”

Supported by the University Senate Executive Committee

The Chair opened the floor for discussion

Senator Darlene Applegate moved to amend Section IV. 5. “**Committees on Academic Quality**” to include a representative from the University Curriculum Committee as a voting member. The motion was seconded.

Chair Smith opened the floor for discussion on the motion to amend.

The Chair called for a vote on the amendment. The motion carried.

Senator Troy Ransdell moved to amend Section IV.5 “**Committee on Academic Quality** to include a second representative (2) to serve as a voting members. The motion was seconded.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

The Chair called for a vote on the amended motion as amended. The motion carried.

Amendments to the first paragraph of Section IV.5 now reads:

“The Committee on Academic Quality shall consist of voting members as well as non-voting advisory members. Voting members will be selected as follows: one senate representative from each college and the Library shall be selected by Senate colleagues from the same college. Two student representatives from the Student Government Association senate delegation to serve on the committee. One representative from the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council shall be appointed as voting members. In addition, . . . “

The Chair again called for a vote on the main motion as amended. The motion carried.

NOTE: (The first and second reading approved pending approval of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, The President and The Board of Regents)

3. Proposal to Revise the Composition of the General Education Committee – Second Reading

Whereas, the inclusion of member of the College Curriculum committees currently constrains the meeting time of the General Education 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 3, First Paragraph, be revised by:

- Striking “one from each undergraduate college, shall be elected by the curriculum committees of the respective colleges;” and revising the paragraph.

After the change Section IV, Letter A, Number 3, First Paragraph, would read.

“The General Education Committee shall consist of senators, one from each undergraduate college, who shall be selected by Senate colleagues from the same college. The Executive Committee shall appoint three faculty members to this committee. (The appointed members should normally be Senators, but non-Senators may be appointed.) In addition, one student senator shall be selected by the Student Government Association to serve on the committee. The selected senators, appointed members and selected student representative are all voting members of the General Education Committee. A representative of the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the General Education Coordinator shall be non-voting advisory members.”

Supported by the University Senate Executive Committee

Again, Chair Smith opened the floor for discussion:

The Chair called for a vote. The motion carried.

NOTE: (The first and second reading approved pending approval of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, The President and The Board of Regents)

4. Proposal to Amend the Functions of the University Senate Executive Committee – Second Reading

Whereas, the University Senate needs to better communicate its accomplishments to the faculty,

Whereas, the University Senate needs feedback from faculty on academic and curricular issues,

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

1) The Charter of the University Senate, Section IV, Letter A, Number 1 be amended by adding the following to the list of executive committee functions:

- g. to serve as a liaison to the faculty in communicating the current issues under review by the senate and its committees and in describing the accomplishments of the senate.

2) To add the following paragraph after the list of functions.

“The Vice-Chair and the college senators to the Executive Committee shall undertake as one of their duties on the Executive Committee the publication of a newsletter (in either

paper or electronic format) to be distributed to the faculty. This Communications subcommittee may appoint additional faculty, who need not be a Senator, with appropriate expertise to aid them in this duty. The newsletter shall be published no less than once a semester.”

Supported by the University Senate Executive Committee

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

The Chair called for a vote. The motion carried.

NOTE: (The first and second reading approved pending approval of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, The President and The Board of Regents)

5. Proposal to Revise the Composition of the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee – Second Reading

Whereas, the current Charter of the University Senate arbitrarily delineates by college the number of members from each college that shall serve on the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities;

Whereas, the College of Health and Human Services is not currently listed and deserves permanent representation on the committee;

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

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

That Section IV, Letter A, Number 4, be revised by:

- Striking first three sentences. Replace with: “The Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee shall consist of voting members and alternates as well as non-voting advisory members. Each college and the library shall select enough senators to serve on the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities committee so that their unit’s representation is equal to ten (10) percent (rounded upward to the nearest whole number) of the unit’s senate delegation.”
- Striking fifth and sixth sentences.

After the changes Section IV, Letter A, Number 4, will read:

The Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee shall consist of voting members and alternates as well as non-voting advisory members. Each college and the library shall select enough senators to serve on the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities committee so that their unit's representation is equal to ten (10) percent (rounded upward to the nearest whole number) of the unit's senate delegation. All members are to be selected by Senate colleagues from his/her unit. A faculty member from extended campus and a part-time faculty member shall also serve as voting members of this committee. (These members shall be selected by rotation among the off-campus centers in the case of the extended campus member and rotated among the colleges for the part-time member.) One student senator shall be selected by the Student Government Association to serve on the committee. A representative from the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs shall be a non-voting advisory member of this committee.

Supported by the University Senate Executive Committee

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

The Chair called for a vote. The motion carried.

NOTE: (The first and second reading approved pending approval of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, The President and The Board of Regents)

6. Proposal for Revision to the University Senate Charter (Term Limits) – Second Reading

NOTE: The Chair noted that Item 6 is a By-Law Change and requires only 50%

Whereas members of the senate are limited to serve a maximum of four years and then must sit out for one year before serving for up to another four years

Whereas such a policy creates a variety of membership and balances more experienced senators with less experienced senators

Therefore be it resolved that the same term limits apply to senate subcommittees, i.e., no person sitting on a senate subcommittee can serve more than a maximum of four years without sitting out for one year before returning to that subcommittee.

That a new paragraph be added to Bylaw 2, which reads:

“Non-senators appointed to the University Committees shall be subject to the same term-of-service regulations as Senate members. That is, a non-senator can serve a maximum of four years on Senate committees and then will be ineligible for serving on the Senate or any Senate

Committee until one year has elapsed.”

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

The Chair called for a vote. The motion carried.

NOTE: (The first and second reading approved pending approval of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, The President and The Board of Regents)

The Chair declared that all the above Charter changes were carried by two-thirds majority votes of the University Senate, and also, the By-Laws proposal carried by 50% majority of the University Senate.

NOTE: The Chair said there are two other Charter changes that concern the University Curriculum Committee, but have been postponed until the Proposal to Revise the Graduate Curriculum Review Process has been approved. (This proposal follows)

NEW BUSINESS

Proposal to Revise the Graduate Curriculum Review Process

Before discussions on the above proposal were completed. Senator Connie Mills called for a quorum count. There was not a quorum present.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Minors, Secretary

Lou Stahl, Recorder

