

**MINUTES
UNIVERSITY SENATE
SEPTEMBER 16, 2004 – 3:30 P.M.
GARRETT BALLROOM**

Chair Sherrie Serros called the meeting to order at 3:30 P.M. **The following members were present:** Lawrence Alice, John All, Darlene Applegate, Ferhan Atici, Mustafa Atici, James Berger, Ray Blankenship, Ellen Bonaguro, John Bonaguro, Charles Borders, Barbara Brindle, Tim Brotherton, John Bruni, Barbara Burch, Robert Choate, Josh Collins, Eric Conte, Robert Dietle, Richard Dressler, Karin Egloff, Dana Emberton-Tinius, Sam Evans, Jane Fife, Malia Formes, Elmer Gray, Bill Greenwalt, Anthony Harkins, Kacy Harris, Michelle Hollis, Tim Howard, William Howard, Nezam Iraniparast, Terry Jepson, Kaveh Khatir, Soleiman Kiasatpour, Wilma King-Jones, Joan Krenzin, Deborah Lively, Marge Maxwell, Andrew McMichael, Connie Mills, Patricia Minors, John Moore, Russell Moore, George Musambira, Sharon Mutter, David Neal, Anne Onyekwuluje, Les Pesterfield, Yvonne Petkus, Morgan Phelps, Matt Pruitt, Heather Pulliam, Sylvia Pulliam, Eric Reed, Loren Ruff, Jeffrey Samuels, Roger Scott, Sherrie Serros, Vernon Lee Sheeley, Byron Sleugh, Douglas Smith, Peter St. Pierre, Mason Stevenson, Jim Stone, Brian Strow, Jue Wang, Nedra Wheeler, Mary Wolinski, Edward Yager, Uta Ziegler. **Alternate Members Present were:** Ed Wolfe for Christopher Brown, Andrew Ernest for Blaine Ferrell, James Becker for Pamela Jukes, Jerry Deday for Amy Krull, Jack Montgomery for Nelda Sims. **Members absent without alternate representation were:** Mike Binder, Suzie Cashwell, Debra Crisp, Jerry Gotlieb, Richard Hackney, Dan Jackson, Robert Jefferson, Danita Kelley, David Lee, Elizabeth Paris, Keith Philips, Gary Ransdell, Sherry Reid, Robert Sims, Stacey Wade.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of May 5, 2004 were approved as editorially corrected.
The minutes of May 6, 2004 were approved as editorially corrected.

University Senate Action Approval

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Barbara Burch, endorsed without exception the actions of the University Senate at its May 5, 2004 meeting.

NOTE: Provost Burch is continuing to withhold her endorsement of the March 17, 2004 meeting, pending implementation issues of the Plus/Minus grading proposal.

Report from the Chair

Chair Serros noted that a supplement email went out with the September agenda asking that Item D under New Business be amended to reflect that Auxiliary Services would prefer to discuss Parking and Transportation instead of ID Cards. The Chair called for a motion to amend the agenda, the motion was seconded. The motion carried.

Next, the Chair announced that each Academic Department as well as the Bowling Green Community College nominate one full-time-tenured faculty to serve on the Faculty Continuance and Faculty Grievance Committee. She said these nominations should be completed and sent to Vice Chair Jim Berger no later than October 15.

Chair Serros said the Senate Website would be updated in the near future. Next she said that the Executive Committee will meet Monday October 11th and asked that if any Senator would like an item placed on the Committee's agenda for that meeting to send her the information and she would place it on the agenda.

Report from the Vice Chair

Vice Chair Jim Berger said he is working on completing the At-Large Senator's membership. Senator Berger said he wants to make sure every department has representation as well as the correct number of representatives.

Report from the Faculty Regent

Faculty Regent Dietle reported on the Board of Regent's retreat held on July 29-30 at Mammoth Cave National Park. He said the first morning was spent in an informal discussion of the ways in which President Ransdell's initiatives are changing and improving Western Kentucky University. The regents uniformly expressed appreciation for Dr. Ransdell accomplishments and there is a strong continued support for his plans for Western. Dr. Dietle said he expressed his concern for what he calls "the academic culture of WKU." While he certainly agrees that many good things are happening on campus -- renovations, new buildings, new faculty positions -- he saw this as preparation. Now comes the hard part: Improving academic standards, and the quality of our University. In this area, Dr. Dietle argued, we have barely begun. He said he felt that the Senate's new standing committee on Academic Quality has the potential to move us forward in this area, but only if faculty members come to believe that we have the freedom to try new approaches and carry out new policies.

Regent Dietle said the afternoon of the first day, July 29, was spent visiting parts of Mammoth Cave Park and the nature preserve that our Biology Department has along the Green River. WKU has important initiatives in these areas. On the morning of Friday, July 30, the Board of Regents met for their quarterly business meeting. Dr. Dietle said that on the original agenda for this BOR meeting there had been an item concerning the creation of a New Transportation Department. He was concerned about this, as the BOR had no prior knowledge of the plans to create this department. In fact, the Regents had cancelled all Board Committee meetings before the July meeting because they had been told there would be no actions items to be presented. Regent Dietle contacted President Ransdell and urged him to remove that item from the agenda, arguing that parking is a big concern at this University, and that there had been no presentation of the plan to the University Senate. Regent Dietle believed that the creation of this new administrative unit, particularly one which would move a committee, the University Transportation Committee, which now has faculty representation, from its current role with policy making authority to one of a mere advisory body,

needed to be discussed before a final decision was made. The President agreed and withdrew the item from the BOR agenda. This is now on today's Senate agenda. Dr. Dietle said a Director has already been hired, and this seemed strange considering the new Transportation Department has not yet been approved.

Regent Dietle explained that during the July 30th business meeting, the regents approved new contracts for the Athletic Director, Women's Basketball Coach, and the Dean of Extended Learning and Outreach. He voted in favor of each contract. He noticed, however, that each of the new contracts contained provisions for substantial bonuses; in particular each contract promised supplemental payments if the individual stayed throughout the full term of their contract. Regent Dietle said this gave him the opportunity to raise the issue of faculty bonuses upon promotion. He made the point that if we are going to reward long-term service, that the \$1,000 bonus received upon being promoted from assistant to associate, and associate to full professor, which has been that amount for at least past 30 years or more, should be increased considerably. Dr. Dietle pointed out to the Senate that this issue had been previously raised on the Budget Council and at the Council of Deans but without progress being made. Regent Dietle said he was pleasantly surprised when President Ransdell agreed that the amount needed to be increased and several key Regents expressed their support for this as well. Dietle said he cannot say how soon or how much the bonus will be increased, but he has hope that action will be taken on this issue during this academic year.

Next, the Regent said he would like to discuss the Benefits Committee of the University. In February of this year, the faculty representative on this committee informed him that they were considering the creation of a new position for "Wellness Coordinator". Dietle said what concerned him at the time was the proposed financing of this position. The original proposal was to pay the salary and benefits out of the Insurance Reserve Fund. He found this to be troubling for two reasons: 1) When WKU moved to self-insurance, faculty and staff were promised that any money that accumulated for reserve fund would only be used for the reserve fund. 2) After having spent many years on the Budget Council, he was taught by his colleague Mel Borland that it is not sound budgetary policy to fund permanent cost out of a reserve fund, which may, or may not be there from year to year. At this point, Dr. Dietle contacted Staff Regent, Pat Jordan, who had served a number of years on the Benefits Committee. She agreed that this was not a good way to fund the Wellness Coordinator position. Dietle said at the June BOR meeting they spoke with President Ransdell, who was happy to discuss the issue. Their discussion did not question the usefulness of the position but only the proposed financing. Dr. Dietle said when the proposal was later brought back to the Benefits Committee, that it had been changed. Instead of financing the position from the reserve fund, it was now suggested that a "fee" be levied on each faculty and staff member to pay for the salary and benefits of the Wellness Coordinator. While no exact amount has been determined, the proposed fee would be in the range of \$4.00-5.00 a month per employee. Regent Dietle believes that that levying a fee is not an appropriate way to finance either a faculty or staff position. The University Senate Executive Committee heard a presentation on

this matter earlier this month, they discussed it at length and it was their strong consensus that whatever the merit of the position, a fee is not an appropriate way for it to be funded. He added that a majority of the Benefits Committee support the levy, and he urged this body to inform their constituencies because if this goes through, each of us will be paying a fee.

Next Regent Dietle said he would like to discuss a growing concern that he hopes, over this coming academic year, that we can have a continuing conversation. He expressed his concern about the role of the faculty at WKU in influencing policy and controlling the curriculum. He said that it is his belief that consultation and representation are the key elements in faculty governance. He fears that consultation and representation are being weakened at this university. He is not suggesting that there is a conspiracy or a concerted effort, but it is the natural consequence of either not wanting to bother, or not wanting to be bothered, because self governance is time consuming and often is a boring process. Recently there have been too many instances where, instead of meaningful consultations in which faculty have the opportunity to influence decisions, we are simply being informed of decisions that have already been made. If we object, we are told either there was not enough time to consult us, or that it does not come under our purview. Of these two objections, Dietle said he finds the first one usually doubtful, and the second one he finds enraging, because as faculty, we are the heart of the University. He noted that this body had recently been transformed from the Faculty Senate to the University Senate, and his view has always been that anything that happens upon this campus is of interest or potential interest to this body. Regent Dietle also warned that the value of faculty representation is also being undermined. Over the past year and a half he has heard more and more comments that this group is “only advisory,” he feels this is a dangerous trend. He interprets this phrase as a polite way of saying (administration to the faculty), “we have to listen to you, but we don’t have to pay attention to what you suggest.” The Regent urged the University Senate to protect its role in the governance of Western Kentucky University.

Report from the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dr. Burch said she would like to refer to one item discussed by the Faculty Regent, which is “stipends that are applied to promotions”. The Provost said this has been discussed by the Council of Academic Deans in consultation with Department Heads and it had previously been determined that it would be possible for the stipend amount to be “very moderately” increased for next year. She said it was determined that we could afford an additional \$500 but she knows that amount is not enough. She said this matter has since come before the Board of Regents. Dr. Burch said she has also requested the Deans address the increase in stipends, as well as working with the Department Head Council to produce a proposal for increasing the amount that comes with promotion. Determining that amount should not pose any problems, since we have substantial benchmarking data as a point of reference. Burch continued by saying the complexity is implementing the system, with the determination of the amount of dollars needed to offset the consequences of inequity and compression. There is, for example, the possibility one could be promoted twice in the last five years and if we address stipends for new promotions only, we could find the differentiation in

salary levels inequitable. In looking for the proper solution, Dr. Burch indicated that she anticipates having a proposal to discuss with the President during this semester, and one to take to the upcoming budget council. She anticipates that it may require a multi-year plan to reduce the inequities, one that would both increase stipends for promotion and address the compression issues that may result.

Next Provost commented on several things happening beyond the campus that she believes have the potential of reducing some curricular decision making from faculty. There is a considerable emphasis at the state level, and appropriately so, that more transfer students find it easier to move on toward their baccalaureate degree. She noted that the numbers of transfer students from the community colleges in Kentucky is abysmally low. The state goal for this situation is a more friendly articulation system for transfer students. Dr. Burch said we have worked toward this goal in the past few years and we have seen the system move from one that accepted completion of entire general education (gen-ed) programs from other institutions, to one that now allows the transfer of any part of a gen-ed program to be transferred. In effect, the sum of the parts of gen-ed automatically equals the whole for community college transfer students. An issue that will be presented to the Chief Academic Officers is one that was addressed by representatives of each campus earlier this week. It has to do with gen-ed transfer in the sciences. (WKU now requires any student transferring science courses to have at least one laboratory science course). The state proposal is that an institution must accept non-laboratory science courses as equivalent to laboratory science courses Dr. Burch said we have responded previously that the general sentiment here on the WKU campus is that we do not consider this equivalency appropriate. Burch said that at this time, we are the only campus that does not support accepting a general transfer policy that would cause us to eliminate that requirement. Dr. Burch requested that our General Education Committee review this.

Dr. Burch praised the campus community for being able to achieve a stable enrollment this academic year. She said our official numbers show our enrollment to be up about 270 students. She reported that the state is also in pursuit of a new program of benchmarking on funding, which will be discussed with CAD at an upcoming meeting.

Dr. Burch next discussed the plus-minus grading proposal. She reminded Senators who are critical of her decision to hold this proposal at this time, that in the eight years she has been this University, she has never failed to support the recommendations that come to her from the Senate. She said she has met with Dr. Serros and Dr. Berger concerning the proposed pilot system, and asked that they take another look at the present research design proposal. It needs to be simplified and focused on the critical implementation plan question. Pending resolution of this issue, the proposal has been postponed. She said that the proposal that came forward would require an exceptional commitment of human resources and financial resources to support the research design. She stated that in a time of budget cuts, and other high priorities such as accreditation review

preparation, this support is not available this fall without negatively imposing whether we move those monies from faculty lines or wherever else in order to achieve this proposal. Dr. Burch said she does not personally have a strong feeling either way on the plus/minus grading, but does feel it is important that if the energy is to be invested in this proposal, that we all need to be in agreement that the data being collected and the manner in which it is being collected, provide a substantive base upon which to make a decision on changing the grading system. Dr. Burch reiterated that she had not disapproved the proposal; she simply asks that this be revisited for simplification and focus.

Next Provost Burch spoke on Academic Quality Funding. She said staffing hearings are being held this week also a simplified form for requests for funding under the Academic Quality priorities will go out within a week. It will include the opportunity to apply for Action Agenda grant incentives and Academic Quality resources.

Senator Andrew McMichael asked to go on record that he has researched faculty promotion stipends with other benchmark institutions and noted for the record that Ball State was the only university lower, and the range goes from WKU's \$1,000 to the high of \$19,000. He noted that the average range is \$5,000-\$8,000.

Standing Committee Reports (No Action Items)

Chair Serros said there are no items to come before the Senate she would like to announce the chairs of the following Committees

- A. University Curriculum Committee, Dr. Andrew McMichael
- B. General Education, Dr. Brian Strow
- C. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities, (tba after today's caucus)
- D. Academic Quality, Dr. Douglas Smith

OLD BUSINESS

Chair Serros said this is the "second" reading of the Appeals Process Regarding Tenure and Promotion, and moved approval of the following: (Noting that there was not a quorum from the electronic vote after the May 5, 2005 proposal)

A. Appeals Process Regarding Tenure and Promotion

Report from the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee

May 6, 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. **[Due to the revision of item 1 above, remove this sentence:] 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

[Due to the revision of item 1, remove this sentence from the 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

[Due to the revision of item 1, replace the end of item 6:] In the case of a negative recommendation by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the faculty member has the option to file a complaint 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 **Negative** Tenure Recommendations and the Procedure for Termination (see sections IV and V).

p. 36 IV. Procedure for Review of Non-Reappointment and **Negative** 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. **Non-Reappointment or Negative Tenure Decisions.**

[Insert this new paragraph before 3rd paragraph:] If a decision is made not to recommend tenure **for** 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 **recommendation**:

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

[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, 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 a **negative tenure decision** will be furnished if the faculty member requests them in writing.

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 a **recommendation not to grant 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.

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 **complaint** by the faculty member. The Ad Hoc Committee must make a written recommendation to the President. **[Delete:] 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 **recommendation of the President's decision relative to the faculty member's complaint.** Its decision is final.

The flowchart distributed 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.

The motion was seconded. The motion carried.

B. Senate Resolution Concerning +/- Grading

Chair Serros said that the Executive Committee of the University Senate recommends that the research plan be sent back to the Academic Quality Committee. The Chair moved approval.

The motion carried.

C. Report from the Graduate Council

Chair Serros said there is an inconsistency between Item #9 of the May 5, 2004 proposal below and Item # 11. Chair Serros said in the process of changing or removing item 9 from the consent agenda and placing it on the action agenda; we changed the recommendation concerning the analytic writing score requirement. We removed the 3.5 analytical writing score in Item 9 however it was left in Item 11. Since this was an oversight, Serros said we should take formal action at today's meeting to reconsider Item 11 and remove the 3.5 analytical writing score requirement from that item. Chair Serros called for a motion to remove the last sentence in item 11.

Senator Andrew McMichael moved to strike the last sentence in Item 11. The motion was seconded.

Chair Serros called for a voice vote from the **Graduate Faculty Only**.

Senator Nedra Atwell appealed the decision of the Chair's call for a voice vote from graduate faculty only; Senator Atwell raised the issue of, "was it in fact Graduate faculty only voicing the vote." A lengthy and unresolved discussion followed. Regent Robert Dietle suggested that the motion be withdrawn and that the Executive Committee discuss the issue at the next meeting.

Senator Atwell withdrew her appeal.

Chair Serros again called for a vote by **Graduate faculty only** on the main motion by Senator McMichael to delete the last sentence from Item 11.

A friendly amendment was accepted by Senator McMichael to only remove the words "and 3.5 analytical writing score" Another friendly amendment by Senator Mutter was also accepted by Senator Michael to remove the word "either" and "or the Analytical Writing Section."

The motion as amended carried. **The Graduate Council Policy Actions in its entirety now reads as follows.**

**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. This regulation will apply to all students admitted to a graduate program at WKU in fall 2004 or later. 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</p>	<p>2. No Regulation on Probation. Admission to Candidacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">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; ande. Approval of major advisor and Graduate Studies.

<p>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 assistantship.</p>	
<p>2. Students who qualify for graduate assistantships may qualify to become graduate teaching associates by meeting the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Completion of 18 hours of study in the major with a GPA of at least 3.0; b. Either (1) or (2) below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Completion of a full semester (for at least one graduate credit) course in teaching, or (2) Attendance at six FaCET sessions (no more than two of which may be viewed on videotape) AND participation in a departmental teaching seminar. 	<p>2. The following requirements must be met for approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Successful completion of 18 graduate hours in the teaching discipline; 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>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>4. Maximum of twelve (12) 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 at WKU or one of the cooperating consortium colleges may</p>

	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)
8. Graduate Certificates a. Admission to a graduate certificate is based upon a bachelor's degree and adequate preparation in the area of study. b. Admission or completion of a graduate certificate does not guarantee admission to a graduate degree program.	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 taken the GRE	11. No Regulation. The GRE General

a second time due to low scores in the Verbal/Quantitative sections, 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.	Test was changed in October 2001 to include a separate score for analytical writing.
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)

Next, Chair Serros said that the following Curriculum Review Process Proposal is now before the Senate for its Second Reading. She noted that this proposal has been attached to several agendas in the past, and is a motion primarily distinguishes the curriculum action that concerns undergraduate curriculum and graduate curriculum. Chair Serros opened the floor for discussion. Chair Serros also noted that item #6, should editorially be amended to #5, and it was so amended.

Regent Dietle suggested that one phrase be removed from the document below, located in Item 5. that references that recommendations go to “the President and the Board of Regents” noting that this is not an action by either.

Senator Douglas Smith moved approval to amend the statement by deleting the reference to “the President and the Board of Regents” in the second sentence in Item #5 of the proposal.
(Corrected below)

The motion to amend was seconded. The motion carried.

Senator Darlene Applegate recommended that each of these two subcommittees continue to use the same guidelines and proposal templates that have been accepted as standard formatting process. There were no objections

The second reading of the following motion as amended carried.

Next Chair Serros said an implementation date needed to be established. After discussion, an immediate implementation date was agreed upon.

The Proposal as amended now reads:

A. Curriculum Review Process Proposal

Whereas the College of Graduate Studies and Research is concerned that review of its material by a subcommittee of the University Curriculum Committee may threaten its accreditation,

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

That Section IV, Letter A, Number 2 be renamed to read “The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee”

That Section IV, Letter A, Number 2, First Paragraph, be revised by striking references to the graduate curriculum committees, the Graduate Council and/or Graduate Studies and Research from the 3rd sentence and last sentence of the paragraph.

That remainder of the section on the University Curriculum Committee be revised to read:

The functions of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall be:

- to review existing undergraduate programs and new program proposals in light of the university’s mission statement to review any undergraduate academic matters such as degree and graduation requirements, standards of scholastic achievement, rules and regulations governing faculty-student relations
- to review existing undergraduate courses and new courses having significant consequences that cross college lines
- to study any undergraduate curricular matter it chooses
- to study undergraduate matters assigned to it by the Executive Committee

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall have two types of responsibilities: 1) to make proposals to the University Senate concerning university-wide undergraduate academic policies, and 2) to review particular undergraduate programs and courses to determine whether they meet established standards. The latter includes both action and consent items received from college curriculum committees.

Undergraduate university-wide academic policies include such matters as admission requirements, degree and graduation requirements, and all similar matters that have application or significance beyond a single college, except matters pertaining to General Education. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall make recommendations concerning these matters to the University Senate for its approval. Upon Senate approval, such items shall be forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall place on its agenda the following items. In his/her report to the Committee, the Chair shall inform the Committee of all information items submitted by the college curriculum committees. (See Appendix A for a definition of “information item.”) All consent items submitted by the college curriculum committees shall be placed on a consent agenda. (See Appendix A for a definition of “consent item.”) Any member of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall have the option of removing a consent item from the consent agenda and placing it on its action agenda for regular review. All action items submitted by the college curriculum committees shall be placed on an action agenda. (See Appendix A for a definition of “action item.”) Any action item that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee rejects shall be returned to the college curriculum committee that submitted it, accompanied by a rationale for the rejection. All consent and action items that the Committee approves shall be placed on the University Senate consent agenda and upon its

approval shall be forwarded as a recommendation to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

That Section IV, Letter A be amended with a number 5 to read:

5. The Graduate Council

The Graduate Council has general supervision and control over all matters of graduate instruction, including admission and degree requirements, curricula, Graduate Faculty membership, and general academic regulations. The Graduate Council submits recommendations concerning initiation or revision of graduate courses and programs through the University Senate to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Council is composed of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, three faculty members elected by and from the Graduate Faculty of each of the academic colleges offering graduate courses, and four students - one graduate student member elected by and from the graduate students of each of the academic colleges offering graduate courses.

The functions of the Graduate Council shall be:

- to review existing graduate programs and new program proposals in light of the university's mission statement
- to review any graduate academic matters such as degree and graduation requirements, standards of scholastic achievement, rules and regulations governing faculty-student relations
- to review existing graduate courses and new courses having significant consequences that cross college lines to study any graduate curricular matter it chooses
- to study graduate matters assigned to it by the Executive Committee

The Graduate Council shall have two types of responsibilities: 1) to make proposals to the University Senate concerning university-wide graduate academic policies, and 2) to review particular graduate programs and courses to determine whether they meet established standards. The latter includes both action and consent items received from college curriculum committees.

Graduate university-wide academic policies include such matters as admission requirements, degree and graduation requirements, and all similar matters that have application or significance beyond a single college. The Graduate Council shall make recommendations concerning these matters to the University Senate for its approval. Upon Senate approval such items shall be forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Graduate Council shall place on its agenda the following items. In his/her report to the Committee, the Chair shall inform the Committee of all information items submitted by the college curriculum committees. (See Appendix A for a definition of "information item.") All consent items submitted by the college curriculum committees shall be placed on a consent agenda. (See Appendix A for a definition of "consent item.") Any member of the Graduate Council shall have the option of removing a consent item from the consent agenda and placing it on its action agenda for regular review. All action items submitted by the college curriculum committees shall be placed on an action agenda. (See Appendix A for a definition of "action item.") Any action item that the Graduate Council rejects shall be returned to the college

curriculum committee that submitted it, accompanied by a rationale for the rejection. All consent and action items that the Committee approves shall be placed on the University Senate's consent agenda and upon its approval shall be forwarded as a recommendation to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

That the Appendix be changed to read

[Appendix]

Functions of the College Curriculum Committees

Each college shall have undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees to review all curriculum-related matters, including the determination of degree requirements and standards of scholastic achievement. Departments shall submit to their college curriculum committees all proposals for changes in their academic programs. If a college curriculum committee approves a proposal and it has significant implications for departments in other colleges, then it shall be forwarded to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Council as an action item. Proposals with significant implications include the following: proposals for new programs (majors, minors, certificate programs), significant changes in programs, new courses, multiple changes to existing courses, changes in course credit hours, changes in course numbers with changes in level (e.g. PSY 342 becomes PSY 453), multiple offerings of "one-time only" courses, and academic policies and regulations.

If a proposal does not have significant implications beyond the college, then it shall be forwarded to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Council as a consent item.

Proposals that do not have significant implications for programs in other colleges typically include the following: proposals to change program (major, minor, certificate) titles, replace one intradepartmental course in a program with another, delete programs, suspend programs, delete courses, suspend courses, change course titles, change course catalog descriptions (as long as course content is not changed), change course numbers without changing level (e.g. PSY 342 becomes PSY 353), change course prerequisites, or create community college equivalent courses. Any member of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Council shall have the right to remove a proposal from a college-curriculum committee's list of consent items and to treat it as an action item. If a member of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Council does so, the committee may postpone review of the item until their next meeting.

One-time only course offerings and proposals to change course prefixes shall be forwarded to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Council as information items.

If a new course is also being recommended for inclusion in general education, then the proposal shall first be forwarded to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for approval. If approved, the proposal shall be forwarded simultaneously to the University Senate for consent and to the General Education Committee for review.

If the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Council, or the General Education Committee rejects a proposal from a college curriculum committee, the college curriculum committee shall have the opportunity to revise its proposal and to resubmit it to the same committee. If the proposal is rejected a second time, the college curriculum committee shall have

the right to appeal its case to the University Senate. It shall submit the proposal to the Chair of the Senate to be placed as an action item on the Senate agenda. If the University Senate rules in favor of the college curriculum committee's proposal, the proposal shall be forwarded as a recommendation to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

NOTE: Senator Darlene Applegate explained the flow chart of how curricular matters are now processed. She said a proposal would go from the department to College Curriculum Committee, if it were an undergraduate course proposal with gen-ed implications it would go to General Education. If it were an undergrad or graduate course proposal that has Teacher Education implications, it would go to that Committee. From Teacher Education it would go either to UCC or to Grad, whichever it implies. If it is a 400 level with a "G" component, it goes from UCC to Graduate Curriculum Committee who would only vote on the "G" component.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Serros moved approval of the following Bylaws proposal:

B. Bylaws Change Regarding Senate Membership Proposal

Whereas the Senate bylaws do not clearly specify that members of subcommittees should only fill one slot, rather than two, and

Whereas filling two slots on a subcommittee, even if one slot is a non-voting slot and the other is not, violates the spirit of representation and governance, and

Whereas on at least one committee there is a representative filling two slots at the same time,

Be it therefore resolved that the Senate bylaws be amended to read:

Bylaw 3. Representatives serving in the Senate, and on Senate subcommittees in any capacity may not serve in more than one slot in a subcommittee at the same time.

Senator Douglas Smith moved to amend the last sentence by adding the words "in a subcommittee at the same time" after the word "slot" (corrected above)

The motion to amend was seconded. The motion carried.

The main motion as amended was seconded. The motion carried.

C. January Term and Calendar Changes

Provost Barbara Burch referred to two documents about the winter term. She said the two documents consist of the revised J-term calendar and discussion points on the new term. Literally every discussion point that has been considered, the rationale, the characteristics, and the impact are included along with concerns that were presented that "have already been addressed", and concerns that are resolvable but are "still to be addressed". Dr. Burch said a widely representative committee has been appointed that includes the various offices on campus that

have a stake in the new term, including Senate representation. The group has been tasked to develop the implementation plan. Burch said discussion about the new term have been on the table almost two years. She said she took the concept to the Calendar Committee almost two years ago for discussion, but the Committee turned it down. She said a task force was created and chaired by Ms. Eggleton, and it worked out a revised plan. This revised plan was again presented to the Calendar Committee, and after some modifications, it was approved. Dr. Burch told the Senate that the J-Term will not be implemented until 2006, and there will be plenty of opportunities to shape it. She told the Senate that the term is optional for students and faculty. The expectation is that program faculty will determine what will be offered based on what is pedagogically sound to be offered in a three week term, and based on student needs and interests. She said we would conduct pre-assessments to determine what is going to be offered. There will be a registration period in November; this will not be a term where faculty or students show up early in January only to find that the course did not make. Students will not be able to walk in and add a course on January 2nd. Faculty who want to teach in the January term will be compensated similarly to the May term or the summer term. In some departments there may be scheduling options for faculty who may want to buy more time for research in the Spring semester, if in fact the dean and department head support such requests for swapping out teaching in the January term for a reduced load in the spring. Dr. Burch said it is anticipated that initially many of courses offered will be field courses, study-abroad, and some on-line courses, as well as face-to-face courses, depending on what the departments find feasible to offer and what students decide what they want to take. Dr. Burch reiterated again that this means no change in holiday periods but, it does require that there be an additional five minutes added to each class period, and an approximate one week difference in the term length. She said the summer term would not be affected; it will remain a 13-week summer term. (May + 10 weeks) She said there are some issues that remain to be worked out. Discussions have previously been held with Deans, Department Heads, Administrative Council, and Staff Council. Housing is another concern, and at the present time, we do not anticipate providing housing during this term. There will be no Pell Grants, although there will be loan programs. In terms of Academic Quality, Burch said we are working on opportunities for modest student scholarship and stipends for study abroad.

Chair Serros opened the floor for discussion. Lengthy discussion followed, and it was the consensus of most Senators, that while they agree with the January term, they were displeased that they were not involved more in the decision making process.

The Plan and Calendar follows:

JANUARY TERM – Discussion Guide

August, 2004

1. Rationale/Benefits

- a. Consistent with academic mission of university.
- b. Provides opportunities for special offerings and enhanced studies.
- c. Maximizes utilization of university facilities and resources.
- d. Facilitates reducing time to graduation for students (by taking additional courses or by making up courses to stay on track to graduation).
- e. Extra week in Dec./Jan. break – allows time for faculty research, planning, travel,

- professional development, and other related activities.
- f. Provides additional teaching opportunity for faculty wishing to do so (this is optional).
- g. Allows additional week for students – beneficial for those working and needing time to earn extra money, and to those traveling long distances to visit their homes over the holidays.
- h. Many students feel holiday break is too long and want to come back to school earlier; they can do so with the J-term.
- i. Bookstore – Additional business opportunity.
- j. Campus traffic: Ease of parking on campus during this time period.
- k. Additional opportunity for staff to be enrolled, assuming schedule permits.
- l. Provides opportunity for “uniqueness” in programming and study options at WKU, particularly on off-site/travel/study abroad courses, consistent with QEP for ‘engaged learning’.
- m. Eliminates future potential conflicts for Spring Commencement (with Derby Day).

2. Characteristics of the January Term

- a. Start up date: January 3 of 2006, with approximately 18-month lead time, allowing ample time for quality planning.
- b. Primary focus of offerings: Exploratory, travel, internships, field courses, online courses, special certificates, some selected make-up courses, and specially selected offerings.
- c. J-term will not be used by all students, but will be taken by some.
- d. J-term offerings will be limited, based on demand and suitability of the offerings to the time period.
- e. Provides a big plus for enrolling in internships and international experiences, at a time of year where travel rates are often lower.
- f. Participation is optional (for students and faculty).
- g. No impact on faculty nine month contracts.
- h. Includes a study day in both the fall and the spring semesters.
- i. Includes an optional day in February of each year for campus wide programming opportunities.
- j. Expected to initially be small (as was the case for May term).
- k. No negative fiscal impact on university base budget; would operate under DELO and would generate its own revenue.
- l. Student Housing: There would be no provision for student housing unless the housing offices wishes to do so (TBD).
- m. Food services: Would use services already available on campus during that time of year, thus increasing business for food services.
- n. NO IMPACT ON HOLIDAYS and other scheduled benefits. All holidays remain unaffected and scheduled without change, including Christmas holidays.

3. Description of January Term and Academic Schedule

- a. Three week term, immediately preceding Spring term; begins on January 2 (unless it is on a weekend or holiday; then classes also meet on the first Saturday of first week).
- b. 15 week fall and spring terms (currently 16 weeks); 3 week J-term; no change in current summer term to include basic configuration of 3/5/5 weeks (e.g. 3 week May term). Strongly encourage 3 week term classes within last 5 week summer term to accommodate P-12 professionals.
- c. Adds 5 minutes to all classes during fall and spring terms
- d. Length of academic year (to include Fall and Spring semesters) will be overall unchanged, and within the current nine month period
- e. Fall semester starting date will be approximately one week later in August, with the Spring semester ending at approximately the same time in May.
- f. Registration will be held in early November and conclude by late November (thus allowing for all processing and payments to be completed prior to the end of fall term). Late and walk-in registrations are not provided.
- g. 'Go' or 'not go' decisions (on whether a class makes) will be made early enough in December to eliminate crunch time on faculty and office staff.
- h. Books/course materials: Students will be required to purchase in December before end of fall term, or to order by mail.
- i. Course offerings: TBD by each academic department based on student interest and needs, and pedagogical appropriateness within the time period.
- j. There will be an annual assessment to determine which specific courses will be offered. Enrollments/demand/interest will determine which courses will be offered.
- k. Re-student financial aid: Students will typically rely on loan programs (these are available) or their own resources – PELL grants will not be available to students for J-term. Time to apply and process loans TBD.
- l. Re-faculty compensation: Stipends will be provided, with amount TBD. It is anticipated that the stipends would be in range of those currently paid for off-load teaching and/or summer term teaching.
- m. Faculty load flexibility options TBD. In some instances it may be possible for a faculty member to teach in J-term (without compensation) in exchange for obtaining a reduced course load in the spring semester to engage in research, etc. (would have to be agreed upon with department head and dean, and stipend normally earned by faculty member in J-term would be used to hire replacement for spring term teaching).
- n. Calendar: (See attached proposed calendar).

4. Concerns presented

Addressed:

- a. Communicating offerings: Some offerings may be in regular schedule bulletin. Offerings could be listed both online and in special marketing pieces.
- b. BANNER: There are programming implications. The VPIT and staff in this division have indicated that with sufficient advance notice, this can be handled.
- c. Library impact: Fully manageable.

- d. Marketing Plan: To be handled principally through DELO, with assistance from PR and other means TBD.
- e. Quality question: Can you have quality learning in three weeks? Obviously you can, and we now do so in the May term (as do many prestigious universities offering similar terms). However, not all programs and courses lend themselves to this format and time frame. This is a decision to be made by the faculty in each program area.
- f. Computer lab: Can be provided; not an issue.
- g. Alignment of Calendar with other universities: There is no alignment at the present time, and the J-term does not appear likely to exacerbate the problem (as best can be determined).
- h. Impact on P-12 teachers: No impact. Increasing offerings of three week classes in the last summer term will be helpful in light of the starting dates of local schools.
- i. Impact on renovation and summer term facility projects: No change from present.
- j. Is there an option to initiate J-term travel courses that begin in late December? Yes (choice of instructor).
- k. Scheduling implications for AY evening classes meeting only one night per week (M, W, and MW evening classes). This will be adjusted to assure ending time of last class is at a reasonable hour.
- l. Amount of credit taken in J-term: Normally up to three semester hours.
- m. Snow days in January: TBD (but most likely will utilize weekends for makeup time). This will be announced, in advance to all students enrolling in J-term.

5. Resolvable/TBD

- a. Where will onsite classes be held? In one or more buildings on campus. This is negotiable and TBD. Since this is a “catch-up” time for BSA’s in particular, this could possibly increase the workload for some staff in building(s) used. This impact would need to be offset. Using one building where possible would concentrate the impact on fewer BSA’s; spreading the classes lessens the impact on any one BSA, making the load more manageable. We could consult with BSA and supervisor, and if needed, pay (as a J-term expense) for supplemental staff needed in the area where classes are held, or provide a stipend to the staff member impacted.
- b. Impact on athletic events scheduled during J-term: Uncertain but likely to be minimal. Hopefully the scheduling could be coordinated to minimize impact of games being held during the J-term period (when many students will still be on break).
- c. Impact on scholarship students and athletes on scholarship, who wish to enroll in J-term: There are no university based regular scholarships for J-term at the present time. It would be up to the Athletics Department to decide if they wished to budget for additional scholarships. It is most likely that scholarship students would have to pay their own tuition for the J-term.
- d. Impact on Athletic Department in arranging housing/food for in-season athletes during J-Term (involving additional costs of one week or more).
- e. Residence hall issue – for housing enrolled students, international students, and

- athletes (also for J-Term)
- f. Creation of more pressure on Office Associates in terms of assistance needed by teaching faculty. This would have to be managed at the department level and addressed within each individual unit.
- g. Economic impact on local community with some students being gone one additional week before returning in January (unknown).
- h. Students on academic probation- can they enroll in J-term? TBD by academic probation committee.
- i. Faculty contract expectations and return date after Christmas holidays: TBD and TB clarified with deans and department heads (e.g. there will be one additional week in January before the start of the spring term).
- j. Spring Break – Flexibility may be needed in scheduling break (e.g. 7th or 8th week) – consult with Special events.
- k. Fall Break – Flexibility may be needed in scheduling break (e.g. 7th or 8th week) – consult with Athletics Department.
- l. Tuition rates for J-Term – Clarification: expected to be same as Fall/Spring AY per credit hour.

6. Other options to consider

- a. Consider the possibility within the AY schedule, of a common hour (campus-wide) with no classes scheduled. Benefits include:
 - Planning time for departmental/college meetings
 - Open time for holding university wide special events
 - Enhanced accessibility with time for faculty/students to meet and work in groups without scheduling conflicts
 - Time for special meetings of faculty and staff
- b. Consider other innovative scheduling options that have been suggested in terms of feasibility within the normal scheduling format (e.g. options other than TR and MWF during AY; more FS classes, etc).
- c. Summer School Special rates – Consider marketing value of setting and special rates in summer to attract students who have gone home for the summer back to the campus.

7. Action

Action to be taken immediately: Initiate J-term Task Group (comprehensive to include all affected units) and a smaller Faculty Program Group.

8. Discussions to be held for facilitation further planning and implementation:

Calendar Committee
 Council of Deans
 Administrating Council
 Department Heads

University Senate/Executive Committee
Staff Council
University Relations
Academic Committee of BOR – BOR
Student Government Association
Student Interest Groups
Community Members

Academic Calendars

2005 Fall Semester – 2007 Fall Semester

The revised academic calendars contain the following elements:

- 15-week fall and spring semesters (weeks calculated from the first day of class through last day of classes), plus one week of finals each semester
- 55-minute periods for M-W-F class meetings
- 80-minute periods for T-Th class meetings
- 3-week January Term
- 13-week Summer Term consisting of one 3-week and two 5-week sessions (same format as current summer term)
- Current days off in Fall/Spring semesters remain the same EXCEPT for adding a study day on the Friday before finals week to try to balance the number of class meeting minutes between M-W-F and T-Th class periods and adding President's Day as a non-class day in the spring semester. Days off: Labor Day, 2 days Fall Break, Wednesday before Thanksgiving, 1 study day in fall and 1 in spring, President's Day, and 5 days of spring break
- Other non-class days include MLK Day in January Term, and Memorial and Independence Days in May/Summer Term.

2005 Fall Semester

Thurs.-Fri., August 25-26	OAR
Mon., August 29	Fall classes begin
Mon., September	Labor Day (no classes)
Thurs.-Fri., October 6-7	Fall Break (no classes)
Wed.-Fri., November 23-25	Thanksgiving Holiday (no classes)
Thurs., December 8	Last day of classes
Fri., December 9	Study Day (no classes)
Mon.-Fri., December 12-16	Finals Week
Sat., December 17	Fall Commencement

Note: Fall semester consists of 40 M-W-F class meetings at 55 minutes each, for a total of 2200 minutes of instruction and 28 T-Th class meetings at 80 minutes each for a total of 2240 minutes. The campus is officially closed from December 18 through January 1.

2006 January Term

Mon., January 2*	New Year's Day holiday observed
Tues., January 3	January Term begins
Mon., January 16	MLK Day (no classes)
Fri., January 20	January Term ends (finals day)
*Classes will meet on Saturday, January 7 due to the Observance of New Year's Day on Monday, January 2.	

Note: January Term consists of 13 days of instruction, 1 non-class day (MLK Day), and 1 day for finals. Classes will meet for 3 hours and 5 minutes each day with one 15-minute break (170 minutes instruction per day X 13 days = 2210 minutes of instruction)

2006 Spring Semester

Thurs.-Fri., January 19-20	OAR
Tues., January 24	Spring classes begin
Mon., February 20	President's Day (no classes)
Mon.-Fri., March 20-24	Spring Break (no classes)
Thurs., May 4	Last day of classes
Fri., May 5	Study Day (no classes)
Mon.-Fri., May 8-12	Finals
Sat., May 13	Spring Commencement

Note: Spring semester consists of 40 M-W-F class meetings at 55 minutes each for a total of 2200 minutes of instruction and 28 T-Th class meetings at 80 minutes each for a total of 2240 minutes. One Monday in the spring (President's Day) will be designated for campus-wide special activities to be determined (no classes).

2006 Summer Term

13 weeks, consisting of one 3-week session and two 5-week sessions

Mon., May 15 - Fri., June 2	3-week May session
Mon., June 5 - Fri., July 7	5-week term
Mon., July 10 - Fri., Aug. 11	5-week term

2006 Fall Semester

Thurs.-Fri., August 24-25	OAR
Mon., August 28	Fall classes begin
Mon., September 4	Labor Day (no classes)
Thurs.-Fri., October 5-6	Fall Break (no classes)
Wed.-Fri., November 22-24	Thanksgiving Holiday (no classes)
Thurs., December 7	Last day of classes
Fri., December 8	Study Day (no classes)

Mon.-Fri., December 11-15
Sat., December 16
Tues., December 19

Finals Week
Fall Commencement
Final grades due

2007 January Term

Mon., January 1
Tues., January 2
Mon., January 15
Sat., January 20*

New Years Day
January Term begins
MLK Day (no classes)
January Term ends (finals day)

**In this particular year, two holidays fall within the J-term period and only 12 days are available for instruction. Therefore, Saturday will need to be used for the final exam.*

2007 Spring Semester

Thurs.-Fri., January 18-19
Tues., January 23
Mon., February 19
Mon.-Fri., March 19-23
Thurs., May 3
Fri., May 4
Mon.-Fri., May 7-11
Sat., May 12

OAR
Spring classes begin
President's Day (no classes)
Spring Break (no classes)
Last day of classes
Study Day (no classes)
Finals
Spring Commencement

2007 Summer Term

13 weeks, consisting of one 3-week session and two 5-week sessions

Mon., May 14 - Fri., June 1
Mon., June 4 - Fri., July 6
Mon., July 9 - Fri., Aug. 10

3-week May session
5-week term
5-week term

2007 Fall Semester

Thurs.-Fri., August 23-24
Mon., August 27
Mon., September 3
Thurs.-Fri., October 4-5
Wed.-Fri., November 21-23
Thurs., December 6
Fri., December 7
Mon.-Fri., December 10-14
Sat., December 15
Tues., December 18

OAR
Fall classes begin
Labor Day (no classes)
Fall Break (no classes)
Thanksgiving Holiday (no classes)
Last day of classes
Study Day (no classes)
Finals Week
Fall Commencement
Final grades due

Revised Class Periods

To accomplish the 55-minute M-W-F class periods and 80-minute T-TH class periods, the following class period schedule will be used to retain the same number of class periods as are currently being used. This chart compares the current class periods with the periods that will be used in the revised class period schedule.

CURRENT
M-W-F
Class Periods

REVISED
M-W-F
Class Periods

CURRENT
T-TH
Class Periods

REVISED
T-TH
Class Periods

Day Sections

8:00 – 8:50 a.m.	8:00 – 8:55 a.m.		8:00 – 9:15 a.m.	8:00 – 9:20 a.m.
9:05 – 9:55 a.m.	9:10 – 10:05 a.m.		9:30 – 10:45 a.m.	9:35 – 10:55 a.m.
10:10 – 11:00 a.m.	10:20 – 11:15 a.m.		11:00 – 12:15 p.m.	11:10 – 12:30 p.m.
11:15 – 12:05	11:30 – 12:25 p.m.		12:30 – 1:45 p.m.	12:45 – 2:05 p.m.
12:20 – 1:10 p.m.	12:40 – 1:35 p.m.		2:00 – 3:15 p.m.	2:20 – 3:40 p.m.
1:25 – 2:15 p.m.	1:50 – 2:45 p.m.			
2:30 – 3:45 (no Fri)	3:00 – 4:20 (no Fri)			

No late Friday afternoon classes to permit time for meetings.

Late Afternoon and Evening Sections

Meeting Two Times Per Week

(Class periods will remain as they are currently scheduled)

M-W		T-TH
4:00 – 5:20 p.m.		3:30 – 4:50 p.m.
5:30 – 6:50 p.m.		5:00 – 6:20 p.m.
7:00 – 8:20 p.m.		6:30 – 7:50 p.m.

Classes meeting in the late afternoon or evening two times per week do not include a break.

Late Afternoon and Evening Sections

Meeting One Time Per Week

(Class periods will remain as they are currently scheduled)

M or W		T or TH
3:45 – 6:40 p.m.		3:30 – 6:25 p.m.
5:30 – 8:25 p.m.		5:00 – 7:55 p.m.
6:50 – 9:45 p.m.		6:35 – 9:30 p.m.

Classes meeting one time per week include a 15-minute break.

D. DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION

Gene Tice, Vice President for Student Affairs and Campus Services introduced Dr. Jennifer Tougas as the Director to the newly formed Department of Parking and Transportation. Dr. Tougas distributed a Power-Point document outlining the purpose of the new department. She discussed at length how the new department would operate. She said that currently, parking services are provided by the WKU Police Department and transit services are provided by the Department of Facilities Management. Overall integration and coordination of these services are the responsibility of the Parking and Transportation Committee that consists of volunteer faculty, staff and students who are appointed by President Ransdell. Tougas said WKU is proposing to the Board of Regents that a single Parking and Transportation Department will be created within the Division of Student Affairs and Campus Services. The new department will be organized as a self-supporting Auxiliary Service department and will consolidate existing parking and transportation revenues and personnel.

The majority of the Senators opposed the creation of this department because the administration did not consult the Senate before making the decision. Although, it was noted that Administration is not required to obtain Senate approval, and that Dr. Tougas will continue as the Director of the new Department, the Senators expressed their disapproval of the decision.

Senator Andrew McMichael moved to oppose the department's creation, and to forward the following resolution to President Ransdell:

“The University Senate is dissatisfied with the decision making process used to develop the Parking and Transportation Department, and therefore opposes the creation of this Department without prior consultation with the University Senate.”

The motion was seconded.

Chair Serros called for a vote on the Resolution.

The motion carried 17 – 9.

E. OTHER

Senator Jim Becker said he would like to request that the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee identify and develop a grievance procedure for retired faculty. He discussed a present problem that has occurred recently that causes a retired WKU faculty member to be refused his membership to the Preston Center. Senator Becker said that there does not appear to be a clear grievance procedure identified in the *Faculty Handbook* for retired faculty who has had entitled benefits revoked. Further, as evidenced by the existing problem, as he discussed with the Senate, the present policy states that upon retirement under the existing university retirement system, university retired personnel are entitled to several benefits, including recreational facilities.

After a lengthy discussion, Chair Serros called for a vote on deferring this request to the Faculty

Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee for the task of developing a process by which retired faculty can pursue a grievance.

The motion unanimously carried.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Minors, Interim Secretary

Lou Stahl, Recorder