



Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, May 14, 2026 -- 4:00 p.m.
Senate Chambers
Minutes

Call to Order:

- Chair Dan Clark called the regular meeting of the WKU Senate to order on Thursday, April 16, 2026, at 4:00 pm in the Senate Chambers - DSU 2081. Senate Chambers. A quorum was present.
- Members' Present: *Robin Ayers*, David Bell, Kristin Bennett, Erica Billingley, Scott Bohnam, Jenny Burton, *Margaret Crowder*, William Czekanski, Susann DeVries, Gihan Edirisinghe, Brian Elliott, Xingang Fan,, Sheila Flener Ashley Fox, Said Ghezal, Amber Giacona, Brooke Gross, Gregory Ellis Griffith, Phillip Gunter, Kate Hudepohl, Sara Herbert, Gary Houchens, Kerron Joseph, Eric Kondratieff, Yuyun Lei, Jim Lindsey, *Mac McKerral*, *Andrew Mienaltowski*, Yaser Mowafi, *Miranda Peterson*, Kimberly Pharris, *Matt Pruitt*, Kelly Reames, Michelle Reece, Stephanie Riehn, Pinky Rusli, Sarah Scali, Matthew Shake, Kandy Smith, Jason Stewart, Dan Strunk, Thomas Blair, *Melissa Travelsted*, Aaron Wichman
- Alternates Present: Whitley Stone (Kirk Atkinson) and Mindy Waldrop (Nancy Hunlan)
- Absent: Brandon Barber, Pallav Bera, Daniel Boamah, *Dan Clark*, Tom Hunley, Angie Jerome, Sebastian Leguizamon, Meghan McKinley, and Matt Tullis
- Guest: Jillian Cole, Jen Hanley, Andreen Boon, and Rob Hale

A. Approval of the previous month's Senate Meeting:

1. [Faculty Senate Minutes 4-16-26](#)

Minutes stand approved

B. Officer Reports

1. Chair - Dan Clark

- a. My report, committee chairs, please give a brief update, even if you don't have a report. I think most of you do. Also, a few people have emailed us about the committee chairs for the upcoming 26-

27 academic year. If you haven't done that yet and figured out who that's going to be, please convene your committee via Zoom or something to elect a chair for next year. It makes our lives a lot easier if that happens in May rather than in August or September. So, please, please get that done.

c. Hb490 is also under my report. Shane Spiller and I discussed HB498 with the University General Counsel, Andrea Anderson, and at this time, we do not believe any changes are needed to our faculty handbook. We think the procedures in place are satisfactory under the law. A key aspect of the law is that it sets out some things the board might do, but it does not oblige them to do so. So, if the board reaffirms that portion of our handbook as is, then we don't need any changes.

d. On another note, before we move on, I know some of the discussions on new business, a little bit later, are going to be, you know, maybe a little bit more contentious than some of the other things that we normally talk about. I've got the gavel; I'm going to do Rules of Order today. Sometimes I'm a little more loose with it. A lot of times, when we're just having discussions and trying to figure things out, like the rules of order.

If there are no more objections, have the elections for the new BEC representative

2. [Vice-Chair - Brooke Gross \(Report Posted\)](#)

The report has been posted. I still need an Ogden representative and two at-large members for the faculty handbook. At-large member does not mean you have to be an at-large senator to fill that seat. It just means that you are an at-large member of that particular committee. Faculty Handbook people must be tenured. I will send out a reminder about all of this.

3. Secretary - Sheila Flener, no report

C. Standing Committee Reports:

1. [Academic Quality, Missy Travelsted \(Chair\): \(Report Posted\)](#)

1st/2nd: Travelsted, motion passes unanimously

- So, we've continued to explore AI and how it affects the quality of the education we provide to our students, and we have determined that we are going to do a letter of support to the university and establish a committee with a few of our people involved.
- Dan: So, we discussed this a little bit at SEC, but you said that the committee wants to draft a letter of support for the University AI Committee. What, what exactly does that mean? What are... what are you supporting? The creation or functioning of the committee, or the use of AI? I also asked to give a little input as we continue to discuss that, as it affects academic falls.

2. [Budget and Finance, Eric Kondratieff \(Chair\): \(Report Posted\)](#)

1st/2nd: Kondratieff, motion passes unanimously

- Jacob Barker, our SGA representative, who's going to be Vice President of SGA next year, told us that we sort of followed up with him on some student concerns that he told us. Something interesting he feels is that about 80% of students here at Western

have normalized using AI and don't feel it's cheating. Even if their professors do. So, they use it regardless, and I think that's worth noting. And he does say... he did say that some students use it wisely as a tool to make things like flashcards and just to help them learn material. He said many students he knows will go ahead and use it to write papers, even though they're told not to.

- So, I think the AI committee or something like what Missy's trying to put together makes a lot of sense. We've got to figure out how to get ahead of this.
- Travelstead: Can I speak to one of his points about the AI group? So, I'm on the AI committee. We've been divided into three subcommittees: one focused on research, one on pedagogy, and one on student use and guidelines. I'm actually the chair of the student subcommittee, and so that's something that we are considering. We're putting together a survey with the students. The co-chair is a student as well. In computer science, those are things that we are cognizant of. We're going to continue surveying the students in that area and create student-focused guidelines and training. That's... our main goal in this subcommittee.
- Pettus: I'm not sure when the shift happened to just have objections and not, like, an affirmative vote, but I guess I would prefer... I think they're different things, so if that would be okay, to go back to that.
- Clark: For the support?
- Pettus: For anything, for everything. Okay, I mean, I'm just trying to make sense and move along more efficiently for all the stuff that always gets uniform folks anyway, but... Yeah, and I know that's why this isn't one that requires that, but I think if we start doing that, it could kind of slide into things that are more... It's a suggestion. I don't know what the procedure would be to make that suggestion, but that... I would prefer that. I don't know how others feel.
- Clark: Alright, so I'm going to do that? Yeah.
- Wichman: Thank you for making that suggestion. I think it supports faculty engagement with the process, even as I acknowledge, Dan, what you've said. We do want to promote our faculty engagement. This is one small way to continue that.

3. Colonnade/General Education, Andrew Mienaltowski (Chair): (No Report)

- We met on April 28th, and we reviewed a few things. We reviewed what potential workflows would look like for the Gen Ed curriculum should the charter revision pass. Essentially, the Colonnade Committee would be replaced with UCC, with the OAI group providing input to UCC about general education proposals.
- Learned more about the OAI workgroup
- The last thing we discussed was a new policy idea that takes the existing policy where students who do faculty-led study abroad and get international experience connections credit for it. We would extend that to students who are in non-WKU faculty-led programs. That would potentially require an appeal process with forms and documentation, and meeting those objectives.
We did not vote on that policy, but the draft is available to anyone on the Colonnade Committee shared drive in the 2627 folder.
- Landon: So, is it... Sorry, am I understanding the current policy right? Connections courses and study abroad that faculty leave every day do count, assuming there's an equivalence that the department signs off on. But if they do it at the other institution, it's not WKU-led.
- Mienltowski: They still would have to appeal. Okay. Now, they... I think they could appeal, but I'm not aware of any cases where WKU faculty have appealed study

abroad decisions for students. This is a concern raised by the Honors College with the committee because some students study abroad at other institutions, not through WK.

- Wichman: Right, so we just... just this last week, we had a student who got a poll right, I think, and was asking about this, and so wanted to kind of force connections, so thanks for...

4. [Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities, Ashley Orehek \(Chair\): \(Report Posted\)](#)

1st/2nd: Orehek, motion passes unanimously

- We have our final meeting tomorrow for the year, primarily for transition purposes and also voting purposes, so they can select a new chair, because I will be on leave next semester, and I do have a replacement for my spot. In addition to our report, we have 3 attachments to it, the first being that the work-life survey was used, and that parts of the report were generated by AI. I do want to be open about that, but it just helped us with the qualitative and quantitative analyses for the entire report.
- I also want to note that I did read through every single raw comment to every single open-ended question, and it was a very sobering experience, because clearly y'all are unhappy, and have been for a very long time. I've only been here 4 years, and I'm feeling unhappy myself, unfortunately. But I'm hoping that, as data-driven as this report is, it can provide evidence to our administration and even to the Faculty Senate to make meaningful changes moving forward. It was brought to my attention that at least one meaningful change is coming from the library's perspective, and I'm looking forward to seeing progress over the next year or so.
- The other two attachments relate to the faculty compensation resolution we initially proposed at the Senate meeting last May. It's just an update: the initial resolution said the deadline for materials from the administration was January 2026, which has obviously come and passed. We have no data from that, so we extended the deadline to January 2027 to get it and look at it. I do want to acknowledge Kelly Reams and Eric Reid from the History Department. Eric Reid is not a committee member, but he's very invested in faculty compensation, so I at least want to acknowledge his work on this endeavor.

a. [Faculty Welfare Survey Report \(Posted\)](#)

1st/2nd: Orehek, motion passes unanimously

b. [Resolution on Faculty Compensation \(Posted\)](#)

1st/2nd: Orehek, motion passes unanimously

c. [Related Information - Salary Data 2024 \(Posted\)](#)

1st/2nd: Orehek, motion passes unanimously

5. [Graduate Council, Kirk Atkinson \(Chair\): \(Report Posted\)](#)

1st/2nd: Stone, motion passes unanimously

- We met... we've actually met twice since we were in the Senate last. We have moved the curriculum forward. In our last face-to-face meeting, we formed our executive board. And then we also met virtually last week to move a few remaining curriculum items forward. So, that they will be on the Senate docket at the first meeting when we return. We're just tidying things up.

6. [Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Ashley Fox \(Chair\): \(Report Posted\)](#)

1st/2nd: Fox, motion passes unanimously

- We did a virtual vote for next year's officers. I'll be chair again. We have Ray Amber, who will be our VP and Vice Chair for next year. And I do want to express my personal appreciation to everyone who has had a hand in moving through the process this year. We've had a lot of movement, a lot of changes, and I'm excited to see what next year brings.

7. [Faculty Handbook, Mac McKerral \(Chair\): \(Report Posted\)](#)

1st/2nd: Scali, motion passes unanimously

- We met virtually on April 8th. We decided to go virtual because we just had a few minor things to look at. Usually, we get some requests from Mr. Hale with the Handbook. And we look at it, review it, and go through it. We do have four different amendments we looked at. Each one is posted if you want to look at some of the really drastic changes we've made inside. They're not drastic, I promise. But we're just trying to mirror and align some of the terminology we use. And in one of them in particular, we're trying to make sure we're treating tenure and continuance as two separate items. So again, not really major things going on, just some minor revisions.
- All four amendments were bundled as requested by Dan Clark and voted on.
 - a. [Amendment to II.A.3. Reassignment of Faculty \(Posted\)](#)
 - b. [Amendment to III.A. Faculty Rank and Promotion \(Posted\)](#)
 - c. [Amendment to III.D. Criteria for Promotion Recommendations \(Posted\)](#)
 - d. [Amendment to IV. Faculty Tenure and Continuance \(Posted\)](#)

1st/2nd: Scali, motion passes unanimously

D. Other Committee/Organization Reports:

1. [American Association of University Professors \(AAUP\) \(Report Posted\)](#)

- Hi everybody, I'm Landon Elkind, and I'm an alternate center for Political Science. I'm also president of the WKU AUP chapter. So, what is the AUP chapter? It's a group of faculty at WKU who are concerned about protecting and safeguarding tenure, your intellectual right, the contractual right that exists between you and the university. Part of why I wanted to appear today on behalf of the chapter is that HP490 might have some of us feeling a bit more frightened about the protections that tenure safeguards. And I would urge you not to give in to peer pressure. Tenure still does mean something. You have... tenure grants you contractual rights; it grants you rights under the U.S. Constitution, which the legislature cannot dictate out of existence. So, if you need a resource on campus, if you're worried about tenure and protecting academic freedom on campus, worried about stories about professors getting in

trouble for posting on Facebook, you know, posting on Facebook or something like that, reach out to us. We are here to work with the Senate to protect what it means in Kentucky. It doesn't mean anything, even with HP 490's passage. And you can read more in the report, but the real thing I want you to take away is not to give in to fear. Continue still matters, it still has significance, it is still important. It does give you legal and other protections.

2. Budget and Executive Committee (BEC)

- Clark: The timing of BEC and when things are allowed to come out, and all those things kind of don't jive with the SEC and Senate agenda well, so I don't have anything posted there. But the BEC did recommend a compensation pool to executive leadership, and I've gotten permission from the provost to talk about what the vote was and how it's structured. The BEC recommended a 2% compensation pool, based on if certain enrollment targets are met by the fall census date. So, if we reach a certain enrollment level in the fall, we'll consider a 2% compensation pool. If we don't hit that target enrollment. We likely won't, or it'll be pared back or something. 2% compensation pool, you notice that it's called a compensation pool and not a raise pool, because that keeps open the idea that it could be some form of one-time payment instead of a permanent salary adjustment or things like that. There were also amendments offered to the proposal to at least cover, no matter what, you know, increases in healthcare premiums and costs and things, but those were not approved by the BEC. But that is, the recommendation that's been made to executive leadership at this point.
- Kondratieff: Since an adjustment to compensate for increased health costs would be much lower than a 2% on somebody's salary, I'm wondering what the gist of the exceptions to that idea was? Make sure I don't speak out of turn with a rib there, but the basic... the basic recommendation, or the thoughts against it, were that if we don't hit the enrollment target, we don't have money for any kind of increases, even to cover healthcare.
- Kondratieff: And then the second was... So I was the one who made the motion. The way I made the motion was to cover health insurance premiums for whatever level the person was currently on. And there were discussions, right? You're a single person on the PPO1100, or you're a family person on the Healthy Saver. 30, whatever, 100, then that would be a different amount covered.
- Clark: Yes, those are parts of the discussions, and why I was asked. Were there also gradations in potential compensation pools if they got close to the target, because, you know, I know that actual net revenues are more important than the number of students?
- Unknown Participant: I'm wondering if being just slightly off the target means nothing?
- Clark: Well, that wasn't discussed. But there's a general feeling in the room that if we hit X target for enrollment, and I don't remember exactly what the number was, so we have a 2% compensation pool, I would assume that we're, like, 500 students below that or something, then we're not really going to be talking about it. But if we're, like, 12 students below that, then we'll talk about some gradation or something, I would assume that would happen. But it's just, we didn't get down into the nitty-gritty, find very detailed, though, because we just don't know where enrollment's going to be in the fall yet.
So, the admissions and enrollment reports the administration has been getting and presenting to BEC have been looking really good and really rosy, and there's been different points in the process where there's like, okay, it's going to fall off and come back to reality, or something along the way, and it hasn't yet. It just keeps... keeps looking good in the metrics they're looking at. And I'll admit, I don't work in the enrollment office, I don't have committed to memory all the different metrics they're looking at and comparing to in terms of the previous year's enrollment, what's happening at other universities and things like that, but they... they seem to be pretty confident that enrollment is trending upward, and we're going to have a

good number for the fall. But they also wanted us to say, too, you know, anything... anything faculty can do to, you know, increase enrollment, get students here, or at least do it, because that way your salary depends on it. Yeah. Just a comment to piggyback on what Eric said: we're being told by the board and the president that we're not focused on headcount.

- Schafer: So... And that we're focused on things like that tuition revenue, right? But then we're also hearing that head down is going to determine?
- Clark: Alright, let me come back, so it is about net tuition revenue, all right? So, you're right, it is about net tuition revenue. That is what the BEC, the President's Cabinet, and all these groups discuss. It is net tuition revenue, not headcount. However, the state's appropriation is set, so we kind of know what rates are coming in next year. As for net tuition revenue, that's... that's in the model they're telling us for enrollment and how many people we're going to get. The idea is, if we hit these numbers, we know X percent of them are going to be paying this amount, Y percent of them are going to be on scholarship for this amount, that's... that's part of the model. So, yes, thank you for correcting my mistake. There is about tuition revenue, but it's factored into the enrollment numbers and vice versa, yes.
- Landon: Yes, is this typically done, or is this new tying to the head panel? Because I think this would set a bad precedent. Maybe, maybe it happened this year and it's too late, but it seems generally bad to take in salaries for enrollments. Why? Because, you know, enrollment and payment are based on how much scholarship money is awarded. So, the university has the authority to give more money in scholarships rather than raises, which seems to create some perverse incentives. But also, our stuff still gets expensive. Inflation's not going to stop, just because our enrollments don't do well or degrade. Backed by the opposite, perhaps. It's unprecedented for this to be happening, right? Like, this is the first time.
- Kondratieff: Were we informed last year that that was the metric? Because I don't... I just remember hearing about a 2% raise pool, not that it had been tied to enrollments, and we had hit the enrollment number. That's why it feels new, and that's why Landon's saying it feels new. When the campus wasn't informed of it, but that's how it was done last year. I don't remember that was the way we received the 2%
- Clark: If I misspoke and the Provost or the deans want to correct me, I'll let you know what I misspoke about, so... Alright, that's it with BEC.

3. Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL) / ONE WKU, no report

E. Advisory Member Reports:

1. Provost, Rob Hale for Bud Fischer

- Provost thanks you for your service this year. It's been... every year brings new challenges, and we appreciate all the hard work that we've done this year.
- The other thing he wanted me to tell you was that we're in good shape for this year's budget, wrapping up this year's budget cycle, and we're on track to have a new budget online soon.
- Mienaltowski: Has there been a presentation from admissions on anticipated yield, or what admins look like? So, I know BEC is saying that we're on... we're on track, and it could be a 2% compensation. Has there been a report from admissions about, like, admit numbers? They have to get a report every week.
- Hale: I think, thanks, we're up about 100 compared to last year.

2. SGA President, No one here

3. Staff Senate Liaison, Not here

4. Faculty Regent, Clark for Shane Spiller

- All faculty tenure was approved
- The P3 approval for the new public-private partnership for the dorms is moving forward
- Elkind: when I emailed Shane about HP490, he sounded like... it was sort of like... The Board of Regents has been totally focused on the housing thing and has not really addressed how they're going to proceed regarding HB490. But in your earlier report, it sounded like after you met with the University Attorney, maybe things have concealed or gotten clearer? Like, so I don't know, like maybe you could just say that, speak to that a little bit.
- Clark: Shane and I met with the University Council in our office, and we, you know, we came with copies of the handbook, copies of what other public universities in Kentucky had done. We spoke with her. It ended up being a brief meeting with a lot less red pen writing than I thought there would be. By that, I mean none. Like, she thought that our main book was good the way it was, particularly when it comes to time in August. I believe the law requires the board to have a process, but basically, on the advice of the General Counsel, they're just going to send them that portion of the handbook and be like, " This is what we already have, you're still cool with it, affirm that, and we're good to go.
- Hale: A lot of the law sounds like what we do. Don't be afraid.

F. Old Business:

G. New Business:

BEC election: The candidates are as follows

- Katrina Burche (OCSE)
- Alexander Olson (PCAL)
- Eric Reed (PCAL)

Comments from the Senate floor-

- Jerome: Recommends Eric because of all the work he has done.
- Mienaltowski: Katrina will not be the faculty chair
- Kondratieff: I've worked with Eric Reid since I started in the Senate over 10 years ago on things like budget and finance. And I worked with him last year on the Welfare Committee's first proposal, or first resolution, which has now been renewed this year.

A vote was taken by secret ballot, and votes were processed by Brooke Gross (vice-chair). Eric Reed was elected to serve as faculty representation on the BEC.

1. Senate Charter Revision - Second Reading (Posted)

1st/2nd: Meinaltowski/Pruitt, motion passes unanimously Andy/Pruitt

- Meinaltowski: So, since the last meeting, there have been some small changes to the rationale that was submitted, which describes the membership and responsibilities of the oversight assessment. So, the charter revisions are being proposed to better manage Gen Ed,

both operationally and for the future. General Education maintains faculty governance over the curricular approval process by shifting course and program approval from the Colonnade Committee to UCC, while relocating operational program oversight and assessment responsibilities to the newly proposed group.

Since the last Senate meeting, Rob, Stacy, and I have worked on the OAI group description, now included in the rationale. Rob has reached out to many senators who had voiced concerns about the group, especially those concerned with the appointment process and what that would look like coming from local settlements, to ensure those concerns were addressed.

Under the current structure, the Gen Ed Committee functions primarily as a body that approves general education courses and implementation guidelines. It doesn't follow up on oversight to ensure that units are complying with the learning outcomes attached to courses. It doesn't review assessment data. It does not make recommendations to the Senate or back to units for continuing. All programmatic change is driven by units proposing to add or remove courses. So, responsibility for the comprehensive program assessment currently resides with academic affairs rather than the committee faculty.

Assessment is piecemeal, and it doesn't inform faculty-led improvement of the program. So, the charter revision clarifies these roles by separating curricular approval from assessment and operational oversight. So why should we be concerned about assessment? All undergraduate programs undergo assessment. Each year, we submit terms of student learning reports. It takes place every 5 years, and the goal is to reflect on what's working and what's not working in our programs.

- So, assessment requires a substantial investment of time from the team writing assessment reports and evaluating the program. So, assessment leads to deliberate choices about which program features to continue and which to modify. This isn't happening under the current structure. Now, if it did, our duties on the Colonnade committee would expand significantly to include gathering and reviewing assessment data.

It is to make recommendations based on that data. Now, our committee does valuable work on course approval, but those are time-consuming operational duties, such as gathering data and communicating feedback to units. It's just going to dissolve into bringing together faculty, essentially, to make recommendations on how we can improve general education. So, the proposed OAI group addresses this need by identifying faculty invested in Gen Ed to coordinate assessment and study the Gen Ed program.

These are our peers who have expertise in delivering Gen ED courses, and the OAI group description includes details on membership and how time is freed up for them to work. It expands... it does not remove faculty contributions to reviewing our general education program and to its ongoing improvement. So, it aligns expertise with responsibility, and it restores faculty ownership of assessments.

So, the charter revision for us, and the creation of the OAI group, are meant to improve gen ed operationally, and it's what we said here: WKU's faculty governance will continue through UCC, and the OAI group's role is to oversee the operations of general education and to offer UCC information that it needs to make decisions about changes.

- Clark: So, is there any other discussion on the amendment?
- Jerome: And, you know, what we've noticed is, number one, it's hard to get people to serve on Colonnade Committee, sometimes. Number two, some of the people on there are doing it, but they don't really teach in Gen Ed. Like, no shade to them. Actually, I'm happy that they're willing to do it. But a lot of the time, the ones who are really digging into those artifacts and whether they've made learning outcomes really land with the chair. And so, you know, we don't have the time or whatever, but we know the assessment isn't being done at the level it needs to be. We know that the oversight isn't, and so I support this, because I think it will make our general education better and stronger, and having sat on the Colonnade and UCC for 10 years, I feel

like... I just feel like it's got to go through UCC anyway, so it's really getting approved twice now, whether it would just go to UCC.

- Pruitt: I just want to add that, when this first came forth, I had a strong response today, but in terms of the process of how people are appointed. This newer iteration in terms of the process, associated with the group, the structure, its function, and now support, I appreciate Bob, having multiple discussions with him and several other senators with concerns, and having them addressed is now being reflected in this document. I think the part of the assessments that's really important to consider for continuation in the longer term is the institutional memory of the people who serve on this committee. And, you know, nothing changes regarding the UCC and the faculty senate, so faculty control remains.
- This proposal, which we're looking at right now and voting on today, with some changes that are maybe going to be considered with the Big Red Gen Ed, which is another issue. Just wanted to clarify that all we're voting on today is the creation of this committee. This has nothing to do with the proposed changes to general education. That will come before the body in the fall, and that's a different conversation.
- Kelly Reames: The document refers to the Director of General Education, and I don't know who that is. So, how is that person appointed? Do they have a certain term? Is this spelled out somewhere else? Or... and if not, shouldn't it be part of the document?
- Hale is the Colonnade concierge (godfather). We have never put in the resources to support gen ed. We are in a good place for supporting Gen Ed.
- There was a discussion on the history of the Gen Ed director and that Stacey Forsythe is now the Colonnade Director.
- Eric K: First of all, I want to acknowledge all the hard work that went into updating this, and I appreciate Rob and everybody else doing that to make it more clear, so I second what Matt said. I do have a couple of questions, though. And that is, I still wonder if it isn't precipitate to get rid of the Colonnade Committee when... I mean, the mechanism you're setting up with the OAI makes a lot of sense. But everything then, instead of flowing, you know, like UCC would do its thing, Colonnade would do its thing as committees, but now everything's going to flow through UCC, and I'm wondering how they're going to handle the workload, even with a, even, you know, with a simplified system or mechanism or whatever to speed it through. It just seems like an awful lot of work for one committee, so why are we getting ready to colonnade? Why can't we have the OAI direct things through the Colonnade Committee until we've decided that we're actually going to change the colonnade program to something else?
- Fox: As the chair, and I was chair 10 years ago as well, I... first of all, there's been no pushback from UCC or the members of UCC that I'm aware of about taking on this role. As mentioned, we review the curriculum anyway, and we vote on whether it's approved for a course, a certificate, or a full program. So, this would just be one more category, so to speak, we would approve. Also, part of this committee makeup would be someone, the vice chair, actually, of UCC. That would be the liaison from the committee to UCC for the gen ed go-to person. So, they would be able to answer questions, and I do foresee myself as the chair, the vice chair, and whoever is over OAI is. So, I feel like there's going to be an open communication between those three and the proposal. But I don't necessarily, at this point, and maybe I'm being optimistic, but I really don't think that it will entail that much more work. Will it be more work? Of course it will, but not necessarily as much as it seems in the discussion. It is yours to address this particular point. I was going to comment on a conversation I had with Jennifer Hammonds about the ability to provide notifications to people at all levels, whether it's the way I agree with UCC about proposals that come in, to facilitate communication between these groups.
- Hudepohl: Yeah, I guess I just don't understand the need to eliminate the gen ed committee. I agree, assessments are a huge task, and it makes sense that the Provost's office would have an interest.

- Forsythe: I'm actually the colonnade director, not just the chair of the work group. The group would report to UCC, so there would be Senate oversight. There's actually more faculty representation in the OAI group than there is currently on the Colonnade Committee, so there'd be more faculty representation for this. We feel like it's important to have this, even if, as maybe, as Matt said, the new program does not get passed through. There needs to be significant improvements to the current program. Even if the new one is not put forth. This group would work on that. It would meet regularly, just like the colonnade committee does, providing a direct pathway to UCC from this work group. The input from your college would be in that OAI group, not the work group. And this group would not only do the assessment, but would look at what is currently happening in general education, what's working, what's not working, and provide improvement recommendations to UCC, so the work would happen in the OAI group with a liaison with the UCC, and it would go to UCC for both, just like it does Colonnade does right now. So, that pathway would not change. This group would just be way more involved in the workings of general education at WKU, and we'd be able to make input more regularly instead of waiting years. I need to be able to really help with assessment, feedback to departments, and help with pedagogy for faculty who are looking for ways to improve these colony courses or general education courses, so this group is not taking away any oversight for faculty; it's just improving the overall program, regardless of whether the new program gets passed next fall. We would need this for the current program as it stands today.
- Travelsted: I think one of the benefits that the OAI has over the Colonnade Committee is stability, and these people are going to serve for extended periods of time; they're going to be enrolled in this, whereas Colonnade Committee functions great, but it changes annually, right? We change senators; we bring in new people, so there's going to be some... I think the stability pact is about investing in the process, not having to rebuild every year, and not going to the basement only to never get anything out of it. I think that's a benefit to the new
- Crowder: So, I think one of the concerns, this is one of the concerns that I have, comes more with getting rid of a standing committee of the Senate that is currently functioning. We may have some issues with it and want to revise it. That could be something that we could look at. But getting rid of a standing committee of the Senate to replace its current functioning, so I'm not going to say that the new proposed committee will do exactly the same things, because obviously, there are different things there, but replacing this with something that's not yet actually created. Why get rid of something that we currently have before the thing that we want to replace it with is not there? Like, we don't know how that's going to work. So, can we not revisit this next term after you have OAI more delineated, defined in place, and in the meantime, you could have the current Colonnade Committee work with, because we've got people in place right now, incoming senators, to go on Colonnade as it is. Couldn't they work with that OAI committee next term?
- Jerome: Point of clarification, Brooke, you did not caucus for Colonnade next year, is that correct?
- Gross: Correct. There is no caucus... There was no caucus for Colonnade. Well, I mean, I don't know, I've gotten... OCSE's got somebody in place for Colonnade. The Vice chair, not the chair, will be interacting with
- Kondreiteff: I'm a little concerned. You said that we have to have this in place for the new... for the new Gen Ed program. We haven't voted on the new Gen Ed program, so we're assuming this is a fait accompli (Irreversibility). This has been my one objection: it looks like a fait accompli (Irreversibility). Now, I think the OAI makes sense. But I agree with Margaret that we should have a transitional period where we still have a colonnade, we can... we can caucus somehow in September or August. But we should have a transitional period while

we're still doing the stuff we do, until these guys are up and running, actually know what they're going to be doing, and how they're going to do it together.

- Meinaltowski: All new courses and revisions to courses are on pause, so the committee is not voting on adding new courses to general education. Our work is limited to discussions of policies, such as counting, international experiences of students who take part in the WKU faculty-led study abroad, and revisions to artifacts, which, like our connections, are due to the maker. That's essentially what we've been doing.
- Forsythe: I just want to... I think it's important to clarify again that the majority of the work will be done by the OAI group. UCC will not be reviewing... they will be reviewing it as it comes to them, but the discussions, the information, the feedback, the communication with proponents, all of that will be happening in the OAI group, and then will be brought to UCC. The UCC vice chair was added to that group so they could, I guess, oversee and ensure that information was being brought to UCC from the OAI group. So, the OAI group would be doing the work, so the load of the work would be very minimal on UCC, because it would be inferred... not information items, because they'd be voting on them, but the OAI group would bring forth all of the information that has been discussed in the OAI group And a recommendation would be made to UCC, and then UCC could either... even if the recommendation comes from the OAI group not to accept something into General Education, the UCC has the vote. They could overturn that if they felt it necessary. But the work would be done in the OAI group and brought to UCC. And UCC, if they wanted to, could still talk to proponents. Absolutely.
- Jerome: I just want to... I think it's important to clarify again that the majority of the work will be done by the OAI group. UCC will not be reviewing... they will be reviewing it as it comes to them, but the discussions, the information, the feedback, the communication with proponents, all of that will be happening in the OAI group, and then will be brought to UCC. The UCC vice chair was added to that group so they could, I guess, oversee and ensure that information was being brought to UCC from the OAI group. So, the OAI group would be doing the work, so the load of the work would be very minimal on UCC, because it would not be information items, because they'd be voting on them, but the OAI group would bring forth all of the information that has been discussed in the OAI group, and a recommendation would be made to UCC, and then UCC could either... even if the recommendation comes from the OAI group not to accept something into General Education, the UCC has the vote. They could overturn that if they felt it necessary. But the work would be done in the OAI group and brought to UCC. And UCC, if they wanted to, could still talk to proponents. Absolutely.
- Jerome: I would move to end the discussion and take the vote.
- Clark: Is there a second to close? Flener
- Clark: All right, moved and seconded to close the debate. That motion is not debatable. This requires a two-thirds majority of senators to pass. So, all in favor of closing debate on this issue of moving to a vote, Senators and alternate senators, raise your hands
- 32 in favor to 10 abstentions
- Clark: Vote conducted by raising a hand. The vote is as follows: 30 for the charter change, 8 against, and 2 abstentions.
- Hale: At the last senate meeting, he was worried. We have a much better proposal
- Gross: Take a cookie
- Pruitt: It is a reflection of faculty governance
- Pettus: We represent voices more than ourselves, productive conversation

H. Adjourn to Summer

Meeting adjourned. Pruitt/Ayers: The motion passes unanimously.

Faithfully submitted: Sheila S. Flener