



Graduate Council

Minutes—February 12, 2015

3:00 pm - Academic Affairs Conference RM 239

Members Present: Kirk Atkinson, Phillip Coleman, Andrea Paganelli, Kristin Wilson, Marge Maxwell, Dawn Winters (alt, Kerr), Ferhan Atici, Cheryl Davis, Lance Hahn, Robert Beverly, Eric Reed, Angie Jerome, Shannon Vaughn, Jen Garmon (alt, Norman), Eve Main, Kurt Neelly, Beverly Siegrist, Emily Bouchard, Andrew Rosa, Molly Kerby, Kelsey Burton, Carl Fox

Members Absent: Minwoo Lee, Blake Ditto, David Kerr, Dori Norman

Guests Present: Colette Chelf, Julie Harris, Scott Gordon, Laura Upchurch, Danita Kelley, Janet Applin, Ken Crawford, Sylvia Gaiko, Tiffany Robinson, Larry Snyder, David Keeling, Gordon Emslie

I. Consideration of the December 11, 2014 minutes *Coleman/Main motion to approve; passed

II. Public Comment

*Maxwell reported CEBS faculty concern regarding approval of thesis committee/topic selection prior to registration in 599 course; Chelf clarified thesis committees are comprised of graduate faculty only and approval required to confirm all committee members have graduate faculty status as required by policy, and further clarified that registration hold is placed after initial registration and students are only restricted from enrolling in a second term without committee approval; Chelf requested Maxwell send her the student 800# to check the student's hold status.

*D. Kelly questioned need for maintaining matriculation syllabus; members agreed syllabus not required for maintaining matriculation; D. Kelly questioned if syllabus policy needed to be revised; D. Keeling suggested describing syllabus for course as "non-standard course, no syllabus required" to meet the syllabus policy.

III. Reports

a. Graduate Faculty Report *Hahn/Coleman motion to approve; passed

b. Research Grants Report (Main, Vaughan, Hahn, Atici)

*Vaughan summarized report; Kerby questioned criteria for not approving any funding; Vaughan, use of rubric, if project was developed, potential results & dissemination, articulation of project question, relation to formed research project; Vaughan, funding was issue and did not have enough; Main clarified only \$8,000 available; Wilson asked if those receiving low amount of money was considered helpful for their project completion; Vaughan, yes, offered to pay for registration or gas or other individual item; Hahn, approvals constrained by budget, asked Fox when we would know if additional funding was available so committee will know need to meet in April; Fox, working on it; Wilson, questioned potential benefit to fully fund some & zero to others; Vaughan/Hahn agreed, no, want to support as many students as possible; Hahn, some students had access to other funds, also committee may send feedback to students; Siegrist, complimented committee for working two days to review and hear student presentations; Atkinson/Jerome motion to approve; passed.

c. Policy Committee Report (Neelly, Davis, Kerby)

i. Graduate Council Charter draft

*Reed requested moving consideration of the draft to the end of the meeting; Siegrist polled the council and agreed.

--Consideration of curriculum proposals--

**Neelly presented the draft; significant changes include the document reflecting Graduate Council charter rather than detailing Graduate School responsibilities and processes; presents the Graduate Council as peer advisory body to the Senate, reporting to Graduate Dean who reports to Provost; selection and terms revised to include three year terms as well as vice-chair will be chair-elect; committees outlined to include a new curriculum committee to review curriculum prior to general meetings; Atkinson, noted that vice-chair would need to be elected at end of first year to be able to serve as vice-chair second year and chair third year; Reed, what is proposed from the committee regarding this draft; Neelly, draft presented for review by Grad Council to be approved after revisions if needed; Neelly, discussion began regarding graduate council mission and revision of charter in September 2014 and committee is ready to discuss and take some action; Siegrist, no second needed on this since coming from committee; Jerome, questioned if this removes Graduate Council from sending items to Senate for approval; Kerby, yes, removes Graduate Council totally from faculty voice; Siegrist disagreed, Graduate Council is a faculty body and Senate would still hear all university-wide policies; Kerby, dissented that Senate would take no action regarding Graduate Council decisions and would have no voice on graduate issues; Siegrist noted that Graduate Council has no voice at Senate now since not a standing committee of Senate; Kerby/Jerome, commented that Siegrist [Grad Council Chair] was offered a vote/seat this week at SEC; Siegrist, disagreed, SEC member asked if charter could be reopened and Siegrist requested SEC wait until Graduate Council met this week, SEC members disagreed and relayed that Graduate Council could not restructure without Senate approval; Siegrist, Graduate Council is not trying to secede from anything but restructure to streamline approval, both are elected bodies and we are not severing any relationship since we do not have a relationship now; Kerby disagreed, Graduate Council is severing and should be a standing committee of Senate; Siegrist, Graduate Council has no voice in what Senate is doing, Graduate Council needs to deal with own charter; Siegrist, SEC was appointed to be the ad hoc committee to review the charter, etc. and I pointed out that Graduate Council did not have a vote on SEC; Wilson confirmed that Siegrist approach Senate to discuss the relationship and they did not want to discuss; Wilson added that a Senate member is denoted as an ex-officio member of Graduate Council in this draft of the Graduate Council Charter; Jerome questioned if Graduate Council would turn down the opportunity to be standing committee of Senate; Siegrist questioned why Graduate Council would want to be a committee if Graduate Council was already a governing body comprised of graduate faculty members now; Wilson denoted that not many graduate faculty members serve on Senate now; Atkinson questioned if curriculum and policy are already voted on here at Graduate Council by graduate faculty, not sure why would send to senate to vote on again by Grad Faculty there; Kerby, graduate faculty serve in Senate too and anything about graduate education would be removed from Senate approval as a check and balance; Reed, requested vote on draft charter and reiterated that this draft would sever the relationship since the Senate currently approves the Graduate Council report; Davis, reiterated that Graduate Council is not a standing committee and do not have a vote, Graduate Council is not part of the Senate now, we are trying to streamline and be more practical about doing business; Reed, directly reporting to the Dean is not streamlining but diminishes Graduate Council power by inserting the Dean between the faculty and the provost; Neelly, questioned if this draft inserted the Dean or if he is already there; Reed, agreed he is there in an advisory role and sits in on our meetings; Neelly, I don't think we say who reports to whom, the provost must say; Reed agreed; Atkinson concluded point is mute; Reed, issue is changing control of curriculum all the way to the provost, and creating peer institutions makes two bodies of faculty speaking to curriculum which may be adverse and the provost would have to choose between them; Siegrist, Graduate Council is only concerned with graduate education issues; Hahn, Graduate Council voice is stronger on graduate issues since we would be the graduate body; Atkinson reminded Council that when he was Chair of Graduate Council he could not even make the motion to approve the Graduate Council report since he was not a voting member of Senate, and when motion made and voting on Graduate Council report was by graduate faculty only, no one at Senate audits to make sure only graduate faculty are voting; Atkinson, Graduate Council was not formed as standing committee of Senate; Kerby, not decision of Senate that Grad Council not a standing committee; Atkinson, questioned origin of omission of Graduate

Council as standing committee of Senate; no members responded; Atkinson, questioned why Senate has been resistant to making Graduate Council a standing committee; Kerby, refuted resistance; Atkinson disagreed, for years Senate has declined to make Graduate Council a standing committee; Kerby, Senate must change the charter to do so; Atkinson, reiterated the discussion has been ongoing for years; Neelly added last year Graduate Council was criticized for not using UCC forms tied to Senate; Wilson, Graduate Council requested several meetings ago to vote and we agreed to see if Senate would consider working with us, Senate did not want to talk until we had something in writing; Reed/Kerby/Jerome, Senate would be agreeable to change their charter and give a seat to Graduate Council; Siegrist, that has not been discussed or offered until Senate received a copy of this draft last week; Kerby, disagreed; Atkinson, Senate requested something in writing before discussing the relationship and this draft has been prepared, Graduate Council cannot secede from something it has not been a part of; Jerome, asked what is provost opinion; Emslie, regarding draft of charter, would like to see library faculty representatives in membership and change section regarding amendments to the charter requiring two-thirds vote for approval to be changed to some percentage less than two-thirds; larger issue is line two stating that Graduate Council reports to Graduate Dean who reports to Provost; although this is the way it is at most institutions and Graduate Council is not standing committee, the Senate charter says that curriculum and policy from Graduate Council will be submitted to Senate; could not approve this draft as written because it would create a conflict with Senate charter; either Senate charter or this draft need to be changed so the two are consistent; this conflict is similar to the graduate faculty policy from last year which conflicted with faculty handbook and could not approve; opinion is most places this is how it works - Grad Council to Grad Dean to Provost; could recognize symmetry between this body and UCC and both report to Senate; this workflow is redundant but also redundant with UCC; nothing else here conflicts with Senate; could not sign it if line two is not changed because it conflicts with Senate charter; suggest working with Senate to make concurrent senate charter change, revise this, or revise both; Atkinson, provost's opinion dictates Graduate Council action because Senate will not change their charter; Reed disagreed, we are not at such an impasse since Senate would include us with voting rights; Reed, the practicality of voting on this is that Graduate Council's current operating papers require two-thirds vote to change so we should vote and refer to committee for one month; Jerome, no reason to vote because provost will not sign; Siegrist, regardless of support Graduate Council operating rules are outdated and incorrect and have to change; Emslie, recognized that provost approval is not required for the charter approval and questioned if the most recent Senate charter revision was approved by the Board of Regents, does not believe it was; suggested could take both charters to the Board of Regents and let them decide what structure; Kerby, agreed this was a better option because the provost should not rule on the conflict or would be taking away the faculty voice, Senate could recommend a reconciliation between the two charters; Kerby, asked if most universities have an undergraduate curriculum committee; Emslie, yes, traditionally Senate does not have any oversight of curriculum and curriculum is disjointed between undergraduate and graduate; Jerome, questioned what will happen if Graduate Council approaches Senate and requests a Senate charter change and they refuse; Atkinson, questioned why Graduate Council could not change their charter based on the notion that it would create a conflict with a charter that Graduate Council is not a party to; Emslie, agreed, Body A cannot require Body B to do anything without Body B agreeing; Jerome, questioned if Senate disagrees with Graduate Council charter changes then Graduate Council cannot change; Emslie, the BOR may decide between options or as the governing body you could decide here; Wilson, reiterated need for straw vote today; Neelly asked if anyone wanted to make revisions to the draft prior to the straw vote; Emslie articulated that if statutes conflict then the Attorney General decides, so what is the equivalent of attorney general at university; Fox, questioned if it would be beneficial for Senate Executive Committee and Graduate Council Policy Committee; Jerome, yes but SEC members including the chair are mostly not graduate faculty and meeting should be between an ad hoc Senate committee of graduate faculty and Graduate Council committee; Neelly agreed that it would be beneficial to discuss with SEC; Siegrist, reiterated that SEC is not representative of graduate faculty; Davis, stated a vote of this body is needed so Policy Committee can meet with Senate to discuss the collective position of Graduate Council and not individual views, also

believe Graduate Council has the right to revise their charter; Reed, only one issue is controversial which is severing from Senate and Graduate Council needs to vote to find if two-thirds of Graduate Council members supports the separation; Maxwell, according to the draft language Graduate Council does not have a right to vote on governance, the draft states Graduate Council only advises, recommends, and serves as liaison to colleges, so Graduate Council does not have any rights and are giving away any rights we had; Fox, my experience is that the Graduate Dean would never stonewall or override the recommendations of Graduate Council; Emslie, stated the Graduate Council must change because the old operating papers are not working, proposed could change line 2 [reference to chain of recommendations] to avoid Senate conflict issue and then propose an amendment to change line 2 afterward; Jerome/Reed, agreed that the remainder of the draft is generally good; Maxwell, questioned need for a curriculum committee; Siegrist, explained the reason for the curriculum committee is to review curriculum and bring report to the larger body; Maxwell, believes takes a lot away from the council to not consider all curriculum issues; Neelly, stated last year Graduate Council never had a discussion except curriculum and need to remove the minor curriculum issues from the larger body discussions; Siegrist, curriculum committee would review proposal issues before full meeting; Maxwell, curriculum is major function of the council and important for full body to review; Kerby, all curriculum would still come to the full body; Chelf, clarified that committee would be able to thoroughly review proposals and at this time no faculty are reviewing prior to full meeting except for public posting of agenda one week prior to meeting; Fox, pointed out that the Senate charter is also inconsistent since it states Graduate Council will have control over all matters and further states that Graduate Council will send recommendations through the Senate to the provost which suggests Graduate Council does not have control over anything; Maxwell, current operating papers describe responsibility for programming, research, serve students, etc.; Siegrist, clarified that the existing operating papers are for Graduate Studies which includes the Graduate School and are not specific to Graduate Council, this contradiction is part of the problem with the current papers; Chelf, clarified that Senate charter language is identical to this draft of Grad Council charter stating both advisory bodies are making “recommendations to the provost”; Siegrist, requested a motion to revise the draft so we can move forward; Reed, line by line revision of the draft is not necessary; Siegrist, agreed but still need to address chain of command in order to move forward; Emslie, suggested option of curriculum and policy committees of Graduate Council report directly to Senate; Hahn, disagreed; Siegrist, the conflicting sentence is that the Graduate Council will report to Dean who will report to Provost; Wilson, we need a vote to determine if the majority support or do not support the premise of severing from the senate; Wilson/Jerome/Atkinson, agreed straw poll needed; Emslie, Senate charter says Graduate Council reports to them and informs the Dean, question is which body does Graduate Council reports and/or informs; Reed, Senate only cares about policies and curriculum; Chelf/Atkinson, those are only two areas reported to senate now; Reed, but Graduate Council has many more responsibilities; Emslie suggested Graduate Council curriculum and policy committees may by-pass Graduate Council and send reports to Senate; Hahn/Atkinson, disagreed, full Graduate Council should review all curriculum and policies leaving this body; Emslie, Senate argues the same that a graduate faculty body at one level should not act on behalf of the Senate; Hahn, reminded the provost the he stated that national model is like the draft with Graduate Council reporting to the Graduate Dean and not another faculty body, and Graduate Council is not currently a committee of Senate, questioned the provost’s suggesting Graduate Council cannot revise their own charter until the Senate – a body that does not recognize Graduate Council—agrees; Atkinson, suggested the Senate charter needs to be revised; Emslie, currently approves the Senate report and questioned if his approval would be negated on graduate matters; Siegrist, refuted that the draft Graduate Council charter indicates that the Graduate Dean would report to provost; Emslie, asked if the Graduate Dean would send report to the provost for approval like the Senate; Siegrist, yes; Wilson, if we find that most want to separate then we continue with this language and if want to stay with Senate then we can pursue becoming a standing committee; Jerome, Senate believes they are in control and according to the Provost’s comments they are since they need to amend their charter and can without consulting Graduate Council, and Graduate Council needs to amend their charter and cannot without consulting Senate; Atkinson, Graduate Council has members to have the

conversation, but if Senate is going to send SEC members who are mostly not graduate faculty then we should not meet, Senate says they will give Graduate Council chair a vote but are they going to change their charter to do that; Siegrist, as an example I was told I could not vote on Senate matters because I am chair of graduate council; Reed, but they are willing to change that; Siegrist, another example is the newly created research committee, I made the suggestion that graduate faculty be represented on it and that did not happen because we drew straws for representatives on that committee, it does not help to just give a vote, we need other graduate faculty at the table to discuss; Kerby, agree and we do not need to be divisive; All agreed need to move forward with revisions to graduate council operating papers/charter; Jerome, noted that it benefits departments to send graduate faculty as senate representatives so they can vote on all matters; Siegrist, pointed out draft removed term limits; Atkinson, should make minor changes in Article II and on so body can vote on all of it except Article I and discuss with Senate; Kerby/Reed, should vote so we know if body would like to sever from senate; Maxwell, questioned why not sever with senate; Reed/Kerby, important to have a collective faculty voice at Senate; Siegrist, most universities not functioning that way; Kerby, not interested in other universities, only interested in WKU; Siegrist, called for straw poll to separate from Senate as the draft is written; 10 yes, 6 no, 1 abstention; Reed/Kerby, will not support draft of governance without Senate involvement; Chelf, questioned if those voting no would support the draft if eliminate Graduate Dean from the workflow and send recommendations from Graduate Council directly to the Provost; Reed, not sure; Hahn, stated many members would not support a charter without the severing language; Atkinson, we have non-graduate faculty in SEC deciding graduate council governance, it is important who comes to the table to discuss the relationship; Wilson, Graduate Council can only control who Graduate Council sends to the table for discussion; Fox, could Graduate Council ask Senate to create an ad hoc committee of graduate faculty to discuss charter revisions; Wilson, questioned if policy committee would be Graduate Council representatives; Siegrist, cannot make a motion at Senate because not a member since serving as Graduate Council chair; Reed, Graduate Council chair should contact Senate chair; Davis, noted that several members have left the meeting and as member of policy committee am unsure how to proceed, what does 17 represent of the voting members; Fox, 23 members, 15 represents two-thirds; Jerome, who will represent Graduate Council; Siegrist, the policy committee; Kerby, this committee represents all sides of issue; Neelly, if they do not agree to form an ad hoc committee of graduate faculty to discuss then that will indicate they do not want to work with us; Vaughan, agreed the Senate reaction will be definitive statement of their intent; Wilson, will Neelly, chair of policy committee, approach Senate; Neelly, yes; Atkinson, should be chair to chair request; Siegrist, agree; Reed, there are no SEC members on Graduate Council; Siegrist, will contact Senate chair tomorrow and be clear that we want graduate faculty included in this discussion; Neelly, will there be enough graduate faculty on Senate who have not been on Graduate Council; Wilson, is there a way to get something on Senate floor without going through SEC; Jerome, yes, can make a motion on floor; Kerby, good move from floor; Wilson, motion to have someone make motion from floor at Senate to create a graduate faculty committee to discuss charters; Neelly, did we address all issues from Maxwell; Maxwell, yes all concerns in article I; Reed, need friendly amendment to stagger elections; Reed, would we want associate deans and/or representatives of provost's office to be ex-officio members; Neelly, associate deans come anyway so do we need them to be listed as ex-officio members; Fox, ex-officio would require them to attend; members agreed no; Jerome, need term limits; Siegrist, why, can be voted off at college level, and smaller colleges have limited graduate faculty to serve; Vaughan, friendly amendment for voting should be "50%+1" and not 50%, and add executive committee language to be sure Graduate School dean is ex-officio of that committee as well; Atkinson, friendly amendment to create term limit of two consecutive terms; Reed, friendly amendment to use Sturgis instead of Robert's Rules of Order; Siegrist, this is first reading and amendments will be made; D. Kelly will curriculum committee body require the curriculum be submitted an additional month before; Siegrist, no.

d. Graduate Dean's Report *No report

IV. New Business

a. Curriculum Proposals

College Education and Behavioral Sciences	
Consent	<p>Revise a Course EDU 695 Advanced Topics in Education Contact: Tony Norman, tony.norman@wku.edu, 745-3061 *Atkinson/Coleman; passed</p>
Action	<p>Revise a Program #0010 Doctor of Education Contact: Tony Norman, tony.norman@wku.edu, 745-3061 *Coleman/Main motion to approve; Applin summarized inclusion of GRECC prior learning credit similar to NBCT credit already used; Hahn questioned if Grad Council can approve no charge for these credits; Applin agreement between Grad School and EdD program; Fox, Grad Council would be making recommendation to the provost and Ann Mead; Gaiko agreed; Applin clarified that no charge is already in the program for NBCT credits; passed.</p>
Action	<p>Revise a Program #0457 MAE: Special Education for Teacher Leaders: Learning and Behavior Disorders Contact: E. Gail Kirby, gail.kirby@wku.edu, 745-3746 *Jerome/Hahn motion to approve; Applin, previously discussed amendments needed with Gaiko and revised proposal was distributed to council members which clarified that certification for this program can be in additional fields other than special education; Applin, proposal should say teacher preparation programs must have or be eligible for a certificate “in LBD or another certifiable area”, friendly amendment to add this language to each of three admission requirements; Gaiko, in list of courses SPED 595 is listed as internship, should remove “internship” designation since it is a capstone course and not internship; Applin agreed to friendly amendment; Siegrist, is SPED 595 required for all students; Applin, yes; Chelf, SPED 559 is only course not listed as required in the note; Applin, students must take it and cannot take proficiency exam; Gaiko, are all students with certification considered advanced certified; Applin, yes; Gaiko questioned internship requirement; Applin, students who are working/teaching in the field may complete capstone in his/her classroom, students who are not teaching must complete an internship in a classroom; Siegrist, will EPSB contract be updated on the website when approved; Applin, yes; Fox, credit hours do not add up if don’t specify in the note that SPED 559 must be completed, wording indicates it is not required; Chelf, SPED 559 could be added to list with TCHL 500, 530 & 560; Jerome, should we table this proposal to allow amendments to be made; Applin, no, will accept friendly amendment to add SPED 559 to note as required course that no proficiency exam is available; Wilson, is new tuition schedule (i.e. flat rates, grouping courses, etc.) considered in this proposal and with the EdD program proposal; Applin, draft tuition schedule not relevant to doctoral program; Fox, not relevant here, but yes, need to consider; Applin agreed; passed.</p>
College Health and Human Services	
Information	<p>Temporary Course NURS 521 Statistics in Health Care Contact: Eve Main, eve.main@wku.edu, 745-3486</p>

Action	Revise a Course KIN 514 Lab Methods in Exercise Physiology Contact: Scott Lyons, scott.lyons@WKU.edu , 270-745-6035 *Hahn/Neelly motion to approve; passed
Ogden College of Science and Engineering	
Action	Revise a Course GEOS 502 Geoscience Field Research Contact Person: David Keeling, david.keeling@wku.edu , 5-4555 *Coleman/Atkinson motion to approve; Keeling elaborated on need for course to change hours; passed
Action	Revise a Program #072 Master of Science in Geoscience Contact Person: David Keeling, david.keeling@wku.edu , 5-4555 *Hahn/Davis motion to approve; Keeling revised program includes course change above and aligned from “concentrations” to “clusters” to align with undergraduate program for upcoming JUMP program; Chelf/Harris questioned concentrations or clusters at graduate level; Gaiko clarified state policy requires use of concentration at graduate level; Keeling, friendly amendment to keep “concentrations” and omit “cluster” language.

(**Consideration of Graduate Council Charter draft – see above.)

V. Announcements/Adjourn *Atkinson motion to adjourn