Chair Andrew McMichael called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. The following members were present: Lawrence Alice, John All, Greg Arbuckle, Ferhan Atici, Nedra Atwell, Lynn Austin, Marty Boman, Barbara Brindle, Barbara Burch, Stuart Burris, Mike Carini, Walter Collett, Robert Dietle, Richard Dressler, Dana Emberton-Tinious, Freda Embry, Sam Evans, Jane Fife, Malia Formes, Joe Hardin, Anthony Harkins, Michelle Hollis, Nezam Iraniparast, Pamela Jukes, Kaveh Khatir, Soleiman Kiasatpour, Amy Krull, James LeTourneau, Deborah Lively, Karen Mason, Kathleen Matthew, Marge Maxwell, James McCaslin, Josh McCubbins, Laura McGee, Andrew McMichael, Roger Murphy, George Musambira, Atici Mustafa, Dan Myers, David Neal, Johnston Njoku, Laurin Notheisen, Anne Onyekwuluje, Lester Pesterfield, Katrina Phelps, Keith Philips, Heather Pulliam, Kara Ratliff, Eric Reed, Jeffrey Samuels, Bud Schlinker, Roger Scott, Peter Sepanski, Julie Shadoan, Douglas Smith, Peter St. Pierre, Mason Stevenson, Samanta Thapa, Tom Tutino, Stacy Wade, Judy Walker, Carol Watwood, Jeff Willis, Mary Wolinski. Alternates present were: Michelle Blake for Saundra Starks. Andrew Ernest for Blaine Ferrell, Connie Foster for Deana Groves, Jill Onedera for Cynthia Mason, Pat Hodges for Timothy Mullin, Jerry Daday for John Musalia. Members absent were: Mike Binder, Ellen Bonaguro, John Bonaguro, Tim Brotherton, John Bruni, Thad Crews II, Scott Dobler, Jerry Gotlieb, Elmer Gray, Kirk Heriot, David Lee, Minwoo Lee, Terrence McCain, Katharine Pettit, Sylvia Pulliam, Gary Ransdell, Robert Reber, Sherry Reid, Vernon Sheeley, Robert Sims, Nevil Speer, Richard Wilson

Approval of the Minutes

The Minutes of April 21, 2005, were approved with no editorial corrections

Report from the President

Chair McMichael reported the following:

1. At the May meeting of the University Senate, the senate passed a motion on asking the university to block access or change the ways in which information was passed to outside corporations such as prof-eval and pick-a-prof. McMichael reported that the senate has heard nothing back from this issue thus far. The chair noted that several universities in the same situation have chosen to block access to prof-eval on their university internet servers.

2. SGA evaluations were done a week after SITE evaluations. The numbers of returns (by students not by classes) was not very good. There was about a 92% return on the SITE evaluations and a 69% return on the SGA evaluations. The joint SGA/University Senate/Provost Committee met concerning the results. They agreed that SGA evaluations would again be done in the same manner, but if the SGA evaluation return rate does not approximate closely the SITE return rate then the SGA evaluation items would be added to the SITE evaluations. McMichael urged the senators to urge the faculty to administer the SGA evaluations.
3. The Chair is working to fill committee appointments. If anyone has individuals to nominate, please email the chair.

4. The University Senate Executive Committee has no SGA representation. The Chair reported that the executive committee discussed this issue and that it was decided to invite a representative from the SGA to attend the executive committee meetings. At the end of the year, the executive committee would evaluate how often representatives attend. If they do attend, then the senate might consider a charter change to include permanent representation on the executive committee.

5. The University Senate Executive Committee met with President Ransdell on Monday, September 12, 2005. At that meeting, Provost Burch mentioned that there will be a new classroom scheduling system going into effect. This scheduling system will move the responsibility out of the departments and into Wetherby. This will be done in the attempt to fix issues of finding classrooms for correct sizes. President McMichael was concerned that a classroom scheduling system will begin to affect when we teach what we teach instead of being a negotiated agreement between faculty and their chairs.

Report from the Vice Chair

Vice Chair, John All reported

1. Faculty regent elections will be held this semester. Tentatively, the election has been scheduled for November 1, 2005. Submission of candidate names should be put forward to the Vice Chair by October 21, 2005. A list of all eligible voters and candidates will be to departments by October 9, 2005. Currently, if you are an assistant professor or above, you are eligible to vote in the election. If you are an assistant professor and above and three quarters of your time or more is devoted to teaching you are eligible to run for faculty regent.

2. As chair of the faculty liability committee, All reported that the administration had not yet responded to the University Senate resolution regarding the request for liability insurance for off campus activities.

3. At the meeting with President Ransdell, All had asked about child care and the use of child care in on-campus facilities. He stated that the administration was going to get back to us on this issue.

Report from the Faculty Regent

The Faculty Regent, Robert Dietle, reported on two issues from the July Regents Meeting.

1. There was a personnel matter deciding the employment status of a faculty member in their first year in a tenure track position. The Regents went into closed session and while Dietle could not discuss their deliberations he could discuss some of the documentation used to make the decision since those are now part of the public record. In the
documentation, one of the issues raised was a set of SITE evaluations. The SITE evaluations for this one class were very poor. Dietle’s concern was that the SITE evaluations were viewed out of context. They were not seen as one set of SITE evaluations out of five for that semester. A negative response in one class in one semester does not reveal a pattern of activity and a pattern of activity should be necessary for termination.

The Regent was not interested in debating the final Board of Regents decision. However, Regent Dietle was concerned about the need to give the appropriate context to SITE evaluations so that they are used in the manner they should be. If there is an issue with a class, all SITE evaluations should be presented. In addition, professional literature on the pros and cons of such evaluations should be provided to regents so that they can make a more informed decision.

2. After the Board of Regents came out of closed session, one regent began to make a motion which included a sub-motion that all due process appeals be removed for provisional employees. At Regent Dietle and Earl Fisher’s suggestion, that part of motion was dropped. Dietle views this as another cause for concern. There appears to be some feeling at least among some of the regents that the answer to faculty appeals is to remove the process for appeals. University Council Deborah Wilkins believes, according to Regent Dietle, that the motion was meant just for appeals to the Board of Regents. Regent Dietle felt that it was all grievance procedures for untenured faculty. Dietle did not know whether this would be followed up.

Dietle noted that there is a movement afoot, reported in the meeting with President Ransdell, to revise the current grievance process.

**Report from the Provost**

The Provost reported the following things:

1. SITE/SGA issue. Last year a document was put together by Senate/SGA/Provost office to come to an equitable agreement. The agreement stated that the SGA evaluation participation would be similar to SITE. It was not. It was gracious of the SGA representatives to agree that it would be extended. If not, they will be included on the SITE evaluations. The Provost’s office will carry costs of the SGA evaluations this fall.

2. Provost Burch wanted to report back on the serious concerns and legal action in place concerning the Council on Post-secondary Education request that all grades be submitted them—every grade for every student, course by course. WKU had already been submitting selective grades for students placed as freshman and submitting feedback to selected high schools for some time. WKU has fought this fought it legally and otherwise. Ruling just a few days ago said that in effect that we do have to provide the data. Currently, CPE is restricted from giving the data to anyone else to use. However the CPE proposes to change the data collection agreements in the next few months to enable them to do all kinds of comparisons. She hopes that the University Senate and COSFL will give that some attention.
Promotion & Tenure Appeals. The Promotion and Tenure Policy has been in place since 1970. In 35 years the policy has been implemented fairly well and we had never had a case like the one Dietle referenced. We have never ever not acted on non-continuance for a first year faculty member—never before this case.

Where we are. I would urge you to conserve your energy until after the next board meeting in November. A report on this topic will go to the Board of Regents in October. There are expansive appeal rights for tenured faculty. The question was how far these appeal rights extend for untenured faculty. Board concerned about appeal process for probationary faculty, president was directed to clean up the process.

President met with Provost, Wilkins. Report back will be that nothing wrong with policy. The issues are the committee membership is constantly changing and that the committee often goes outside the bounds of the appeals process. The committees need more guidance in what is appealable and the ways that appeals can go forward. She is confident that no change in policy is going to be forthcoming but a change in process to provide a better understanding of prerogatives and parameters of appeals is forthcoming.

Study abroad procedure. A fully developed policy on the programmatic side exists, and the President has directed to work with finance and accounting to have a user-friendly and workable system. Provost Burch anticipates that being completed in the next couple of weeks.

Classroom scheduling that Chair McMichael referenced. This has been something that has been talked about for a while. Every year CPE states that we have plenty of underutilized space. This hurts us when we try for new building and renovations. We are convinced we don’t have enough space, but we also don’t have an efficient system for space utilization. We are looking at a classroom space utilization system. Provost Burch assured the University Senate that there will be no one in Wetherby making those decisions. Department heads and Deans will continue to have decision-making over classroom space. However, we are going to operate on the assumption that no faculty, department, or college owns their classrooms, the university owns them.

The provost has had a number of assessment walkthroughs done at different times of the day. She stated that 55% of classes are between 10a.m. and 2p.m., Monday through Thursday. There will be meetings with each department. If they can justify everyday from 8 to 4, x number of classrooms, then those classrooms will be assigned and they are theirs to schedule and they will be expected to use them. They have first priority to areas nearest them. But if the rooms aren’t utilized they will be up for grabs. Rooms not assignable on a permanent basis will be put in a pool to be drawn from when departments need another room.

Lastly, new processing and administrative guidelines for tenure and promotion. These guidelines are not going to affect anything but the way that they are sent forward. Provost Burch states that currently everything is in the tenure packet including kitchen sink. The university is moving to 1 binder with a maximum of 2 inches. Additional information can be submitted, but all the most important information should be in the 2 inch binder.

Dr. Burch then took questions:
Senator Samuels: As someone who uses classes outside dept. I appreciate the centralized system. One thing that is always brought up is equipment. The department usually pays for equipment, who will be responsible for replacement of bulbs and equipment.

Answer. Not sure how that will be handled yet, but the user will probably be held accountable.

Senator Samuels: I appreciate the work of the administration to keep our course grade information from CPE, has there been any decision administratively about Pick-a-prof.

Answer. Only decision has been that has been made is that as long as something is in a form that makes it available on an open-records basis that we will continue to allow that. Nothing has changed in that regard.

Regent Dietle: Who directed President to review the appeals process? There was no direct motion by the Regents. Who is on the committee? When they complete their work will their recommendations be brought before the University Senate as was the case with the last set of recommendations?

Answer. There was no motion. But there was a sentiment that it needed to be looked at. There were many mixed views but there was consensus that they did not want to go through that again…that the process needed to be clearer and without equivocation and the President took the initiative. There are many instances when the board is uncomfortable and the President takes the initiative. That is the president’s job as chief administrator. Within a few days we will try to define in writing what has made the process confusing. Provost Burch stated that she would be happy to share this as an information item at the next meeting of the University Senate. The administration will report back to the board as a whole informationally what we have done to address the issues and the disconnects that caused this problem.

Regent Dietle: Will the senate be asked to approve this?

Answer. The senate would be asked to approve anything that was a policy change. This will not change policy but it may change instructions given to a committee. The provost will share with us what the changes will be.

Vice-Chair All: Students performance data (response rates) was given and essentially we as faculty are going to penalized for student’s desire to submit to the evaluation. Vice-Chair All asks to see information on how many classes were represented.

Answer. The fact is that they are the number of class sections.

Vice-Chair All disagreed stating that he had checked the numbers and that they were student percentages.

Answer. Well what I got from Mr. Cobb earlier this afternoon had to do with the number of sections. Frankly, to do that would entail many hours of time and energy. I am not going to commit to you the time and energy because frankly we don’t have it. We don’t...
have the wherewithal to do it because as you know the data is disposed of by us automatically 30 days after administration.

Vice Chair All asked for clarification whether the SGA evaluations were disposed of or the SITE evaluations were disposed of after 30 days.

Answer. We dispose of everything after 30 days. We transmit the summary data to SGA. SGA has never asked for raw data. The Chair of this body has noted that the importance of working with the students on this. Provost Burch stated that we are on the verge of revisiting SITE. Some discussion will probably take place concerning whether the material of the SITE evaluations could address the needs of the students, while remaining personnel documents.

Senator Reed asked how will student engagement be incorporated into tenure and promotion?

Answer. Two years ago in preparation for SACS we went through a process or revisiting tenure and promotion guidelines and post-tenure review process. Many departments did not ever get those formally approved, which the policy calls for. We are currently recommending that departments revisit guidelines and that they need to be moved through the college. In the guidelines, need to ask the question if they have framed the guidelines in a way that that people can be credited and acknowledged for student engagement and all other areas. Dean of Ogden College has spent a lot of time on their guidelines and has come to reflect the value of publications and scholarship with students.

Postscript. Promotion stipend changes have put us at top of our benchmarks. We knew that the impact would be salary compression. She asked the president if he would approve a several year plan that would bring us to 65 percentile benchmark for faculty salaries knowing that we are now currently below the 50th percentile. If we could bring forward a plan to show the added value that that would be the way to leverage and get there. The plan is not asking for more work, but encouraging faculty to transmit what they actually do and value those things that are institutional priorities.

University Senate Action Endorsement

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Barbara Burch, endorsed the April 21, 2005 actions of the Senate.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

University Curriculum Committee (Report attached to Agenda)

No report other than attachment

General Education Committee (Report attached to Agenda)

No report other than attachment

Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee
No report.

**Academic Quality**

Information that the chair was elected

The new chair reported that a subcommittee of CAQ has been created to review SITE evaluations. They will be meeting before the September 23' 2005.

**Graduate Council.** (Report attached to the Agenda)

Vice Chair of Grad Council, Douglas Smith, reported that Dean Gray was away on a family matter. Smith moved approval of two new course proposals CNS670 and SOCL545. The course proposals were unanimously approved by the graduate faculty of the University Senate.

Smith moved approval of a program revision for the Masters of Higher Education which would put the newly approved CNS 670 into the MAE program. This proposal also was unanimously approved by the graduate faculty of the University Senate.

Last, Smith moved approval of a new academic policy concerning the number of transfer credits acceptable for WKU certificate programs. This proposal had been approved by all departments that currently had a graduate certificate program. This proposal also was unanimously approved by the graduate faculty of the University Senate.

**New Business**

**Parking Report** (Report attached to the Agenda)

John Bruni the University Senate representative to the Parking Committee was not present.
There were no questions.

**KTRS and ORP retirement**

Motion out of the Executive Committee concerning ORP. (Information and motion attached.)

Senator Smith moved to definitely postpone this motion to the next University Senate meeting because the Benefits Committee had been working on a report dealing with this issue. Senator Njoku seconded.

Discussion on this motion centered on the following issues:

The proposal had been the headline of the Bowling Green Daily News. Many felt that waiting a month would steal the thunder from the issue. They wished to strike while the iron was hot.

ORP retirees concerned that waiting continued to bleed money from their retirement accounts. Others noted that a lawsuit would take some time to get under way and felt there was still time to get all the facts.
Some discussion about the other options available: sue, change legislatively, fix the rate on either WKU or the government end.

Others wished to wait because the Benefits Committee was still setting the rates for this year.

Still others were concerned that this would be a conflict of interest for those in KTRS.

A motion to end debate was made and seconded. It was approved.

The motion to definitely postpone passed 26-24.

**Announcements**

Meeting will be here again MMTH.

The meeting adjourned at p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Smith, Secretary

**NOTE:** The agenda with its attachments for this meeting can be found on the University Senate website: http://www.wku.edu/Dept/Org/FS/meetings.htm