**OVERFLOW MEETING**

**MINUTES**

***February 3, 2010, 3:00p.m. -5:00 p.m.***

# ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ROLL CALL**

Present:

John Bardo, Richard Beam, , Heidi Buchanan, Kyle Carter, David Claxton , Beverly Collins, Chris Cooper, Terre Folger, Steven Ha, Rebecca Lasher, Frank Lockwood, Ron Mau, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Elizabeth McRae, Sean O’Connell, Phillip Sanger, Barbara St. John, Jack Sholder, Jack Summers, Laura Wright, Vicki Szabo

Members with Proxies:

Mary Kay Bauer, Wayne Billon, Eleanor Hilty, John Hodges, Christopher Hoyt, David Hudson, Jane Perlmutter, Chuck Tucker, Cheryl Waters-Tormey

Members absent:

Michael Thomas, Libby McRae

Recorder:

Ann Green

**OTHER BUSINESS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Richard Beam announced that the primary agenda item of this meeting will be the Old Business of the Rules Committee changes, however, Dr. McFadden has some comments about the movement to the new Blackboard 9.

**Report from Dr. Anna McFadden:**

As everyone is likely aware the university is moving to Blackboard 9. We have a test server and are putting together a Blackboard Faculty Advisory Group, one from every college, to help with troubleshooting before rolling out to faculty. They would like to have someone from the Faculty Senate to this group if the Senate would like to appoint someone. They are waiting on Blackboard to release Blackboard 9.1 which will probably be released March 1 or by March 31 at the latest. 9.1 has a file manager feature that they really like.

One of the changes that will take place is that faculty will log on with Outlook credentials rather than 92#. Also beginning a discussion of what the Blackboard going to look like at Western. Blackboard will be here in March to help with the integration. Some faculty will begin designing classes in Blackboard 9 in April and they would like to pilot classes in Summer, 2010.

It is the dean’s desire that department heads and program coordinators will start training first.

Dr. McFadden commented that WebCat migrates beautifully into Blackboard and any tools in WebCat, blogs, journals, etc. will migrate well. They will do Faculty / Student Satisfaction Surveys.

July 2011 is the date everyone will be on Blackboard 9 and will turn off Vista (WebCat).

Comment: I know we have an 800 number for tech support. The few times I’ve talked to tech support, they don’t know what they are talking about.

Comment: Right that is our outsourced support level 1. For level 2 support it is escalated to the Coulter Faculty Center. The number for WebCat Team is 2930 and you can always call them for assistance.

Comment: If you are already familiar with WebCat will it be fairly easy?

Comment: It is going to be easy…Dr. McFadden shared her experience with migrating a class that went almost flawlessly.

Another somewhat related issue is there was a question about storage on the H drive that came up at the Faculty Caucus. Campus has just purchased some storage. We are leasing storage and once in place for a standard faculty user you will go from 300 MB to 1G. On email will move from 500 MB to 750 MB.

**Comments from John Bardo:**

Last week the comment was made about the 42 hours and if we reduced that we would be in violation of accreditation. I pointed out that accreditation requires 30 hours. Please don’t interpret that as my belief that 30 hours is the right number of general education. It is just a SACS minimum. I don’t believe we are in any danger of recommending a 27 hour general education program. I don’t think that’s out there, but it is not an accreditation question that we’re dealing with here in terms of number of hours; that’s just not on the table…

The other issue Dr. Bardo shared that worries him a lot is an accreditation issue. Currently under SACS standards 3.3.1 if he remembers the number correctly, institutional effectiveness and specifically, the effectiveness of general education, you must document 1) learning outcomes, 2)appropriate assessment and 3)that you are improving your program based on that assessment.

This is the standard and is a great concern. Dr. Bardo commented that nothing in our documentation highlighted that this is the primary role of the General Education Committee Council. It has to be, there is no choice. If it is not and if we are in the same place that we were in the last time we were up for review, we will not be accredited.

Dr. Bardo related the reason for this is President Obama’s speech in which he talked about effectiveness in education and cost reduction. Everything at the US Department of Education is about outcomes and cost—Everything. SACS is under the requirement by the US DOE to keep its certification that it must continue to raise standards on outcomes assessment of learning. What passed last time, can not pass next time because of the pressure SACS administration is under. The Bush administration seriously considered decertifying the region. That got pushed back and did not happen, but Obama’s education department is called Bush 3 in higher ed circles. There’s been no change and the reason is that the pressure is coming from the consumer and from congress.

You can count on this being an on-going conversation. The core question has to be that this committee has to provide the leadership and oversight that every element in general education must have defined outcomes, must have defined assessment and must be able to document improvement bases on the outcomes of that assessment.

Comment from Carol Burton: I think the language that I recall last time was that we could not demonstrate that our graduates had achieved the learning outcomes we had established. And we couldn’t because we didn’t have an assessment plan.

John Bardo: Correct, we really didn’t have the learning outcomes well defined. So, for example in P1, Social Sciences we have how many courses: 24. The question I would ask if I were leading the SACS team coming to Western: What are the outcomes for that area and how are you documenting that all of the courses for that area are achieving those learning outcomes and that you have improved the teaching in that area based on that. If you have 24 courses, all 24 courses have to achieve those learning outcomes. And the learning outcomes can’t be “exposure to Social Sciences.” It’s got to be more than that….

Comment: Are you saying that everything in P1 that there is a set of outcomes that each of these courses needs to….

Response from John Bardo: Must, not needs,

Comment: Is there a different outcome for each course?

Response from John Bardo: No, if you have a requirement in SACS it must have a learning outcome. If you say these 24 courses meet that objective, what is the objective?

Comment: An example might be..we’re doing this in the COB, is that the student has to demonstrate that they have the ability to write. You would measure that in all of the courses and all the P1 courses if that were the outcome there…

Comment from John Bardo: Right, but it might be reasonable, for example, any course in this area the student must be able to show they understand scientific method as applied to social and behaviorial science and that they can use that information to reach conclusions based on the particular subject matter of that field. That would be a legitimate learning outcome.

Discussion continued with Dr. Bardo wrapping up by saying this is the single biggest issue that we deal with. The two questions that always come up: 1. Effectiveness of the institution primarily around the education program and 2. Are you financially stable? Those are the two issues. There are others that can come up, but when anyone gets in difficulty with SACS it is almost always around these two.

Richard Beam interjected that that is probably more that this committee, whatever it may eventually be called, that this task force that is looking at general education that will be looking at this…creating the learning outcomes and so on will have to come from them.

Dr. Bardo responded that as we are modifying the By-Laws I think it would be helpful, that this committee is the one that assures learning outcomes are being achieved. The committee will recommend learning outcomes and that will be through you, but remember part of what you are doing here with these By-Laws is documenting for SACS that you understand their standard. So, when they come back again you can say we know that it is in our By-Law.

Discussion continued.

Comment: Chancellor, I would be curious, who is the owner of general education? Who the stakeholder is? That’s one thing we are struggling with here. One perspective is the programs that grant the degrees have the most stake in the general education. There are other points of view. Mine would be that there are 500 faculty members here and the 500 of us own that program and it’s a reflection on all of us.

Response from John Bardo: I would tend to come down philosophically on the ownership of the faculty as a whole of all program quality in the institution. And that any program that is not being represented with quality is injuring the reputation of the university regardless of the location of the program. My feeling is the faculty own all curriculum and own the importance of quality of the curriculum.

Comment: If I could push you a little bit. We have faculty members that only teach doctoral students. Would your point of view be that the general education program also has some relevance to their career and they should have some proportional voice in the representation in the committee that manages it?

Response from John Bardo: My point of view is that all faculty who share the name of the institution own the curriculum regardless of area in which their curriculum resides. That does not mean that the profession if it is a profession has standards that are defined by the profession but it is important then for the faculty of the institution to be comfortable that the standards of the profession are being adhered to at a reasoned level.

Comment: Every faculty member has a voice, some have more stake than others…whether the people that have the responsibility for generating a graduate out of this institution that it is proud of that has the capability in their general ed, those people have more responsibility and stake in it. So, it’s not a question of voice, it’s a question of intensity of voice. He used the word proportional and I think that’s key because it it proportional to degrees granted or is it proportional to number of faculty?

Response from John Bardo: No, I couldn’t argue either of those…I would argue is that the faculty as a whole has a vested interest in the educational quality of anything produced at this institution that is equal to their proportion of the faculty and equal to their I will say that the faculty as a whole…and I am a member of the faculty. I firmly believe that I have a vested interest in the quality of every graduate whether I have any experience, expertise or capability in that field or I do not. It is critical to my reputation, and to my view of education that the quality of the program be appropriate for ownership by this institution…

Discussion continued with Dr. Bardo then commenting that the reason we have a Faculty Senate, that your purpose is to set an empirical standard that matches with the expectation of the faculty as a whole. You are here as a voice and representation of the faculty. Therefore if you have a committee that you are assigning the work to in a certain area, it is the responsibility of the committee to make their best judgments about what constitutes an appropriate outcome and bring those back to the Senate for the representation to say as a whole to say yes this is what we believe to be correct or no, it is not. That is I believe what the Senate’s primary function is. That is where this becomes very important and why I was raising the question about the By-laws because in the end as a Senate you can not be in a position, no faculty as a whole, can be in a position of having the institution losing accreditation because of their actions. And therefore it is critical that you as a faculty understand the standards that are set by our accrediting body and that your actions document that you are following those. You can do more than they require, but not less. As a collective we have agreed we will be accreditated to SACS.

Discussion continued about setting learning outcomes and measuring them.

Comment from Richard Beam: I do think we’re getting—I’m not suggesting these are not important issues. If you go back to the resolution about the Task Force, most of these issues are to be adopted by the Task Force.

Comment from Dr. Bardo: What I would ask for today, I would ask for the By-Laws to reflect in the way you structure that Liberal Studies Committee that you as a faculty are committed to the SACS standards that you understand that this is, if not the primary role, one of the primary roles, because that will help you and all of us at the next SACS review and it will also clarify for the committee when they get into the discussions that we’re having that their real purpose was to do this.

Discussion continued about defining outcomes.

Comment from Carol Burton: SACS does not determine what those outcomes should be and they almost don’t care. They entrust the faculty at each institution to develop those outcomes and to create the program that best fits their graduates. I’ve seen hundreds of those and some of them…have diversity or cultural awareness or information literacy, the whole gamet. The ACENU has put out wonderful materials to help institutions identify what those learning outcome could be; we could adopt some of those or not. It really is up to the faculty.

Discussion continued around the topic of outcomes and assessments and it was revealed that assessments can be different for each outcome and that it applies to every program not just general ed. It applies to every major, every program including non-credit courses.

At this point Richard Beam asked if the Senate was ready to proceed towards action and referred to the distribution of documents addressing the changes to the version from the Rules committee of the changes to the By-Laws and the version that was distributed by a member of Senate. It seemed that the proposed changes to Article II.10.1, Section 10.4, 10.5 and 10.6 there was no proposed change in the language between the two versions that were offered. Found the same to be true in Article III Section 3, in Article IV, Section 5.1, Article VI Section 4.1 (typo change, minor language change). In the hope of proceeding the chair would be happy to entertain a motion to adopt these changes that there doesn’t seem to be much dispute about. Motion made and seconded.

Discussion:

Comment: There was discussion last time. X had issues with UCC Committees considering all the programs…

Discussion centered around Section II.10.5, 10.3, 10.4 and the authority of the committees.

Comment: What this does is that it sets these councils up basically in parallel to 3 councils of the Senate, so that these councils report directly into the Senate so they are equivalent and they don’t have any representation or leadership from the Senate. Somehow I think you need to connect that linkage. Either you don’t do that and you have a report through the APRC which we used to do or make it parallel, streamline the process and we need to hook that in that we get reports, etc from the committees in a timely fashion.

Comment: …I feel personally that Article II 10.6 makes that clear, they report and send their recommendations to the Senate for consideration however as part of the streamlining process the idea was that this would be a direct process without the potential delay of funneling it through APRC to consider all of these things before it comes to Senate. Which is pretty much how things have been working for the past year or so.

Comment: I tried to make a differentiation to which bodies were making policy to which bodies were implementing policy but I could not make that clear. I put that aside. To me, if we are going to do it this way we need to have provisions in these bodies that you get reporting directly to the Senate on what’s going on either by the chairman, ex officio on the Senate or the chairman being the ex officio or somebody from the Senate be the chairman of these bodies. Otherwise they are not linked at all.

Comment: They send a report to the Senate; that’s the only link. They send a report on the curriculum but we ought to be involved in these processes specifically. Is that what you are saying?

Comment: Yes, but I’m not attached to it. I just think it’s good policy that you do that. It creates the link.

Comment: The only thing I could see that would make it equivalent to what we’re doing, but not slow down the process is the report could go through APRC but I don’t think having APRC re-vote everything on the curriculum would be appropriate. If you prefer that their report go to the APRC and then the Senate, I don’t see a big difference on that, but I do disagree with having APRC vote on everything again.

Comment: …We get reports from everyone of the councils, those councils produce resolutions from which we report on.

Comment: Lately they haven’t come from the councils, they have come from the floor (of the Senate).

Comment: Regardless, generally they are supposed to come from councils that have meetings and make a report. This sets up a policy where they don’t even regularly report to us.

Comment: Could you have a chair be on the APRC, flip it?

Comment: But (Section) 11.10.6 says The Faculty Senate will receive all recommendations from the above curriculum…

Comment: ….this change to the Constitution has given these bodies policy making (authority).

Comment: I do not understand your insistence on the use of the term policy. Saying we’re going to change the title or number of the course, that’s not policy and that’s what is being done by the curriculum committee. A serious change in policy is going through APRC to begin with.

Comment: Ok, let’s go back to the Liberal Studies Committee. You changed wording to say they are not overseers, they are just the Liberal Studies Committee and would give the responsibility for all modifications to the program. That’s not policy?....

Comment: If you will note, I specifically excluded Article II, Section 10.2 from that list. So, that is not on the floor.

Comment: If you go to the Faculty Handbook, there are still are sections that are not part of the Faculty By-Laws or Constitution that outline the curriculum development process and policies or procedures for curriculum review which is for the most part what the Rules Committee has taken and put into the By-Laws. ..It’s there, it’s in the handbook we’re just moving this so that it is easily found and so that you can in particular identify how do you get members of each committee?

Comment: Suggestion, in the Section II, 10.6, where it says, “Faculty members will receive all recommendations…” add the “from a regular report included in the Senate agenda” and that gives us an opportunity to talk to the chairman.

Discussion continued with reference made to the Excel Spreadsheet with all curriculum identified on the spreadsheet that is distributed before the meeting and anyone can bring any item forth to the Senate.

Comment: Do these other committees other than the Liberal Studies committee have learning objectives that they are required to modify and that we’re going to have problems with accreditation if they do not meet the standards? And, if so, I think that is a question.

Comment: I think X’s suggestion to put that language in 10.1 we put that language in that covers all of this.

Comment: So Professional Education Council, I’m assuming they have objectives that have to be assessed and they have to have feedback, is that correct. So, a proposal from PEC and as the Faculty Senate we’re going to vote to accept or reject…

Comment: That we accept the outcomes and that they’ve come up with a measure and a process for making changes based on what they do…

Comment from Dr. Bardo: Let me just clarify, general education, the reason I raised that here, is that general education applies to all majors regardless of college, applies to all bodies at the institution and therefore it is a university wide standard. Engineering has its own disciplinary standards and it would be appropriate for the Professional Education Council to document that the Professional Education Programs, in this case, Engineering, has outcomes that meet (their accrediting body’s) standardsand they are following the rules of their accrediting body and as long as that’s happening then SACS would be perfectly happy that they are meeting their professional standards. Where you are going to find most of the issues are in the majors that do not have professional accreditations because they’re not used to thinking like that. So that would be where you want to have a body of the Senate assuring this is happening across all majors regardless of whether professional or disciplinary. That SACS requires all programs to have learning outcomes appropriate to that program, assessments appropriate to those learning outcomes and documentation they are modifying the curriculum or other means of delivery to make it work better…That is required of all levels of the university. As the owners of the curriculum, where are you insuring it is happening appropriate to each level of the institution?

Comment: Again, we go back to Section 16 of the Handbook, there’s an entire section on WCU’s assessment program. My question is, is this not covered under the instructions per se rather than making one general statement in the By-Laws of the Constitution?

Comment: The area that we were in trouble on (were hit or miss on) was general education.

Comment: I was questioning X’s question about everyone and everything and in this case there’s so many different parts on who does what. I think detailing that in the By-Laws is not the purpose, that’s why there is this entire section in the Handbook.

Comment: I think if you would reference assessment that you understand that it is all curriculum. I think that would help us a good deal in the By-Laws whether it is Liberal Studies or not, but Liberal Studies is where we were weak in our assessment.

Comment: I propose a friendly amendment to Section II, 10.1 to read “The responsibility for curriculum assessment, development and revision rests with the faculty and is overseen by the Faculty Senate.”

Comment from Dr. Bardo: Yes, and when SACS comes back, it documents that Senate recognizes that this is now a core issue.

It was suggested that the word assessment be added to the heading in Section 10 also.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE ON PROPOSAL OF FRIENDLY AMENDMENT**

Chairman Richard Beam: Would the representatives of the Rules Committee agree that this is a friendly amendment? (answered affirmatively).

**25 Yes**

**1 No**

**The Vote passes.**

The next item raised for discussion is the proposal that Erin sent out yesterday regarding the Article II, Section 10.3 regarding the Graduate Council review of curriculum. There is revision to the language for the Graduate Council and there was one additional change to the language as a friendly amendment that the “excluding graduate education programs” be revised to read, “not excluding graduate education programs.”

Motion was made and seconded to adopt the changes.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE ON PROPOSAL OF FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE II, SECTION 10.3**

**25 Yes**

**0 No**

**Vote passes.**

The next item up for discussion is Article III, Section 5, Faculty Scholarship Advisory Committee, which has been significantly re-written about the Faculty Scholarship Advisory Committee.

Motion was made and seconded to adopt the revised language in the section.

Scott Higgins added that they are trying to make it consistent with the university mission to be more inclusive not just to be administratively focused. We don’t have people on there outside the colleges that are doing scholarship and we want to make sure that happens….

Comment: Unlike our other committees this one is appointed, do we want that? And, not elected?

Comment: In a time of faculty taking more responsibility. Elected is more in sync with that movement of faculty being more responsible. Whose motion is this?

Comment: FAC enjoined with Scott.

Comment: The reason I ask is who do I address a friendly amendment to?

Comment: I addressed the one I had to Scott just because it came to him, but I would say both.

Scott Higgins: Do you want to see the representatives to the college elected? …Is that what you are looking for?

Comment: Yes.

Scott Higgins: Then make that amendment.

Comment: So, made.

The language incorporating the friendly amendment reads as:

*…The Faculty Scholarship Advisory Committee shall be chaired by a nominated faculty member and composed of one elected representative from each college, appointed members from the Faculty Center, the Office for Undergraduate Studies and the Graduate Student Association. All college representative members shall be elected by the respective college faculty to serve three-year terms and may only serve two consecutive terms. Membership outside the college representatives serve term lengths as recommended by the Dean of the Graduate School, the Advisory Group shall meet at least once per semester.*

The motion was made and seconded.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE**

**26 Yes**

**0 No**

**Vote passes.**

Chairman Richard Beam:

The last item for discussion is Article II, Section 10.2 the question of the Liberal Studies Committee.

There are two slightly different forms circulated. One of these comes from the Rules Committee and does not require a motion to bring it to the floor. This is the item that is currently on the floor.

Comment: I propose a friendly amendment to Article II 10.2.a to insert language that the Liberal Studies Committee *monitors, assesses and maintains established learning outcomes within the program*, and then continues as written.

It seems to me that addresses the issue the Chancellor was concerned about and it doesn’t change the tenor of what was proposed initially by the Rules Committee.

Comment from Dr. Bardo: That would meet the obligation for SACS.

Comment: Where are the learning outcomes going to come from?

Comment: Initially at least they would be developed by the Task Force that creates the…

Comment: Well they are already in existence.

Comment: If the Task Force comes up with new ones, they are charged with developing learning outcomes and assessment techniques and so on and once those are adopted this committee would be enforcing them.

Comment: So that substantially changes the objection that X and I, at least that I objected to that seem to give Liberal Studies Committee power over the learning objectives. So, complete revisions of the program gives that committee power to change what the objectives are.

Comment from: If I can interrupt in the interest of time. It seems to me that X has raised two further questions and they are both appropriate. One has to do with revising the language suggesting that the Liberal Studies Committee can be charged with total revision of the program. Personally as someone who does not vote in this body and that’s my personal choice, I like the language that Jack has proposed for that statement suggesting if there is going to be a total revision, there be a separate task force set up. The other issue has to do with how the numerical make up of this committee; whether it reflects FTE, Undergraduate students or proportion of undergraduate degrees confirmed. I have no specific preference on that. I support the idea that we might want to amend this proposed amendment to include the language that X has done here. Which is basically what we have already done, we would simply be putting it into the Constitution.

Comment: I have one question about the previous amendment. If we say this committee monitors, assesses and maintains it sounds like this committee assesses learning outcomes.

Comment: ….My understanding they have to turn in and the Liberal Studies Committee is actually the one that has to assess whether those courses, groups, meet the outcomes they were charged with.

Comment: That’s correct.

Comment: It’s also correct that is why the LSC has the responsibility of reviewing LS courses –that is what they are supposed to be doing is determining whether or not there is an assessment, there are appropriate learning outcomes to satisfy the current LS program. That should be happening...before it ever gets to us for what is usually a fairly routine approval… I interpret our actions as a Senate that we are approving these courses based on the fact that these matters have been looked at.

Comment: What I’m reading, the amendment does not give this committee power to establish or change; it is a monitor, assess and maintain what has already been established.

Comment: …that was exactly my point, the actual outcomes and so on. If X proposes a LS class, he has to demonstrate in the paperwork going to the committee how it is that what he is proposing is going to be assessed and how it fits into the outcomes that are established; either the ongoing process or in the case of revision, the standards that have been established by the task force.

Discussion continued

Comment: I suggest a change to the language to say: *monitors and maintains established learning outcomes and their assessment within the program.*

What it says they are not responsible for assessing, but they’re making sure the proposals have assessments in them.

Comment from Dr. Bardo: If I might, it is critical that a committee of the faculty document that the assessments are happening, and that those assessments meet the standards of the faculty. Not that they do the assessments themselves, but that the assessments are happening and they meet the standards of the faculty. That is what I believe SACS is asking for.

Comment: Will SACS also ask to see the data?

Comment: Oh, yes.

Comment: Different language suggested: *monitors and maintains established learning outcomes and documents their assessment within the program.*

Comment: Who sets learning outcomes? The instructor?

Comment: The faculty, not the instructor.

Comment: Who is assessing the outcomes?

Comment from Dr. Bardo: The outcomes, there has to be a plan for the assessment that can not be the grade in the class. It could be that you do something with a final exam that a broader group looks at within a rubric that says yes, that is doing it. It could be a standardized test, but something other than all students in the class will get at least a “ C”. An assessment involves, “how do you know what a C means?”

Richard Beam: Are we all agreed with what is on the floor? This is a friendly amendment.

There are still two issues left. One is whether or not, I throw this at X because he was the one who proposed it, to amend this amendment with the language X suggested *while the LSOC will have the authority to suggest the total revision of this program…* basically saying that an independent task force will be required, will be empanelled by the Faculty Senate….

This amendment was seconded.

Richard Beam: Is this controversial enough as to whether we need a vote by clickers on this amendment to the amendment.

Comment: Is the purpose of this new amendment is to prevent the LSC committee from total power over changing the curriculum, and then the task force will have total power over changing that curriculum?

Comment: Yes

Comment: And so the task force is better suited to that?

Comment: I think the idea we were discussing is that the LS committee meets every week and has got a perspective and a view and they are dealing with nuts and bolts. To ask them to gain perspective on how does this fit into the big picture. It is just inconsistent with the role they play every week…

Comment: And the task force reports back to LSC or to us?

Comment: To us, to me that is the most significant change is that if there is desire for complete revision of the program they may make that suggestion to the Senate, but the Senate creates a task force for that kind of revision which then would have a different make up…

Chairman Richard Beam: There is still one issue that remains before we are ready to vote on the while think as amended. That is whether the membership of the LSC will be elected according to the proportion of undergraduate degrees conferred or in proportion to the full time equivalent undergraduate students in each unit. Based on the data I have seen, X prepared some that has been passed out. I’m not sure there is a significant difference.

Comment: I think there is. If you go by undergraduate degree, it goes Arts and Science, 3, Business, 1, Education 4, and that’s giving a little Fine and Performing Arts, 1 Health and Human Sciences, 5 and Kimmel School 1.

With FTE instead of 3 its 4, instead of 1 its 2, instead of 4 its 2, 1 and 1, instead of 3 its 5, instead of 1 its 2. So it is quite a difference. I guess because of my perspective in Education is you go from graduation we have 4 members, by FTE you have 2.

References made to an analysis done with averages of different methods. Another analysis done by SCH was completed. A comment was made that what was proposed by the Rules Committee was to use FTEs.

The analysis are quite different in terms of what the numbers come out to.

Concerned was expressed about the amount of time that LSC committee people have to take and how much time and amount of committees we have in the university. If we have 15 more people’s time is spent.

Discussion was had about voting on the motion on the floor which is the one put forward by the Rules Committee.

Comment: There are two issues that are kind of mixed up here perhaps we can separate them. How many do we want on the committee?

Comment: I think the Rules Committee would support the smaller, 10 or 11 people (10 + library).

Comment: Would that be accepted as a friendly amendment?

Comment: I would think so.

Comment: We don’t have numbers to support that.

Comment: Yea, we kind of on the right bottom.

Comment: Can I add one complicating item? In light of what we started out with, an alternative framework for proportionately, might be, and in my opinion this would be the best way to do it, would be Full Time Faculty in each college. That’s who owns the program.

Comment: I disagree.

Comment: I disagree.

Discussion continued.

Comment: I agree with that because if we all own it, we are all working from the same platform than the size of the college is going to deal more with communication and getting the information around.

Comment: The problem with that is the College of Business is a customer of the LS program and I don’t have…

Comment: All of our students are a customer of the program.

Comment: I understand that.

Comment: Let me again, the idea that it’s customer driven, that we have faculty that are end users of the program and they should have larger voice in what that program is, I think is a faulty premise.

I’m going to stretch the point….WCU in some future point evolves to the mission that everyone of our graduates, everyone of the degrees we grant is either a teacher, or a nurse or a health practitioner or a business degree holder…then the college of arts and sciences has zero members in this committee which I think is patently absurd.

Comment: No, it’s not patently absurd because you probably would not have many faculty members in Arts & Sciences College.

Comment: We have many faculty members who are spending their careers contributing to the education of our students, but are not granting degrees to students.

This discussion continued and a clarification was made that what is on the table is the FTE undergraduate students in each unit.

Comment: Please interpret that. That is an ambiguous statement. Does that mean that we take the SCH generated with prefixes within that college and convert them to FTE based on the 12-cell grid?

Is that what that means?

Comment: It means I asked Melissa for FTE by College. I honestly don’t know. I think its by prefix of the course.

Discussion continued with a question being raised about the undeclared numbers under the FTE analysis. Basically the question is how do we have faculty under the undeclared category?

Comment from Dr. Bardo: FTE is the number of credit hours generated in a prefix divided by 15.

It has nothing to do with how you generate faculty FTE. The funding formula only talks about generating faculty FTE it doesn’t talk about generating student FTE. Student FTE by IPEDS standard is credit hours at the undergraduate level divided by 15, it is credit hours in a discipline divided by 15. The assumption is that a full time equivalent student takes 15 credit hours a semester. That is what an FTE student is. At the graduate level it is 9 hours.

Comment: And the fact that it is distributed by prefix means that it can be assigned to a specific college.

Comment: Correct, if I were the chair of the Sociology department, I would look at my FTE students for taking the number of credit hours generated in Sociology divided by 15… That is what an FTE student is; it has nothing to do with the funding FTE.

It was determined that a vote is needed on whether the discussion or debate are closed. No means the discussion will continue.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE**

**2/3 majority Yes**

**minority No**

**The Vote passes.**

**Next an Electronic Vote was held on Section 11, 10.2 and the amendment on the table.**

Comment: If this fails, then the language as it sits basing it on FTEs would not be accepted.

Comment: The whole section would not be accepted.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE**

**15 Yes**

**9 No**

**The Motion failed.**

Comment: I ask for a friendly amendment to change the language to base it on degrees granted as X’s language proposed. The motion was seconded.

Comment: I am fundamentally opposed to basing it on degrees granted. I think it is a really bad idea.

Comment: It is not a friendly amendment; it’s been objected to. Now it has to be voted on as an amendment.

Comment from Chairman Beam: It has been moved that we change the language to read that “*by calculating the proportion of degrees conferred in each unit.”*

**ELECTRONIC VOTE**

**15 Yes**

**6 No**

**1 Abstain**

**The amendment passes.**

Now the next vote is whether or not the Article II, Section 10.2 as amended is to be adopted.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE**

**14 Yes**

**8 No**

**1 Abstain**

**The motion fails.**

The Chairman moved to table the Article II, Section 10.2 discussion until the next meeting.

Meeting Adjourned.

**COUNCIL REPORTS**

Faculty Affairs Council /Frank Lockwood, Chair:

OTHER

Old Business:

None.

Other New Business: