Faculty Senate

**MINUTES**

***November 20, 2014***

***3:00 -5:00 p.m.***

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

ROLL CALL

Present:

Andrew Adams, Bob Beaudet, David Belcher, Lisa Bloom, Christopher Cooper, Yang Fan, George Ford, Katy Ginanni, David Henderson, Mary Jean Herzog, Ian Hewer, Beth Huber, Leroy Kauffman, Will Lehman, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Bob Mulligan, Peter Tay, Karyn Tomczak, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, Tonya Westbrook, John Whitmire

Members with Proxies:

Kia Asberg, Shawn Collins, Jeanne Dulworth, AJ Grube

Members Absent:
David Dorondo

Recorder:

Ann Green

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Motion:

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of October 23, 2014 were approved and the Overflow Meeting of October 30, 2014 were approved with amendments.

**EXTERNAL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Chancellor’s Report/David Belcher:

The Chancellor’s Report was posted on SharePoint prior to the meeting.

Discussion following the Chancellor’s Report:

Q/C: …I respect your attention and your pain in this big issue and your position as the top administrator in the university, but I don’t see how it could be any different then the way you are taking. As pure faculty members without administrative responsibilities, it may well be that the conclusions and positions that we reach will differ from that and I think it’s really important that we are all comfortable with having different perspectives on this issue and that we have a level of comfort in the debate over where we stand.

A: Absolutely. Absolutely.

Q/C: As a psychologist for instance a head injury issue affects me in the sense of ethics and morality and so that is part of the way I assess things.

A: I’ll tell you an interesting thing from my point of view…I don’t know how close you are following what is going on with the NCAA. There is a brand new governance system. I’m on the presidential advisory group to the NCAA. There’s a representative from every FCS and non-football division 1 conference and I represent the Southern Conference on the Presidential Advisory Group. I got installed in that about a year and a half ago and I’ve been in meeting after meeting all about this new governance document and it’s all this autonomy to the big five and the lesser five sort of follow along for good measure. There is a whole new governance structure which is expanding the board of directors of the NCAA from seventeen to twenty. …Come next summer I will be one of 20 presidents on the board of the NCAA. It’s going to be fascinating, …Both SACSCOC and the NCAA put Athletics squarely on the shoulders of the chancellor or the president so it’s an important issue that we have to deal with.

Q/C: …a few times it’s come up in Faculty Senate conversations, the FAR (Faculty Athletics Representative). I know different universities have different models for how you put in an FAR, and some of them like us you have it’s a chancellor’s appointment so its normal so like that’s weird. But I know that A.J. does a great job, but I am curious going forward when A.J.’s not doing the job if at some point if you might be open to having the faculty elect a Faculty Athletics Representative.

A: Sure. Absolutely…we are talking about what is the role of the Athletics University Committee. I think my predecessor put together and you know, I appoint some people and ya’ll appoint some people…the question is if it reports to the chancellor what is it? Is it the Faculty Senate receive a report? So, I think this is a good live conversation that can only strengthen things and I think the question that you ask is very much in line with that.

Q/C: …you said some of our sister institutions I think are going to ask for 5% and what you think the reception.

A: I don’t think it will be good at all. When the board was on our campus; at the August meeting when we had talked about some of these things, they were saying things like no more than 3%. It says 5, but not 5% - (it should be) 3%. On our campus the budget finance committee basically said he didn’t want to see a request for any increase whatsoever. We’re going to push that a little bit. Every campus is going to ask. I think we are trying to be as lean as possible in our requests so we can have some hope of actually getting anything. … we’re not going to have any flexibility if we don’t have a little bit of funding coming into the institution. The Budget Finance Committee had a conference call last week and I think the question of how higher ed is funded in NC is bubbling up in the Board of Governors. I did not help matters in that regard last week by pointing out how the system is completely bifurcated to begin with…we are funded based on enrollment, but the system wants to use metrics on us like retention rates, graduation rates, how many alums give to the university…so, what do you want? You need to fund what you want and then we’ll go and we’ll do….

**Provost Report/Alison Morrison Shetlar:**

The Provost Report and materials was submitted and posted on Sharepoint prior to the meeting.

Discussion following the Provost’s Report:

Q/C: We have a previously designated emeritus faculty member who does not now have email.

A: They’ve already been issued one. …We contacted all the faculty who have been retired emeritus and asked them if they wanted an email and if they said yes, we provided one for them.

Q/C: …if the weather is supposed to be terrible, for a straight week, are you going to cancel it on each day or will it be cancelled for a week?

A: We cancel it each day and if something happens during the day, for instance, evening classes might be canceled. The agreement is to have those canceled by 4 p.m….as you know there are microclimates in this area so it can be quite difficult in one area and not on campus or immediate surrounding areas. The way that Tammy Hudson and I are working is to clearly delineate if the CAT-TRAN can run or not. The ability to get students from one end of campus to another is one of our safety criteria…on days when it looks to be bad she and I are in constant contact.

Q/C: Will the same timelines (in relation to weather announcements) apply to Biltmore Park?

A: We will deal with that slightly differently in terms of the timelines it will be the same in terms of evening classes and day classes so yes to that. We work very closely with UNC Asheville and make sure we are in alignment there… We have a lot of activities during the day now at Biltmore Park. It is hopping during the day as well as the evening so we will make sure we get communication to those community members who are involved at Biltmore.

Q/C: …Last year because of the numbers…the idea of switching class to online--there are a pretty consistent number of students who actually don’t have access to internet or decently fast internet because of their home or the region and maybe by choice financially. It sounds simple, but may not be…a lot of micromanagement for the faculty to come up with something that is fair, meaningful and timely. We can’t just put out this canned thing…

I would want to flag…it definitely came up last year in terms of workload and effort and positives and good outcomes. Some days it did not feel that way. Every year is so different with the weather and I get that and that faculty need to be in touch with their students…if the expectations is that it will be documented that the faculty has made an assignment as a replacement for that hour or 3-hour lab. There is some grey area in there.

A: I think that’s a really good point and my preference is to leave it to the good judgement of the faculty member to make sure that the students get a good educational experience. We’re not going to micromanage that in terms of individual faculty… Discussion continued.

**Faculty Assembly Report/Linda Comer:**

The report on the Faculty Assembly is posted on Sharepoint.

Discussion:

Q/C: On the military training there is a whole system that already is evaluative objectives, training, learning objectives that you mentioned…the American Council on Education provides a transcript for all service members…so a lot of that work is done…the reviews I do are just for Engineering and Construction. We review those courses for our content so I feel very strong that those are good evaluations.

A: They brought that up and many of the institutions are using those assessments for military service. Some are not and as you said there are some branches of the service that it doesn’t translate to so it’s a matter of pulling together what’s being done and standardizing it in some way.

Q/C: If there is anyway I can help with the committee, I would be happy to show them the process. I think Lowell would also be impressed with the evaluations.

Q/C from Provost Alison Morrison-Shetlar: And X, we do use that on this campus extensively. As you know we are one of the most military friendly campuses in the nation and that is highly used on this campus.

Q/C: I think one of the things they are looking for from the GA perspective, is something similar to the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement where if it is this, it will be accepted as this UNC wide as opposed to us doing it, them not, them maybe or evaluating it differently. I’m sure at the CAO, this is one of your discussions too. It they are looking for something that if military, or somebody with prior training experience; not just military, though that’s the one that’s probably the most advanced, to make it friendly to them to see I’ve done this, this is what I get credit for – to make it friendly to them that way.

A: Yes, to broaden it. It’s not just about military although that way is being implemented mainly right now in our system. There is a movement out there to grant people academic credit for prior learning or competencies that they’ve mastered in other experiences in life…that really could be a big game changer in higher education and this is a piece of that.

Discussion continued.

Staff Senate/David Rathbone:

One of the Staff Senate student scholarship receipients is graduating in a few weeks. The Staff Senate is very glad they were able to help with that. Sargent Jerry Adams’ daughter has accepted a scholarship award and will receive $500 for the spring semester. The Staff Senate’s ornaments will be going out to Charlotte and Raleigh to be sold thanks to Marty Ramsey and the alumni. This will help sell more ornaments than they have in previous years. They have gained about $7000 in discretionary funds. They will have a vote this spring to put the bulk of this money in a general fund that will gain more money for scholarships in the future. There is a meeting of the Staff Assembly in Raleigh which will include an invitation to a Board of Governors meeting on December 5th. The Senate is planning a three-hour retreat at the HHS Building and David gave a summary of events at the retreat.

Chair Kauffman reminded everyone that there are really nice ornaments for sale by Staff Senate in the colors of purple, gold and white. The proceeds go to support scholarships.

SGA/John MacEwen:

The SGA had a dining forum yesterday to talk about new ideas and what is happening at Brown. They have talked about tuition and fees recently and the library hours pilot. They are trying to get the news out about the library hours. They also discussed the flag at halftime at the last home game to honor veterans.

SACSCOC Update/Steve Miller, Director SACSCOC Reaffirmation:

At the last Senate meeting, the importance of the QEP and the topic selection process for the next QEP was discussed. The original QEP on Synthesis has not gone away and is part of the university culture. Although Synthesis is no longer the QEP as we are in the process of selecting a new one, it is still part of the university and what we do. It is under Undergraduate Studies and Carol Burton has taken the lead on it. The website has migrated from QEP.wcu.edu to IntentionalLearning.wcu.edu and you can see there all the great stuff that is going on on campus that is the continuing implementation of our original QEP. The qep.wcu.edu will soon be the site for hosting the call for topics for the QEP which will open up in January. There will be an open forum in January and the plan is to have both provost and chancellor there to help kick off the selection of a new QEP topic. It is important to accreditation and also important to our academic culture. It is how we can continuously improve in terms of student learning outcomes. Please be thinking about and discussing with your collegues on the importance of assessment and how you can actually use it to make your programs even better.

Chair Kauffman reminded everyone that the timeline for the QEP selection is out and available.

SENATE COUNCIL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Academic Policy and Review Council (APRC) / Katy Ginanni, Chair

Chair Kauffman led off by stating that he was making a bit of an executive decision with regards to the one curriculum matter that since it was not distributed early enough for people to re-look it over he suggested a first hearing and discussion and then pick it up for vote at the next meeting.

A system generated email from Curriculog was sent out, but it appears that Senators did not receive the email.

Dr. Mimi Fenton, dean of the Graduate School, gave an overview of the curriculum proposal which is the Appendix A, Permission to Plan for a Psychology doctorate. It has been worked on and has gone through the Council of Deans twice, and through the Curriculog process in respect to getting everyone’s feedback. Dean Fenton explained the Appendix A now goes to General Administration and they will give feedback. It will probably be sent back a couple of times for any corrections or revisions and then it goes forward for distribution to all 17 of the UNC campuses for feedback, then is presented to the NC Council of Graduate Deans by the Psychology Department administrators and then a vote for permission to plan the program. There is some urgency to this because it has been worked on for two and half years and it needs to get up to General Administration so it can receive feedback in a timely way. It is under somewhat of a deadline due to some changes in the laws that NC is not going to allow clinicians with masters degrees to practice in NC starting in 2017. The curriculum process is an attenuated, elongated process that could potentially be a detriment to us being able offer the curriculum in a timely manner.

Katy Ginanni commented that the hope is for implementation in fall of 2016 (confirmed by Dean Fenton).

Discussion continued on the vetting that has already taken place through councils including the APRC.

Q/C: You are requesting that we vote on this despite not having access to Curriculog, am I getting that right?

Q/C: Everyone has access to Curriculog and they could look this up. It’s just this was not on the agenda.

Q/C: Because I would also like to request the item about the Comprehensive MAEd adjusting credit hour requirements.

A: Actually since that is just a program change, I don’t think we have to vote on that.

Q/C: Unless somebody wants to take exception to it.

Chair Kauffman asked for an informal show of hands vote on if Senate is willing to modify protocol to take a vote on the permission to plan today.

The outcome of the informal vote was to move ahead with the vote on the curriculum proposal.

Dr. David McCord of the Psychology Department gave additional background information. In summary, WCU has offered a masters degree in Clinical Psychology for almost 45 years and the program has provided a lot of mental health community personnel for the area. The proposed doctorate of Psychology is consistent with the other three doctoral degrees in existence at Western, the EdD, DNP and DPT. A PhD would not be consistent with the other offerings.

Q/C: So, they would get a masters degree first?

A: Yes.

Q/C: What is the job market like for PsyD holders?

A: That is a big part of what is in the Appendix A. It’s strong. This would be the only PsyD program in NC. The PhD programs are remarkably limited in how many they take. Cohorts are 4 to 5 and you put them all together you don’t address a fraction of the need for psychologists in NC.

Q/C: What would be your cohort size?

A: Six

Q/C: Question for Alison from a provost perspective and our Carnegie Classification…as we continue to add doctoral programs where do we cross over?

A from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: That’s a good question and I don’t have a definitive answer for that and I’ll certainly find that out. I’m very supportive of this for all the reasons David stated and because I think it meets our mission as as institution. I don’t know how far it would take us over. But we always have to specify how many of each program we provide. I think it behooves us to move in this direction as we did with Physical Therapy. It’s happening nationally. If we don’t do it, we are doing ourselves a disservice.

Q/C from Associate Provost Brandon Schwab: I’ve been looking into this and this would not be a substantive change in terms of SACSCOC accreditation. We would have to submit a prospectus, but we don’t have to do the bigger step.

Q/C from Chair Kauffman: This is a Permission to Plan as was mentioned. There are other protocols as Dean Fenton mentioned…and eventually it develops into the curriculum that we ultimately will see again. This allows them to move ahead with our blessing with a more definitive plan.

Q/C from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: Just an fyi, each institution has the opportunity to put forward three programs for consideration and they are thinking of expanding that to five and the PsyD is up there.

Q/C: I want to register for the minutes that while I logged into Curriculog and read this today, substantively I am in favor of it and will vote in favor of it, as a deliberative body, it is a bad idea to get into the habit of doing what we’re doing now when we haven’t all necessarily had the opportunity to go in and get this on record. I think the whole point of a deliberative body is to have time to deliberate about these issues. So, I would like to put in the record; register that for the record.

Q/C: I would agree with you as well. …we find ourselves in a point of transition with Curriculog. A year from now this wouldn’t be an issue because we would know how to log into Curriculog and it would flow smoother, but your point is well taken.

Q/C: I agree. I think it is a very legitimate point and it should be in the record and I would make it myself in other circumstances. The only thing I can say in defense is when it’s planned; when the curriculum is planned, and comes back through, it won’t be rushed through. That’s the point – this is the program itself, there’s no real curriculum.

**Vote on Poll Everywhere on the PsyD Curriculum Proposal:**

**YES: Unanimous**

**NO: None**

**Abstain: None**

**The vote passes.**

*Fostering Student Success*

Lowell Davis, assistant vice chancellor for student success, came to talk to APRC. They are waiting for guidelines from G.A. There is not an update yet. The policy was amended on August 1st.

*Revision to Academic Integrity Policy*

Kevin Koett, associate vice chancellor of student affairs and dean of students, wasn’t able to meet with APRC because of Division of Student Affairs Budget Hearings. The meeting is delayed until January.

*Curriculog access for Senate*

There were issues with senators receiving notice in Curriculog, but Ann Green added Faculty Senate members to the APRC in Curriculog so when I send an agenda to the APRC, you should all get it also. That should give you at least a week to review curriculum and whatever curriculum is out there even if it’s not something the APRC is reviewing. In the future you should get a system generated email from Curriculog saying there is an APRC agenda and if you click on that it will take you to Curriculog and you can see the proposals listed there.

Q/C: My understanding for our voting procedures is that it also needs to be on what I send out to the entire university before we can vote, is that correct? As far as on an announced agenda to the general faculty?

Q/C: I don’t know. I don’t remember that happening in the past.

Q/C: By the deadlines that the curriculum calendar is set, it’s announced to the university when the senate is supposed to be enacting on things. We never used to send out specific, but you could look at the spreadsheet on the h drive, which apparently isn’t there. It would be lovely if Curriculug could generate something like that or I guess it’s kind of closest to the agenda. I guess formally everybody can go on and look at the agenda for the APRC if they should want so we should probably say with every meeting feel free to look at the agenda that Katy Ginanni posts that will have the curriculum up for vote by the Faculty Senate. I don’t think you have to send out specifically; we haven’t historically.

Q/C: As long as it’s available for public comment.

Q/C: If you click on ‘All Proposals’ everything we’re supposed to – is there where you find it? – Everything we’re supposed to look at.

Q/C: You could. You click on this tab that says ‘All Proposals’ you see every proposal that’s out there, but if you click on ‘Agendas’ the way I’m going to do it from now on is (to name the agenda) “APRC/Faculty Senate,” so that is the one. Click on view agenda and there will be a link to any proposals we’re considering in that meeting.

Discussion continued with instructions for locating the agenda.

Collegial Review Council (CRC) / Erin McNelis, Chair

There is nothing coming to Senate today for a vote. The CRC heard from Andrew Adams on the proposal for verbage to be added to the Faculty Handbook regarding Activity Insight. The intention is to cut that back a lot and they discussed the use of it in CRC. It will be coming back to them in January for review. Andrew also reported on data security already in place and this answered some questions from the last meeting. They split the group into sub-committees to deal with minimum criteria and expectations for awarding emeritus status and that process, and on standardization of CoursEval reports and investigating promotion of tenure and non-tenured faculty. The Council as a whole will work on Post-Tenure Review (PTR) together. Associate Provost Brandon Schwab has asked to schedule a department heads meeting with the Collegial Review Council. The meeting is set for the first week of school in January. They will be discussing ideas.

Faculty Affairs Council / A.J. Grube, Chair (Report by Lisa Bloom):

There was a resolution sent to FAC on the transparency of SAI data and grade distribution data. They discussed the resolution but sent it back to the originator with questions/concerns. It will be discussed further if the resolution comes back to the council.

There is a subcommittee looking at fixed-term faculty issues and the committee has a list of questions that they will begin addressing.

There was a resolution sent on music around the Coulter Building and class hours. They decided that a revised resolution would be drafted that might address outside noise that would include other things like lawn mowers near academic buildings during peak class hours.

The last thing is the SOCON Faculty Award Campus Winner – Lisa did not have information on this, but

Chair Kauffman was able to share that the response from Senate for volunteers to serve on the election committee was underwhelming to non-existent so he served on the committee. The SOCON is very intentional about bringing athletics and academics together. It’s not just about athletics; it’s also about academics. They have invited every school in the SOCON to submit the name of a faculty member to be recognized as the SOCON faculty member of the year (or something similar). They will be recognized at the men’s basketball final game in Asheville in March. The person selected will get a $4000 check. Our committee has selected a person whose name will be put forward. This will happen again next year.

Rules Committee / David McCord, Chair:

The Rules Committee is meeting December 2nd. There is a tentative agenda with items that are important, but not time urgent.

Senate Chair Report / Leroy Kauffman, Chair:

The Faculty Assemblies have been thematic. The last one was about student success. A lot of time was spent giving feedback from faculty back to the GA staff people who are working on these issues.

The theme for the January Faculty Assembly is faculty work conditions. As an agenda is made available, Leroy will ask for senators to share feedback and comments on the topics. The chancellor reported on items that came out of the chancellor’s leadership council.

Leroy offered to anyone interested that there are 12 tickets to a men’s basketball tickets available for January 15th and February 5th. He will send a note to Senate when he has the tickets in his possession.

SENATE COUNCIL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

New Business:

Chair Kauffman said the topic of early registration came up at the Faculty Planning team meeting and is on the agenda for discussion at this meeting. David McCord introduced the topic and gave an overview. Feedback received from this discussion will be brought to the Planning Team and they will decide where to go from there, i.e. give it to a task force, assign to a council, or take another path.

David explained that the issue of early registration has slowly bubbled up to be significant and involves approximately 6500 undergraduate resident students (Cullowhee campus students). At issue is the access to on-campus courses for these students. There is a therotically good system of staggering registration based on how far away you are from graduation. For spring registration those people who are going to graduate in spring need access to the schedule first so they can get the classes they need and can graduate on time. This system would have a positive impact on degree efficiency which is a performance metric and a source of funds for the university. August graduates should be next in line and then the December graduates in order to have a clear priority concept. WCU had that in place. The registrar and banner are highly sophisticated, both the person and the system. It can be done in terms of by the hour and this is concept David argued should be the driving concept.

Well- intentioned people a long time ago said students with disabilities need to pre-empt the system because there are some legitimate needs for scheduling and building access that are required. Clearly there are some students with some disabilities that warrant that, but there are some disabilities that this is not relevant.

Honors College students were added to the early registration group. As David explained, there is no logic to the need for Honors College students to the need for early registration. It is just a perk. Athletes having early registration access to the schedule is saying athletic need to get to the schedule before regular students so they can get schedules that match their practice schedules. As academics and as faculty this is saying we want a system that makes sure we don’t allow student athletes’ academic work to interfere with their athletic practice.

Cheerleaders made a very legitimate case that if the athletes can do it, cheerleaders are athletes too and they have the same practice schedule. Cheerleaders won this argument and the dance team got in on it also. Then because we like our freshman to take a Collegiate Learning Assessment for which they were paid to take, but that wasn’t working, so they got added to the early registration population.

The band is not in the early registration group yet, but if they are let in that would bring the early registrants up to about 2500 fighting for 6500 seats including a lot of seniors needing to graduate. It has evolved to over a third of the students. As David explained if you are in the trenches this is a huge problem for students getting close to graduation. There are are students who waited until their number came up and at midnight every class they needed to graduate was full. The seats are being filled by sophmores who can take them next semester and the next. It is disruptive to degree completion and to the faculty who handle overrides because that is all you do during the entire registration. Every midnight presents a flood of people needing overrides.

David shared that his vote would be to remove all early registration entirely and let logic drive the system with the one exception of students with disabilities whose disabilities warrant early registration logically and the Office of Disability Services can add that as accommodation as they do in other situations. This would smooth things out tremendously for faculty and for our students and mainly would smooth the progress toward graduation. Early registration is grossly out-of-hand to open the gates for over a third of our students.

Q/C: After hearing that long list and being a mother of two sons that are now students at Western and belong in none of those lists, I want to now include all male students with the last name of X…

Q/C: …what is the rationale for the Honor’s Students?

A: It’s a perk. Brian will admit it. The tail wagging the dog is the metaphor. Start asking your Honors students in your classes what exactly they are in Honors College for and a phenomenal number will say for early registration. That’s why they’re in Honors College. This is the largest contingent by far of the early registrants with over 1500 in number.

Q/C: It would not be hard to make that early registration just subservient to the class order thing also. Early for seniors, etc.

A: Here’s another ironic piece though…one of my seniors would have a better shot in getting the classes he needs if you really went the full hunger games route. He would at least have a fighting chance at midnight.

Q/C: Would the problem be resolved if we do it by grade level?

A: Yes, and I think we can do it even more fine tuned than that. I think we should do it by anticipating – we have three graduations per year – those three conferrals and stagger the dates back from there.

Q/C: It seems to me that the students who need the courses to graduate should be a priority. This brings up the question, do we have enough faculty for some of these majors that can’t get the courses?

A: Registration is so out of whack, it’s hard to know what the supply and demand would be if we were organized in our registration.

Q/C: I’m with you in that it affects me every semester. I’ve got seniors on my advising list that I’m not having to put in the override request for because they are not in classes they need.

Q/C: Yea, that’s not right and it really hurts my feelings that honors students are on this list. My son is going to apply to Honors College next year and I’m going to ask him when I get home, why he wants to do that. If he says so he registers early, I’ll let you know.

Q/C: I also agree with a lot of the categories you mentioned, we’ve got athletes. That is a bit of the tail wagging the dog…I’m with you on that.

A: It didn’t start out that way long ago.

Discussion about when it started.

Q/C: Could they separate it by majors and liberal studies classes? Would that help?

A: That is possible.

Q/C: Maybe the early registration for honors is for the liberal studies classes or some grading.

Q/C: I just think it’s a perk they shouldn’t have. I don’t understand the rationale of letting honors students register over anyone else.

Q/C: One issue…I think it’s an issue that faculty need to decide from an academic integrity standpoint. This is a faculty issue and it’s one we’ve not laid in on specifically by faculty.These issues are good ones for us to give some thought. The registrar and Banner can do just about any system that you could conceive of, so we really need to do the conceiving.

Q/C from Chair Kauffman: I can tell we’re going to have some interesting discussions. The Planning Team will take this up at our next meeting and we will try to figure out how we want to move this discussion forward.

Senators can give additional feedback to council chairs, Karen Tomczak and George Ford, on the Planning Team.

As a final word, Leroy encouraged senators to take Senate information back to their colleges, to filter it through their colleagues and bring it back to Senate.

The meeting was adjourned.

Voting Record for November 20, 2014 Meeting:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Senator/Ex-Officio Member- (organized by first name)** | **Last Name** | **Attendance****11/20/14** | **Vote (PsyD Curriculum Proposal)** |
| Andrew Adams | Adams | H | Yes |
| Kia Asberg | Asberg | PR | Yes |
| David Belcher | Belcher | H | n/a |
| Lisa Bloom | Bloom | H | Yes |
| Bob Beaudet | Beaudet | H | Yes |
| Shawn Collins | Collins | PR | Yes |
| Christopher Cooper | Cooper | H | Yes |
| David Dorondo | Dorondo | A | No Vote |
| Jeanne Dulworth | Dulworth | PR | Yes |
| Yang Fan | Fan | H | Yes |
| George Ford | Ford | H | Yes |
| Katy Ginanni | Ginanni | H | Yes |
| AJ Grube | Grube | PR | Yes |
| David Henderson | Henderson | H | Yes |
| Mary Jean Herzog | Herzog | H | Yes |
| Ian Hewer | Hewer | H | Yes |
| Beth Huber | Huber | H | Yes |
| Leroy Kauffman | Kauffman | H | Yes |
| Will Lehman | Lehman | H | Yes |
| David McCord | McCord | H | Yes |
| Erin McNelis | McNelis | H | Yes |
| Alison Morrison-Shetlar | Morrison-Shetlar | H | n/a |
| Bob Mulligan | Mulligan | H | Yes |
| Peter Tay | Powell | H | Yes |
| Karyn Tomczak | Tomczak | H | Yes |
| Cheryl Waters-Tormey | Waters-Tormey | H | Yes |
| Tonya Westbrook | Westbrook | H | Yes |
| John Whitmire | Whitmire | H | Yes |
|  |  | Yes = | 25 |