

Western Kentucky University

University Senate

Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting Minutes

April 3, 2017 -- 3:15 p.m.

WAB 227 - AA Large Conference Room

A. Call To Order

1. A regular meeting of the WKU University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Kate Hudepohl on Monday, April 3, 2017 at 3:18 P.M. in the Wetherby Conference Room.
2. A quorum was present: Heidi Álvarez, Amber Scott Belt, Barbara Burch, Thad Crews, Susann Davis, Laura DeLancey, Marko Dumančić, Claus Ernst, Ann Ferrell, Kate Hudepohl, Andrea Jenkins, Richard C. Miller, Patricia Minter, Jay Todd Richey, Julie Shadoan, Matt Shake, Liz Sturgeon, and Shannon Vaughan.

B. Approve March 6, 2017 SEC Meeting Minutes

1. Patricia Minter made a motion to approve the March 6th 2017 Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes as posted.
2. The motion was seconded by Liz Sturgeon.
3. There was no discussion.
4. The March 6, 2017 Senate Executive Committee meeting minutes were approved unanimously as posted.

C. Officer Reports

1. Chair (Kate Hudepohl):

- a. A link to the recommended syllabus statements will be put on the University Senate Website to make it more visible. It will be under information items. A reminder will also be sent over Faculty All Email.
- b. Chair Hudepohl and Vice Chair Shadoan met with Paula Sadler from ORI for a twenty-two person conference table. She sent two quotes. The first quote was \$3900 for the tables only. We have a new set of twelve chairs and some that were given to the University Senate by the libraries. The second quote was for \$4100. Chair Hudepohl will check with Ladonna Hunton to make sure the carry forward money for University Senate is still there. Chair Hudepohl is confident that this can work out.
- c. Claus Ernst made a motion to empower Chair Hudepohl to order and purchase a conference table in the \$3900-4100 range with the existing Senate carry forward money. The motion was seconded by Andrea Jenkins. There was no discussion. The motion passed.
- d. Chair Hudepohl said that she is looking for places to plug in phones and laptops in the new senate office, which is located in Helm 108B. The proxima is old. There is a lecturn and the air conditioning works. Chair Hudepohl will be looking into getting a new proxima supported by IT as well as getting a new laptop for the University Senate Chair (Chair Hudepohl has been using her personal laptop during her tenure as Senate Chair). The new proxima and new laptop will be the next purchases for the University Senate.
- e. From Helm 108B, there is an adjacent multi-purpose room (Helm room 100). University Senate will meet at this location (Helm room 100) next year because

audio recording is easier than at the Faculty House and because of the convenience of the meeting room being next to the new senate office. This will be conveyed to the new Senate Chair.

- f. Amber Scott Belt said that there has been some progress on finding administrative support for the standing committees. The report is still being looked at, but Provost Lee has been in conversation with LaDonna Hunton about it.

2. Vice Chair (Julie Shadoan):

- a. There are four election-related announcements.
- b. Most Departmental Senators for 2017-2018 have been reported. There are three departments that have not: Educational Leadership in CEBS, Computer Science in Ogden, and Journalism/Broadcasting in Potter.
- c. The University Academic Complaint Committee has been filled; all colleges except for Ogden have reported. Some colleges do not have names given for students (CEBS and CHHS). Potter College gave names from the current committee and it needs to be a new list.
- d. The Faculty Mentoring Award Committee needs to be populated by May 1. Gordon Ford and CEBS gave only one name. Potter College, Ogden, and University College gave at least two names. Chair Hudepohl drew names by lottery, and the following names were selected: David Lenoir from PCAL, Gordon Baylis from Ogden, and Jim Fulkerson from University College.
- e. These colleagues are not senators; they go to the standing committee meeting only. Colleagues who are interested in serving on standing committees should sign up for special seats.
- f. New senate officers will be elected in April.

3. Secretary (Heidi Álvarez):

- a. No report.

D. Committee Chair Reports

1. Academic Quality Committee (Ann Ferrell): No Report (see joint committee report in b)

2. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee (Patti Minter): Report posted

a. **FWPR_AQ March 10, 2017 Joint Report**

- The document will be put on Google Docs and will go forward to the Senate Executive Committee and the new WKU President, Dr. Caboni.
- Patricia Minter made a motion for endorsement of the joint committee report.
- There was no discussion.
- The motion to endorse the joint committee report passed.

b. **Policy 1.4062 Course Syllabi**

- The joint committee assembled an amendment for the syllabus policy. They met for an hour and proposed that point G Federal Mandates requiring be put under detailed information and be put in the syllabus because faculty are required to comply to these federal mandates.
- Richard Miller asked if the mandate has to be spelled out or can it be a link to the mandate. Under “G”, what are we asking faculty to do?
- Provost Lee said that for including Title IX Clery on the syllabus, a mandate would require an amendment to the syllabus policy.
- Everything not in yellow is stuff that was already there.
- The Department Head reviews this; the amendment is to include federal mandates as an addendum on syllabus information.
- The existing policy is .B1 A-F; the amendment is the stuff in yellow.

- Richard Miller asked what are the federal mandates that are supposed to be included?
- Patricia Minter said that we are often sent information that should be included. For Title IX Clery, the Provost included suggested languages for the syllabus. In the future, if there is another federal mandate that is a “have to”, it would be included on the syllabus.
- Richard Miller said “are you suggesting a link?”
- Patricia Minter said at this moment, there is no link to go to for Summer 2017. The requirement can be met with a link to relevant information.
- Chair Hudepohl said that SARC usually sends out a link at the beginning of the semester.
- Patricia Minter said that this puts it back in the Provost’s court to revisit it.
- Regent Burch asked how much is suggested?
- Patricia Minter said that Andrea Anderson said they are required to require faculty to put this on their syllabus. They asked us to do it rather than mandating. The committee endorsed it because it is the right thing to do. The website is still not up. Until the landing spot is there, we do not have this resource. This makes it so that faculty have to include this in the syllabus. To have the link for the syllabus information page would help this.
- Patricia Minter made a motion to approve Policy 1.4062 Course Syllabi.
- The motion was seconded by Laura DeLancey.
- Laura DeLancey suggested that rather than entire language in letter G, add “information regarding” instead of the entire text.
- Richard C. Miller said this is why he was asking if there would be specific language.
- Patricia Minter said she would accept “information regarding” as a friendly amendment.
- Matt Shake asked if everything in A through G is required. Is it a “must” or is it a “should”?
- Claus Ernst asked if the syllabus information link is up or not.
- Amber Scott Belt said that it is ready now and it does have the sample language that Dr. Miller is asking about.

- Chair Hudepohl said that Dr. Lee will notify the faculty about it after he returns from his trip.
 - There was no more discussion.
 - Policy 1.4062 Course Syllabi was endorsed unanimously with the friendly amendment.
 - Chair Hudepohl will make the edits.
- c. Gender Equity Salary Study
- The Faculty Welfare Committee is working on the gender equity salary study.
- d. Faculty Welfare Survey
- The Faculty Welfare Survey closes on April 11 at noon.
 - A reminder will go out tomorrow.
- e. Document for Dr. Caboni
- The document for Dr. Caboni will be put forth in May.
 - Does the Senate Executive Committee want to see a draft in the May Senate Executive Committee meeting and in the May University Senate meeting?
 - Patricia Minter said that it has been helpful to listen to the people on the transition committee.
3. Budget and Finance Committee (Claus Ernst): No Report
- Claus Ernst gave an informal update on the WKU Health Insurance and there will be a formal report in May.
 - With \$1.5 million lost, the reserve is depleted.
 - In 2018, there will be changes to our health care.
 - There was a 21% increase on health care expenditure.
 - High-cost claims going from 38 to 62 means \$2 million in extra cost.
Forecasting for this is extremely difficulty because you cannot predict things like a heart attack.
 - The Committee is currently looking at bidding out the third-party provider.

- Faculty may be interested that employee cost was computed. High deductible HSA/HSR has had a lot of criticism, but the employee cost share has actually dropped. 31% dropped to 28% for the last two years.
- Patricia Minter asked how is this possible?
- Claus Ernst responded that this is an average. What we spend on premiums and what we spend on doctors. Anthem keeps track of this. For health care that does not run through insurance, we do not know. Where does the money come from? For HSA, the university puts money in. If the WKU seed money is exceeded, then this is an employee expense. The 28% comes from this. It is an aggregate of all employees.
- The 70/30 split is standard. We are in a tough place financially and will recommend that we go back to 70/30.
- Regent Burch asked where does the catastrophic kick in? How much is happening?
- Claus Ernst said that with stock loss insurance, an individual case, it is a quarter million, then the insurance pays the remainder. There are between three and five per year. There was nothing unusual. These cases remained below the stock.
- It is up to the Senate Executive Committee on how we put forth this information. We will not be in a position in May to know what to do.
- Chair Hudepohl said that we should tell people.
- Marko Dumančić said “we can assume it will not get better and tell people to start saving money.”
- Regent Burch said in the interest of transparency, we should tell people what we know. There is a clear message and it is important to understand.
- Marko Dumančić said that as employees, we have no control over any of it, but at least we can plan ahead.
- Chair Hudepohl said that we cannot predict what will happen with people’s health and whether or not we can choose which to use. It is frightening that we used up our reserve.
- Claus Ernst said the committee will recommend that the Reserve be funded through one-time money. There are several faculty and staff representatives.

Employees did have some say in our insurance. There are numbers to back that up. There is an 87% increase in employer compensation. 1.7 to 3.1 is an 84% increase. The members of the committee have been fair and equitable. The university contributed more in recent years than in prior years. Looking at aggregate cases is how fairness is.

- Patricia Minter responded that then we need to look at increased compensation. The University and Board of Regents need to make a real commitment to increasing employee salaries.
- Claus Ernst said that there will be a formal comment at the May senate meeting.

4. Colonnade General Education Committee (Marko Dumančić): Report Posted

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to approve the Colonnade General Education Committee report.
- Richard C. Miller said that the Provost's Office suggested adding a sentence under 2.1 World.... For returning students. Students who begin before 2004 summer term... are required to complete on level of foreign language. This is expected, but it now puts it in writing.
- Marko Dumančić accepted this as a friendly amendment.
- There was no more discussion.
- The Colonnade General Education Committee report passed unanimously and was approved with the friendly amendment from Dr. Miller.

5. Graduate Council (Shannon Vaughan): Report Posted

- Shannon Vaughan made a motion to endorse the Graduate Council report.
- There is an amendment to the top of page 48 Revise A Program, Reference #152. The change adds a sentence to what they have already revised to make it more explicit about their capstone and thesis. Add in a sentence at the top of page 48 "students are required to successfully complete and defend capstone project, which could include a thesis, prior to graduation." This was passed in

the Curriculum Committee and in Graduate Council. It is a clarification and not a substantive change.

- There were no questions about the friendly amendment or about the Graduate Council agenda.
- The report passed with the friendly amendment, with graduate faculty only voting. The report stands approved with the amendment on page 48. Shannon Vaughan will make the corrections and will send the revised report.
- Shannon Vaughan said that at the Board of Regents meeting, it was stated that Graduate Student Enrollment was down dramatically because there is no Pathways program. This is not true; graduate enrollment is flat. The total graduate enrollment for 2014 was 2,647; for 2015 it was 2,646; and now, it is 2,649. We are down from last year because of the India Pilot Project. International graduate numbers are not down dramatically.
- Regent Burch responded that she thinks this was not directed at the Graduate Council.
- Shannon Vaughan said that the Graduate Council as a whole has been cautious about a Pathways program and wants to make sure they get it right.
- Regent Burch said that looking at numbers and how numbers translate into dollars are two different things. With the loss of Indian students, she thinks the predictions were based on tuition.

6. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (Liz Sturgeon): Report Posted

- Liz Sturgeon made a motion for endorsement of the March Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report.
- Liz Sturgeon said that 270 pages into the March Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report, there are a few academic policies to be aware of. (1) How we calculate grade point average when we repeat courses is different now. Now, it is “the higher of the two grades will be counted.” It will be changed to “the two higher grades that are combined.” (2) For the last policy, this was a table about the different options 54 unduplicated hours was translated into verbage. There are three bullet points that are now written out so the table can be understood by people.

- There were no questions or comments on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Agenda.
- The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report passed and was approved as posted.

7. Faculty Handbook Committee (Patricia Minter for Margaret Crowder): Report Posted

a. **FH Meeting Report 3/20/2017**

- Patricia Minter made a motion for approval of the Faculty Handbook Committee report.
- There was no discussion.
- The report was endorsed unanimously.

b. **08-2017 Guidelines for Tenure-eligible Faculty Members
- Senate Recommendation 2016-2017**

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse 08-2017, Guidelines for Tenure-eligible Faculty Members.
- The motion was seconded by Laura DeLancey.
- Patricia Minter said that the proposal came out of Faculty Welfare while revising some of the Tenure and Promotion documents in some departments. This only affects people from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. It allows them to go up under the documented standards at the time of hire, which is the date of hire (the letter hiring) – this is where the clock starts.
- Richard C. Miller asked if we are talking about August 15. Patricia Minter responded yes. If the tenure and promotion guidelines are changed in year three, they can either go by the date of hire or by the new document. The starting date is whenever they are told to show up; not the date of the letter. The time of hire is the date in which the person starts work, for example, August 15.
- Julie Shadoan asked if this is retroactive. Patricia Minter said no, it means that if someone was hired five years ago on this set of documents, then the faculty member can go up on the document in which they were hired. People

most immediately affected are those in year five going up for the mandatory year six. Anyone not tenured now can go up for the standard at which they were hired. This applies to anyone at the Assistant Professor level who is not yet tenured.

- Liz Sturgeon asked why couldn't Full Professors do this as well? Patricia Miter said that certain colleges feel this is the only decent raise you get in your career. Some do not feel this way -- some others do not feel this way.
- Chair Hudepohl said that some will lose their careers over changed expectations to the tenure process.
- Regent Burch said that the Tenure and Promotion criteria traditionally are directed toward professional relations, good teaching, service, and scholarship. What happens if faculty are doing well, but things at the institution change? For example, lack of retention and performance model criteria. We can think about looking at this. It allows people to be different and homogenize. The assumption of everything fits is something that faculty need to look at in what is important in their career.
- Chair Hudepohl added that giving clear credit for what people are doing will create different classes of faculty.
- Regent Burch said that the notion of Tenure and Promotion criteria remaining unchanged is questionable. Look at different ways of documenting peoples' strengths. People bring different strengths to the table.
- Chair Hudepohl said we all differentially reward; no matter how much you do, it is not measured.
- Regent Burch said that in helping people aspire to something more in higher education, strategies for retention, what are we going to do about faculty criteria to make it happen?
- Richard C. Miller said that the Performance Funding Model will require us to look closely at our Tenure and Promotion guidelines. In looking at the conditions at date of hire, if someone's enrollment is not sustaining the program, this might affect tenure. The landscape is changed.

- Patricia Minter said that this speaks to why we should approve this now. The moving target is the research target; this is designed to keep us current with the standards in the profession.
- Regent Burch said it is also suggestion that the teaching model can also change. The ways of measuring – the best way we know how – is not always the best. We need to put forth ways that are compatible with best practice.
- Patricia Minter said this will be difficult to find a consensus.
- Amber Scott Belt said that on page 33, Provost Lee has the same concern with the date of hire. The suggested change was “first day required to report.”
- Patricia Minter asked what the language in the Board of Regents is.
- Richard C. Miller said it says “upon approval of the Board of Regents” For example, there is an August 15 start date, but the Board of Regents does not approve it until later.
- Patricia Minter said it is the moment they are officially on payroll – “on date of official appointment.”
- Chair Hudepohl suggested why don’t we say “official start date of position?”
- Patricia Minter asked what is the language that should be here? At the official start date where the faculty member...”
- Richard C. Miller said why don’t we say “starting date as indicated in the formal letter of appointment?”
- Amber Scott Belt said that the annual continuance review is supposed to be showing progress toward tenure.
- Richard C. Miller said the notification in the fifth year when previous guidelines were the way the continuance reviews were is problematic.
- Patricia Minter said the standard only gets higher. This is the time at which it has to be reported. Can it be “no later than”?
- Richard C. Miller said that continuance is based on standards of hire; if the department changes in year four or year five, then the faculty member has the option to go to the standard of the original document.
- Patricia Minter said that continuance and tenure and promotion are two different sections of the Faculty Handbook.

- Richard C. Miller said if the faculty member is denied tenure because they went up under a new guideline, are the continuance evaluations valid if in the twelfth hour the faculty member switches the document they are evaluated under? Richard C. Miller said that annual evaluations are different than tenure and promotion. A continuance review is different than an annual performance review.
- Regent Burch asked how many times you can change. Can you go back and forth?
- Patricia Minter said at any time, you have the option of going back to the original date of hire once you make the declaration.
- The Provost Office’s understanding for continuance is that of progress toward tenure.
- Chair Hudepohl said as long as the department chair indicates which document the annual continuance is reflective of.
- Chair Hudepohl said she went over the language. She suggested a friendly amendment in the first section of yellow: “departmental standards at the starting date as indicated in the formal letter of appointment.” “In place at time of hire” would be replaced with “at or on starting date as indicated in the formal letter of appointment.” There are four places where this needs to happen. There are two in page 33; the phrase is used twice in the same section.
- Patricia Minter accepted those as friendly amendments and will send the changes to Margaret Crowder because they were in a PDF document.
- If you don’t formally select which document until going up for tenure, then it makes the annual evaluation invalid.
- Chair Hudepohl said each annual continuance review should clearly state which tenure and promotion review was used. The continuance committee would be told by the faculty member which document they are wanting to be evaluated under. This would need to be put back in additional sections of the handbook.

- Amber Scott Belt reiterated the Provost’s concern; if you wait until submission of materials for tenure, then the first five years are null and void if the document is not the same.
- Chair Hudepohl said as part of the annual continuance review, the candidate should indicate in writing which they are considering.
- Patricia Minter said the departments update going forward. This protects everyone and does not break promises at the time of hire.
- Richard C. Miller said that the Handbook Committee has done a good job with this -- “Guidelines in place...at formal time of hire.” Notifying the Department Head which they will follow is what the question is. The continuance document will be addressed later.
- Chair Hudepohl said that “at time of hire” was accepted in four places, but there is argument for not changing on page two, despite the changes suggested by the Provost, because there will be a separate motion for continuance based on this discussion.
- Claus Ernst said that the person gets evaluated under the time of the hire. He prefers page 35 to say “time of hire is the default unless given in writing to the department chair.” This means the faculty member will go under the old policy unless the faculty member requests otherwise. The old standard would be automatic unless the faculty member wants to be under the new policy.
- Patricia Minter said that the section on page 35 in yellow, the default standards are the tenure and promotion standards in place at time of hire. In effect, the faculty member would have to inform the department head at the time they turn in the materials.
- Claus Ernst suggested taking this back and doing this with continuance. If a change takes place in the departmental document, at that point they are given a choice and this has to be done in writing at that time. The first yellow part “shall be evaluated based on” is a substantive change. Both of Claus’s suggestions are substantive and they cannot be made on the floor today because it is not ethical; this part needs to go back to the committee.
- The friendly amendment was accepted.

- Claus Ernst made a motion to send this back to the committee.
- The motion was seconded by Laura DeLancey.
- If we send it back, will we make the continuance change also?
- Yes.
- Laura DeLancey made a friendly amendment to Claus Ernst's motion to make changes to continuance in the faculty handbook.
- Julie Shadoan seconded Laura DeLancey's amendment.
- The motion passed.

c. **09-2017 Grading and Quality Point System**

- **GC Item on IP Grades**

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse 09-2017, Grading and Quality Point System.
- The motion was seconded by Laura DeLancey.
- 09-2017 amends the language from one to three years.
- Shannon Vaughan said that the IP (In Progress) Grade is an administrative hassle and 09-2017 cuts down on this.
- Amber Scott Belt for David Lee asked why this is through the Handbook Committee instead of the Curriculum Committee? Patricia Minter responded that it just syncs it up.
- There was no further discussion.
- The motion to endorse 09-2017 passed.

d. **10-2017 Continuance Documentation Flow**

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse 10-2017, Continuance Documentation Flow.
- The motion was seconded by Ann Ferrell.
- Last year, there were two objections: (1) the timetable; and (2) the committee's memo to the candidate.

- This year, (1) the timetable is changed again; and (2) there is a meet-in-the-middle approach.
- Page two bullet points the committee memorandum can be given through employment records. Richard C. Miller asked if the letter is in the faculty member's file. Patricia Minter responded that there are wide variations between colleges and departments; this makes it as foolproof as possible. Richard C. Miller asked what is meant by "employment records"? Patricia Minter said that the Department Chair's evaluation and recommendation to the Dean. It contains the vote and the committee letter. The Department Chair's letter goes to the Dean. The recommendation going to the Department Chair and Dean includes the written recommendation from the Committee. The faculty member cannot get the letter from the file. The policy would have to be amended to include it. The official faculty records are housed in Academic Affairs, the Office of the Provost. What goes in those files does not yet include. Amber Scott Belt for David Lee suggested strike "employment records" and change to "contact Office of the Provost" on page two. This makes in consistent with the Committee's intent.
- Richard C. Miller said that he would not change annual continuance records 1.1064.
- The two changes are the (1) timeline and (2) memo issue. We just took care of the memo issue.
- The September 11th letter to the Department Chair or Dean was something the Committee really wanted. People need to know they have to do it by the deadline. The timeline in the Faculty Handbook is different from what we saw last year.
- The friendly amendment to change "employment records" to "Office of the Provost" was accepted.
- 10-2017 Continuance Documentation Flow passed with the friendly amendment.

e. **11-2017 Salary and Paychecks**

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse 11-2017, Salary and Paychecks.

- The motion was seconded by Claus Ernst.
- Richard C. Miller clarified to faculty when formal appointments begin. Faculty are employed on a nine-month basis from August 15 to May 30, but they are paid on a 12-month basis. Faculty get paid for half of July and August prior to their appointment. If the faculty status changes between July 1 and August 15, (for example, if they leave on July 30), they get a paycheck for the time in which they have not yet earned. They have to refund the earnings back to the university. In a few cases, a few people have not complied with this. This substantive change was recommended to clarify it.
- Chair Hudepohl said if someone quits in May, do they still get paid through the end of June? Richard C. Miller said that the first six weeks is from the previous year's income and the second six weeks is the next year's income.
- There was no further discussion.
- 11-2017 was endorsed unanimously.

E. Advisory Reports

a. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch)

- The Board of Regents met last week. There was a lot of discussion on budget and finance.
- Other discussion pertained to where international is going.
- There was a lot of analysis on tuition drops.
- The \$5 million shortfall had a lot of discussion. This was addressed through carry forward money in the past. \$2.5 million in reserves. The DELO money is faculty money. There is reason to watch this carefully.
- There was discussion on international populations, especially Saudi and Chinese.
- Regarding the dual scholarship program, the Board of Regents is concerned and the number one priority is budget and resources. Student retention is the most logical answer.

- Compensation is still a priority but will be on hold because of the budget priority.
- Distribution will be discussed at the April 28th meeting,
- There is a merger of three departments in Ogden.
- The Board discussed the first STAFF Emeritus appointment.
- There are 39 endowed professorships.
- The board looked at state legislation and federal budget overviews.
- Regent Burch gave a handout on performance funding guidelines for performance funding dollars. Student success is defined in five bullets at the top left: (1) degrees and credentials awarded; (2) degrees per 100 full-time enrollments; (3) STEM+H degrees; (4) degrees earned by minority and low-income students; (5) student progression.
- Regent Burch gave a second handout on Dual Credit Enrollment. There is a catch 22 – it gives start in Higher Education, but we operate at a loss. 209 international down does not matter if we have 429? Dual credits up, because one does not bring in dollars. Backing up one year, see how many are coming. Dual Credit underwrites the cost of them taking the course somewhere else. There is a national publication on the philosophy that everyone should have a dual credit. There is a drop off in percentage. KCTCS has benefited because they can get money for it but we have not. We will be looking at partnerships with the community college to bring these students in.
- Take a look at students your department is retaining and those which you are not. Look at various concentrations; some numbers are healthy and some are not. Consolidation, ways of developing, efficiency of delivery systems, we are looking at a blended institution. How do we deliver to address populations? Do some programs have more potential than others?
- Claus Ernst asked about the second graph. How does dual credit enrollment compare with students actually enrolled? Regent Burch said you have to look at 2015 to see who enrolled in 2016. The fall of 2016 is weighed against dual credit in 2015. Claus Ernst said that 3,226 is the number of people. Regent Burch responded that of 2697 credits and 866 courses, 29.4% came here.

b. Academic Affairs (Provost Lee)

No report.

F. Old Business:

There was no old business.

G. New Business:

There was no new business from the floor.

H. Information Items:

1. Regent Burch gave two handouts to the SEC during her regent's report, which Chair Hudepohl will scan and attach. The handouts pertain to WKU's dual credit enrollment and a guide to Kentucky's proposed higher education performance funding model.

I. Motion to Adjourn:

1. With no further business for the committee to address, Laura DeLancey made a motion to adjourn.
2. The motion was seconded by Marko Dumančić.
3. The meeting adjourned at 5:55 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Álvarez, Secretary