

Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting
Monday, March 5, 2018
3:15 p.m. -- HELM 108-B

Called to order: 3:16 pm

Attendance

Jen Hanley, Liz Sturgeon, Eric Kondratieff, Janet Applin, Elizabeth Gish, Matt Shake, Colin Farrell, Andrea Jenkins, David Lee, Susann Davis, Laura Bokuski, Jerry Daday, Jim Berger, Andi Dahmer, Kirk Atkinson, Claus Ernst, Doug MacElroy, Eric Reed, Ke Peng, Patti Minter

A. Approve minutes of February SEC Meeting:

1. [SEC 2-5-2018 Meeting Minutes](#)

Atkinson, Berger approved unanimously

B. Reports

1. Chair (Eric Kondratieff)

Met with President Caboni, just part of the regular monthly meetings. Nothing new, but we met just before the budget announcement preceding the BOR meeting. Recommended more communication from president's office. Next meeting, the week after break.

Eric Reed: Budget Council Representative. We will follow-up on items President Caboni put under advisement, but we are pleased with how President Caboni explained things.

2. Vice Chair (Liz Sturgeon)

We tried to hold an election on the 26th but it was unnecessary because there were not enough candidates for any college. The plans are to communicate to the folks who will be at-large senators to attend the next senate meeting. Have the different sub-committees there and have them think about what committees they would like to serve on. Trying to get chairs for next year. Avoid the bottleneck at the beginning of the next meeting.

3. Secretary (Jen Hanley)

No report

4. Committee Chairs

a. Academic Quality Committee (Kirk Atkinson; Report posted):

- i. [Report: AQ Meeting 23 Feb. 2019](#)

Atkinson: meeting delegated people to examine the two issues at hand (see report). Going through the draft reports. Move forward to Senate agenda.

Vote: Unanimous

b. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee (Patti Minter; No Report)

Minter: no formal report, revising slightly the Faculty Work Life survey which will be launched the week after spring break. SEC college reps should send out notifications to their colleges.

c. Budget and Finance Committee (Jim Berger; No Report)

Berger: Waiting until next SEC for new business. No report this time.

d. Colonnade General Education Committee (Jerry Daday; Report posted)

i. [CGEC Report](#)

ii. [PS 304 State Government \(Colonnade Connections - Systems Category\) - Proposal](#)

iii. [World Language Proficiency Workgroup Report](#)

iv. [World Language Requirement Option #3 endorsement](#)

Daday: motion to move report forward.

We passed the original resolution last fall: WKU will accept two years of high school world language through the current catalog year which will count as language proficiency requirement. In our Fall resolution, items 2 & 3 required the Modern Languages Department (MLD) to meet with academic affairs and come back with a plan to fix the backlog moving forward. Doug MacElroy, along with a committee of ASL, ARC, ML, met to figure out the best plan moving forward. The recommendations from this meeting were discussed at colonnade meeting on the 20th. Report is posted and we have devised four possible ways of addressing the language proficiency dilemma: 1) eliminate it entirely; 2) keep the current Band-Aid and make it permanent—two years in high school meets the requirement; 3) develop a new test to determine proficiency level of students. MLD has offered to create the test in-house test; 4) doing things the way we had been doing it previously with, presumably, the same outcomes. Colonnade committee feels that options 1 & 4 are not really not feasible. (Side bar: in a straw poll taken during the Colonnade committee meeting, the majority were in favor of giving MLD opportunity to create an in-house placement test. But there was dissension)

Colonnade recommends option 3 (See pp 10-12 of the report.) Give MLD opportunity to develop a test and the opportunity to present the test results at the October meeting.

Davis: What about the language proficiency requirement for the next academic year?

Daday: We recommend that we expand the academic band-aid for one more year.

Shake: I cannot support option three. There are problems with test creation and the usual standardized test takes too long to complete.

MacElroy: This is not the full STAMP test, it's a smaller test that can be taken at home in thirty minutes.

Shake: We should use a standardized test instead of an in-house test. October seems like an unrealistic time line in which to develop a valid test.. We are asking students to take a test without knowing what equipment they have or internet capabilities. Practically speaking, time line is not realistic for option three.

Daday: I agree, the way option 3 is written we either need an Avant placement test or a faculty-created test. The current budget makes the Avant test too expensive. The discussion to create a pilot test came after the resolution. One thing to consider is the feasibility of taking questions from existing 101 and 102 courses and create pilot test to see where students are right now? Resolution only addresses the pilot program, not what happens after. Our next provost will have to determine if we use the AVANT test, but it is expensive. We cannot pass another fee onto the students.

Shake: Have concerns about the psychometric value of an in-house test. Why is WKU one of the only schools to take this on? If we are going to assess it, it needs to be done correctly.

Ke Peng: These are questions about the validity of proficiency. What we are proposing is a placement test. This test gives us a sense of how confident we feel about where the student should be placed. STAMP is a continuum. This test is simpler. Time Line is difficult but we see most of the students will be taking Spanish. What we need to know is if they can demonstrate the same language ability as their peers in 102. We want Option 3.

Lee: I have some reservations about option three. This is a cumbersome process for what we get out of it. If we do the placement test and 90% place at a certain level—does this mean we discontinue the test because such high numbers did well? What does this test tell us? Difficult getting comfortable with option 3, understand its attractiveness, but prefers option 2

Berger: Stamp test is a proficiency test, what we are looking at is a placement test. Is there a nationally recognized placement test? Are there other options from Avant and STAMP

MacElroy: fee based on a discount, gives us the \$8 cost for students. Buy in bulk and give students the unique code, more expensive if it's just on the students

Kondratieff: how do you proctor this? Libraries via DELO's reciprocal agreements?

MacElroy: the mechanism is the same as the math placement test, but with math there is an incentive because math is mandatory. This test has different consequences, if you pay someone to cheat for you, they will find out fast.

Shake: In terms of cheating, the goal is different because they want to avoid the class completely. Harder to do if test assesses multiple aspects.

Davis: Tests are timed—we could never prevent cheating but we can make it more difficult to do that. Not simple translations, application, log-based, timed.

Kondratieff: What browser? Blackboard?

Daday: We have to get students into Blackboard

Shake: We have to get everyone to take this pre-Top

Dahmer: Why can't we just integrate this into TOP?

MacElroy: Prevent pre-registering students for their appropriate course.

Dahmer: Registration for TOP—still registered for the class.

Lee: Where could we do that

Daday: 30 minutes for the test, we need to keep students for the day. We are the only university that requires language proficiency.

Shake: why are we the only one? Make them take the test when it costs money? Table is revealing

Applin: Not everyone from TOP comes to WKU

MacElroy: 90-95% do. Plan not designed to test everyone

Jenkins: retention issue—if they can't sit for 30 minutes to take the test, they won't be retained.

Ernst: Last placement, we have had students cheat on it. Each discipline should have the ability to test their students in their own discipline. Language is capable of designing their own test. If we just count the high school requirement—not all classes are the same. Test is not perfect, it is not a static object—first semester too high, too low scores, you tweak it. If you have a test, some students may be put into the wrong pot? ML should have the expertise to put students where they need to be, we make it difficult to cheat, but it is impossible to deter all cheating.

Hanley: What is the lowest grade for high school credits count?

MacElroy: not grade-based, just have to pass

Applin: gap between when you took class and then came back to school

Daday: What is proficiency? CPE—secondary education board 2 units of high school language is the same as we require. We want to use the placement test to determine proficiency. ML has numerous students who shouldn't be in 102

Applin: the gap between last language class and college is too far.

Davis: changed rules to allow students who have 2 years of high school to make some take 101

Shake: Will the test be just comprehension?

Peng: Receptive, reading, writing, grammar.

Shake: Language placement test should assess the construct of proficiency. Develop a test is difficult, determining proficiency is difficult,

Ernst: Math placement—evolved and the correlation between performance and score is problematic. We can't always guarantee they are in the best form when they take the test. Self-perpetuating industry, standardized tests don't do much

Lee: I am leaning toward option 2—commitment to language requirement, still several hundred students who need language credits. Option 3 involves too much time and effort on the part of faculty and not sure it moves the undergrad experience down the road. Program needs to be able to focus on instruction

Peng: Testing: receptive skills if students cannot understand a manual in Spanish they don't have the competence. Basic survival skills. Understand the situation of the institution and the short-

falls in staffing across the university, worried about the precedent this sets for other departments in colonnade. Logistical challenges and removing a requirement just sets a bad precedent. Faculty are already assigned to develop the instrument to see what efforts are possible. MLD is trying to say we have members working on this, give us the chance to validate this. Language requirement will not be the first to go.

Kondratieff: This is just a pilot to see if it will work, it won't cost anything,

Peng: We need to present the results to colonnade. Option two says don't give them a chance. Give us a chance.

Kondratieff: I.e., continue the two credits Band-Aid?

MacElroy: 30 credit minimum in general education—for accreditation. General ed can't be whittled away like the Cheshire Cat and disappear. CPE 24 state-wide learning outcomes across 6 categories. All of the institutions have to buy into this. Risk to colonnade in terms of precedence is unworthy—flexibility in what gen ed looks like, but what elements are in there are set.

Applin: ML is willing to take this on, 9-10 course releases for faculty who are taking on this test.

Bohuski: System in place for this program, if nothing else this gives us data to look at and see.

Shake: Which of these options is the best?

Davis: Discussion—a lot of support for some kind of language requirement in Nov. from SEC. Option 3 is endorsed by the ML department. Option 2 is not a language requirement just supports what people should have done before they came here—option 3 as a pilot guarantees language requirement.

Daday: We need some resolution by October. Implementation not discussed, this is a pilot and extending the date for one more year.

Lee: We need a clear and reliable message.

Report by itself Jenkins and Davis: (Items 1, 3, and 4)-Unanimous

Item PS 304 State: Daday, Jenkins, unanimous

f. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (Janet Applin; Report Posted):

i. [UCC Report](#)

Applin: UCC report be moved forward to senate, **Applin**

Second: **Sturgeon**

Unanimous vote.

e. Graduate Council (Carl Dick for Kristin Wilson; Report Posted):

i. [Grad Council Report](#)

Eric Reed: move approval to put report on agenda? Discussion: none. Unanimously approved moving forward to the senate.

g. Faculty Handbook Committee (Kate Hudephol; No Report)

5. Advisory Reports

a. Faculty Regent (Claus Ernst)

BOR not much to approve. Raised issues with Caboni there may be changes after the summer retreat.

Minter: bond issues, Aramark contract—a done deal before it went to the BOR. Only put bond issues on the agenda because of the CPE. Bevin gets to add another person on the Board. Reasonable to suggest that the finance committee and academic committee need to be involved in this conversation.

b. Academic Affairs (Provost Lee):

Search processes for CEBS dean and Provost move forward. Greenwood Asher is the search firm. Airport interviews at the end of the month. Interim dean for CHHS forthcoming after Spring Break. University College folks—sit down and talking about how to transition those people into the remaining colleges. Deans involved in the conversations. General meetings and one on one conversations.

Minter: When will the announcements be made?

Lee: everything about budget will take place before Spring Break.

c. SGA (Andi Dahmer)

Main item: the SGA passed a big resolution regarding the Aramark contract.

C. Old Business: None.

D. New Business:

Berger: Budget and Finance committee proposed a resolution modeled after Claus' resolution. Aramark and WKU in a contract for Aramark to provide dining services over the next 20 years. In the contract—it has increasing fees for both commuter and on-campus meal plans. Commuter plans go up to \$350 over time. On-campus face 3.5% or higher each year. Consequently the costs are exorbitant. Feedback from students and faculty—budget and finance committee crafted the resolution.

Sturgeon: Commuter students people who live off-campus. But we have other students nursing students who never step on campus are charged.

Berger: You are paying Aramark \$75 to receive meals and they are \$7.50/meal. When you go to Subway—students are charged for two meals. Extra costs

Davis: BOR approved this fee---

Berger: BOR did not approve this

Minter; Only student fees approved by CPE are approved by BOR

Ernst: This came to the BOR as a signed information item, not told the elevator clause

Sturgeon: Will students know this is what they are paying?

Bohuski: It goes into a general fund

Applin: Can we get this contract voided?

Berger: Intent of this resolution, there are paragraphs about re-negotiation

Ernst: Legally binding for us, we can ask Caboni to re-negotiate, but Aramark has to agree to negotiate

Berger: We have already started receiving money, July 2017--\$11 million that has already been given, going towards what Aramark is doing. \$5092 Flex Plans, 6184 meal plans, Fall 2017. Students will be paying those one way or the other. Rates will go up meal plan prices not commuter plan: will go up 3.5% but in 3, 7, etc will go up 5%

Hanley: This contract just gets worse every time we hear about it. I think it is an unethical contract that gouges students. There are students who struggle to get gas money to come to class, but now we expect them to exorbitant fees on top of everything else?

Ernst: Don't get stuck on the details, we can finance a building bond issue, by doing other things—leasing. Aramark: permanent revenue stream into a new building. We are directing a revenue stream worth \$50 million

Hanley: This hurts students. It is a bad contract.

Davis: Fiduciary negligence? Alumni are concerned about this too.

Ernst: We requested this, Aramark did not.

Meeting adjourned:

Hanley, Berger 4:59 pm