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I. Faculty Senate Finances and Organization

A. Finances

1. 2012/2013

Income 2012/2013
Dues ($5 voluntary contributions): $835.00

Expenditures 2012/2013

Faculty Service Plaques: ($615.45)
New Faculty Reception: ($100.05)
Retirement Reception: ($90.05)
Retirement Cards: ($20.20)
Total expenses: ($825.75)

NET INCOME: $9.25

2. Reserves:

a. BancFirst Checking Account:
   May 2012 Balance: $1939.15
   May 2013 Balance: $2038.05
b. University Account:
   May 2012 Balance: $105.01
   May 2013 Balance: $105.01

3. Five Year Summary
   The total income and expenses for the Faculty senate can summarized by examining the total dues collected for the year and the July BancFirst Checking Account Balance. The July balance reflects all of the previous year’s expenses, with none of the following year’s dues yet collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>July Balance</th>
<th>Previous Fall dues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1749.36</td>
<td>$830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1904.07</td>
<td>$905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$1945.45</td>
<td>$855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1939.15</td>
<td>$920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1948.40</td>
<td>$835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Faculty Senate Committee Assignments

1. Audit Committee
   Audits the financial activities of the Faculty Senate

   Marci Grant (Chair)
   Kristen Montarella
   Amy Barnett
   Tamera Weimer

2. Budget and Program Committee
   Evaluates the distribution of university funds

   Kevin Collins (Chair)
   Eric Paul
   Jerry Dunn
   Kathy Brookes
   Warren Moseley
3. Curriculum Committee

Advises and makes recommendations regarding all curricular issues

Dennis Widen (Chair)
EK Jeong
Ed Klein
Jerry Dunn
Ann Rusell
Evette Meliza

4. Judiciary Committee

Answers questions regarding the intent and meaning of the Faculty Senate Constitution

Jim Long Chair (CPGS)
Tom McNamara (CAS)
Dayna Coker CAAS
Erin Callen (COP)

5. Nominating Committee

Organizes elections for selected university standing committees

Scott Long (Chair)
EK Jeong
Tom McNamara
John Bradshaw
Dick Kurtz

6. Personnel Policies Committee

Makes recommendations regarding policies related to faculty tenure, promotion, class loads, salary and benefits, and dismissal

Fred Gates (Chair)
Andrea Holdago
Jason Dupree
John Bradshaw
Les Ramos
Jim Long
7. Student Affairs Committee
Advises and makes recommendations regarding all matters relating to the student body and student policies

Lisa Schoeder Chair
Jason Dupree
Eric Paul
Erin Callen
Sophia Lee
Maria Ortega, SGA

8. University Policies Committee
Advises and makes recommendations concerning university policies relating to the academic calendar, schedules, faculty handbook, and university matters not assigned to other Faculty Senate committees

Les Ramos (chair)
Jason Dupree
Curt Woolever
Jerry Dunn
Dennis Widen

II. Motions and Resolutions that were adopted in 2012/2013

A. June 19, 2012

FS Motion 2012-06-01
It is proposed that Dr. Sunu Kodumthara fill the remainder of Dr. Leland Turner's term (FS 14) on the Academic Advisory and Scholarship Council.

Rationale: Dr. Sunu Kodumthara has volunteered to take Leland Turner's place on the Council. She is from the same department (Social Sciences). A new member needs to be approved before the next the Council meeting in August.

Motion was approved by a voice vote.

B. July 17, 2012 Meeting

1. FS Motion 2012-07-01:
It is proposed that page 27 of the Faculty Handbook be modified to replace the Director of the Fine Arts Center with the Director of Distance Learning as an ex officio member of the Intellectual Property Committee.
Motion was approved by a voice vote.

2. FS Motion 2012-07-02
It is proposed that the Faculty Senate choose by written ballot one of three volunteers from CAS for the Faculty Recruitment Committee: Gerald East, Doug Linder, or Lisa Schroeder.

Rationale: All three faculty members have volunteered. All three faculty members have had their current committee terms expire this year.

Motion was approved by a voice vote.

Gerald East was chosen as the CAS representative for the Faculty Recruitment Committee from the subsequent written ballot.

C. August 24, 2012 Meeting

1. Special Report from last year’s parliamentarian John Hayden

In answer to the question about “calling the question” in the senate last spring, here is what Robert’s Rules calls for and here is what the SWOSU FS has been doing:

In Robert’s Rules, to end debate, one “Moves to close debate.” The person making this motion must be recognized by the President or Chair and gain the floor. This motion requires a Second. It is not debatable. It cannot be amended. It requires a 2/3 vote. Then, if 2/3 vote to close debate, you then take a vote on the motion.

However, as you know the SWOSU FS has variations from Robert’s Rules. After all, one of Robert’s Rules is that a body need not follow all/some of Robert’s Rules.

Since I first substituted in the FS back in 1992, the practice has been that a motion that has received a second is debated, and at some point, if a senator has heard enough or senses that many senators have heard enough, the practice has been for a senator to raise his or her hand, and simply say, “Let’s vote.” No second or debate required. However, if another senator still wishes to discuss the motion, that senator simply indicates that he or she would like the motion discussed some more. Then, out of courtesy to that senator, discussion continues.

In my experience, the only time the SWOSU FS has used Robert’s Rules to end debate is when senators have become exasperated and can see no end in sight. Most of the time, however, the practice has been simply a call of “Let’s vote.”

2. FS Motion 2012-08-01
Motion to accept the recommendation of the Nominations Committee.
Nominations Committee Report

Pursuant to SWOSU University Committee openings and the subsequent request for faculty willingness to serve in these positions, the Nominations Committee of the Faculty Senate received notification of interest. Based upon faculty feedback the Nominations Committee presents to the Faculty Senate the following:

Campus Environmental Committee – Phillip Fitzsimmons, to serve in the position vacated by Kelly Moor.

Academic Appeals Committee – Frederic Murray to serve in the position vacated by David Henderson.

Respectfully submitted, Scott F. Long, Chair, Nominations. 24 August 2012.

Motion to accept the recommendation of the Nominations Committee passed by a voice vote.

3. FS Motion 2012-08-02
Motion to appointment of Kevin Collins to replace Anil Pereira on the Academic Advisory & Scholarship Council for the rest of the term.

Motion was approved by a voice vote.

D. September 28, 2012 Meeting

The following people were appointed by their respective colleges to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee:

CPGS: Evette Meliza, Ethel Simpson, James Hunsicker
A&S: John Hayden, Robert Chambers, Gerard East
COP: Erin Callen
CAAP: Kathy Brooks
Appeals: Ann Russell (CGPS), Sylvia Esjornson (CAS), Scott Long (COP)

E. October 26, 2012 Meeting

1. FS Motion 2012-10-01:
It is proposed that the Faculty Senate encourage the Administration to revise the University Anti-Discrimination Policy to include sexual orientation and genetic information.
The above motion was discussed and it was the general opinion of the FS that in keeping with the policies with other universities, we need to update our Anti-Discrimination Policy to include sexual orientation and genetic information. Dr. Foust is encouraged to make the necessary modifications.

The motion passed by a voice vote.

UPDATE: The University Anti-Discrimination Policy was so modified just prior to the 2013/2014 school year.

2. **FS Motion 2012-10-02:**
   It is proposed that any course registration for a student requiring the override of a prerequisite be restricted by the system to the chair of the department offering that course.

*Rationale:* The chair of the department offering the course has expertise and experience concerning the topics covered. They are in the best position to make an assessment of whether or not the student requesting registration has the tools needed to pass the course. Currently, the system allows anyone who can override in one department to override in any department. This has led to students being placed in courses they are not prepared for. Naturally, such students wind up struggling.

The above motion was discussed in detail and the FS was unanimous that overwrite of a prerequisite be restricted by the system to the chair of the department offering that course and by the express consent of the instructor. The FS proposes that the Advisement handbook be updated to reflect this proposal. There was also a request to modify the software to prevent overwrite of prerequisite by the chair of other department and administrative assistants.

The motion passed by a voice vote.

**F. November 16, 2012 Meeting**

None.

**G. December 7, 2012 Meeting**

None.

**H. January 25, 2013 Meeting**

1. **Proposed Revisions to the Grade Change Policy (January 2013)**
Report and Recommendation from the University Polices Committee

In response to specific recommendations by Registrar Archer and Interim Provost Foust, the University Polices Committee proposes the following revised version of the original Grade Change Policy submitted by the Faculty Senate for consideration in October 2011.

1. Students requesting a grade change must submit the request in writing [on a designated Grade Change Request form] to the instructor of record. The student must state the specific reason(s) for the grade change request [on the form. The form shall require the student’s signature]. For each course, the number of grade change requests shall be limited to one (1). [The student must request the grade change by the end of the next regular semester (Fall or Spring) after the semester in which the grade was assigned.] A grade change request shall not be granted after the student graduates from the university. If the instructor of record approves the grade change, the instructor shall forward the grade change to the Registrar. In the event that [[(1)] the student requests a change of a grade to a Withdrawal (W) [or (2) the student requests a grade change after the end of the next regular semester,] the student must complete the Application for Academic Appeal form and submit the form to the instructor of record. If the instructor of record approves the request to change the grade to a W, the instructor shall sign the form and forward the request to the Office of the Provost for review by the Academic Appeals Committee. This policy does not apply, with the exception of changing a grade to a Withdrawal (W), in the event that the instructor of record initiates the grade change. [The same time limit noted above applies to this situation.] If the original instructor of record is no longer employed by the university, then all grade change requests shall be submitted to the Office of the Provost for consideration by the Academic Appeals Committee.

2. The Registrar shall serve as an ex officio member of the Academic Appeals Committee in order to provide guidance in respect to the impact of grade changes on regulatory compliance by the university.

3. In order to change an Incomplete (I) to a grade, the student must complete any remaining course requirements by the end of the next regular semester (in which the course is offered) after the semester in which the Incomplete was assigned, unless extenuating circumstances prevent the student from completing the course requirements within this time period. In the case of an Incomplete (I) assigned to a student in a research or independent study course, in which consecutive semesters of enrollment in such a course with the same instructor may be required to complete a project, the student must complete any remaining course requirements by the end of the next regular semester after the semester in which the instructor of record deems that the project should have been completed.

Proposed Revisions

Proposed Revision A: In section 1 of the policy, the clause [on a designated Grade Change Request form] is deleted, as well as the wording [on the form. The form shall require the student’s signature]. There are concerns that the widespread availability of a general grade change form, which only requires a faculty signature, may increase risk for inappropriate and unauthorized use by students. The sentence [The student must request the grade change by the end of the next regular semester (Fall or Spring) after the semester in which the grade was assigned.] is deleted due to the possibility that a student may have a legitimate reason for
requesting the grade change at a later time. In addition, the deletion allows for faculty discretion in respect to grade changes. If a grade change is denied by the instructor of record, then the student has the option of the existing Academic Appeal procedure.

Proposed Revision B: In section 1 of the policy, [1] and the passage [or (2) the student requests a grade change after the end of the next regular semester,] are deleted due to the same reasons described above. The wording “the student must complete the Application for Academic Appeal form and submit the form to the instructor of record. If the instructor of record approves the request to change the grade to a W, the instructor shall sign the form and forward the request to the Office of the Provost for review by the Academic Appeals Committee.” is added. Given the involvement of the Academic Appeals Committee, use of the existing Application for Academic Appeal form obviates the need for developing separate form for a request to change a grade to a Withdrawal (W). Mr. Archer is proposing a revision of the Application for Academic Appeal form to reflect additional reasons for appealing to the committee. The use of the existing form also provides consistency between the Grade Change Policy and the existing Academic Appeals Procedure. Please note that the instructor of record retains discretion in whether to approve a grade change to a W, but the involvement of the Academic Appeals Committee ensures that the university remains in compliance when the requesting student is a veteran, international student, and/or is receiving financial aid.

Proposed Revision C: In section 1 of the policy, the sentence [The same time limit noted above applies to this situation.] is deleted because of the deletion of the time restriction as described in Proposed Revision A. The sentence “If the original instructor of record is no longer employed by the university, then all grade change requests shall be submitted to the Office of the Provost for consideration by the Academic Appeals Committee.” is added to provide a procedure in the event that the original instructor of record is not available.

FS Motion 2013-01-01
Motion to accept the recommendations of the University Policies Committee.

Motion passed by a voice vote.
(See the following: February and May Meetings have additional approved modifications to the policy)

2. Proposed Revision to the Academic Appeals Committee Description (January 2013)

Report and Recommendation from the University Polices Committee

In light of the development of a Grade Change Policy, a revision of the Academic Appeals Committee description (Faculty Handbook, p. 23) is proposed (bolded passages).

Academic Appeals Committee -- Reviews the procedural fairness of an instructor's grading policy upon the filing of a written student academic appeal. The committee also reviews
student requests to change a grade to a withdrawal (W) or grade change requests in the event that the instructor of record is no longer employed by the university.

The committee is composed of thirteen (13) members. Five (5) members are SWOSU faculty who serve two-year terms and three (3) members are students selected annually. The Faculty Senate nominates ten (10) faculty members and the Student Government Association nominates ten (10) student members for the pool from which the final committee is selected. SWOSU’s President, or the President’s designee, selects the final committee members from the nominations. The chair of the committee is a faculty member selected by the President. The Registrar shall serve as an ex officio member of the committee.

FS Motion 2013-01-02
Motion to accept the recommendations of the University Policies Committee.

Motion passed by a voice vote.

3. FS Resolution 2013-01-01

On SWOSU Campus Tree Project

Whereas many trees on the SWOSU campus have been marked for felling across campus, and

Whereas many aspects of SWOSU make this an inviting and welcoming campus, and

Whereas one of these aspects is the numerous trees which have flourished since their planting, and

Whereas these trees provide windbreaks and shade and enhance the appeal and appearance of the SWOSU campus, and

Whereas many of these trees are healthy and possess no apparent disease, deformity, or defect,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Southwestern Oklahoma State University opposes a culling of trees on this campus, and

Be it further resolved that for trees marked for culling, evidence of damage or disease must be clearly supported and presented to the campus community upon request, and

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate of SWOSU supports the beautification, environmental responsibility, and conservation of the campus and its natural resources, and
Be it further resolved that in the event that a tree must be culled due to disease, deformity, or defect, that it be replaced by a new tree planting programme of one tree for one tree.

Approved by the Faculty Senate of SWOSU by unanimous vote, this 25th day of January 2013.

(Update: The administration has agreed to scale back on their aggressive campus deforestation program.)

I. February 22, 2013 Meeting

1. Proposed Revisions to the Implementation of the Grade Change Policy (February 2013)

Report and Recommendation from the University Polices Committee

The University Polices Committee proposes the following revised version (bolded passages) of the original Grade Change Policy submitted by the Faculty Senate for consideration in October 2011.

1. Students requesting a grade change must submit the request in writing to the instructor of record. The student must state the specific reason(s) for the grade change request. For each course, the number of grade change requests shall be limited to one (1). A grade change request shall not be granted after the student graduates from the university. If the instructor of record approves the grade change, the instructor shall submit the grade change to the Office of the Registrar. If a student requests a change of a grade to a Withdrawal (W), the student must complete the Application for Academic Appeal: Request to Change a Grade to a Withdrawal (W) Grade form and submit the form to the instructor of record. If the instructor of record approves the request to change the grade to a Withdrawal (W), the instructor shall sign the form and forward the request to the Office of the Provost for review by the Academic Appeals Committee to determine compliance with regulations applicable to the particular student (e.g., financial aid, veteran status, or international student status). The Academic Appeals Committee review does not apply, with the exception of changing a grade to a Withdrawal (W) or in the event of a student filing an academic appeal for reasons authorized by the Academic Appeals Procedure, if the instructor of record initiates a grade change. If the original instructor of record is no longer available, then the student shall submit the grade change request to the chair of the department. Timelines regarding Academic Appeals Committee notification of instructor and student are as described in the Academic Appeals Procedure.

2. The Registrar shall serve as an ex officio member of the Academic Appeals Committee in order to provide guidance in respect to the impact of grade changes on regulatory compliance by the university.
3. In order to change an Incomplete (I) to a grade, the student must complete any remaining course requirements by the end of the next regular semester (in which the course is offered) after the semester in which the Incomplete was assigned, unless extenuating circumstances prevent the student from completing the course requirements within this time period. In the case of an Incomplete (I) assigned to a student in a research or independent study course, in which consecutive semesters of enrollment in such a course with the same instructor may be required to complete a project, the student must complete any remaining course requirements by the end of the next regular semester after the semester in which the instructor of record deems that the project should have been completed.

The University Polices Committee proposes the following revisions and recommendations regarding the Grade Change Policy and related policies and procedures.

1. Revision (bolded passages) of the Grade Change Policy, originally submitted by the Faculty Senate for consideration in October 2011, in light of recommendations from the Interim Provost Foust, Registrar Archer, and January 2013 Senate discussion.

2. Revision of the Academic Appeals Procedure (bolded passages) for consistency with the Grade Change Policy.

3. Amendment of the REQUEST TO CHANGE A GRADE TO A WITHDRAWAL (W) GRADE form to include the following statement in the To the Student section: “For more information concerning the academic appeals process, see the Academic Appeals Procedure (link).” (See the following page for a copy of the proposed form.)

**Faculty Senate Motion 2013-02-02**

The Faculty Senate proposes the adoption of the FS University Policies Committee recommendations in regard to the Proposed Revisions to the Implementation of the Grade Change Policy.

The motion was approved by a voice vote. (See the following May meeting for a final revisions of this grade change policy)
Application for Academic Appeal: Request to Change a Grade to a Withdrawal ("W") Grade

To the Student: If you would like to request to have a grade earned after the Summer 2012 Semester changed to a Withdrawal (W) Grade, you must complete Step One below and submit this form to the instructor who taught the course and awarded the grade*. If the instructor decides to proceed with the request, the instructor will complete Step Two of this form and forward it to the Vice President of Academic Affairs to begin the Academic Appeals Committee Review Process. The Academic Appeals Committee will review the grade change request. The student, instructor, and department chair will be notified by email of the decision made by the Academic Appeals Committee.

*If you would like to request to have a grade earned before the Fall 2012 Semester changed to a W Grade, the request is at the discretion of the instructor that awarded the grade (or department chair if the instructor is no longer available) and no appeals process is required. If you wish to request to have a grade earned after the Summer 2012 Semester changed to a W Grade and the instructor that awarded the grade is no longer available, the department chair that oversees the subject area in which the course was taught in will serve as the role of the instructor on step two of this form and determine whether or not to proceed with the request.

**Step One: To be Completed by the Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>(First)</th>
<th>(Middle)</th>
<th>(Maiden)</th>
<th>(Last)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student ID Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mailing Address | | | |
| | (Number, Street) | City, State | Zip |
| Phone # | | | |

| Course Prefix | | | |
| Course Number | | | |
| Course Title | | | |
| Semester Taken | | |
| (Circle One) Fall | Spring | Summer | Year Taken | Grade Earned | (as currently on transcript) |
| Instructor that Awarded Grade | | |
| Reason for Request to Change the Grade to a "W" Grade | | |

Student’s Signature __________________________ Date __________________________

**Step Two: To Be Completed by the Instructor who Taught the Course and Awarded the Grade** (will only be completed if the instructor that awarded the grade agrees to proceed with the request to change the grade to a “W”).

| PRINT Instructor Name | | |
| Instructor Email | | |

| Instructor Signature | | Date |
| | | |

**Step Three: Instructor that Awarded the Grade Submits this Form to the Vice President of Academic Affairs to Begin the Academic Appeals Review Process** (the student cannot take this form after the instructor signs it).

**COMMITTEE USE ONLY**

| Recommendations | | |
| | | |

| Emailed Student | | Emailed Instructor |
| | | |

| Academic Appeals Committee Chair | Date | Emailed Chair |
| | | |


I. February 22, 2013 Meeting (continued)

2. Faculty Senate Motion 2013-02-03
The Faculty Senate request that the Administration consider the standard class schedule when determining the opening and closing of SWOSU during inclement weather.

The motion was approved by a voice vote.

J. March 29, 2013 Meeting

1. FS Motion 2013-03-01: (From the Judiciary Committee)
It is proposed that faculty senate will vote in favor of changing two senators’ term expiration dates, in order to allow for approximately one-third of the Senate to be elected each year.

The term of the Allied Health Representative will expire in May of 2014, and the new term of one of the Language and Literature Representatives will expire in May 2014.

The motion was passed by a voice vote.

2. FS Motion 2013-03-02
FS recommends that SWOSU human resources look into the possibility of adding health insurance options and/or exchange programs from the Affordable Health Care Act, in addition to the currently offered BlueCross/BlueShield coverage. These plans would be available for employees and their dependents.

Rationale: The current dependent care coverage for spouse and children costs $1000 per month. These costs are beyond the means of most young employees and their families. If there are any options in the Affordable Health Care Act that can address this problem, then those options should be aggressively pursued.

The motion was passed by a voice vote.

K. April 18, 2013 Meeting

1. FS Motion 2013-04-01
The FS accept the recommendations of the audit committee.
The 2012-2013 Audit Committee (Marci Grant, Tamra Weimer, Amy Barnett, and Kristin Montarella) reviewed the bank statements between the dates of March 15, 2012 and March 15, 2013.

The Audit committee found no discrepancies in either the bank or the University Accounts.

**Observation and recommendation**: There were discrepancies in the receipts for the $5.00 dues and the deposits. We would recommend that the amount not be put on the receipts or if faculty submits a different amount other than the $5.00, a new receipt needs to be completed using the new amount and not writing over the $5.00 and changing to another amount.

**Recommendation**: the Treasurer’s Report in the Faculty Senate Minutes, dated July 17, 2012, referred to a July Meeting Balance and it needs to read June Meeting Balance.

**Recommendation**: the Treasurer’s Report in the Faculty Senate Minutes, dated October 26, 2012, referred to an August Meeting Balance and it needs to read September Meeting Balance.

Motion passed by a voice vote.

2. The Faculty Senate approved the University committee assignments for next year.

L. May 3, 2013 Meeting

1. Report from the Faculty Senate Nominations Committee

   Nominations:
   Faculty Senate President-Elect: Evette Meliza
   Faculty Senate Secretary/Treasurer: Curt Woolever

   **FS Motion 2013-05-01**: Accept both nominations by acclimation. Motion approved.

2. Report From the Faculty Senate University Policies Committee

   **Final Revision to the Grade Change Policy to Clarify that Changing an Incomplete (I) to a Withdrawal (W) Does Not Require a Review by the Academic Appeals Committee**
   (May 2013)
The University Policies Committee proposes a revision (bolded passage) to the Grade Change Policy originally submitted by the Faculty Senate and approved by the University Administration in February 2013.

Rationale
In the case of students who have been assigned an Incomplete (I) and are unable to satisfactorily complete course requirements, particularly due to extenuating circumstances (e.g., serious illness, injury, or personal/family issues or hardship), faculty members have appreciated the option of changing an Incomplete (I) to a Withdrawal (W) in order to provide closure and ameliorate the presence of an Incomplete (I) on the student record for the long term. This option also affords the student the opportunity to enroll in the course at a later time and complete the course in a more satisfactory manner. The purpose of this recommendation is to clarify that this option does not require the review process by the Academic Appeals Committee as outlined in the Grade Change Policy. Since an Incomplete (I) is GPA-neutral, the change from an Incomplete (I) to a Withdrawal (W) does not have the same potential for adverse compliance issues as changing an actual course grade to a Withdrawal (W).

Proposed Policy Revision
Students requesting a grade change must submit the request in writing to the instructor of record. The student must state the specific reason(s) for the grade change request. For each course, the number of grade change requests shall be limited to one (1). A grade change request shall not be granted after the student graduates from the university. If the instructor of record approves the grade change, the instructor shall submit the grade change to the Office of the Registrar. If a student requests a change of a grade to a Withdrawal (W), the student must complete the Application for Academic Appeal: Request to Change a Grade to a Withdrawal (W) Grade form and submit the form to the instructor of record. If the instructor of record approves the request to change the grade to a Withdrawal (W), the instructor shall sign the form and forward the request to the Office of the Provost for review by the Academic Appeals Committee to determine compliance with regulations applicable to the particular student (e.g., financial aid, veteran status, or international student status). The Academic Appeals Committee review does not apply, with the exception of changing a grade to a Withdrawal (W) or in the event of a student filing an academic appeal for reasons authorized by the Academic Appeals Procedure, if the instructor of record initiates a grade change or an instructor changes an Incomplete (I) to a Withdrawal (W). If the original instructor of record is no longer available, then the student shall submit the grade change request to the chair of the department. Timelines regarding Academic Appeals Committee notification of instructor and student are as described in the Academic Appeals Procedure.

Respectfully submitted,
University Policies Committee

FS Motion 2013-05-02:
Motion to accept the University Policies Committee recommendation.
Motion approved by a voice vote.

Gavel passed to incoming FS President, Dr. Fred Gates.
III. Motions and resolutions that were not adopted 2012/2013

A. June 19, 2012 Meeting

None.

B. July 17, 2012 Meeting

None.

C. August 24, 2012 Meeting

None.

D. September 28, 2012 Meeting

**FS Motion 2012-09-01**

It is proposed that faculty be allowed access to all student academic records via Campus Connect.

*Rationale:* Faculty access to student records for all students would increase the quality of faculty advice for students who are not formally their advisees. It would also not restrict students to just their Advisor, they could go to any faculty member for advice. This policy would encourage the Sophomores, Juniors and Seniors to visit faculty member that they are comfortable with. Other regional universities (e.g. NSU) allow faculty members access to student records. In addition, it would be a valuable resource in writing recommendation letters.

Some of the points brought up during the subsequent discussion included: concerns about universal access that may allow faculty from other departments making changes to the students’ schedule. Hence the consensus was to have “Read only” access to student transcripts for all faculty. The feasibility of the Read only option also needs to be looked into. After some discussion regarding the motion, the matter was referred to the University Policies Committee. (see following report in the October Meeting)

E. October 26, 2012 Meeting

1. Faculty Senate University Policies Committee Report on Expanded Faculty Access to Student Transcripts (**FS Motion 2012-09-01**): It is proposed that faculty be allowed access to all student academic records via Campus Connect.)
The University Policies Committee has inquired about expansion of direct faculty access to student transcripts, particularly for faculty within a department or a specific major. Registrar Daniel Archer, Vice President Foust, Provost Sonobe, and ITS Director Mark Engelman have discussed this issue and explain that the current system is designed for access by advisor code, which results in two main possibilities: direct faculty access being restricted to only advisee transcripts, as it is now, or complete access by all faculty, since all faculty have an advisor code. However, the administration is concerned that unrestricted direct access to student transcripts by all faculty or by non-advisor faculty within a department or major raises privacy concerns in respect to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). In addition, it is the intention of the university that only the assigned advisor is involved in making changes to student schedules. Mr. Archer reiterates that, while direct access is limited to the assigned faculty advisor, department chairs and designated administrative assistants in departmental offices have “advise all access” due to working with a wider variety of students and having responsibilities for assisting the university during transitional periods, such as breaks. As a result, department chairs and designated administrative assistants may assist with faculty requests for access to unofficial transcripts if needed for legitimate educational purposes.

Respectfully submitted,
Members of the University Policies Committee

The members that brought the motion have decided to leave things as they stand and not take and further action in response to the above reply from the Registrar Daniel Archer

2. FS Motion 2012-10-03:
The Faculty Senate recommends that, for purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion, and at all levels of evaluation, the university consider Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEF) only on the basis of "positive" or "negative" with an average of 1-3 being classified as good and 4-5 classified as being weak.

Rationale: The current and past practice of evaluating SEF on the basis of average numbers, sometimes taken to the second decimal place, sets important career decisions on a foundation of arbitrary assessments that have never been demonstrated to be objective or part of a fair process. SEF outcomes have long been shown to be strongly influenced by many factors not directly related to the quality of instruction, including gender and age of instructor, various classroom conditions such as lighting, temperature, available space, class size, the time of day an evaluated class is taught, etc., the academic position of the evaluating students themselves, such as whether the evaluated course is part of the student's major, and whether they are upper level lower level students, and how well educated the evaluated student is at the time of the evaluation. Since these and many other factors are out of the control of the instructor, career decisions made on the basis of SEF can only come to biased conclusions as any set of SEF will demonstrate bias towards some classes or instructors and against others. Faculty who teach heavy loads of GE classes are at further disadvantage.
The FS discussed the above motion about Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEF). The proposal as is written uses 1-3 being classified as good and 4-5 classified as being weak. Some members of the FS were concerned about 3 be classified as being good, especially if the departmental average was something like 1.5. Hence the general feeling was to have 1-2 as good, 3 as average and 4-5 as being weak. Some members of the FS did express concerns about using the above grading system as a hard and fast rule. Each T&P binder needs to be looked at subjectively. A motion was passed to revise the grading to reflect 1-2 as good, 3 as average and 4-5 as being weak. The motion was then tabled.

The motion was tabled.

3. FS Motion 2012-10-04:
The Faculty Senate recommends that instructors not vote on the evaluation of tenure track Ph.D.s for purposes of continuance, tenure, or promotion.

*Rationale:* Out of respect for the work it requires to earn a Ph.D. or other doctorate, we should not have instructors, some of whom have no higher degree in the field of their discipline than bachelor's, or perhaps Masters of Education, evaluating the research of scholars who have obtained the highest possible degree in their research field and have made contributions to their fields of study.

The above motion was denied because the candidate has the option to select a committee member from outside the department on the continuance committee. The departments have a system of selecting the continuance committee and the general feeling of the FS was that everyone’s input would be valuable in deciding continuance.

The motion was defeated by a voice vote.

F. November 16, 2012 Meeting

FS Motion 2012-11-01:
The Faculty Senate recommends that for Interdisciplinary majors, a capstone course will be required in at least one area of study if one or more of the disciplines in the student’s degree program require a capstone course.

*Rationale:* Many majors require a capstone course. With the relatively large numbers of transfer students and students changing majors, these capstone courses are important for protecting the integrity of the degree programs at SWOSU. The degree requirements for students with multidisciplinary studies should be comparable to the degree requirements for students with the more specific component majors. Therefore, if any of the student’s
areas of study require a capstone course, the student should be required to take one of the capstone courses.

The faculty senate discussed the issue and a motion was passed to refer the above matter to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. (See the following report from the December meeting)

G. December 7, 2012 Meeting

Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee Report on FS Motion 2012-11-01

The Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee met on Monday, November 19, 2012, to consider the motion presented at the last Faculty Senate meeting to require Interdisciplinary Studies majors to take a capstone course in at least one of the three (3) areas they select for their degree studies. The committee addressed the issue from two perspectives: feasibility and appropriateness, given the nature and scope of the degree itself.

Feasibility

Interdisciplinary Studies majors are required to take a minimum of twenty-one (21) credit hours in each of three areas of study they select for their degree plan. With so few credit hours in each of the areas, students would likely not be prepared or qualified to take a capstone course in most of the areas of study available to them. It was noted by the committee current capstone courses in the areas of study available to Interdisciplinary majors generally require (1) senior standing in that area, (2) permission of the chair and instructor, and/or (3) a series of prerequisite courses not always available to Interdisciplinary Studies majors as course options. Additionally, in many areas of study choices, the capstone course is not listed as a course option.

Appropriateness

The Interdisciplinary Studies degree provides an alternative degree option for non-traditional students who do not wish to major in any particular field of study. Rather, these students seek to gain a general understanding and familiarity in three (3) areas of their choice. There is no intention or expectation in the degree rationale for these students to develop the expertise and depth of knowledge that would be expected of a major in any particular area of study.

In addition, the twenty-one (21) credits required in each of the three (3) areas from which they may choose, is generally equivalent to a minor degree in that area. Although the minor degrees are more heavily structured, there are no capstone requirements in any of them.

Curriculum Committee Recommendation

For the reasons stated above, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee recommends to the Faculty Senate that requiring Interdisciplinary Studies majors to take a capstone course in any of the areas they choose for their degree plan is neither feasible nor appropriate.

The above Committee was discussed. The consensus of the FS was that Capstone may not be feasible for every graduating student and hence the FS Motion 2012-11-01 is not passed.
H. January 25, 2013 Meeting

None.

I. February 22, 2013 Meeting

1. University Policies Committee report:

Proposed Modification of the “Dropping Student from a Class” form.

Revision of the RECOMMENDATION FOR DROPPING STUDENT FROM CLASS form to include a check box for International Student status. This recommendation is based on the potential compliance ramifications in the event of dropping a student from a class who may have international status. The committee believes these are the same compliance concerns as when changing a grade to a W for veterans, international students, or students with specific financial aid requirements. The form currently has a check box for Veteran status.

FS Motion 2013-02-01

The Faculty Senate proposes the adoption of the FS University Policies Committee recommendations in regard to the modification of the University’s “Recommendation for Dropping a Student from Class” form.

The motion was defeated by a voice vote.

2. FS Motion 2013-02-04

The Assessment Center will add new data to its report of student evaluation of courses: a report of grade distributions for each course, the number of A, B, C, D, F, U, and W grades earned by the student in the course.

Rationale: Evaluations of faculty are relatively simple in terms of scholarship and service. Evaluators have little objective evidence apart from peer observation reports and student evaluations, though, when making decisions related to teaching performance for the purposes of continuance, tenure, and promotion. Because of this, some vulnerable faculty members may feel pressure to inflate grades in their courses in order achieve more positive student evaluations, removing the important distinction between students who make genuine efforts in the coursework and those who do not. Adding grade distributions to student evaluation reports can relieve some of this pressure to inflate grade by demonstrating correlations between grades and levels of student satisfaction with a course.

The addition of grade distributions could also serve as an important signal to instructors who could alter the natures of courses that produce either alarmingly high or alarmingly low course grades.
Since student evaluation reports currently arrive in department offices months after the semester in which the course is evaluated, the registrar's office will have ample time to report grade distributions to the Assessment Center, which can add them to student evaluation report.

The motion was tabled for further discussion later. (Update: the motion was not reintroduced during the current senate term)

J. March 29, 2013 Meeting

K. April 18, 2013 Meeting

None.

L. May 3, 2013 Meeting

None.

IV. Visitors

A. June 19, 2012 Meeting

None.

B. July 17, 2012 Meeting

None.

C. August 24, 2012 Meeting

Jonna Myers from Career Services. Myers talked about services offered by Career services on Campus. Career services offer services like reviewing cover letters and CV, mock interviews and professionalism. Careers services can supplement and augment your course material. Office: STF 209 or Ext. 3233.

D. September 28, 2012 Meeting
Lynne Thurman, Assistant to the President for Institutional Advancement addressed the Senate on various matters concerning the SWOSU foundation. Lynne Thurman educated the Senate about the money raised by the SWOSU foundation and the various ways the money is being used. The foundation money is primarily used to help people in desperate need. Ms. Thurman cited various examples where foundation money was put to very good use, including helping students in dire needs, campus beautification, community requests, departmental needs, etc. She also informed the Senate that the faculty giving was about 10% and the foundation would like to increase that to at least 30%. She then urged faculty to “give to your passion” and encourage contribution to the foundation.

E. October 26, 2012 Meeting

None.

F. November 16, 2012 Meeting

None.

G. December 7, 2012 Meeting

None.

H. January 25, 2013 Meeting

Daphne Burns, Director of Sponsored Programs. Ms. Burns provided an overview of what her office does. She spoke about the responsibilities of her office that include support for Grant writing, research proposals adhering to university policy and complying to Federal guidelines. Every granting agency requires different forms and hence each proposal required individual attention of her office. Her office would like to up gains and increase the number of applicants for grant proposals.

The Senate discussed the lack to time as a major factor that deterred more Grant writing. There was also concern how to find suitable grants and what types of grants have the possibility of being funded. The topic of cuts in funding in recent times was also discussed.

I. February 22, 2013 Meeting

None.
J. March 29, 2013 Meeting

None

K. April 18, 2013 Meeting

Randy Beutler, SWOSU President, and Tom Fagan, Vice President for Administration and Finance.

President Beutler updated the Faculty Senate about changes to the budget. Rumor has it that the State is close to finalizing a budget deal. Legislative outlook (budget) is unclear. Best case we have flat budget. We might see a 4.85% budget cut starting 2015.

The University system of Oklahoma might have to repay part of the Principle ($23.9M) on a $475 million capital bond improvement package for higher education that was issued a few years ago (2005). If the State does not help, SWOSU will have to pay back $605,207 and that works out to be a $4.75/credit hour increase to tuition. The President also talked about Transparency and Accountability in the all the State agencies.

Vice President (Administration and Finance) Tom Fagan also talked about the SWOSU budget and incidental cost due to bad weather and increase in utility costs.

L. May 3, 2013 Meeting

SGA Vice President-Elect Taylor Kincanon and Treasurer-Elect Jerrad Richards

Respectfully submitted to the SWOSU Faculty,

David Esjornson, Ph.D.
Faculty Senate President, 2012-2013