



**University Senate Meeting  
Monday, September 9, 2013 -- 3:15 p.m.  
Weatherby Conference Room**

*Draft Minutes*

---

**Call to Order:**

- Chair Margaret Crowder called the regular meeting of the WKU Senate Executive Committee to order on Monday, August 5, 2013 at 3:15 pm in the Weatherby Conference Room. A quorum was present.
- **Members Present:**  
Heidi Álvarez, Jill Brown, Margaret Crowder, Tucker Davis, Gordon Emslie, Ashley Chance Fox, John Gottfried, Jennifer Hanley, Angela Jerome, Alison Langdon, Patti Minter, and Mark Reeves.
- **Visiting or Advisory Members Present:**  
Tony Glisson, Sharon Mutter, Beth Plummer
- **Absent:**  
Lloren Foster
- **Alternates Present:**
  - Rick Grieve for Ric Keaster
  - Adam West for Beverly Siegrist

**A. Approve August Minutes**

- Approved unanimously.

**B. Reports:**

1. Chair – Margaret Crowder
  - Reminded the SEC that the meeting agenda is posted online.
2. Vice Chair – Jennifer Hanley
  - Many committees have not met yet.
  - Potter college has nominated two people to represent the Handbook Committee and the online election to elect one will take place soon.
  - The online election for at-large senators will be soon.

3. Secretary – Heidi Álvarez (no report)

4. Committee Reports

A. Academic Quality Committee (no report)

B. Faculty Welfare & Professional Responsibility Committee (no report)

C. General Education Curriculum Committee (no report)

D. Graduate Council (Beth Plummer)

- The committee met on May 9 & August 15.
- Motion to approve August 15
- Provost suggested that the Graduate Council split new curriculums/programs from new policy.
- Motion by Heidi Álvarez to split the report as suggested was seconded by Jennifer Hanley.
- Provost will talk to the chair of the Graduate Council Committee about splitting consent items, action items, & policy issues.
- This will entail two separate votes (policy and non-policy items).
- The motion passed unanimously. A motion to send this item to the senate passed unanimously.

E. University Curriculum Committee (no report)

5. Advisory:

A. Faculty Regent (Regent Patricia Minter):

- Dr. Minter is attending the CPE Trustees Conference in Louisville. This includes all of the boards from 8 public universities and representatives from private universities. She will send a report.
- The Board of Regents Committee meets on Sept. 27 (no agenda yet).

B. Academic Affairs, (Provost Gordon Emslie):

- The US News Rankings come out Sept. 10.
- Admissions criteria of being more selective is pushing us in the right direction.
- Enrollment head count is down but non-resident international enrollment is up.
- Associate/part time ACT score is up a half-point.
- More students are still enrolling.
- We have met the 2018 goal of professional faculty per student.
- The presentation to the council of academic deans on Wednesday showed that there are 40 sections of English 200; he is looking at how to more efficiently staff these sections.
- The cost of summer utilities is down 6%; use is down 8%.
- The provost wants to continue with 5 abbreviated days in May, and continue with the same schedule as this year June 1-mid-August summer schedule as long as there are no complaints.

- One concern on the Executive Committee was that some faculty were not able to teach in their own building; the provost stated that they are using energy efficient buildings and that Jessica Steinberg is the person to talk to if they want a location change for their summer courses.
- The Provost asked where we are with the grading scale debate (plus/minus). There has been no report or vote from the SGA. Because there was disagreement with the Graduate Council, the Graduate Council was letting the issue float. Someone asked if the plus/minus decision could be split between undergraduate and graduate. The Provost said he was OK with proceeding with undergraduate classes only. The SGA and Academic Quality Committee did not recommend last year's policy. The SGA tabled it and did not vote on it. However, there is a new senate this year, so in two weeks they might be interested in pursuing this issue and look at another proposal. We need a final decision from Academic Quality and Graduate Council; they just did not want to bring it forward themselves. The provost is willing to share ideas with the SGA. Academic Quality wanted to hear from Graduate Council and Graduate Council did not want to make a decision. We will wait for a discussion from SGA on what they want, and then it will go to Academic Quality.

### **C. Old Business**

### **D. New Business:**

#### 1. Policy 1.3140: Priority Registration Schedule

- Priority registration schedule (student athletes, various statuses, forensics, band, cheerleaders, veterans, etc.) has two parts.
- Part One is to establish a hierarchy for everyone requesting priority registration. Graduating seniors will be Tier 0. A Tier 1 and Tier 2 hierarchy will be established.
- Part Two is to limit the number of priority hours to 16.
- Motion to approve by Jennifer Hanley, Seconded by Ashley Fox.
- Item passed unanimously

#### 2. Policy 1.1064: Access to Academic Affairs Electronic Personnel Files

- Changes are highlighted.
- The Dean can request it but cannot just go into it. Only 4 people have the authority to go into it.
- Motion to approve by Jennifer Hanley, Seconded by Ashley Fox.
- Item passed unanimously.

#### 3. Policy 1.3130: Advising Relative to Declaration and Change of Program of Study

- Discussion:
- Motion to approve by Jennifer Hanley, seconded by Ashley Fox.
- Item passed unanimously.

## E. Information items:

### 1. Policy 4.2203: Recruitment & Selection (Tony Glisson)

---

- Tony Glisson highlighted things that are changing or have been worded with new language.
  - Major content change is included with highlighted notes. Most are additions and clarifications. Nothing is taken out.
  - He went through each section word for word with the executive committee and answered questions and clarified the reasons behind each change/addition/clarification.
  - It was suggested by the SEC that wording be added in Glisson's document to clarify working parallel to the Faculty Handbook regarding "it is encouraged that the hiring official should not be a member of the committee" to clarify that the Department Head cannot be listed as a member of the hiring committee.
  - The Faculty Handbook Committee will need to revisit the language "Special Tenure"
  - A motion by Margaret Crowder to send an amended version of Glisson's document to the Senate with the SEC's suggested edits for the purpose of review and approval was seconded by Ashley Fox. The motion passed unanimously.
  - The amended document will be taken as an information item to the Senate.
  - Glisson will send the changes to Margaret Crowder.
  - Any group consulted must have a written statement to Ann Mead or Tony Glisson as to the extent that they agree with it.
- 

### 2. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance Policy (Sharon Mutter)

---

- Dr. Mutter gave an overview of the document and highlighted differences.
  - The impetus for the report goes back to 2010. The UCC voted to form an ad-hoc committee to evaluate faculty governance.
  - There were 68 responses on the survey. The survey suggested that there was widespread discontent with the faculty governance system after the results of the first survey.
  - The committee considered a broader curricular and faculty professional responsibilities.
  - The survey went to the faculty at large to see what kind of governance structure they would prefer.
  - A second ad-hoc committee was then formed. This is the report of the second committee.
  - The results suggested two bodies: Academic Council and Faculty Senate. We are returning to the old structure with some positive changes.
  - One goal was to provide faculty with broad representation. It was a lot of responsibility from just one person. The new structure suggests one representative to academic council and one representative to the faculty senate. This allows the faculty to decide what they like to do; they can focus on what they like and not on what they are disinterested in.
  - The committee proposed a three-year term so people can really become familiar with their position; turnover for the 1<sup>st</sup> cohort is that 1/3 would turn over after 2 years. They can be interested in it and know how to do their job.
  - The communicating curricular body for academic council is built in.
  - Things that are working well will stay in.
  - Other committees communicate with faculty senate.
  - The faculty handbook committee would report to senate.
-

- Senate would elect members and report back (these are listed).
  - These are the highlights. The proposed timeline is as follows:
  - This fall: 1<sup>st</sup> phase of review of the proposal is consultation with the SEC and a presentation of the proposal to the faculty. The Senate will hold a public forum and post the proposal on the website. Comments from the faculty will come back to this committee (SEC) and we will return it to the Ad-Hoc for revisions with suggestion revisions, comments, or changes.
  - January or February: after phase 1, the amended proposal will be sent to the senate. Margaret Crowder asked that the document be sent in parts. Sharon Mutter requested that it be sent as a single “up or down” vote.
  - February to March: Phase 3, presentation of the approved proposal from senate to the entire faculty. P. 6 requires a majority 2/3 of the vote.
  - April: Phase 4 Board of Regents
  - April or May: Phase 5 elections.
  - Question: is there a fiscal affairs committee? Answer: not presently; it is usually under faculty welfare. Sharon can go back and flag things like that. There was a discussion for a need for such a committee.
  - Before sending it anywhere do we want a 2/3 majority? We need to be clear about it before sending it forth. Dr. Minter said to change the senate charter we need 2/3 vote, and we need to phase in. Minter stated that she thinks it is important for the faculty to be behind this, and it is an attempt to give the faculty what they want.
  - Dr. Crowder said that we will post it to the senate website and ask the senate to look at it and ask them to have the faculty look at it to give comments back to the SEC.
  - Sharon Mutter said the document is not completely done but that she is asking the senate to comment on something; they want a broader look at it to catch any things that need to be changed.
  - A motion to require 2/3 of votes cast from the full faculty was put on the table by Jennifer Hanley and seconded by Jill Brown.
  - A clarification of who is eligible to vote: The same people who can vote for faculty regent are those who can vote for this (full-time instructors, clinical; it includes everyone who is not part-time, and it includes the provost).
  - A clarification that the 2/3 majority must require a certain amount of voters.
  - The motion on the 2/3 vote carried unanimously.
  - The second motion by Jennifer Hanley (seconded by Rick Grieve) was that we need a simple majority of voters. We need 2/3 of 75%. In other words, we need 75% faculty participation.
  - The motion to have 2/3 majority of 75% voter participation carried. The motion passed unanimously.
  - Dr. Crowder stated that we need to clarify specifically what is happening with this document. Phase 1 Part A: The SEC will clarify concerns upfront and will clean up the document. The SEC will ask the Ad-Hoc committee about issues and deal with it before sending nit to the full faculty. Crowder made a motion to reappoint the current ad-hoc committee through Phase 1 Part A (through the fall semester). This was seconded by Jill Brown. The motion to reappoint the members of the ad-hoc committee through Phase 1 Part A carried. The motion passed unanimously.
  - The SEC needs to look at the document and send written comments to Margaret Crowder in two weeks (by Sept. 23). The ad-hoc committee will address concerns/questions at the next SEC meeting.
-

**F. Announcements/proposed new business agenda items for next meeting:**

A. Alison Landon suggested that we propose a change of dates for continuance document deadlines so that the faculty has more time to view the documents.

B. Richard Miller said that the University Complaint Committee must be formed on or before November 1. He stated that we need to send a memo to the deans that they need to have a committee in place.

A motion to adjourn by Jennifer Hanley was seconded by everyone.

**Meeting adjourned 5:55 pm**

Respectfully submitted,

Heidi Álvarez, secretary