

**Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting Minutes**  
**April 6, 2015 -- 3:15 p.m.**  
**WAB 227 - AA Large Conference Room**

A. Call to Order

- Chair Crowder called the SEC meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. in the Wetherby Conference Room.
- A quorum was present.
- Members present:  
Heidi Álvarez, Barbara Burch, Seth Church, Thad Crews, Margaret Crowder, Laura DeLancey, Gordon Emslie, Lloren Foster, Ashley Chance Fox, John Gottfried, Rick Grieve, Kate Hudepohl, Evie Oregon, Julie Shadoan, Beverly Siegrist, Andrew West, Patti Minter.
- Substitutes present:  
Ann Ferrell for Jennifer Hanley.
- Guests present:  
Molly Dunkum, Molly Kerby, Kurt Neelly, Larry Snyder, Kevin Williams.

B. **Approve March Meeting Minutes**

- A motion to approve The March, 2015 minutes by John Gottfried was seconded by Lloren Foster. The minutes were approved unanimously as posted.

C. **Reports**

1. Chair, (Margaret Crowder)
  - May reports of university committees elected by senate should send reports to Chair Crowder.
  - Chair Crowder hopes to hear a response from the Benefits Committee next month in reference to the resolution we passed.
2. Vice Chair, (Ann Ferrell for Jennifer Hanley)
  - The handbook is being put together for the week of April 27.
3. Secretary, (Heidi Álvarez)
  - No report.
4. **Academic Quality Committee: (Report Posted)** (Laura DeLancey)
  - The Academic Quality report requires a few updates that have occurred since the submission of the report. The committee talked to President Ransdell; the committee unanimously questioned a need for a Confucius Institute building and requested faculty oversight for the building. DeLancey added that the committee feels there is a place for faculty to be represented.
  - A faculty committee was recommended; Dr. Ransdell appointed Martha Day, Laura McGee, and Ken Dowell.
  - The CI is not an academic program on campus. Several faculty teach classes here on campus. Several take students to events that involve course credit.

- The budget committee should look at finances; Dr. Ransdell said it is private money. Hanban \$1.5 million, WKU \$1.5 million, Ransdell says \$2.3 million is the total cost; the numbers do not add up. In the report, the faculty requests oversight of this.
- The Provost stated that academic course content is student engagement. Laura DeLancey stated that the faculty is not employed by Modern Languages. The Provost said they must be recognized as credentialed instructors; the role has to be part/full-time, credentialed faculty. If paid through Hanban, it is through a grant. Regent Burch said at the end of request #1, the first narrative, impact on academic mission, gives a reason for it. Chair Crowder said the request is to put it under the purview of Academic Affairs. The Provost said he will defer to President Ransdell, but they have to be certified and have to go through a national search. Two faculty were hired under Hanban in the first five years; they do work for the Confucius Institute. Regent Burch stated that many things have an impact on the campus that are not linked to teaching a course and asked the Provost if he sees it as a program. The Provost stated that this is the President's call.
- The contract reads that the building is for "free and exclusive use of the Confucius Institute." The building should be available for other uses -- not just the Confucius Institute as the contract reads -- the use of the building should not be exclusive to the Confucius Institute. The Provost gave an example of the regional campuses; one building is for high school students. Chair Crowder asked Laura DeLancey to look into this. John Gottfried said there was only one meeting saying let's get more information on what this building is for and they are looking at how it affects library space. The Provost expects all space to return to the library except for the Chinese learning center.
- Part 2 of the Academic Quality report (Multi-term registration proposal): there is a pros and cons list to look at the proposal in conjunction with department heads. The committee was divided. Pros included the advantages to helping students. Cons included the scheduling of classes for smaller departments.
- The Provost asked if other members of the task force provided a report. Laura DeLancey responded "only Doug's report." The Provost asked about options about academic year, calendar year, rolling 12-month process. Laura DeLancey responded that they are still exploring what that would look like.
- A motion to approve the Academic Quality report by Julie Shadoan was seconded by Lloren Foster. The report was approved unanimously.

##### 5. **Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee: (Report Posted)**

- The Faculty Welfare committee met on March 30. There is one action to bring forward. The Field Trip policy that Amber put together is something that Minter will share with the committee. The Faculty Code of Conduct for faculty-led or study away trip. The Provost said that the policy states they are not covered under this policy. Patricia Minter said that there is a link to study abroad and study away that was posted a few months ago. Discussion started ten years ago for more liability and more documentation of responsibilities. Minter stated that people want to know what their rights and responsibilities for off-campus trips are. The link shows this. The policy related to course-related field trips and study

- abroad and study away are different things. Minter will take it back to the committee; they want to see the information. The intention was that they like having a live link, and the committee feels the information should be available. The Provost thinks the link should have never been there in the first place, and suggested moving study abroad and study away. Amber's document arrived after the committee met. The second part was pulled.
- Patricia Minter made a motion for approval of the report. There was no further discussion. The report was approved. It will go forward to senate and then to Faculty Handbook.
6. **Handbook Recommendation**
  7. **Handbook Approval, Substantive Change**
  8. **Budget and Finance Committee: No Report**
    - Andrew West gave an informal report, as the committee missed the deadline by one day. The sub-committee (Mead, Cummings (CFO), Kim Reed (Budget Director) sent forms; the group is going over this. The group wants to know if they are line items (ie. CI) or policy level-items. They are considering the Provost's offer for the committee to be a sounding board related to the Budget and Finance committee. There is no real "report."
  9. **Colonnade Implementation Committee / General Education Curriculum Committee: No report (proposed Charter changes include in Ad Hoc Committee report, below)**
    - There is a draft under the Ad-Hoc Committee on charter revision.
    - Lloren Foster said the bylaws that two readings must occur; this is set for the May meeting. Policy and Procedures are forthcoming. Chair Crowder stated that if both readings take place in the fall, it will be the same body.
  10. **Graduate Council: (Report Posted)**
    - Beverly Siegrist made a motion for approval of the Graduate Council report. The report was approved unanimously by graduate faculty only.
  11. **Policy item recommendation (Posted)**
    - The multi-semester policy item was referred back to Graduate Council; the Graduate Council was unanimous.
    - Beverly Siegrist made a motion to approve the policy item as posted.
    - Kate Hudepohl said she is glad it is being sent to multiple committees; some valuable things came back.
    - The policy item recommendation was approved unanimously.
  12. **Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: (Report Posted)**
    - Ashley Chance Fox made a motion to approve the UCC report as posted. There was no discussion. The report was approved unanimously.

### 13. Faculty Handbook Committee: No Report.

### 14. Ad Hoc Committee on Research: (Report Posted)

- Kevin Williams stated that the committee was formed at the beginning of the semester to work alongside the Provost's committee. The meeting will take place on the 20<sup>th</sup>; it was delayed due to weather.
- The committee looked into themes or things that keep coming up, for example, the flexibility with internal funding. The committee wants to find ways of improving grass roots and is committed to a plan for the future that is optimizing research structures in areas of the restructuring chart. The committee was summarizing what the faculty was telling them and was coming up with recommendations.
- Margaret Crowder stated that the report will be presented to the Provost, along with the report by the administrative committee, and will be discussed at greater lengths. She stated that the committee did an excellent job, and that "very real actions could come from this report. The recommendations are doable and tangible." Crowder then recommended that senators continue to follow up with the report, stating that she does not want these issues to die. Follow-up is important.
- Andrew West asked if the group considered budget implications, and asked what do we currently spend and what would need to change? Kevin Williams stated that the committee looked at the OSP report. There would be multiple categories of RCAP and faculty grants. Looking into the future, the committee made a wish list in case more money comes in. Margaret Crowder stated that potential items in the future might come up that would be good for the Budget and Finance committee to discuss.
- A motion by Laura DeLancey for approval of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Research report as posted was seconded by Julie Shadoan. The report was approved unanimously. Chair Crowder stated that she appreciates the hard work of the committee.

### 15. Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Charter Revisions: (Draft posted - 1st reading)

- The Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Charter Revisions met four times and posted information to Blackboard. The draft for SEC includes changes. Colonnade and Graduate Council are the main areas; highlighted are the primary areas of change: p. 7 under Graduate Curriculum Committee: comes to SEC 7 days prior to SEC meeting (not 5). 1 other change – p. 17, name of committee has changed -- Advisory Committee of Faculty Promotion and Tenure. Two main changes are Colonnade and Graduate Council.
- Colonnade starts on page 8. Replaces language received from Colonnade Committee; Crowder reformatted it to align with the formatting of the Senate charter. Lloren Foster said document "with added duty of assessment." The name change "Assessment Coordinator" was added to committee. This version of the charter: Colonnade is the last door with respect to curriculum. Submit learning outcomes information for assessment as identified in course proposal. Julie Shadoan ask how this is defined, and stated that she is apprehensive about this. Molly Dunkum said there will be an Assessment Coordinator. They are looking at this next, and will be deferring movement on it until the fall. The

coordinator will be a new administrative hire. Julie Shadoan said follow-up is good; but she is apprehensive that the committee does not know what it will look like. Margaret Crowder said it will be left out of this charter change until it is put in place; this section could come forward later. Molly Dunkum said that there are 24 outcomes rubric; connections are non-special to WKU. Doug – SACS and CPE? Molly Dunkum recommended leaving the assessment piece in so it does not become lost. Lloren Foster said an assessment subcommittee representative of all colleges will be formed. She wants to have something before the May meeting: how it will look, how it will be implemented, what it will do. The committee is working day and night. They will submit courses approved with respect to assessment. It was sent back with respect to assessment. Process, protocol, will come through in policy and procedures. The bylaws and structure will be shared in May. Julie Shadoan feels it is a lot of power. Other changes include the name: Colonnade/General Education Committee. The change is strictly for students and advisors, for five years until people get used to using the name “colonnade.” Patricia Minter suggested saying this in the report: “five years or so.” Lloren Foster said the committee had them take it out. The Provost said that SACS says “General Education” and cautioned not to phase out the words “general education.” Lloren Foster said it includes the model in search engines to show that we have a general education program. The Provost said the words “general education” are important for accreditation. He added that it could be confusing for transfer students. Barbara Burch suggested making it a “consideration” in five years.

- Pages 12 & 13 address Graduate Council recommendations. Highlighted in green were the changes discussed on the ad-hoc committee (ie. SGA ex-officio member), senator being a voting member. Beverly Siegrist stated that “the Graduate Council needs to review this.” She said the last meeting discussed a Graduate student representative for SGA. Siegrist said she will bring comments back after the Graduate Council meets and has an opportunity to review this. Margaret Crowder said she wishes that the comments had come ahead of time before the two readings in Senate. Beverly Siegrist stated that there are a lot of changes, and it needs to go back to the Graduate Council. She stated that she will take it to the next meeting; they have not had a meeting since this came forward, and she feels it is appropriate for them to look at it, since they have been looking at it all year. The change is that there will be one SGA representative, who is non-voting, to report back to SGA. There are six voting graduate student members. The Provost said that it could be read as one of the six. Julie Shadoan said it might be better if the ex-officio was a voting member. What we vote on here will go in the charter. It is a charter of the Senate we are voting on, not the bylaws of the Graduate Council. Margaret Crowder stated that we will move forward with the first reading. Beverly Siegrist reiterated that the Graduate Council will need an opportunity to review it. Margaret Crowder stated that the first line in green and the second line in green are items that came from the Charter change ad hoc committee discussions. Molly Kerby said that with as many as who wanted the first paragraph, it needs to go back to the Graduate Council because it concerns graduate policy. Siegrist added that time did not

- allow this. Margaret Crowder said that anyone on Graduate Council who wants to be added to the Blackboard site can be added. Julie Shadoan added those who attended the meeting. Margaret Crowder stated that the committee was as transparent as possible. With the inclusion of a Senator and an ex officio member of SGA; communication between bodies is important.
- Julie Shadoan asked about the highlights in the printed version. P. 17 #1 is name change only. Shadoan said she is referring to general education/colonnade. She made a suggestion under #3 or all “periodically... assess” to add “according to committee bylaws.” She asked to explain “revoking a course.” This is taking it out of colonnade, not curriculum. Can you suspend a course? Lloren Foster said “they are discussing that.” The Provost suggested “suspending from colonnade.” Lloren Foster said that under #3 “periodically... of colonnade status... of individual courses.” Julie Shadoan suggested putting it at the end of the paragraph “according to written policies and procedures” “written and approved operating guidelines.” The question is about guidelines, policies, and procedures for assessment. Julie Shadoan said she feels a standing committee should not be able to operate on its own without senate approval. Individual recommendations are a process of determination. Margaret Crowder said that procedural issues are good to come to senate. Lloren Foster said they will come to senate, but the committee has not gotten that far. Someone said this could put some delays. Is it a self-imposed or external timeline? SACS will want to see quickly. QEP is distinct. The five-year report will have to be written in three years; we will need to program to be approved. Assessment rubric needs to be prepared and implemented. Changes have been coming through for a year. Lloren Foster said “it will get done.”
  - Margaret Crowder asked if everyone is OK with the changes. Lloren Foster said there is one more change; the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph under colonnade on p. 8, with approval from SEC. After June, after the transition phase, SEC will approve. During the transition phase... and term will be three years,” so that the language matches.
  - The Provost added the following changes:
    - a. In the Graduate Council part, top of p. 13, item 4, CADS serve as a liaison between... AND .
    - b. Page 5 “and as published.” Yellow/green paragraph “all are employed.” Margaret Crowder said she got this from Kurt in Graduate Council. Beverly Siegrist said “must be employed full time.”
    - c. #4 item #1 advise dean. Paragraph 3 it says “make policies.”
    - d. #3 bottom of p. 12 delete both comments?
    - e. Do all policies and proposals go, or is it just curricular? Patricia Minter clarified that it was parallel to the language of the UCC. The Provost said that paragraph 1 has no parallelism. Patricia Minter said the item in #1 on discussion board is a separate item. 1C policy is related to membership on graduate faculty. Does this go forward to senate? This is in the Dean of the Graduate School’s job description. Curricular changes, local changes (ie. drop in hours), global issues. The Provost asked what goes to the dean and what goes to the senate? Patricia Minter said issues of parallelism (ie.

changing number of hours in a program) go to senate. Internal admission changes are a departmental issue. Many things come from the Dean of Graduate School and go to the committee. The Provost cited GRE change as an example. Beverly Siegrist said it happened at the graduate school level but the committee had input. The Provost said he sees conflict between #1 and #3. Matters that impact quality will go to the dean. They are not mutually exclusive; there are multiple parties. Something under 1C can also go under #3. Kate Hudepohl stated that it is better to have it clear-cut. In 1C, 1B. Non-graduate faculty who have an interest in graduate funding. Margaret Crowder said the interpretation of potentially global issues could be different. If the Graduate Council makes an advisement, then it should have multiple passage. It is always better to error on the side of bringing things in front of senate as a matter of course. Someone said it is in Dr. Fox's job responsibilities; one might ask the Graduate Council for their opinion but it is ideally his call. Beverly Siegrist said she does not know how she can make that determination. Dr. Burch said that every dean of every school has the right to change procedures to make things work. If the intent is for them to go from Graduate Council to Senate, it does not give the Dean a role to stop/sign off/endorse. The Provost said that one way of resolving is to have it go to the Dean: Graduate Council, Dean, Provost, CAD. The Provost suggested to clearly delineate what will go to senate. Regent Burch said this would remove the elected graduate faculty and CADS; this conflicts with the Senate Charter. Julie Shadoan said an administrator's job description should not dictate; the governing system should allow discussion. The Provost suggests a Graduate Council liaison to inform the senate of what they are doing in a case where it does not come forth to senate. The liaison can advise senate to intervene if necessary. Margaret Crowder said regardless of whether it is an action vs. information item, it should be viewed by the body. Beverly Siegrist said that curriculum and graduate policy would be viewed; some things do not come to Graduate Council, such as budget. The Provost cautions that the way it is written could cause it to go down different paths. Margaret Crowder said that red-flagged activities could go forth to senate with due diligence. Questions: Does this change graduate faculty only vote? No. How do you establish quorum with graduate faculty? It was suggested that this could be designated on the attendance sheet.

- f. Margaret Crowder said the charter was a good first-half; she appreciates all the work that has gone into the charter revisions.
- g. A motion to approve as amended by Lloren Foster was seconded by Kate Hudepohl. A vote on those in favor of the first reading of the charter in senate was unanimous; Lloren Foster will send the changes to Margaret Crowder.

## 16. Advisory Reports

- a. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch)
  - The Board of Regents met. The SGA parking garage proposal was discussed; Regent Burch said she wishes more students would do away with cars.

- Tuition and feels 8.2% is allowable over two years. 3.1% this year and 3.8% is approved.
- Special tuition for those working on teacher education is \$495 for the first course, a 25% discount for the semester; and \$295 for the second course, a 30-40% discount. This levels the playing field to increase enrollment through the reduced rate. Fees for student centers \$60-62 based on declining enrollment and increased costs. Regent Burch is sure that there is more operating cost with the new Downing. HEPI increases every year when others were not getting it. \$4 million in student fees; 55-56% is athletic. Everyone is having hard times and has to operate with what they are given. Regent Burch is concerned because it does not send the right message. An increase in athletic fee and student center does not go on HEPI. The last increase was 2.4% in 2012. Current fees are (1) centers; (2) athletic fee; (3) bond for Downing building; (4) garage fee if approved. \$302 is not \$380 if those fees are approved. Regent Burch thinks there will be a day when they look at where instructional support dollars go; the number of athletes vs. instructional support dollars. If the fee is not approved, they would cut the summer instruction. Two years ago, SGA and University Senate passed a resolution to take fees off HEPI; this was precisely worded. In reading it, the implication was a flat fee. Patricia Minter suggested another resolution. Regent Burch said according to student enrollment, concession was made to get the honors college bond passed; the student regent did not vote for it. Seth Church added that he has not talked to students or the student regent, but he will.

b. Academic Affairs (Provost Emslie)

- Reach week went smoothly. During the lunch hour in Fresh Foods, there were faculty talks. The location might be moved for future events.
- SACS-COC was on the regional campus today.
- The Research Council working group is working on a report and will meet the week of the 20<sup>th</sup>.
- Friday, the line in the budget book for VP for Research will be replaced by some lines under academic affairs. The Center for Research and Development will be replaced by a line called Faculty Research (RCAP). This will take place before the committee meets. Minter asked if the work of the committee will be done before the budget book is prepared. The Provost responded that they will work on it this week and will continue to debate through May. The CPE has a research person, Tom Martin. He is charged with the comprehensive sector to examine metrics (faculty productivity... students, honors college). This will be part of CPE's agenda. The Provost will attend a meeting in Frankfort.
- Roughly speaking, a 3% tuition increase covers fixed costs; an increase in retirement, health insurance, scholarship. There is 2 million in enrollment drop. We gave more in scholarships; this is a substantial chunk and required moving \$ funds. Fixed costs were taken out of the general university fund and put into the division where they exist. We are trying to get away from "big bucket" where central pays for it. They took aside only true university, truly central (health, worker's compensation, and other contractual obligations such as insurance) \$5 million. The Provost is looking to absorb 100% of his own and not 70% of

others. The negative number in next year's budget will be addressed in a more thoughtful way next month... nothing drastic. \$2 million in tuition; less than 70% is the Provost's share of allocation; between 60 & 70. 1/3 to 1/2 of total now and the rest is carry over to next year. Regent Burch commented that fewer and fewer are paying tuition, and fewer are enrolling. 1200 in honors is the target; 1300 is what we have now. 70% of the budget for scholarships goes to Academic Affairs. The Scholarship Committee's budget for next year is flat. We always make more offers than show up; 60% is the acceptance rate. It is never done as a budget line. Being seen as all about the high end would make a shift toward a more holistic scholarship base.

- The Provost commented that the visitation for Deborah Wilkins's husband is tonight at Kirby and Sons on Lover's Lane.
- Due to the CPE meeting at Morehead that will address the stand-alone engineering program, the Provost will not be at the next senate meeting.
- 100+ employees have had a fraudulent tax return. The salary on line 7 is exactly the number that appears in public data; this brings up the issue of personal privacy of data. The suggestion is to put it behind a net ID and password. This does not stop anyone from going to the database in Frankfort. It is on the Herald website. Anyone can request it as an open record. Would the senate want this behind a net ID? Patricia Minter stated that it is premature to ask the senate for anything that gives less transparency. She would want an opinion from someone on the first amendment; Minter will make phone calls to get advice. She added that the salary information was not the problem; the hack was the problem. She recommends First Amendment-based rationale; Minter stated that she will get at least two opinions. It is a perception issue of transparency.
- The Provost said that July 1 is the new fiscal year, and salary stuff goes up then. It will be posted after the board retreat at the end of July.

#### **D. Old Business:**

- There was no old business.

#### **E. New Business:**

##### **1. Student Complaint Procedure (Undergraduate Catalog Policy Revision)**

- Richard Miller said that the revision of the student complaint procedure is related to grade appeals. This is within the purview of the department and dean of the college committees with a grade appeal; the University Complain Committee does not feel obligated to circumvent or overturn these decisions. Of all the appeals that go to the committee, 90% or more are grade appeals. The new document defines types of complaints that go under the University Academic Complaint Committee to discuss types of appeals. These are listed in the Student Complaint Procedure Flowchart in #2 of information items. Academic appeals such as program dismissal go under this. This change goes through senate, SGA, then CAD. Every college should have their own complaint committee. It defines what a grade appeal is and what an academic appeal is. A motion to approve by John Gottfried was seconded by Heidi Álvarez. Seth Church stated that he is skeptical

because it strips away a level of protection for the students. He asked why the two-week delay is removed to give everyone time to look at it and consider. Step 3 of the old policy is deleted in the new policy for academic appeals that go on; could this language be included? Seth Church suggested including in step 3 of the new policy “student, faculty member, department chair, and dean.” Revisions will be sent by Richard Miller to Margaret Crowder in word format or PDF. A motion to approve as amended/revised by John Gottfried was seconded by Kate Hudepohl. The motion as amended was approved unanimously with one abstention (Seth Church).

**F. Information Items:**

1. [University of Oregon - Confucius Institute Oversight document](#)
2. [Student Complaint Procedure Flowchart](#)
3. [Anthem Limitations and Exclusions list](#)

A motion to adjourn by Seth Church was seconded by John Gottfried. The meeting adjourned at 5:50 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Álvarez  
Secretary