

**WKU University Senate
Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting Minutes
March 9, 2015 – 3:15 p.m.
WAB 239**

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:**
Barbara Burch, Thad Crews, Margaret Crowder, Laura DeLancey, Lloren Foster, Ashley Chance Fox, John Gottfried, Kate Hudepohl, Patti Minter, Julie Shadoan, Beverly Siegrist, Nicki Taylor, Andrew West,
- **Alternates present**
Marko Dumancic for Heidi Alvarez, Richard Miller for Gordon Emslie, Kelly Madole for John Khouryieh
- **Members absent**
Rick Grieve, Jennifer Hanley, Evie Oregon
- **Guests present**
Molly Dunkum, Lance Hahn, Molly Kerby, Doug McElroy, Kurt Neelly

B. Approve February 9, 2015 Minutes

- A motion to approve February 9, 2015 minutes by Patti Minter was seconded by John Gottfried. The minutes were approved as posted.

C. Reports

1. Chair

- There are some alternates present today: Jen Hanley on a field trip with students and John Gottfried is filling in as vice-chair; Heidi Alvarez is teaching a master class and Kate Hudepohl is serving as secretary.
- If there is no objection, would like to move information item #2 “Faculty members named to President’s ad hoc committee on smoking” to the last item of action under “new business.” There are now three candidates, so we will have to do a ballot vote. There was no objection, so the item was moved.
- There are two remaining Information items to mention:
 - SGA Smoking Resolution
 - Eric Reed named to the Intellectual Property Committee
- Received an e-mail regarding adjunct faculty not being eligible for insurance. This may be something for someone to take on in Senate.
 - Richard Miller makes a point of clarification that part-time faculty and adjunct faculty are not the same thing.

- Patti Minter noted that the topic has been talked about for years on the Benefits Committee but went nowhere because of our self-insurance status and the issue of increasing adverse coverage potential.
- Has compiled a draft copy of feedback about benefits. Cutting and pasting the 41-page document was time-consuming; edited to delete identifying information. The final draft will be run by a Benefits Committee member first and should be given to the Benefits Committee by the end of the week. There was lots of good feedback; she appreciates the help.

2. Vice chair

- John Gottfried, for Jen Hanley, stated that department Senate elections are over but some departments still need to forward names to Hanley.

3. Secretary

- No report.

4. Committee Chairs

a. Academic Quality (report posted)

- Laura DeLancey made a motion to approve the report. The report was approved as posted.
- She stated that the committee is talking to a variety of constituents about the Confucius Institute.
 - Regent Burch suggested that the committee talk to the Asian Studies program.

b. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility (no report)

- Patti Minter reminded the committee to complete the work life survey and remind others to do so as well. The deadline complete the report has been extended.

c. Budget and Finance Committee (no report)

- Andrew West stated that they have established a time to meet with President Ransdell.

d. Colonnade Implementation Committee /General Education Committee (report posted)

- Lloren Foster stated that the report, changes to the Senate Charter to reflect changes to general education, is for information only. Two readings are necessary to make a charter change. The committee does want feedback.
 - Kelly Madole noted that committee membership requirements have changed.
 - Lloren Foster concurred that it changed to a three-year commitment.
 - Chair Crowder asked about other substantive changes.
 - Lloren Foster replied that other changes include fleshing out the assessment coordinator responsibilities, procedure for populating the committee, and that committee members don't have to be senators.
 - Chair Crowder stated that in fitting in with other standing committees of Senate, it would be appropriate to see some Senate representation on the committee. She also asked about the reason behind the increased term of service.
 - Lloren Foster replied that increased term of service relates to consistency.
 - Molly Dunkum added that courses have to come up for review every couple of years so some continuity in memory on the committee will be helpful.
 - Patti Minter noted a typo on the chart. She also asked about the use of "may" or "will" (page 1, last yellow area). Foster provides an explanation that leads to the conclusion that "will" is the correct wording.
- After verifying there was no more discussion, the report was approved as posted.

- e. Graduate Council (report posted)
- Beverly Siegrist moves approval of the report. Report approved as posted.
 - Moving ahead with revisions of operating papers. Will bring forward next month. Glad the SEC Ad Hoc Committee on Charter Revisions is going forward because she is looking forward to potential collaboration.
 - Siegrist stated that she and Lance Hahn looked at the history of the relationship between Graduate Council and Senate. Policy comes to the Senate for information; curriculum comes forward as an action item. There is lots of language to clean up. Graduate Council will be moving ahead and will be glad to answer any questions.
 - Patti Minter asked what “moving ahead” means.
 - Siegrist replied that she would know better after the next meeting which anyone is welcome to attend. Operating papers are very out of date. Second reading of edits is a week from Thursday.
 - Minter replied that given the creation of the Senate Ad Hoc committee, anything that involves how GC fits into Senate should wait until the Ad Hoc committee meets.
 - Siegrist stated that the GC wants to streamline the curricular process and that Provost Emslie supports the change.
 - Chair Crowder replied that GC cannot remove itself from Senate without Senate approval.
 - Siegrist replied that the GC needs more representation on Senate.
 - Crowder replied that the Senate is strongly representative of graduate faculty and the overall faculty voice at WKU.
 - Kate Hudepohl stated that intended changes to GC were not well communicated to graduate faculty, not even those with graduate programs.
 - Richard Miller stated that if the changes affect PEC, they have exclusive and final say over retention in their programs without any input from GC.
 - Siegrist replied that the big change would be curriculum approval would move straight from GC to graduate dean, bypassing Senate altogether.
 - Julie Shadoan asked how the proposed change is streamlining is you substitute one layer, Senate, for a different layer, graduate dean. Second, how do you reconcile with Sturgis premise that the parent organization, in this case Senate, must approve changes to things such as bylaws; cannot separate yourself without approval from the parent organization.
 - Siegrist replied that it goes back to the 1977 operating papers of GC. Maybe this is wrong, but that was the recommendation of the committee that proposed and recommended this. In addition, she dismisses the argument that “more eyes looking at it” is relevant because if nothing is happening other than rubber-stamping of proposals, why go through the process at all?
 - Neelly stated that the majority of what GC spends time on is curricular issues. GC wants to spend time considering other matters as well; trying to look at the bigger picture of where the Graduate School moves in the future. The working papers are out of date and want to clearly expand duties to be more than graduate curriculum committee.
 - Regent Burch inquired what role graduate faculty, GC members more specifically, play in Senate.
 - Siegrist replied that GC is part of only Senate because of curriculum. GC wants more autonomy.
 - Burch reminded the committee of an e-mail sent last fall to the faculty-all list-serv by Kelly Madole regarding the value of governance. Burch agrees that governance is cumbersome and curricular matters are time-consuming. If there is a way to streamline the process, that’s good, but at the same time part of what might resolve issues in GC is the nature of the things that come up with curriculum. Things having to do with approval

- of a doctoral program in nursing, for example, even if it is rubber-stamped is still a Senate issue because it deals with finances and budget that impact the larger university community.
- Siegrist replied that GC wanted to have a dialog but couldn't because it's not a standing committee of Senate and we should be.
 - Minter stated with relation to Burch's point, if there is n discussion in Senate, people get mad; when there is discussion and something gets pulled, people get mad. When people in administration start dictating curriculum then we're in trouble. The "this is too slow" argument in a red herring. It's good that GC is revising its working its working papers, but if you would table the part of your discussion related to the relationship with Senate that would be appreciated in the spirit of cooperation.
 - Marko Dumancic stated that as a graduate faculty member he is uncomfortable with the idea of separating from Senate. He is uncomfortable with the idea that there is no one between GC and the graduate dean.
 - Shadoan stated that to truly streamline the process is opening the doors to rubber-stamping. That's how programs, an institution, gets watered down.
 - Siegrist replied that part of the new working papers of GC includes creation of a new standing committee, a curriculum committee. Structuring GC in this way is parallel to some models from other universities.
 - Kelly Madole stated that whatever happens should be in the interest of what's best for academic quality for the university. Need to take ego out of the equation. Curricular process is broken. There is a tendency to limit comments on someone else's proposal for fear that they will retaliate when you have a proposal coming forward.
 - Minter stated that the creation of new graduate programs does affect everyone on campus; substantial changes to an existing program affect everyone. She wishes people would be more involved and worries about unintended consequences of the proposed change. She worries that it appears to be a top-down push; if it came from the bottom-up, she might feel differently about it. We still need a central forum where everyone can make their point. It doesn't add time to the process. WKU is not an R1 university; decisions about graduate matters do affect the undergraduate mission. GC should be a standing committee of Senate, as it has been in the past.
 - Siegrist replied that the GC brought up the potential for change.
 - Kerby stated that Carl Fox brought up the proposed structural change to GC.
 - Siegrist stated that GC stopped the MPhil proposal. GC cares about quality.
 - Minter replied that the MPhil is a good example because what if it hadn't been stopped at the GC? It would have had to pass on to Senate and there would be a second chance to stop it.
 - Kerby asked when the SEC Ad Hoc Committee to Review Charter Change was meeting.
 - Crowder replied that discussing that is on the agenda today. We could have moved quicker with this if SEC had more direct information from GC sooner.
 - Siegrist replied that she had done so.
 - Hudepohl stated that she only mentioned in passing with no details as to intent and no request for feedback or collaboration with SEC.
 - Crowder stated that it is appropriate to say the SEC didn't have any idea and that we were unaware of the proposed changes coming from GC. We knew only that GC was working on revising its working papers; there was no mention of GC wanting to remove itself from Senate. Information about that did not come forward to SEC until a non-GC member of SEC proposed making GC standing committee of Senate.
 - Siegrist replied that she had brought it up.
 - Minter stated that Siegrist did not make share that GC wanted to separate from Senate.
 - Siegrist objected to that statement and asked that it not be brought up.

- Hudepohl replied that Crowder was responding to Siegrist's statement suggesting that SEC ignored or dismissed concerns from GC about its status.
 - Siegrist stated that she wished it would stop coming up.
 - Hudepohl replied that Siegrist is the one that keeps bringing it up and Crowder was responding to her statements.
- f. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (report posted)
- Ashley Fox presented the report which was approved as posted.
- g. Faculty Handbook Committee (no report)
- h. Ad Hoc Committee on Research (report posted)
- Molly Kerby stated that the report on the findings of the committee will come to SEC before going to Senate.
 - Report attached to agenda gives a summary of the goals of the committee.
 - Lloren Foster moves approval, seconded by Patti Minter. Approved as posted.
 - Minter thanks the SEC for creating the ad hoc committee. Has generated a fantastic discussion; colleges are finding lots of common ground. This has been a model of how a discussion can work. Interesting that there is always this push back from other places. We're talking about what our ideal work life would look like. Wish there would be less time spent criticizing the work of the grass roots and more time listening
- i. Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Charter Revisions
- Chair Crowder stated that Mondays at 3:15 are already times we know SEC members can potentially meet. March 16th, 23rd, and 30th are available for potential meeting days.
 - Kate Hudepohl suggested meeting March 16th.
 - Crowder replied that with no objections the first meeting would be March 16th. We can wait to set subsequent dates.
 - Siegrist stated that she could be present the first day, March 16th, but would not be available on subsequent Mondays.

5. **Advisory reports**

a. Faculty Regent

- Confucius Institute
 - John Gottfried and others will be having discussions about what happens in the Confucius Institute building.
 - Second part of it has to do with the source of matching funds which was said to be private money. The question is whether WKUF is private money.
 - Patti Minter stated that the money, according to the College Heights Herald, came from research foundation money passed through WKU.
 - Burch replied that money in WKU Foundation was in the RF, and therefore research money. But the research foundation board was asked whether it agreed for it to be moved and all but one, Cheryl Stevens, agreed.
 - Richard Miller stated that the funds came from ICSET.
 - Burch added that Dr. Pan supported it being moved to pay for the CI and the research foundation board agreed.
 - Minter stated that the board is mostly made up of members of the administrative council who all pretty much report to President Ransdell.

- Burch stated that money should have been privately-sourced money and it really isn't. She added that she and Chair Crowder had a conversation with Ann Mead about parking garage. President Ransdell moved the commitment from tif6, downtown area, to tif12 which is around campus. The commitment is now in the Alumni Center garage.
- Minter added that President Ransdell did not obtain Board of Regents approval for moving the commitment; he just did it.
- Burch stated that what she and Crowder learned from Ann Mead was troubling. She thought the alumni center was funded through private fundraising. However, the WKU Foundation agreed to make payments over seven years to pay the bond. The rest of it, the largest portion, the garage plus the center itself became a university responsibility. It is a 27-year bond. DELO will pay a portion of it for the privilege of being in charge of conference scheduling, a privilege they didn't want because it doesn't generate revenue. Last year DELO had to make \$185,000 in payments towards their share of the Alumni Center and are obligated for the next 27 years to pay on it. DELO money is academic money. That is a 27-year commitment. The annual payments are relatively small at first but by year 27 could be as high as \$800,000. Amount owed is based on financial ability of associated commercial structure – hotel and conference center – to generate profit. When Jennifer Tougas was here last week talking about people using parking garage spaces, she was talking about the Alumni Garage, not the one downtown.
- Siegrist asked if the new nursing building is in tif6.
- Minter replied that it is in tif1.
- Chair Crowder added that the tif dollars projected to help ease these payments come from the new hotel and potential restaurant, but that is all projected dollars. There is no real money associated with it.
- Siegrist asked how this happened with DELO.
- Minter replied that's what happens when power is ceded. The Board of Regents vote on involvement with tif was 7-4. When you establish a 501C3, you can move money around without board approval. And if the people making the decision report directly to you it's hard for them to say no. This is what happens when you have those kinds of power relationships. No one should voluntarily cede power because then you end up in junk like this; a dangerous house of cards.
- Kelly Madole reads the WKUF committee members and states that it is mostly not administrative council members; it is mostly community members.
- Crowder states that much of the alumni garage is not for faculty/staff/students. A large portion of spots are reserved 24/7 for hotel.

b. Provost

- Richard Miller for Gordon Emslie reviewed approvals: UCC report, Senate recommendations for Colonnade courses, policies that moved through Senate last time.
- Some items under new business:
 - Policy 1.4180 Course Related Field Trips – revised (posted)
 - Motion to consider by Ashley Fox seconded by Marko Dumancic.
 - Minter noted that there are still some links that don't work. They have to work before this goes to the Senate floor. Also noted that Study Abroad and program like Nursing lasered out of the policy. So they just go directly through their respective college deans.
 - Siegrist noted that her college doesn't have such a practice.

- Minter also noted that link to study abroad/away needs to be updated. The issue for the last ten years has been a lack of information about what invalidates coverage.
 - Miller inquired if there is a sense that people think they don't have liability?
 - Minter replied that faculty are embarking on trips with a high degree of risk without realizing they have no coverage or might do things that invalidate coverage they might have. Suggests detailed specific information about what nullifies liability. If a faculty member undertakes their own study abroad trip, which is encourage by WKU, that person takes on a tremendous amount of risk without knowing what invalidates the policy. Faculty teaching through KIIS or CCSA are covered under policies administered by those programs.
 - Crowder added that some things not covered or which invalidate coverage are not so obvious. They might even be things that don't result from your own direct action.
 - Miller suggested adding a "such as" section to the policy to clarify.
 - Minter agreed and asked what the hurry is to pass something that is not complete, not informative, and that doesn't even have working links.
 - Miller asked if there was information available about liability coverage in the various colleges and departments.
 - Minter replied that she did not think so.
 - Minter moved to table approval of the policy until the necessary updates and details are included. Motion, seconded by Lloren Foster, passes.
- SACS QEQ information presented by Doug McElroy
 - Handout distributed at the meeting is a cheat sheet on the QEP.
 - Three years in the making. Feels there is a good chance for favorable review. Extensive assessment is part of the process.
 - Regent Burch inquired if CLAC is a national normed instrument.
 - McElroy replied affirmatively. The rubrics address targeted skills. There will be two-year release time for appointments. A group of faculty attended a AACU workshop.
 - Burch commended the effort and asked if there would be support for faculty development. Push initiatives include curricular changes; pull initiatives include resources for faculty to use in courses. Building faculty capacity is an important component of this effort.
 - Kelly Madole asked about timing of assessment.
 - McElroy replied it would occur in the next academic year; first year freshman in fall and seniors in spring.
 - Molly Dunkum asked if there is a link to Colonnade.
 - McElroy stated there is some bleed over in terms of ensuring Connections courses serve as points of assessment. A number of people on the Colonnade committee have also been on the QEP task force.
 - Retention Task Force presented by Doug McElroy
 - Interested in getting feedback from interested parties and relevant groups. Senate is one of those groups. Discussed with department heads and they were generally favorable.
 - Madole, Minter, Siegrist, Hudepohl all stated that that is not what they heard about the department head response to the proposed plan.
 - McElroy replied that there was at least enough interest for continued discussion.
 - Siegrist asked if it applied to all students.

- McElroy replied affirmatively.
- Siegrist stated that it would not work for Nursing and Clinical programs where students are not progressing.
- Chair Crowder asked whether this is just an item for information feedback or whether SEC was being asked to approve it. If we send it forward as an information item to Senate, will that be taken as de facto approval?
- McElroy stated if there was sufficient positive feedback from impacted constituencies then it would be taken as approval and go forward.
- Siegrist stated that that was a huge concern.
- Kelly Madole recommended treating like the bi-term proposal. Form a committee to consider it.
- Patti Minter made a motion that, as was done with the bi-term proposal, multi-term registration be referred to the following committees for their review and discussion: UCC, AQ, FWPR, and GC. Motion, seconded by John Gottfried, passes.

D. New Business

1. Policy 0.1020 Intl. Travel Registration

- Chair Crowder noted that changes were indicated in yellow.
- Motion to concur by Kelly Madole second Lloren Foster.
- Patti Minter asked about the meaning of the changing the wording to “should.”
- Crowder stated that she was not exactly sure but thought it was because it seemed more definitive and forceful.
- Richard Miller did not know the context for the change.
- Policy approved as posted.

2. Approval of new CLAC member – Mark Staynings

- Unanimously approved

3. Ballots to determine 2 members of President’s Ad Hoc Committee on Smoking

- Based on ballot result, two new members are: Dick Taylor and Cecelia Watkins
- Chair Crowder asks if there was any new business.
 - Ashley Fox stated that again this year, twice, when snow got plowed it was plowed into the handicap spots in the faculty parking lots. As of today, handicap spots in the Mimosa lot were still not available. This happened last year as well and Facilities was informed and took care of it. But it happened again this year.
 - Richard Miller suggested contacting Bryan Russell. He stated that a number of independent contractors plowed the lots, not WKU employees. Russell may be able to pass the information along.
 -
 - Regent Burch noted just for information that WKU made the right decision to close for snow this year. There were a lot of injuries filed to workers compensation previously and we had less claims this time around. Safety is important.

Motion to adjourn by Lloren Foster second by Marko Dumancic. Meeting adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Kate Hudepohl