



UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, May 13, 2010

3:45 p.m. – Faculty House

I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the WKU Senate was called to order on Thursday, May 13, 2010 at 3:45 p.m. in the Faculty House by Chair Paul Markham. A quorum was present.

The following members were present:

Darlene Applegate, Janet Applin, Greg Arbuckle, Kristina Arnold, Melanie Autin, Bruce Battles, Lauren Bland, Dorothea Browder, Barbara Bush, Pitt Derryberry, Jill Duba, Nikolai Endres, Douglas Fugate, Darbi Haynes-Lawrence, Kate Hudepohl, Randy Kinnersley, Joan Krenzin, Qi Li, Kelly Madole, Paul Markham, Michael McIntyre, Vicki Metzgar, Steve Miller, Patricia Minter, Holly Payne, Yvonne Petkus, Heidi Pintner, Beth Plummer, Kelly Reames, Mark Schafer, Gary Schallert, Richard Schugart, Nevil Speer, Mark Staynings, Heather Strobe, Liz Sturgeon, Francesca Sunkin, Tadayuki Suzuki, Megan Thompson, Dave Vickery, Carol Watwood, Richard Weigel,

Alternates present were:

Susan Wesley for Eileen Arnold, Richard Miller for Barbara Burch, Larry Snyder for David Lee, Colton Jessie for Kevin Smiley, Bob Reber for William Tallon

The following members were absent:

Mark Berry, Mike Binder, John Bonaguro, Scott Bonham, Kim Botner, Richard Bowker, Kelly Burch-Regan, Aaron Celestian, Audrey Cornell, Mark Doggett, Uma Doraiswamy, Scott Droege, Melanie Duke, Molly Dunkum, Ahmed Emam, Sam Evans, Blaine Ferrell, Dennis George, Andrea Grapko, Anthony Harkins, Stuart Kenderes, Molly Kerby, Alex Lebedinsky, Jim Lindsey, Nathan Love, Mac McKerral, Roger Murphy, Steve Nagy, Kumiko Nemoto, Johnston Njoku, Ivan Novikov, Les Pesterfield, Keith Phillips, Mark Pickard, Sherry Powers, Lisa Proctor, Gary Ransdell, Sherry Reid, Angela Robertson, Roger Scott, Christy Spurlock, Adrian Switzer, Donald Swoboda, Samanta Thapa, Justin Thurman, Kenneth Whitley, Dawn Garrett Wright, David Zimmer

II. Approve April 2010 Minutes

April 15, 2010 Senate minutes approved as posted.

III. Reports:

A. Chair – Paul Markham

Chair Markham announced that the Faculty Handbook is in the revision phase. The first reading in Senate is expected to occur in September.

Chair Markham announced that based on feedback at the last Senate meeting, he and incoming Senate chair Kelly Madole are part of a small group that met to further consider issues raised by the “Lebedinsky Report.” (See attachment with notes from that meeting posted on Senate website.)

Chair Markham announced that the Senate office in Garrett 106 is now fully furnished and functioning.

B. Vice Chair – Holly Payne

Vice-Chair Payne stated that she has no formal report but asked senators to review the green sheets on their tables with information about candidates to be considered for election to the University Academic Complaint Committee.

C. Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership for Higher Education (COSFL)

Representative – Molly Kerby

No report.

D. Advisory

1. Faculty Regent – Patti Minter

Regent Minter shared items of interest from the April Board of Regents Meeting:

- 1) The contract for the new athletic director went forward in the new agenda. Regent Minter noted that she questioned the justification for the \$10,000.00 pay increase and also why the raise would be funded through base budget instead of private funds (former AD Selig's raise would have been funded through private money had he remained at WKU). In response she was informed that a substantial pay raise was normal procedure to attract replacement personnel. Regent Minter noted that does not occur when the replacement has less experience as is the case with the new AD. Regent Minter noted that his contract also includes rich incentives such as a cut of concession sales and parking, bonuses for team performance, etc. Regents Minter and Smiley were the only two dissenting votes.
- 2) At the time of the board meeting the state budget was unknown. She noted that the CPE approved tuition increases (5% for in-state and 6% for out-of-state) do not cover fixed costs at WKU. She is concerned that we will face a real challenge in 2011 when the non-recurring stimulus money ends.
- 3) She also shared that at the end of President Ransdell's discussion about a hypothetical budget that Regent David Porter delivered an impassioned statement about the need in this state for a hard day of reckoning that in a poor state there still has to be some type of realization that you have to have funding for infrastructure: roads, bridges, K-12 education, and higher education. He also stated that what has been going on in Kentucky in the last several years is inadequate and has put a poor state in a crisis situation. Regent Minter stated her hope that we can put politics aside and function as a commonwealth again.

2. Provost – Barbara Burch

Dr. Miller, on behalf of Dr. Burch, urged the Senate to make sure they tackle approving the Faculty Handbook in the Fall 2010 semester.

3. SGA President – Kevin Smiley

Incoming SGA President Colton Jessie introduced himself to senators and shared with them that although Kevin Smiley will remain student regent until June, that he has assumed his leadership role in SGA. He also announced the following SGA activities:

- tee-shirt swap at the library (trade other school shirts for WKU shirts)
- creation of website to help students find off-campus housing

IV. Standing Committee Reports:

A. Graduate Council (see attached report) – Nevil Speer

Chair Nevil Speer moved approval of the GC report. The report was approved as posted.

B. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (see attached report) – Beth Plummer

Chair Beth Plummer moved approval of the UCC report. The report was approved as posted.

C. General Education Committee (see attached report) – Rich Weigel

Chair Rich Weigel moved approval of the GEC report. The report was approved as posted.

D. Faculty Welfare & Professional Responsibilities – Jim Fulkerson & Vicki Metzgar

On behalf of FWPR co-chairs Fulkerson and Metzgar, Senate Chair Markham announced that hard copies of their committee report were available for dissemination.

E. Academic Quality – Tony Harkins

No report.

V. Old Business:

No old business.

VI. New Business:

Chair Markham switched the order of the items. University Academic Complaint Committee elections occurred first via the green ballots.

1. University Academic Complaint Committee Election

Elections for the committee proceeded and will be tabulated at a later date.

2. Report from ad-hoc committee on SEC and committee report procedures

a. Motion to adopt the report and amend the charter accordingly

Chair Markham provided background about the why the committee was formed. Once he concluded his comments much discussion followed. Some comments included the following:

- giving the SEC power to do more than merely forward committee reports to the full Senate for consideration undermines representative governance; even though the SEC is comprised of representatives from every college plus the chairs of standing committees which are themselves representative bodies of every college it is possible that the SEC may skew towards a particular college(s); for instance in 2009-10 most chairs of standing committees were members of PCAL and although they were elected to serve by their respective committees (representative bodies), at the SEC level power may concentrate in particular ways
- much discussion about the meaning of the word “amend” (and all of its variations) as defined in Sturgis
- although uncommon, in the past the SEC has 1) sent standing committee reports back to the committees and 2) forwarded standing committee reports to the full Senate with comments (in addition to merely forwarding a report to the full Senate for consideration without comment); therefore, despite claims to the contrary, SEC actions proposed in the ad hoc committee report are not without precedent
- raises issues regarding the relationship of the Graduate Council to the SEC because the GC is not currently a voting member of the SEC
- more debate is needed about the implications of possible SEC actions, including philosophical to practical issues (e.g. if it is ultimately decided that the SEC can send back particular parts of committee reports, thus for instance particular proposals in the UCC report, does that mean that representatives of particular proposals should plan to attend SEC meetings?)
- discussion about possible types of actions and whether SEC should be able to forward or send back specific parts of a committees report (as opposed to the whole thing); relates back to the discussion of the word “amend”
- every member of the Senate already has the right and ability at the full Senate to express their concerns about something
- if SEC is just supposed to “rubber stamp” reports, then why bother to send them there at all?

Senate moved to have a second reading of the ad hoc committee report in the fall semester.

Meeting adjourned at 5:08 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by Kate Hudepohl, Secretary