



**University Senate Meeting
Wednesday, May 15, 2013 -- 3:45 p.m.
Faculty House**

Draft Minutes

Call to Order:

- Chair Mac McKerral called the regular meeting of the WKU Faculty Senate to order on Wednesday, May 15, 2013 at 3:45 pm in the Faculty House. A quorum was present.
- **Members Present:** Darlene Applegate, Lauren Bland, Charles Borders, Kristi Branham, Christa Briggs, Chris Brown, Amy Cappiccie, Ashley Chance-Fox, Tucker Davis, Patricia Desroiers, Robert Dietle, Amanda Drost, Marc Eagle, Gordon Emslie, Joseph Evans, Barbara Fiehn, Ron Gallagher, John Gottfried, Jennifer Hanley, Nancy Hulan, Angela Jerome, Guy Jordan, Randy Kinnersley, Alison Langdon, Kelly Madole, James May, Mac McKerral, Matt Nee, Matt Pruitt, Beth Pyle, Kelly Reames, Richard Schugart, Vernon Sheely, Fred Stickle, Dana Sullivan, Janet Tassell, Paula Trafton, Rico Tyler, Tamara Van Dyken, John White, Mary Wolinski
- **Alternates Present:** Mark Berry (Kristin Polk), Jim Kanan (Carrie Trojan), Danita Kelley (John Bonaguro), Andrew Mienaltowski (Aaron Wichman), Helen Sterk (Bruce Crawley),
- **Absent:** Cain Alvey, Shahnaz Aly, Diane Carver, Christopher Costa, Ismail Civelek, Brittany Crowley, Cory Dodds, Sam Evans, Connie Foster, Mary Jane Gardner, Dennis George, Steven Gibson, Becky Gilfillen, Frederick Grieve, Peggy Gripshover, Darbi Haynes-Lawrence, Jeffrey Kash, Jeffrey Katz, Richard Keaster, Ed Kintzel, Joan Krenzin, Roberto Jimenez-Arroyo, Suellyn Lathrop, Alex Lebedinsky, David Lee, Sonia Lenk, Qi Li, Ingrid Lilly, Eder Maestre, Steve Miller, Patricia Minter, Samangi Munasinghe, Ngoc Nguyen, , Gustavo Obeso, Keith Phillips, Shura Pollatsek, Gary Ransdell, Kateri Rhodes, Nancy Rice, Jonghee Shim, Beverly Siegrist, Janice Smith, Mark Staynings, Cheryl Stevens, Samanta Thapa, Evelyn Thrasher,

A. Approve April Minutes

- Approved

B. Reports:

1. Chair – Mac McKerral
 - Appreciate all of the hard work by members, committee chairs, new administration
 - Take the work of the Faculty Senate seriously
 - Learned a lot—especially budget presentations
 - I now aspire to be a fixed cost, i.e., something essential to the operation of the institution that must be paid for
- Thanks to all

2. Vice Chair – Jennifer Hanley
 - Thanks to all,
 - Especially Kelly Madole, who answered so many questions
 - look forward to working with you next year

3. Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership for Higher Education (COSFL) Representative – Molly Kerby
 - Read by Dr. Minter
 - Thanks to member of CPE that did vote for 5% increase

4. Advisory:
 - a. Faculty Regent – Patricia Minter (read by Chair Mac McKerral)
 - Board of Regents will meet two more times this summer:
 - Called Budget meeting, June 21
 - 2-day BOR retreat at end of July
 - BOR met April 26
 - Two items added to agenda after closed session (very unusual)
 - 1st item: property acquisition for proposed Honors College Building
 - Purchase of former fraternity house for \$240,000
 - To be funded by future agency bond issue (which will come before Board in October)
 - 2nd item: resolution to procure property (Hillcrest Apartments)
 - Take apartment property by condemnation and eminent domain
 - Would also authorize University to purchase property from agency bond revenue
 - Rough estimates of cost for these two properties would be at least \$1 million
 - Board vote was 7 to 2 for, with Regents Minter and Dodds voting against
 - Regent Minter: “This building is a want; it is most certainly not a need.”
 - More information in digital issue of the Herald released last week
 - Budget cuts (announced after Board meeting)
 - Good thing: end of use of Higher Education Price Index (HEPI) to escalate most student fees
 - Regent Minter glad of this, would also like to see move away from a subsidized model of student athletics to self-supporting model
 - Student Government has asked for the same thing
 - Shows what can be accomplished when student and faculty leadership work together
 - Budget cuts over \$2 million
 - Real budget cuts...part-time cuts, real reduction in workforce on campus, and real reduction in the number of sections offered to our students
 - Funding for benefits is flat—would like to see report from the benefits committee in the fall
 - University stakeholders need to know what’s about status of self-funded funded insurance program given absence of increased university contribution
 - 48.9% of budget cuts were made to academics
 - Not okay—this is a university, and academics are our business
 - Everything else is support
 - Two units did not receive cuts
 - Athletic cut is being spread—totals 5%, but is being spread over 5 years, so it is only 1% per year
 - Statewide--Cuts will likely continue in the near future, will continue to be a challenge for at least 2 years
 - Looking to fall—BOR will be asked to pass agency bonds for \$22M for the Honors College construction

- This is an issue that affects everyone—we cannot afford this
 - If we take on this obligation, we cannot escape it—the debt would require \$1.4 million per year.
 - No reason this project could not be delayed until University is in better fiscal health
 - Fiscally irresponsible to fund wants when we may not have funds to supply needs
 - This is an amount we will pay for 30 years, no matter how unstable our situation becomes
 - Along with other university debt, this would push out total debt load to well over 5% of our total budget—we would mortgage the University's future
 - Finally, the Internal Auditor is looking at Travel abroad fee issue
 - Their report will be given to BOR for June 21
 - This is a good thing—the BOR has fiduciary responsibility to maintain transparency and accountability on fiscal matters
 - Positive results are thanks to cooperative work of faculty and student
- b. Provost – Gordon Emslie
- 16.5 recommendations from last Senate:
 - Most approved
 - One graduate council; two UCC with subsequent recommendation fixing clerical error, all approved
 - Student production policy—as requested by senate, no further action has been taken at this time
 - Program coordinator policy approved
 - Colonnade course approved
 - Faculty handbook revisions are pending—wish to gather all together, including those on today's agenda
 - Math program filed as addendum to UCC report was also approved
 - Study Abroad application fee
 - Senate recommendation: “the fee be applied to all WKU students and all WKU students in all programs which the fee will be assessed”
 - To cut this short—as already approved: The fee for all faculty-led Study Abroad courses for spring and summer 2013 study-abroad experiences...fees have been, or will be, refunded...either through an augmentation of the World Topper Scholarship or, if necessary, through a refund to the student's TOPNET account.
 - It is my understanding that that original senate recommendation stated that the Senate understands that new revenues are important to the welfare of the Study Abroad Office, but the main issue was that fees were instituted after fee structure was already in place. With that in mind, all students who applied to *any* study abroad prior to January 30th (when the application fee was publicly announced) will have that fee returned, and this time we'll do it as a straight reimbursement to the TOPNET account. For any application filed after the public announcement, that fee will remain.
 - The matter of program fees in general—lab fees, program fees and, if necessary, the Study Abroad application fees will, as mentioned by Regent Minter, will be the subject of not only an internal audit, but will also be an agenda item on the called meeting on June 21.
 - Enrollment:
 - Summer is a good gauge of how we stand with enrollment, and as of this time we are pretty steady
 - Currently within 100 or so students of enrollment last year
 - Recent report shows fewer students dropped for non-payment than last year (less than half as many)
 - Fall enrollment report: up about 61 new freshmen
 - There is still a bubble of low enrollment moving through—I encourage everyone to focus on retention

- Total tuition shortfall for the fiscal year about to end was \$656,000, about 70% of which would be academic affairs
 - Additionally, over-budgeted the amount for the nursing program by about \$200,000
 - Net shortfall to Academic Affairs may only be \$200,000 -- \$300,000 from one-time funds. Very good news—this will allow carry-forward of substantial funds to deal with various issues next year
 - Budget items that have been protected despite shortfalls:
 - All faculty searches under way will continue, and failed searches will continue for another year, staffing plan as a whole will continue as scheduled
 - Protected 2% raise (made permanent) for all employees
 - Protected money for market equity for some employees to help meet benchmark goals
 - Would like to have on-campus committee that would meet this summer to review ideas to advise Provost and others on AHEA (Adult Higher Education Alliance).
 - Idea is moving forward quickly
 - Provost Emslie meeting with other provosts across the state to discuss
 - WKU could play a leading role in this program, so I ask Faculty Senate to appoint a 5-6 member team
- c. SGA President – incoming president Keyana Boka
- Just back from KLA retreat
 - Look forward to working with Faculty Senate
 - Please send any questions
- d. Budget Council Report - Eric Reed
- Council met twice this spring
 - To this point the Council has played no role in budget decision-making
 - Has no role in the recently announced budget cuts
 - Has not seen a draft of the budget plan that Dr. Ransdell will present in June
 - It is generally unclear what role the Budget Council will play in decision-making
 - Some thoughts
 - Glad Dr. Emslie is protecting academic funding—urge him to fight even harder to do that
 - Putting recent budget issues into perspective:
 - Budget cuts announced recently are not simply the result of the CPE’s refusal to allow us to raise tuition rates by 5%
 - These cuts are latest manifestation of long-term deficiencies in funding that are, in part, our own fault.
 - Our decisions and spending choices make it difficult to fund academic activities adequately
 - Best example of this trend is the spending plan alluded to by Dr. Minter a few minutes ago: the spending plan, if approved, will be cutting academic programs next year, will be closing classroom space, will be de-funding teaching and research activity, will be letting some of our part-time colleagues go
 - At same time, we will spend nearly a half-million dollars of tuition money in order to build an Honors Building
 - Effects of budget-cutting accumulating; already undermining everyday academic operations
 - Some of you have already received requests from me to identify the effects of belt-tightening taking place even before the recent budget cuts. Faculty from every college report that their colleges and departments have experienced some or all of the following: reductions in upper or lower level course offerings, cuts to number of sections offered, reductions in teaching staff, cuts to department budgets, reductions in the services offered by faculty and departments to the University, students and public, reductions in research and professional

development funds (and related release times), reduction in productivity as faculty take on larger teaching loads and other duties they were not previously required to do, and difficulty recruiting for Study Abroad due to cost-shifting to students in the form of new fees, and requiring students to pay for things that were normally paid for by the University until recently.

- Why are these trends important?
 - Affects student retention, recruitment, and graduation rates
 - Also impacts faculty morale, productivity, effectiveness, and esprit de corps
- What is to be done?
 - Senate needs to take strong, repeated public stands about spending priorities at University
 - Must repeat message that ongoing process of cannibalizing academic budgets must end
 - Must insist that backfilling of everyday academic budgets end immediately
 - Must insist that spending on basic essentials like teaching, offering courses and supporting faculty research be ramped up, not ramped down

C. Standing Committee Reports and Recommendations

1. [Graduate Council: \(Report Posted: Endorsed by SEC\)](#)
 - Approved
2. [UCC Report/Policies: \(Report/Policies Posted: Endorsed by SEC\)](#)
 - Approved with exception of “Create new degree type” form
3. Academic Quality: No Report
4. Faculty Welfare : No Report
5. General Education: No Report

D. Old Business

1. [UCC Policies - April \(Posted\)](#)
 - Chair: Senate approved UCC report in April, but the policy portion of the report was not posted on the Faculty website as required. Now we are just approving policy portion.
 - Motion to approve, and discussion:
 - Question: Regarding prior learning portfolio, who is going to be involved in developing the committee that reviews the portfolio? That is not delineated here. When I spoke to registrar I was told there would be an implementation committee, but I don't see that mentioned here.
 - Answer from UCC Chair: As it was explained to us, the office will coordinate with Department Heads to identify specific faculty members who will review the portfolio
 - Question: But that's not in here at all
 - Answer: No, that part of the policy is not included. The portfolio is pass/fail, it will just appear as “transfer credit” on the transcript.
 - Question: And if this is approved by the committee and the department head, there is no collegiate oversight, and no other oversight of that approval?
 - Answer: I believe that is a fair statement.
 - Q: will that be delineated a little more formally soon?
 - A: If that's the way you feel, I would suggest this being tabled pending that update.
 - Q: Would the Registrar be willing to accept a friendly amendment, worded in some way that would outline the identification of an implementation committee explicitly, such that they will identify all the policies a little more clearly?
 - Registrar: My name is listed as the contact, but I don't want to speak for University College.

- Question: I don't know how to proceed...is it necessary that this get approved now?
- Registrar: We are just approving the policy today. Typically when policies are approved, the procedures would be worked out in course.
- Comment: What I'm worried about is that this will be done differently in every department, and I don't want that. I want this to be consistent and clear what the appropriate procedure is. I don't have a complaint about the procedure described; I just want to make sure we're doing the same thing.
- Registrar: I will pass this along.
- Provost Emslie: This emerged from the findings of a 2008 task force, which didn't get as far as recommending procedure. I would be more than happy to entertain Senate recommendations on procedure. It does say that the consensus recommendation is reviewed by the Department Head and Dean of the College, so there is collegiate oversight. We can add an Academic Affairs to that we can do it for you. I think it's important, since this is the last Senate meeting before break, to get this moving. It won't happen overnight, but it's important to certain people to know that it's on the table. Could be very important for the adult learner initiative, so I would welcome any addenda that the Senate, or any other group, would like to propose.
- Chair of UCC: I want to make clear that this will be a faculty-approved process; it will be controlled by faculty in the department.
- Q: Is there a limit on total credit hours the student can receive for one portfolio?
 - Registrar: No limit at this time—it is up to the assessor to determine if the student has fulfilled the learning outcomes equivalent to those hours.
 - I find this troubling---an expanding portfolio where the only limit is the total number of hours in a major or program. We need more clarity.
 - Provost Emslie:
 - Limit for all portfolio credits
 - Question: Isn't this giving a student 3 credits for a course that just helps the student apply for credits? Isn't that troubling in itself?
- Comment: We already have a procedure to grant credit for previous learning; we give departmental exams.
- Barry Snyder (on the original committee that put this together): Departmental exams miss the point, we are looking at life experience and crediting general life experience for the purpose of helping people who have been out of school for many years.
 - National models show that preparation courses are helpful and used frequently
- Question: has the University College Portfolio Course already been created?
 - Registrar: Presented at Senate last Month
 - Was it presented as the basis for this policy—as a key to giving credit for life experience?
 - Registrar: I believe it was in the rationale for the course
- Question: this will require departments to create rubric--Will students be able to shop among different rubrics from different universities in the system?
 - Provost Emslie: No, because we will have people looking at making programs consistent. It doesn't mean all standards have to be identical, but it will be relatively uniform
- Comment: I think most of us don't think giving credit for life experience is a bad idea, but what might make me feel better is a trigger that says after one year or two we will have Academic Quality review this
- John White: Just to clarify...we anticipate use of this at only 3 to 10 per year
- Motion to approve: fails 23 to 11
- Motion to approve two polices excluding prior learning policy
- Approved

E. New Business:

1. [Policy No. 1.3070: Evaluation and Orientation of Student Teaching Assistants \(Posted\)](#)
 - Approved

2. [Policy No. 1.1120: Graduate Assistant Instructor Credentials, Supervision, and Evaluation \(Posted\)](#)
 - Pulled, still in sub-committee in Graduate Council subcommittee on policies
3. [Policy No. 1.2121: Summer Sessions-Winter Term Compensation-Distribution \(Posted\)](#)
 - Approved
4. [Policy Nos. 1.2091/2.2091: Faculty Workload and Compensation \(Posted\)](#)
 - Approved
5. [Handbook Committee recommendations: \(Posted\)](#)
 - a. 2013-005 Continuance recommendations
 - Approved
 - b. 2013-006 Continuance Dates
 - Approved
 - c. 2013-007 Conflict of Interest
 - Motion to approve
 - Comment:
 - Independence of candidate's work—two concerns
 - What is the concern—is it the independence of the scholarship, or the conflict of interest? Both things are mentioned.
 - If co-author is within department, having person on committee could be positive, because the person might be in the best position to review role and value of contributions
 - As written, the policy assumes senior faculty is carrying junior faculty, but it could be the other way around—in which case there could be conflict of interest in that senior faculty want junior faculty to continue service to senior faculty member
 - Policy states that it does not seek to inhibit collaboration, but that seems a likely outcome
 - Comment: I believe collaborators should be allowed to take part in evaluation
 - Comment: Who defines “significant contribution”? In some departments, this could result in all faculty be excluded from the process. I do not believe collaboration is a conflict of interest, and I think it should be removed from the policy.
 - Comment: Language says “may” be conflict of interest, not that scholarly collaboration is a conflict of interest-- I read it as the department head making the determination. Would that satisfy the concerns that folks are expressing right now?
 - Response: it specifically says the Department Head will make determination, as opposed to the Promotion and Rank Committee, a larger body, and it's not clear even then how the Department Head makes that determination
 - Chair: no wordsmithing at this meeting
 - Several suggestions for changes—Chair suggests up or down vote
 - Handbook Committee—from the Handbook Committee's view this is not a Handbook Committee decision, this is a Senate decision. Handbook committee will put into place whatever the Senate decides.
 - Comment: the Handbook Committee needs specific guidance from the Senate, so this discussion is very helpful; the committee can listen to the tape and draw comments from there.
 - Not approved
 - Chair: given this vote, it is now incumbent you all to send your specific comments to the Handbook Committee

- d. 2013-008 Clarification of Appeal
 - Approved
- e. 2013-009 Mandatory Tenure Year
 - Approved
- f. 2013-010 Mandatory Promotion and Tenure
 - Approved
- g. 2013-011 Board of Regents Will Have Approval of Handbook
 - Discussion:
 - Comment: Speaking in favor of this motion.
 - BOR has approved past handbooks and there was no problem, no micromanagement.
 - There is a talking point that holds that the Board may become too involved. This comes down to a feeling that we don't want the Board asking too many questions.
 - The advantage of BOR approval is that the changes will be solid until there is a formal BOR meeting. It prevents having a moving target. This will mean that the Faculty Handbook is a document set in stone until the next formal revision. I do not believe it opens us up to meddling from the Board, but it does prevent meddling below the board level.
 - Comment: This is fine until the BOR does start to meddle. I don't feel the need to get Board approval because, by Senate charter, we publish a new version of the Faculty Handbook every July.
 - Comment: Should be approved by the BOR, because that is its fiduciary responsibility. BOR is "where the buck stops." Not including BOR leaves us exposed. It's just best practice. Board bylaws do not allow line-by-line editing—it is just a straight up or down vote.
 - Comment: Lawsuits will include everyone; BOR is no protection. I don't think we need to have this approval.
 - Approved

Meeting adjourned 5::03pm

Respectfully submitted by John Gottfried