

University Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 7, 2014 -- 3:15 p.m.
Wetherby Conference Room

Call to Order:

- Chair Margaret Crowder called the Executive Committee meeting of the WKU Senate to order on Monday, April 7, 2014 at 3:17 pm in the Wetherby Conference Room. A quorum was present.
 - **Members Present:**
Heidi Álvarez, Jill Brown, Margaret Crowder, Tucker Davis, Gordon Emslie, Lloren Foster, Ashley Chance Fox, John Gottfried, Jennifer Hanley, Ric Keaster, Alison Langdon, Patricia Minter, Mark Reeves, Beverly Siegrist.
 - **Guests Present:**
Mac McKerral, Beth Plummer, Nicki Seay, Kristin Wilson.
 - **Absent:**
Angela Jerome
- A. Approve April Minutes**
- A motion to approve the March minutes by J. Hanley was seconded by B. Siegrist. With a unanimous vote, the April minutes were approved as posted.

B. Reports:

1. Chair – Margaret Crowder

- A Senator has asked that Senate make a formal request for the changes on the IT policies that were discussed at various points this past term. This formal request will come in the Fall. Chair Crowder has already been in contact with both Bob Owen and Deborah Wilkins about what was agreed upon at the April Senate meeting and has gone through the recorded minutes and picked out several time stamps referring to specific items.
- A follow-up on last month's SEC meeting in which the Provost mentioned that Bob Owen had not received the Senate response on the two IT policies that had been discussed: Crowder emailed both Bob Owen and the Provost, forwarding the strand of email communication between Dr. Owen and Crowder that occurred subsequent to the February Senate meeting, and outlining the sequence of communications that had taken place between IT and the Senate leadership. Dr. Owen responded that Crowder's recollection of the events corresponded with his own and that he had even made a report to AC regarding the Senate's response to the IT policies at the time.

2. Vice Chair – Jennifer Hanley (no report)

3. Secretary - Heidi Alvarez (no report)

4. Faculty Regent – Patricia Minter

- The next Board of Regents meeting will be the budget meeting at the end of June. The President has send email about tuition and budget; the budget will be built on 4.8% tuition increase.
- Minter attended the statewide AAUP meeting last weekend. The speaker was an editor of the AAUP Redbook. Minter stated that she learned quite a bit, specifically that faculty governance means faculty governance, not shared governance. This means that we have to work on it all year long rather than react to something we don't like. Minter stated that we have to keep our game up.

5. Provost – Gordon Emslie

- The modest compensation for faculty and staff will be 1%.
- The staffing plan for 2015-2016 is alive and well.
- The Provost met with the President on April 30 and will meet with him next on May 19. They will discuss benchmarks, efficiencies in Academic Affairs, the fiscal 2016 staffing plan (filling vacancies vs. pool for compensation down the road).
- There are three searches: Gatton Academy Director, Chancellor for the Elizabethtown/Fort Knox Campus, and the CHHS Dean (will be reopened using a search firm this time).
- The three University Awards winners will be recognized at commencement.

1. **Standing Committee Reports and Recommendations**

1. Graduate Council (Beth Plummer):

- B. Plummer made a motion to endorse the April 8 Graduate Council agenda items on the University Senate Agenda as posted. The Graduate Council items were approved unanimously by the Graduate Faculty.

2. University Curriculum Committee (Ashley Chance Fox):

- There was a question about suspending a course indefinitely.
- A. Chance Fox made a motion to approve the UCC April 24 report for inclusion on the University Senate agenda. The motion passed unanimously.
- A. Chance Fox made a motion to send the 7 Policy UCC items on the the Senate. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Academic Quality: K. Wilson for A. Langdon

- K. Wilson submitted the Academic Quality report for approval. Discussion centered around the current instructional evaluation system. The Provost said there is a three-year plan to evaluate. P. Minter said that this is year two. R. Keaster said that feedback is better. P. Minter said that the report puts it on Senate. If Senate wants to make changes, then it has to go through Senate; this would require going through the minutes and it must be faculty driven. This is an ongoing review. M. Crowder said in terms of the proposition for Senate, how do these documents occur within the context of a large senate meeting? Student evaluation of instruction either a survey or have question that make sense to us. With the primary purpose, are we content? K. Wilson stated that the flexibility allows for improved pedagogy. Comment: the document is currently being used for promotion and tenure. Student comments are open to interpretation. M. Reeves said that Academic Quality doesn't want to spend time generating questions and then have the

Senate reject it. K. Wilson stated that there is a document that has been tested that is reliable but it is very general, so it doesn't help for improved pedagogy. M. Crowder said this body will have to find suggestions on how to improve it. P. Minter asked if the object was to come out of the Senate meeting with a clear mandate? K. Wilson said the committee wants to find out what kind of instrument we want. Academic Quality meetings bring up various issues but the Committee does not feel like they have the power. P. Minter stated that she feels this is the function of the committee; to come forth with a proposal that can be voted up or down. K. Wilson said that the committee recommends a change of wording. M. Crowder said, to clarify, Academic Quality feels it should stay with the current evaluation items? K. Wilson said the questions are what came back with changes of wording of the questions. M. Crowder: Should the SEC charge the Committee with finding one with more validity? K. Wilson: The literature can find positives and negatives about anything. Is the rewording sufficient? R. Keaster said that based on his previous experience, he feels no matter what is done, it will be impossible to keep everyone happy. It is good and important to have questions to ask such as why are we doing this and what is our purpose? Are these all the questions we should have, and what extra layers should we add to it? P. Minter said this is what we are recommending; what do we need feedback on and what will we do with it? Question: can the department add questions? Answer: yes. J. Brown: are the SGA questions still on TopNet? SGA said yes. J. Brown: Do they show up on our responses? Yes. M. Crowder recommended a revised report, summarizing clearly what the Academic Quality Committee is asking of the Senate, and ask what we require of Senate. She added that she recommends a quick turn around by Wednesday or Thursday at the latest. K. Wilson said she needs permission to revise from the Chair of the Committee. M. Crowder said that as a member of the Committee, she can submit it for them. P. Minter made a motion to remand to the Committee for revisions (2nd. R. Keaster). The motion to remand to the Committee for revisions passed unanimously.

- J. Brown asked the SGA to update their questions because they currently say 2012. P. Minter said that the feedback shows that some feel the SGA questions detract from the other questions. K. Wilson said in order for it to be statistically valid, the questions need to be worded in a different way.

4. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility (Tucker Davis):

- T. Davis submitted the April 19 Faculty Welfare Report for inclusion on the Senate agenda. The report passed unanimously.
- Resolution for Instructors: The Committee looked at the original goal of the resolutions. (1) creating a feeling of security/longevity for instructors; (2) creating instructor ranks; (3) encouraging multi-year appointments beyond temporary. The Committee outlined continuance procedures and language was struck in this updated resolution. In the first year, they are notified by March 14; every year subsequent, they had to be notified by December. The Committee wanted instructors who had been here to be notified in time so they can have time to seek additional employment. No notification equals continuance. Are people who are not being continued being notified by these dates? The Provost said it is on the calendar, and if nobody is getting notifications, it is a good thing. In providing longevity/security for the long-

term, the only possibility is tenure. 1.200 does not allow for tenure. Regarding the resolution, they are in favor of creating long-term security for instructors, along with the possibility of creating some sort of tenure. B. Siegrist said she is not in favor of the resolution. Though she feels that they are in need of raises and promotions, she feels that there is a lot that goes into that in terms of credentials and tenure requirements. P. Minter said she thinks what AAUP recommends would have a high turnover at year five. T. Davis said the resolution is in favor of the possibility of creating some sort of tenure system, but realizes it will require further discussion. P. Minter said that AAUP wants the use of tenured lines, not cheap labor. Year five could have a different effect; because of this, P. Minter stated that she does not see it as an option. The Provost stated that accepting the promotion issue is feasible, but tenure is not. M. Crowder had the SEC vote on sending the Resolution for Instructors on to senate: 6 voted yes, 3 voted no.

5. General Education: (no report)

6. Colonnade Implementation Committee: (no report)

D. Old Business (none)

E. New Business:

1. Mac McKerral brought five new items of new business:

a. Policy 2.01405 (returned from Senate last time because of the Regent Election voting): revisited and came back with a modification: section 282 (some disciplines might not require ABD or terminal degree). This position without a statute would be ineligible to vote in a regent election. M. McKerral discussed this with R. Dietle. The data for the number of folks hired in this category since 2013 (12 = high end, 5 = low end). M. McKerral is not in favor of disenfranchising anyone and feels it takes away their ability to vote every three years and their ability to vote within their department. He feels that 10 votes is a minimum number. This item addresses how long do we want people to be here; this says here two years and looking for work the third year. The committee feels it affects a small number of people. P. Minter had a question for the Provost. Are the terms explained to someone coming in on an ABD appointment? The Provost responded "yes". M. Crowder asked what is the legality of letting them know ahead of time that they cannot vote? P. Minter said that Gordon Ford will be in charge of coming up with a list for the Regent Election. It specifies in their Tenure and Promotion Policy who can vote for Faculty Regent. She feels that there has not always been clarity in every department, and feels that some do not have a clear idea of who can vote. The Provost said that Human Resources takes the position that after two years, they have to reapply for the position. The resolution would appoint them at instructor level and then there would be a search. Individual appointment letters can be made. This is a straight-forward resolution in dealing with the ambiguity. P. Minter said she understands that people want to have exceptions made, but this is governed by state law. Minter feels disenfranchisement is the discussion on our campus (ie. South Campus). The Provost commented that some ABD's come in and are ready by that fall. P. Minter said that the Regent election is in the fall, and the Regent is sworn in before the fourth quarterly meeting. The election process takes place for five weeks in the fall, usually after fall break. Many things are not clear at this university, and

conversation takes place in small groups behind closed doors, instead of public forums. No further discussion. The lecturer appointment as changed was voted in favor (with one opposed) to send to Senate for further consideration.

b. Policy #2.01407 Instructor Ranks: the criteria for eligibility had language that was borrowed from the 1st paragraph, second sentence. This gives departments a year. P. Minter suggested that he clarify this to Senate. M. McKerral clarified the type of change. Following a motion by J. Brown (2nd T. Davis), the item will be sent to Senate. J. Brown had a question regarding some instructors who have been here for 10 years vs. some who were hired in; some who have been here for a long time might have to wait longer than a new employee (20 years vs. 14 yrs); she said this seems unfair to the employees who have been here longer. J. Hanley asked what form will the annual evaluation be in? J. Brown said the requirements for instructors vary from department to department. P. Minter said this will support a more standardized work life. M. Crowder said that from department to department the requirements for instruction might be different. J. Brown said that she is all for promotion of instructors, but just has questions. For example, terminal degrees, would this mean MM & Doctorate in Educational Leadership? R. Keaster said he told students coming into the Ed.D. program that the EDD degree has to qualify them for what they are pursuing, and that they should check with the Department Head, Dean, and Provost, and realize that they might not be there when they finish; thus the advice is to get it in writing. It is the end user's determination. Time, money, and effort might be wasted if the degree does not qualify them in terms of credentials in their discipline. J. Brown said she does not know how instructors are evaluated but thinks the shorter time for newer instructors is unfair. The Provost stated that he feels it is transitional. M. Crowder said she has been told that there are not many full-time continuing instructors on campus. The administrators think it does not affect very many people. M. Crowder argues that it is a long time to be promoted to Senior Instructor. M. McKerral said that as the Provost stated, you have to start with something. Additionally, there are budget implications. He drew attention to a change; it is not 12 years of continuous service; taking a year off is not a break in service. The average time is 15 years. M. Crowder said that 20 years seems too long. The Provost commented that last year, it was not possible at all, and there are budget implications. P. Minter said she agrees and feels it should be endorsed and cautioned that getting bogged down with detail could kill the document. The Provost said that transitional retirees going into full retirement would fill lapsed salary money which would be used from the promotion raises. Minter asked why this was not funded through Central Budget. P. Minter said that this is how Potter College funds travel, how they hire adjuncts; there are consequences. This is still not a guarantee of employment. Has anyone thought about the adverse consequences? In Potter the 1-years who were let go; this was a financial decision. It is a ladder but a ladder with a professional standard for review. J. Hanley said this could add a lot of work to instructors due to the expectations outside of teaching. M. McKerral said this discussion leads to the fact that everyone in Senate has constituents; do they talk to them? Does everything have to be in this room? McKerral recommends sending a doodle poll out to the faculty to get a foundation for decisions.

c. Policy #2.01408: M. McKerral stated that one Committee member strongly opposed; two seemed to be in favor; one was in favor; the Committee does not have a position. This has been through the Senate three times in the last two years, and they have heard from the President that it is the purview of the Board to approve

this document. M. McKerral said that the Senate needs to sort it out themselves. The Committee is not endorsing one way or the other. A motion to send it on to senate by J. Hanley was 2nded by M. Reeves. P. Minter discussed that in AAUP guidelines, all handbooks and policies should be approved by the board. M. Crowder said she is concerned about the resolution for Board of Regents approval because of conversations with other senate leaders at other institutions in Kentucky. It does not make it a legal document. Based on conversations with the President, Crowder feels that if this goes forward and gets approved, the President said clearly that he will go through item by item and change things that he did not like, and he would be able to edit and change as he sees fit. This has happened at other institutions. Crowder feels that the implicit threat will be followed up on at the Presidential or Board level, and that changes could be made that are not in the faculty's best interest. P. Minter said that this is a silly argument, and that the President and Provost will work it out. She does not think the threat will be carried out. The President should have a conversation with the Faculty Handbook Committee. She added that the Board either approves or sends items back. The Board does not line-item edit anything. She thinks it is unfortunate that this argument is taking place due to fear, because President Ransdell already can make changes. The discussion is due to unfortunate fear that is generated in the memo. M. Reeves said he is inclined to do the exact opposite of the memo, and does not want to operate on fear. M. McKerral asked what are the chances the board would reject what the President says? 99 to 0. P. Minter said the Board does not see unendorsed items on board agenda. M. McKerral said that this is a scenario that could occur. J. Brown said she is curious as to whether the Faculty Handbook Committee would have to go through Senate throughout the year to make changes. P. Minter said that is an up or down vote, once or twice a year. Ransdell does not want to take things to the board if it is not going to pass. She said that SACS wants faculty to have control over tenure and promotion, Ransdell wants a clean bill from SACS. This is best practice. Why are fewer and fewer things going to the board? M. Crowder wants to know why the President is so opposed to it. P. Minter said this is not going to lead to a veto of anything that the faculty cares about. M. Crowder said the opposition is so vehement to this and it makes her wonder why. She is concerned that the threat will be carried out. P. Minter said the Board of Regents does not have line item veto authority. If he has a problem with something, he should have been saying it all along. Letting the politics of fear dictate matters as much as the bi-term issue. M. Crowder added that she is reflecting thoughts from other faculty. J. Hanley called the question, leading to a unanimous vote to send the item on to Senate.

d. Policy #2.01409 Language for Promotion Criteria: the existing document uses sustained, tangible, sustained, and effort was made to keep the language consistent. McKerral added that he is not sure what "tangible" means. It was originally an editorial non-substantive change. A motion to send it on to Senate by R.Keaster (2nd B. Siegrist) passed unanimously. The Provost commented on the sustained/tangible distinction.

e. Policy #2.01410 allows Senate to act in a timely fashion instead of the first meeting in the fall. Changes must be endorsed throughout the year. A motion to send it on to Senate by J. Hanley (2nd L. Foster) passed; the item will be sent on to Senate.

f. Policy #2.01411 (non-substantive changes) in a marked-up PDF with the rationale for the changes. Whatever gets accepted and merged into the original

document. It knocks out pagination; URL's live and correct, and will sanitize and edit FACET because it no longer exists. There is a difference in the faculty handbook and charter process; the senate can act immediately with substantive and non-substantive changes to the charter, but with the handbook, non-substantive changes require waiting until the next meeting. R. Dietle's position is that the Senate Charter takes precedence because it is approved by the Board of Regents. The existing glitch will be fixed. The Faculty Handbook is not currently approved by the Board of Regents. Minter stated that this is a conflict of laws. McKerral said it does not work to make non-substantive substantive, and that he wants to stick with the Charter language. He suggested moving it on to Senate. A motion by M. Reeves (2nd J. Hanley) voted in favor of sending non-substantive changes on to Senate. M. McKerral advised Senators to make sure those that are endorsed make it into the revised version and that they be put into effect in the next academic year. The Senate has to endorse the final version pending review by the Senate Chair, Welfare Chair, and Handbook Chair. M. McKerral has a meeting with M. Crowder tomorrow to merge.

2. Resolution from SGA (M. Reeves): This recently passed, and Reeves wants the shared governance on Senate to discuss it. M. Reeves hopes the faculty will concur; Reeves sees it as a move that he feels will help. The 1% raise is not really a raise because of inflation. There is 4.8% tuition increase, and 3.2 next year. He went to benchmark institutions and feels it is opaque; it is 119% of the average benchmark for salary. Reeves doubts that faculty receive this same percentage. A 1% flat raise 500/600/700/800 vs. if this \$420,000 is really his base rate. The resolution asks Ransdell to consider a salary decrease. P. Minter said that since 2007 when he negotiated a contract until 2022, there is no longer a rigorous review process, fewer and fewer things are sent to the board, the board has less and less authority on compensation, and it is a locked-in escalator at very minimum. \$100,000 escalated very quickly a few years ago, plus other perks; it is a corporate model. In 1997, there was a high economy. In 2008, the bottom dropped out, and concerns were expressed at that time. We should look very carefully at 2022. \$423,588 is the base salary, plus deferred compensation. M. Reeves said that he considers 119% an amateur percentage. He said that he asked President Ransdell if he would consider giving some back in the last SGA forum; Ransdell said no. R. Grieves stated that the President's job is a very difficult job. He doesn't know where he sits according to benchmarks, but he is a CEO and has a lot of employees compared to other institutions. M. Reeves made a motion to send the SGA Resolution to Senate without endorsement (2nd T. Davis). The motion to send to Senate passed, with 7 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstained. P. Minter said that the top two complaints that she gets as Regent are the Athletic Coach and the President's Compensation, in that order.

3. Crowder discussed the plan for the final lists and nominations for the Provost's Committees (space, keys, recognition). Names were drawn randomly by the SEC when there were multiple nominees from each committee. The final lists are as follows:

Space

1. Pitt Derryberry – Psychology (CEBS)

2. Sheila Flener – Family & Consumer Science (CHHS)
3. Rich Patterson – Facilities & Mgmt/Hospitality Mgmt (CHHS)
4. Mark Ross – Accounting (GFCB)
5. Katherine Pennavaria – Libraries
6. Matt Nee – Chemistry (OCSE)
7. Mark Revels – Information Systems (OCSE)
8. Ann Ferrell – Folk Studies (PCAL)
9. Steve White – Journalism & Broadcasting (PCAL)
10. Said Ghezal – Professional Studies (UC)

CEBS – 1

CHHS – 2

GFCB – 1

Lib – 1

OCSE – 2

PCAL – 2

UC – 1

+ 1 each from Regional campuses

Keys

1. Rico Tyler – SKyTeach (CEBS)
2. MariBeth Wilson – Nursing (CHHS)
3. Evelyn Thrasher – Information Systems (GFCB)
4. Allison Day - Libraries
5. Joel Lenoir – Engineering (OCSE)
6. Trish Jagers – Academic Support (UC)
7. Doug Smith – Sociology (PCAL)

1 from each college + lib + regional campuses

Recognition

1. Martha Day – SkyTeach (CEBS)
2. Lynette Smith – Nursing, Graduate Program (CHHS)
3. Dean Jordan – Economics (GFCB)
4. Laura DeLancey – Libraries
5. Robin Ayers – Mathematics (OCSE)
6. Peggy Otto – English (PCAL)
7. Andrew Rosa – Diversity & Community Studies (UC) [in NYC for an NEH fellowship until summer]

1 from each college + lib + 1 regional rep

4. The President's Response to Prayer: He has chosen not to enact and not to take it up.

T. Davis (Fac. Welfare): wants to know is it always the case that a violation of policy. The Provost said there is not a violation list but there would be action taken. There is not a

penalty. T. Davis asked when is prayer necessary? The Provost said all members are advised to accept the policy. The Administrative Council member understand what this is all about. M. Crowder asked if there is a possibility of lawsuit. P. Minter said maybe; constitutional to open local may be constitutional
, and would describe sectarian as ill-advised.

F. Information items:

1. In the middle of line 1, the president interpreted “S. Campus”; “Academic South Campus” might be better wording in terms of organizational structure (trying to integrate the Community College into the University College). The final step was in 2010. The Provost said there were preplanned intentions but not in writing. The steps could not all be taken at once. Dr. Burch had certain things that needed to be done. The dissolution of the Arts and Sciences had to wait until all had become tenured. (James Asare was not tenured – Af. Am. Studies & Sociology).
2. Take notes of the blanks on committees for Senate Committee membership and leadership and find someone to fill these holes.
3. Computer Information Technology: came through UCC to suspend program; the Provost denied because there were students in it. The program got moved. This was a withdrawal of the previous proposal to suspend program. M. Crowder contacted Greg Arbuckle (AMS) and wanted to make sure AMS knew about it and was on board. G. Arbuckle said yes, he had talked to their faculty and there was transparency in this process.

A motion to adjourn by L. Foster was seconded by J. Brown. The meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Heidi Álvarez
Secretary