

University Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 7, 2014 -- 3:15 p.m.
Weatherby 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 Weatherby 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:**
Molly Dunkum, Mac McKerral, Beth Plummer (Graduate Council), Larry Snyder.
- **Absent:**
Angela Jerome

A. Approve March Minutes

- A motion to approve the March minutes by J. Hanley was seconded by B. Siegrist. B. Plummer clarified that the policy was withdrawn: “without approval from the Provost, the motion was withdrawn.” The motion to approve as amended was 2nded by J. Hanley. With a unanimous vote, the March minutes were approved as amended.

B. Reports:

1. Chair – Margaret Crowder

- Chair Crowder requested that the SEC members be in charge of the April Caucus meeting; members of the SEC will come up with standing committee members. The SEC representatives for colleges, library, and SGA will be in charge. Forms will be passed out at the Senate meeting, and the SEC members will be responsible for securing new members for open spots on the committees.
- Several requests for information on various aggregations (broken down by college) were requested for the Faculty Worklife Survey. M. Crowder expressed that this data could be useful if it is looked at in different ways. A. Langdon stated that perhaps these committees could request specifically what they want since it might be difficult to articulate the parameters. P. Minter stated that disclosure for each college would be difficult because maybe only three people took the survey. Having established rules might be better than a policy; ie. Send request in writing to the Chair of Faculty Welfare. T. Davis said that similar situations arose with the bi-term survey, and most faculty will want to have their anonymity protected. P. Minter said that people need to have anonymity and many have a fear of retaliation. T. Davis said that information from old surveys will be passed on to the new Faculty Welfare Chair, and so will the Qualtrics data.

- Question: is there a policy on our campus for eCigs? P. Minter said that they are working on one in the Staff Council. M. Crowder said this was brought forth because of a student feeling they had the right to do this in class.
- M. Crowder addressed the fact that there is a difference between what was approved by the Senate and Provost for Policy 1.5170. The first page she showed the SEC was how it was approved by Senate and stamped by the Provost. The 2nd page she showed the SEC was how it was posted on the website; there was a clause added under section II.A.2. “except under unusual circumstances and with the approval of the provost and the vice president of the division in which the staff member is employed.” M. Reeves stated that SGA has had issues with a department on campus where information is posted online is different than what is approved. M. Crowder said that she did not receive anything from the Provost saying there were any requests for alteration to the final Senate draft. P. Minter stated that if the Provost thought there needed to be a change, he should have formally requested that it come back to the Senate. P. Minter suggested as an advisory member that it stay in the records as it was approved. M. Reeves asked if there are other policies that were posted online other than as they were approved. M. Crowder said that this one included an addition in what was posted online. If there is an issue with the policy, then it should be marked “seeking approval” instead of being stamped as “approved.” If a change is subsequent, then the Senate needs to know and approve it as amended. The Provost stated that he does not approve policies but approves the recommendations of the Senate. The recommendations then go to AC and the President. M. Crowder stated that in a previous situation (with a GC policy item) the Provost sent an email and stamped the document “will seek continued approval”. This Policy 1.5170 was stamped as “approved.” A. Langdon reiterated that something was added to the policy that we were not aware of and it was posted. The Provost said that the Senate was supposed to receive the update and comment on it. M. Crowder said that the issue was with the process and that the Senate had never received the revision. The Provost said that the Senate approved it on a Thursday, the Provost and BOR the next day, and this was posted on Monday the 27th. He approved a recommendation to seek continued approval. P. Minter said that the SEC needs to have trust that the document is not going to change. The Provost said that the final version is not supposed to be sent through the Senate again. M. Crowder said the 2nd time it came through Senate there were not comments on it. The Provost stated that he feels “blindsided” by the inquiry into the policy changes. M. Crowder said she is concerned that this could start happening on a regular basis. J. Hanley clarified the process by reading a section of the charter that addresses the process. “Non-substantive approval of policy”. P. Minter said that you cannot add something to something that has been approved without sending it back. The social contract requires that the SEC be informed of the change. The Provost apologized for not sending it back in the final version and said that he understood the procedure differently. J. Hanley read a line in the Policy on Policies that said a statement must be received from Senate showing if it is “In concurrence” with the final version of the draft. The Provost said that “final version” is not the same as “review and comment”. M. Crowder said that communication happens between the various level in order for the university to function well, and we want to have clear communication between the administration and the faculty governance. T. Davis asked if there is ever a footnote that the Senate does not concur with the final version of a policy? The Provost responded “no”, it is review and comment. The Provost then brought up several IT policies that were sent

through Senate by his request and stated that Bob Owen had not received final Senate comment on those items. M. Crowder said the 2nd time those items came through Senate, there were not comments on it and that she had been in contact with Bob Owen regarding the Senate's response to the IT policies. It was also stated that Senate has not yet had a chance to speak with the General Counsel about some of the items within those IT policies, but would do so at the next meeting in April. M. Crowder said that she will respond to the Provost about the IT Policies (for review only) because they do not pertain to this discussion. M. Reeves stated that there is a general communication issue. The fact that these issues seem to be blurring together indicates that there is a communication problem. IT information items in November were comment and review but not brought through the Senate for approval; they were only for review. P. Minter said that we and the people we represent need to be informed of any changes and need to have a paper trail. It has happened in student affairs. M. Crowder requested that the Provost please look into it and report back to the Senate, and she added that she does not want something like this to become commonplace.

2. Vice Chair – Jennifer Hanley (no report)

3. Secretary - Heidi Alvarez (no report)

4. Faculty Regent – Patricia Minter

- The Board of Regents met on March 28. Regarding the enrollment report, Regent Minter wants more details like what they are used to getting.
- Regent Minter mentioned the emails about the changes in enrollment management.
- She has gotten many questions about the health center. They are meeting in executive session. Anyone with concerns should contact Regent Minter.
- Regent Minter is still wanting more disclosure on football expenses from Athletic Director Stewart. The 2006 revenue statement is without expenses. She wants a fuller picture of the Hilltopper Athletic Foundation because it is not transparent. The AAUP released a recent study regarding the disparity on athletics in higher education. Minter commented that this is a systemic problem.
- The Board of Regents is continuing with their evaluation of President Ransdell.
- Information on the organization of the University College was presented in the form of a flow chart and showed where various people went. It was consistent with what was sent out over email.
- There are not any minutes taken at the Board of Regents committee meetings and not all members of the Board of Regents are required to attend.

5. Provost – Gordon Emslie

- House Bill 333 would affect under age 60 retirement; several faculty who were electing to retire before June 1 might not have to. House Bill 333 did not pass through and could reemerge in 2014-2015.
- The 0370 Prayer Policy is being looked at in Administrative Council.
- General Budget Remarks: Statewide cuts went from 2.5% to 1.5%. The \$3

million tuition shortfall is a combination of many things, such as enrollment, redirection of tuition to other things such as the health sciences building expansion. The fall 2011 tuition amount went up \$100,000. The shortfall is real but not in gross tuition from the university. \$5 million is 1+3+1. \$3.4 million will be reduced by \$500K because of the reduction in health through privatization of health services. \$3 million in cost of living salary adjustments is back up to \$4 million. Staffing play and adjustments in summer school. In a 70/30 model, next year is the first year that 5% of tuition will be kept centrally. The missing \$908,000 - found without affecting fiscal 2016 staffing plan or faculty positions. This depends on CPE's tuition cap; they are looking at different models. The tuition cap will be set by the CPE and we will know by Wednesday or Thursday. The budgets for stipends is \$220,000. Money from stipends that are spread out and will be recouped as part of the budget because stipends should not be long term. We are ready to move forward with next year's staffing plan. The budget advisory committee advises not to support an across the board cost of living adjustment. The Provost is not supporting it because they requested that. The cost of living increase will not be across the board; it will be calculated differently. T. Davis clarified that it is "raises" not "cost of living" that is across the board. It is not really "cost of living" but a "bump". The Provost is meeting with the President on Thursday to discuss faculty and staff "bumps". The academic budget is about 70%. If the Governor signs it, WKU will receive \$48 million for the Thompson North Complex renovation. WKU \$72.4 million; by next year \$74.6 million (3.16% increase) which includes the Gatton Academy. Some colleges got no increase in money; some see a 1.5% reduction in funding. \$1.3 million increase for KERS. UK and U of L get zero because they do not participate. No bucks for brains. Morehead 5.7, 2.3 million dual credit program. Commonwealth adult learner competency based, not constrained to state-wide; did not get funding. \$1/2 million shortfall this year is not across the board but most colleges gave up 1/2 of the last installment. Each college lost some of their carry forward money; it was trimmed to balance this year's budget. Regent Minter stated that the Gatton Academy is fully funded and everything it touches is fully funded through other means (including private donors), which is nothing but good from every angle.

C. Standing Committee Reports and Recommendations

1. Graduate Council (Beth Plummer):

- B. Plummer made a motion to endorse the March 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):

- A. Chance Fox made a motion to approve the March 27 UCC minutes for inclusion on the University Senate agenda. The motion passed.

3. Academic Quality: No report

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

- T. Davis made a motion to approve the March Faculty Welfare Report. The incorrect report was posted. J. Hanley suggested that the Faculty Welfare Report be emailed and approved separately from the two resolutions. M. Crowder forwarded the correct report via email for the Executive Committee to review. The report includes two resolutions. Faculty Welfare was asked to look at issues within the liberal arts and sciences move. These issues are governed by the faculty handbook. Any broad sweeping policy was not a good fit for individual departments, and faculty welfare thought it would be a better practice to tailor the policy within the department.
- Resolution for Instructors: ranks and multi-year appointments can be offered to instructors who have been here a while and give them some security. Instructors without rank and tenure will get more security with multi-year renewable contracts. L. Snyder commented that Potter College does not have 3's and 5's. T. Davis said their appointments are renewable as they go through the evaluation process. One of the issues is that Modern Languages has had a few contracts that are suddenly not going to be renewed. This presents an issue because there is no time for these faculty to look for other jobs. People who move their families here need to have enough notice to look for other positions if they are not going to be renewed. The Provost said that 1.200 refers to multi-year contracts for instructors. It has a March 1 date for notification. One year is renewable up to three years. This is renewed unless the faculty member is notified in March. Within the first year, "will be renewed if not notified," and the notification date changes to (sometime in) December on the subsequent years. The Provost asked if the resolution is asking to change this policy. T. Davis said we won't want to change it but we want to use multi-year appointments and not one-year renewal. One-year appointments would be used for the first year, then after that it can be decided if they can be offered multi-year contracts (3 years). R. Keaster suggested that they bring a revised policy that includes the annual review period. J. Hanley said that instructors would like to have what is and is not required of them in terms of workload in 1.2091. The Provost said that workload is determined by the department. T. Davis said that this should be consistent within the department. P. Minter suggested that T. Davis follow up with the Faculty Welfare Committee to see if they want to review the resolution to clarify terms of employment. It was added that looking into multi-year contracts could present a problem because year-to-year might be all that we can do. R. Keaster made a motion to send the resolution back to Faculty Welfare (2nd J. Hanley). J. Brown said she thinks instructors who have been here a long time should get some equity and a pay raise. T. Davis said that this was part of the resolution. A promotion system is being kicked around but it is not in place yet. P. Minter said that the larger issue is that with benefits vs. salary, there is a great disparity between what is coming out of pocket. T. Davis said that some multi-year appointments could be utilized to offer more security. The motion to send the resolution back to Faculty Welfare passed unanimously.
- Resolution for South Campus: some main campus departments had issues with being excluded from the loop. There was a "behind closed doors" feeling. The South Campus is going through many changes and the liberal arts and sciences did not know about the changes. Over the past few years, many changes have occurred without consulting with the faculty. Long

term, all of these changes have a clear and definite trend, which is the minimization of South Campus. It is no longer a community college. There are no longer 3-4 departments. They are now fighting for resources. The Professional Studies Department has moved to the main campus. The Liberal Arts and Sciences have dissolved. B. Siegrist added that the history is even more complicated. Academic Support is left at South Campus. The trend is telling, so the resolution asks if there is a long-term plan, and has there been a long-term plan that no one knows about? The faculty wants to feel like they are informed and included in discussion of any changes. J. Brown said that faculty morale continues to go lower and that she is concerned about the last statement.

- A motion to approve the March Faculty Welfare report with the removal of Item #1 (Resolution for Instructors) by T. Davis (2nd J. Gottfried) was on the table. It was clarified by J. Brown and B. Siegrist that the 2nd resolution is not endorsed; the vote to accept the report does not mean that specific action items within the report are approved. Resolutions and recommendations that come in through the report are approved as recommendations within the report. B. Siegrist said that the parliamentary procedure says that report is different than a resolution. M. Crowder said that recommendations are part of the report. A. Langdon said that if people want to discuss the 2nd resolution, then restate the motion. T. Davis withdrew his first motion, and then made a second motion to accept the report as only a report, with the resolutions pulled out (2nd J. Gottfried). The motion passed. A second motion to table the resolution indefinitely until the next SEC meeting was seconded by J. Gottfried. There were 4 votes of yes and 6 votes of no; the motion to table indefinitely requires a 2/3 majority, so the motion to table indefinitely failed. A motion to endorse the 2nd resolution by T. Davis was seconded by A. Langdon. J. Brown said that she feels uncomfortable with the last statement in the resolution and wants to know what is going on. Regarding plan revision, changes are supposed to be faculty led. J. Brown is on a task force researching changes that they would like to make and faculty input is not being considered. T. Davis clarified that this resolution drives at the fact that a plan is already in place and that the task force needs to know what these changes are so that they can act accordingly. The task force was appointed by the Dean's office. A. Landgon stated that the resolution will help support the work of the task force. J. Brown said that the people at South Campus need to know what is going on. B. Siegrist asked if the statement "stakeholders" should be removed. P. Minter said that the last paragraph articulates Jill's voice. R. Keaster said that the last paragraph stands for the task force. J. Brown asked how do we get the answers? R. Keaster suggested passing the resolution. The Provost asked to clarify "move". T. Davis said "departments responsible for 12 hours of teaching at South Campus". At the last meeting D. George, M. Price, and R. Miller said 12 hours total: either 2 classes (6 hours) teaching plus 6 hours advising; or 4 sections (12 hours) and no advising. Nuances are being described differently over time. The Provost said that he can supply what is in writing, and wants to see what T. Davis has in writing. The move of workload hours increases workload of those who remain at South Campus. Professional studies "HIM" is a physical move, not an administrative move. B. Plummer called the question. The motion to approve the second resolution passed.

- T. Davis sent an email regarding the Prayer Policy.

5. General Education: (no report)

D. Old Business (none)

- The Colonnade Committee sent a motion to M. Crowder for consideration, and the governance structure would put this into place in the Fall 2014 senate. The motion was amended to extend the Colonnade Implementation Committee for one year and put in a Colonnade Coordinator (a faculty member with a half-time role). Essentially, there needs to be more time to refine the role. The change is that the 2014-2015 General Education Committee would meet concurrently with the Colonnade Committee; in order to make a smooth transition, it will be one big committee for one year. L. Snyder will send the revision to M. Crowder. He stated that the current document and Senate Charter will need some additional conversation to run together. A motion by T. Davis to accept the motion as amended (2nd A. Langdon) passed unanimously.

E. New Business:

1. Mac McKerral made a motion that the Handbook Committee be passed onto the Senate for integration into the revised handbook. There are two substantive changes: (1) instructor ranks and (2) faculty welfare BOR approval for the handbook. This will go through possible non-substantive changes with the Provost "soon". The meeting is from 10-12 on April 11. P. Minter asked if the conflict of interest policy is identical to last year's. M. McKerral said the language changes "also" to ensure material element under #2 was all-inclusive. This applies to tenure-eligible faculty members. #3 added "must" still submit... or forgo early application for tenure". #2 conflict of interest – the word "the" changed to "any" and added "prior to the committee convening its work". The Provost said this is the 2nd version. P. Minter suggested specifying the time period under lecture appointment: establishes category "instructors ABD, then become Assistant Professor". Advertise as requiring a terminal degree and then specify when the degree must be completed. Instructors and Professionals in Residence cannot vote on the Regent election was amended to include instructors, 5 comprehensive instructional departments, and KCTCS. (ask Mac to send changes). Motion to move forward to Senate by A. Langdon was seconded by M. McKerral. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Policy 1.2180: motion to approve by A. Chance Fox, 2nd T. Davis. Senate would pay for mileage once approved. This will offer consistency and will clarify language for the IRS. The Provost added that in the definition, most people in their appointment letter will not have any words clarifying this, so the Provost suggested that faculty will need to look out for this. This guarantees that you will get mileage. J. Hanley asked when this started and what does it include? She asked if she should have been paid to travel to university senate meetings. P. Minter stated that is is not retroactive. Provost Emslie explained some of the circumstances that get (or don't get) reimbursed. The complete listing is not there but it is work related. M. Crowder stated that this has been an issue for quite some time. Provost Emslie said that it does not apply to all faculty and that they should check letters to be sure. The policy passed unanimously.

3. Budget Committee Charter Revision was brought up at the last senate meeting on the floor by E. Reed and the senate approved it. E. Reed wrote it up and it will require two readings; one now at the SEC meeting and then at the Senate meeting. Motion to approve: R. Keaster, 2nd A. Langdon. This was approved without discussion. The Provost then had a question about the last line; should it go to the President instead of the Provost? The Provost is not over the whole university budget. He discussed his Budget Committee, which was related to Academic Affairs. The scope of the committee goes beyond. The recommended revision was "Provost and President". A motion to approve as revised by R. Keaster, 2nd L. Foster was approved unanimously. Provost Emslie asked if the last line of the first paragraph which reads "representative from Provost's Office" should there be someone from Ann Mead's office? P. Minter said no, because it is academically formed. Provost Emslie asked why the Honors College is excluded. P. Minter said because they are a degree producing unit.

4. Formation of Provost's Advisory Committees: Three additional committees (space, keys, and faculty award/recognition). A list of volunteers was provided, with nominees organized alphabetically by college. An asterisk clarifies those who were put on a committee different than what they asked for or who said they would be on any committee and were placed where they were needed the most. Starting first with the Space Committee, the Provost asked if all nominees are acceptable to the SEC. P. Minter asked if he wanted to strike assistant deans (#4 & #9). M. Crowder suggested having reps from each college. The Provost responded that these are either nominated or self-nominated. R. Keaster said he doesn't think anyone would want to call out their colleagues as unacceptable. P. Minter asked if he had a number in mind. The Provost responded that one from each college is OK. P. Minter suggested two from each college, using Potter College as an example (one from FAC and one from Cherry). The Provost responded that if a college has one building home, then one representative on the committee is fine; if a college has more than one building, two is reasonable. J. Hanley suggested having reps for the regional campuses. The Provost said that he is OK having regional campus representation and will email Sally Ray. The Space Committee is a problem-solving group. It will use 13 people total from the list, and will end up having 20 people: 1 from CEBS, 2 from CHHS, 1 from GFCB, 2 from OCSE, 2 from PCAL, 2 from UC (one from Main Campus and one from South Campus), 2 from regional campuses, 1 from libraries, as well as 1 from the construction committee, and 1 from campus facilities.

The Provost stated that he is establishing this committee because many issues with keys are coming up. The task of the keys committee members will be to gather information. The keys committee charge will be to "make suggested revisions to the key policy". Campus facilities and student affairs will be a part of this committee. M. Crowder asked the Provost if he was asking the member to be a sounding board for complaints, and stated that she wants this committee to have across-the-board representation. P. Minter commented that there have been problems with women who get locked out because they don't have pockets. The Provost said that the committee will rewrite policies and that he does not want too many people on the committee, so some people will need to be eliminated. T. Davis asked how these people would be known if their committee is small. J. Hanley asked if the 13 people on the list can be used. The Provost thought that might be too many people. P. Minter suggested having Chair Crowder contact the people on the list and ask them

if they would like to stay on the list if they are going to be the point person for the college and listen to complaints. Members will have to be responsive. M. Crowder will tell the people on the list what the committee is about and will get consent from them. J. Gottfried suggested giving people a forum (either publicly or through email) in which they can vent and then have the people on the committee work it out. People will need to know what their job is. T. Davis suggested perhaps doing it in a similar way to the faculty handbook committee. The Provost suggested including a form that people have to fill out. P. Minter stated that it is a policy-fixing group. Other voices have to be heard. She added that this is a good idea to fix the disconnect. The Provost suggested that M. Crowder contact these people and ask if they are willing to serve and show up, then the SEC will vote. This committee will be a 2-3 year commitment, with staggered terms 2-3-4. It will be one major effort at the beginning and then will suggest improvements. P. Minter suggested staggering it by college or draw numbers. M. Crowder stated that she feels this is getting too complicated, and that she wants it all to have a clear charge for each committee to have a better understanding of what each committee does: (1) number of years of service; (2) duties; (3) number of members per college; (4) would like the charge of each committee to be clear. J. Hanley added that she wants the regional campuses to be included.

J. Hanley asked what the recognition committee does. The Provost said that he wants to have other ways of acknowledging faculty on an annual basis other than the four categories. He is looking for some creative suggestions on how to recognize more people, either regularly or on an occasional basis, since the university is unable to reward people with salary increases. J. Hanley asked for regional representation on that committee on a rotating basis.

M. Crowder said that the Space Committee will have varying numbers of faculty from each college and one from regional, Keys will have one from each college, regional, and one from libraries. Recognition will be same as keys. Provost Emslie said that Space can be chosen by lot or by drawing. It is a 2-3-4 year commitment, and people from the same area should rotate off separately. Keys will be a one-time committee, and recognition will be 2 years rolling. M. Crowder said that once she hears from the Provost about the charge for each committee (the charge, the number of years, the number from each college), then she will post the list for the next meeting. The Provost said three years, staggered in a way that two college reps do not rotate off. With the Recognition Committee, the Provost prefers more continuity; a rolling committee with all. 1-2 on the awards (a rolling committee). The Provost wants 8 people on awards. M. Crowder will email the people on the keys committee to know what the charge is and to see if they still want to serve. The list will be posted by the next SEC meeting. M. Crowder will need help telling people when their term is up. J. Hanley will take care of Recognition (1-2 year, half on, half off) and Space (3-4 year rolling). M. Crowder will take care of Keys. The Provost will contact Regional himself.

F. Information items: (none)

A motion to adjourn by J. Hanley was seconded by J. Brown. The meeting adjourned at 6:23 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Heidi Álvarez
Secretary

Assisted by Jill Brown