

Western Kentucky University

Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting Minutes

August 31, 2015 -- 3:15 p.m.

WAB 227 - AA Large Conference Room

A. Call To Order

1. A regular meeting of the WKU University Senate Executive Committee was called to order at 3:15 PM on August 31, 2015 at 3:20 PM. A quorum was present.
2. **Members in attendance:** Heidi Álvarez, Barbara Burch, Thad Crews, Laura DeLancey, Kate Hudepohl, Molly Kerby, David Lee, Gayle Mallinger, Richard C. Miller, Kurt Neely, Bryan Reaka, Jay Todd Richey, Julie Shadoan, Liz Sturgeon.
3. **Members absent:** Rick Grieve and Jeremy Maddox.
4. [Approve August Meeting Minutes](#)
 - A motion by Bryan Reaka to approve the August 17, 2015 Executive Committee meeting minutes was seconded by Laura DeLancey.
 - Kate Hudepohl provided a copy of the secretary's edits to the Faculty Regent Advisory Report that were made after the minutes had been posted. These edits were made at the request of Regent Burch to help clarify a few points for those who read the minutes.
 - Patricia Minter made the following additional edits to the minutes concerning the discussion with President Ransdell and Kim Read: Under letter F, point 1 (p. 4) 5 bullets, not all one-time fees are embedded into tuition. The blank should say all "student" fees. Page 6, the second bullet from the bottom, the missing words are International Student Tuition from Navitas students \$1.6 million. On the next page, the 7th bullet, revenue from in-state tuition, delete the statement "with..."
 - There were no other changes to the minutes besides those requested by Regent Burch and Dr. Minter.
 - The minutes were approved unanimously as amended by Patricia Minter and Barbara Burch.
 - Chair Hudepohl asked the secretary to please put page numbers in the minutes for ease of discussion in the editing process.

B. Reports

1. Chair (Kate Hudepohl)
 - **University Athletic Committee**
 - a. Chair Hudepohl stated that Dr. Ransdell accepted the names provided as recommendations for the University Athletic Committee.

- **Senate Budget**
 - a. The Senate Budget has updated/corrected numbers; this will be on the September agenda. The UCC Recorder was \$1752.92. The carry forward balance will be slightly less. Chair Hudepohl asked if there were any questions about the budget.
 - b. Vice Chair Shadoan asked if the money is at the discretion of the Provost's office. Provost Lee responded that it is budgeted.
 - c. Regent Burch asked if there are anticipated recurring funds. Chair Hudepohl stated that last year, there were travel expenses for a conference. Regent Burch added that the office move might be an added expense. Chair Hudepohl said she plans to purchase an online copy of Sturgis to be accessed electronically. There were no other questions about the budget.
- **Scholars at Risk**
 - a. Chair Hudepohl received an email from a faculty member who was interested in our institution becoming a member of Scholars at Risk (SAR). Hudepohl defined the mission of the group and stated that she is considering referring this to Faculty Welfare.
 - b. Regent Burch stated that she is familiar with it; it is formulated to work on scholars who feel they may be in danger in other parts of the world, and it might place these people on our campus.
 - c. Patricia Minter said she agrees that it should be referred to Faculty Welfare.
 - d. The membership costs \$800.
 - e. Julie Shadoan made a motion to ask Faculty Welfare to review Scholars at Risk, evaluate the pros and cons of WKU joining the organization, and submit a recommendation to SEC (2nd Patricia Minter). There was no further discussion.
 - f. The motion to refer the Scholars At Risk email to Faculty Welfare passed unanimously.
- **Faculty Worklife Survey**
 - a. The Faculty Worklife survey results were left on the agenda. Chair Hudepohl attached it for comments and questions and asked if it is worth referring to look at patterns over the past few years.
 - b. Patricia Minter said she will take it to the committee to have them graph it in a way to see trends.
 - c. Minter added that the committee has to figure out on their own how to run the survey. Only the involved parties and the Board of Regents see the subjective comments. The Board of Regents sees the survey in its entirety; these cannot be made public. President Ransdell saw all of the comments this year. The Provost only sees his section. Patricia Minter told Provost Lee that it is an ethical breach to discuss comments of the previous Provost, but that the committee would be able to discuss visible things. Provost Lee said that anything ethical that needs to be shared about what needs to work well in the future is welcome.
 - d. Julie Shadoan made a motion to analyze the Faculty Welfare Survey trends for the future as something to show closure and goals on the back end that can be published for the faculty. The motion was restated: Julie Shadoan made a motion for the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee to analyze the data from the Faculty Welfare Survey, including historical trends,

with the ultimate goal of publishing for the faculty. Patricia Minter seconded the motion.

- e. Barbara Burch said that some data is very personal and specific. The instrument is just one tool to send a message to the President and Provost. What are the faculty concerns that are identified? She suggested removing the personal and to look for general messages in the context.
 - f. Shadoan added an amendment to the original motion: In addition, look into the research possibility of the survey being conducted by an external body. This would involve investigating options that are out there (the cost, and who could do this). Shadoan restated the amendment to the motion: "In addition, ask the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee to look into having an external agency conduct the Faculty Welfare survey and analysis in the future." The amendment to the original motion was seconded by Richard Miller.
 - g. Patricia Minter asked about having original trend data in a single page, and asked if we want the full eight years of data. Julie Shadoan responded that as long as it is clear who was in what position at that time when publishing the results. Minter stated that she thinks this will be very revealing. It will give the committee a chance to talk about whether or not they want to send it out. It was time consuming to figure it out.
 - h. There was a question about the confidential comments. The first eighteen pages are very different information. The trending will be easy to share after the first eighteen pages. Patricia Minter said that the personal comments are confidential and therefore cannot be shared. People need to know they will have anonymity when filling out the survey. A certain level of distrust exists with some who are in fear that it will be retaliatory. The committee discussed revisions to the survey after the fact; it cannot be changed after it is posted.
 - i. There was no further discussion; the motion as amended by Julie Shadoan passed unanimously.
- **Ombudsman**
 - a. Chair Hudepohl has been receiving many emails; there are three situations that have come up. One is regarding the ombudsperson on campus. This individual is called upon as a neutral sounding board. The Senate Chair is not the best person to negotiate a solution. We have an Ombudsman now and it is appointed by the President. The perception is that this person reports to the President. In early fall last year, the Ombudsman came to Senate. Chair Hudepohl asked if we want to push for a new Ombudsman or do we want to look at peer institutions to see what they do?
 - b. Vice Chair Shadoan stated that when she was the Chair of Senate, that there was a clear intent that it should be a faculty member who gets a workload reduction, and that the Ombudsman should not have a relationship with the President. The Ombudsman was intended to benefit the faculty.
 - c. Patricia Minter added that the faculty asked for neutral arbitration; the current Ombudsman is a presidential appointment. Karl wrote a note to the President and reports on activities. He was sent to the Campus Regent to ask an opinion. He wondered if it was worth the money being spend to continue the program. The Ombudsman is intended to listen; not to solve problems.

- d. Regent Burch said she wonders if it is worth talking to Karl [Laves]. Perhaps he thinks there is a better way to do it; his perception is that the money being spent might not be worth it.
- e. Chair Hudepohl asked if we should invite him to come to the next meeting to know what his role is and to give clarification to questions. Patricia Minter said she wanted a tally and some categories.
- f. Richard Greer was the first Ombudsman; Karl Laves was appointed by President Ransdell after Greer retired. There is a webpage for the role of the Ombudsman; it explains what his role is and provides his contact information. During his appointment, there have only been a few who have contacted him. Regent Burch said that talking to Karl will help us know where to go next.
- **Whistleblower**
 - a. Chair Hudepohl said that she was told that the Whistleblower procedure is not truly external. She would like to know the actual facts. She wants to know if the phone call is directed to our campus.
 - b. A faculty member used the whistleblower line and felt that it was revealed. People need to feel that they have a place they can go.
 - c. This went out of the Board of Regents; external auditor Bailey Jordan uncovered problems in the internal audit and reorganized the office. There was a recommendation to establish the usual procedure of a third-party whistleblower. This person reports to Jennifer Miller.
 - d. At some point, you have to follow up with the whistleblower. Internal audit refers to the current Faculty Regent. At some point, a valid whistleblower has to go to the appropriate place.
 - e. Patricia Minter said that all audits are under the Finance Committee of the Board of Regents.
 - f. Chair Hudepohl said she will respond that this is the way the system is supposed to be working.
- **Meeting with Regent Johnson**
 - a. Last week, Chair Hudepohl and Vice Chair Shadoan received an email from Provost Lee. Regent Gil Johnson invited them to have a sit-down discussion with him on Friday. The meeting included Staff Council Josh Marble. Gil Johnson is the current Chair of the Board of Regents Finance Committee.
 - b. Freddie Higdon is the new Chair of the Board of Regents. Chair Higdon appointed the new Chair of the Board of Regents Finance Committee and put Faculty Regent Burch on that committee for the first time. The Finance Committee was tasked to look at compensation for all employees. The reason for this was because of the Resolution that came out of the University Senate in May.
 - c. During Friday's meeting with Gil Johnson, he mentioned that he wants to meet with small groups for feedback about compensation.
 - d. The Staff Council has already met several times and collected feedback; this resulted in a compiled list about compensation from staff that summarized trends in three ways: (1) concern over priority spending and revenue stream not based on one-time money; (2) problems with compensation (new employees make more

than those who have been here already); and (3) the declining quality of work life and morale.

- e. Chair Hudepohl and Vice Chair Shadoan said they see three issues that result in an over all neglect of human capital: (1) salary; (2) insurance/benefits; (3) spending reallocation as a result of the second shortfall – cuts and how they manifest in Academic Affairs.
- f. Vice Chair Shadoan said that her perception was that things like focusing on legacy projects and the need for better oversight of spending are a few of the issues that caused the budget crisis.
- g. Hudepohl and Shadoan were very clear that they were speaking as themselves and not for the faculty as a whole when discussing spending models and compensation priorities.
- h. Provost Lee said that he is concerned about salaries for the junior faculty. The stagnant salary results in significant loss. He is concerned about salary for faculty members who are committed to being here and he is concerned about salary compression. He said that with compression, they have tried to keep people in the right order; the same starting salary over time makes WKU less competitive in the marketplace. Last year, in Potter College, we got our first choice with all ten tenure-track hires. Compression is a long-term institutional problem.
- i. Chair Hudepohl said that those at the meeting told Gil Johnson that they are appreciative that he is reaching out to faculty and staff. Hudepohl is optimistic that things will turn. She gave the Senate Executive Committee two things to think about: (1) additional names for small-group meetings; a small list of names to forward to Gil Johnson that has representatives from each college; and (2) think about how to get comments from the faculty for patterns and trends.
- j. The limited list of 10-12 names should have a comprehensive view; for example, Eric Reed (Potter College) has served on the Provost's Budget Committee, the Senate Budget Committee, and is knowledgeable about the AAUP, and the Chronicle of Higher Education. Regent Burch said it would be good to hear different perspectives, such as those of Department Heads and Distinguished Professors. David Keeling's name was brought up. Other ideas included diversity among colleges and junior faculty. Patricia Minter suggested that the messenger should be selected carefully.
- k. Minter said that the total cut went out the day after the resolution was approved. Capital was first on the list and legacy was last on the list.
- l. The SEC was asked to send Hudepohl a list of names; she will look at this list and will try to limit its size. Hudepohl added that she wants to move fast.
- m. Regent Burch suggested talking to people prior to the actual meeting.
- n. Vice Chair Shadoan suggested an individual list of comments from the faculty; a large faculty voice put in writing. She said this could be similar to the request that Margaret Crowder sent out on Faculty All email; she asked Senators to compile comments from their department/college.
- o. To add credibility to comments, get a diverse voice. The Board initiated the conversation; this allows faculty to give comments, a total and anonymous response that includes junior faculty, instructors, and part-time.

- p. Hudepohl said she will keep the Executive Committee updated and will ask for comments on compensation.
- q. The document will deal with both faculty and staff and will get a sense from faculty about what is most important. Regent Burch suggested: across the board base, cost of living, compression, benefits, merit, equity. Patricia Minter said that strong differences of opinion exist. She thinks keeping in general will be more beneficial, and that the message should not become muddled. She feels it should be built in.
- r. Chair Hudepohl said she does not want to limit comments, and will say that the focus is compensation.
- s. Vice Chair Shadoan suggested providing a resolution. The brief context is resolution.
- t. There was discussion over a survey vs. open-ended comments. The purpose is encouraging senate to present something comparable to the staff's comments. Hudepohl said she wants to hear the thoughts of the faculty.
- u. Vice Chair Shadoan said this needs to be completed by September 25; September 18 is the goal for gathering faculty thoughts.
- v. Patricia Minter said that there is only one chance; a word document will put in the voices and everyone will have an opportunity to speak. She added that stories have power.
- w. Molly Kerby said that putting it in the format of a survey will give an element of confidentiality.
- x. Regent Burch said that the Board wants to know more preface, and we are well positioned to provide them with that.
- y. Chair Hudepohl said her inclination is to do it on email due to the time constraint. The Board of Regents is mainly interested in our voices.
- z. Molly Kerby made a motion to vote on the format. The motion was seconded by Gayle Mallinger.
- aa. A motion by Molly Kerby to vote to inquire of the faculty to solicit feedback on compensation and other issues was seconded by Laura DeLancey. There was no further discussion. The motion to solicit feedback on compensation and other issues passed.
- **Upcoming Q & A with President Ransdell**
 - a. Chair Hudepohl reminded the Executive Committee that President Ransdell is coming to the Senate meeting on September 17.
 - b. Hudepohl asked if we want to task the Budget and Finance Committee with data?
 - c. The agenda for the Q & A includes (1) the President/Provost response to the May resolution and (2) the Confucius Institute Building. Chair Hudepohl asked to send any questions to the Chair.
 - d. It was suggested that the President should not prepare remarks; it is a Q & A session.
 - e. It was also suggested that the A/V equipment be set up in the center and that copies of handouts be provided in advance to post in the agenda.

2. Vice Chair (Julie Shadoan)

- Vice Chair Shadoan has been working on filling standing committee final appointments with college representatives and standing representatives by committee, Graduate Council, at-large (education college and university college).
- Attached under new business: Academic Quality; Potter College At-Large representatives are Heather Strode and Mac McKerral. Alternates are Lauren Bland, Dale Rigby, and Natasha Gerstenschager. Appointed by the Executive Committee were R. Tucker Davis (alternate Staynings); Colonnade (Ervin, Cuisinier, Tyler, Epley), Faculty Welfare (Wolf, Evans, Bohuski), At Large (Fox, House, Watwood, Onion).
- Vice Chair Shadoan will post the at-large departmental senator list; please notify her via email which term you are in.

3. Secretary (Heidi Álvarez)

- No report.

4. Committee Chairs

- Academic Quality Committee: No Report
- Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee: No Report
- Budget and Finance Committee: No Report
- Colonnade Implementation Committee / General Education Curriculum Committee: No Report
- Graduate Council: No Report
- Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: No Report

5. Advisory Reports

- Faculty Regent (Regent Burch)
 - The Student Government Association is working on a resolution concurring with the University Senate's Confucius Institute resolution. The earliest this will happen will be September 8.
 - Regent Burch will be discussing the University Senate resolution over the Confucius Institute with Dr. Ransdell on Friday; she also sent the resolution on to the Chair of the Board of Regents.
 - The Staff Regent said that the staff council will do a similar resolution for the Confucius Institute.
- Academic Affairs (Provost Lee)

- Provost Lee said that he is delighted that Larry Snyder is taking over as the Potter College Dean. Cheryl Davis is the new interim Associate Provost.
- The Phase 1 staffing plan consists of seventeen searches as of Friday. This does not include the failed searches from last year. The total number of searches is in the low twenties.
- Provost Lee met with ORCA, the research and creative activities committee, and is hoping to have more money for research; he will report more about this in a few weeks.
- In terms of enrollment/revenue status, this has not yet been determined. So far it appears that WKU is down 100+ with continuing students and up by 30 with first-year students. Regent Burch commented that at the last SEC meeting, Julie Shadoan raised a question about what Plan B is if we become a smaller institution, and how would this play out?
- Provost Lee will speak about Affiliated Faculty at the next meeting.

C. Old Business: There was no old business.

D. New Business:

1. [Policy 1.1280 Affiliated Faculty/Professional Staff](#)

- Provost Lee gave the context on Policy 1.1820, adjunct faculty appointments. He used two English Faculty members, Olmstead and Price, as examples. Non-degree granting units have affiliation with a faculty member. The process outlined here establishes an affiliation with the department for non-degree granting.
- A motion to include this on the University Senate Agenda by Jeremy Maddox was seconded by Laura DeLancey.
- If the Alive Center wants to establish this connection or the other way around, it allows it to happen; it does not discuss compensation.
- Question: How does this related to work load? Can it count for service? Some adjuncts were not full-time faculty members. The redistribution of work load is done through the department head for approval. But if the work load is reassigned, it would go through the department chair.
- Question: Will they be posted on a website or faculty all? Response (Lee): Any of the above; this is an option or a possibility, and can be invitational over faculty all. This is for faculty and staff who are already here at WKU.
- There was no further discussion.
- The motion to include Policy 1.1820 on the University Senate agenda was approved unanimously.

2. [Approve \(new\) At-Large Senate Standing Committee Members](#)

a. [University Senate Standing Committee Rosters](#)

E. Information Items:

1. [Senate budget](#)
2. [President Ransdell and Provost Emslie joint response to the may 2015 University Senate Resolution for Appropriate Emphasis: Academics](#)
 - a. [May 2015 University Senate Resolution for Appropriate Emphasis: Academics](#)
3. [Results of 2015 Faculty Welfare Study](#)
4. [Vice President Mead powerpoint revised for University Senate 8/27/2015](#)
 - a. [Funding Priorities History FY 12-FY 16](#)

A motion to adjourn by Patricia Minter was seconded by Bryan Reaka. The meeting adjourned at 5:15 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Álvarez, Secretary