

Western Kentucky University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting Minutes
November 2, 2015 -- 3:15 p.m.
WAB 227 - AA Large Conference Room

A. Call To Order

- A regular meeting of the Western Kentucky University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Kate Hudepohl on Monday, November 2, 2015 at 3:15 PM in the Wetherby Conference Room.
- A quorum was present: Heidi Álvarez, Barbara Burch, Thad Crews, Jr., Susann Davis, Laura DeLancey, Marko Dumančić, Claus Ernst, Jennifer Hanley (for Patricia Minter), Jeremy Maddox, Richard C. Miller (for David Lee), Kurt Neely, Bryan Reaka, Eric Reed (guest), Julie Shadoan, Liz Sturgeon, Adam West (for Gayle Mallinger).

B. Approve October Meeting Minutes

- A motion by Bryan Reaka to approve the minutes as posted (2nd Jeremy Maddox) was approved unanimously.

C. Reports

1. Chair Report (Kate Hudepohl)

Senate-appointed representative to Budget Council – Eric Reed:

- See information item #1
- The budget discussion follow-up: Regent Gil Johnson had a special meeting with the Budget Council on Oct. 22. Two senate-appointed members attended the meeting: Indudeep Chhiachhi and Eric Reed.
- Eric Reed came to the SEC today to report on the meeting he went to last weekend. Reed stated that Regent Gil Johnson was interested in some sort of guidance on finance and was interested in listening to what they had to say about compensation (developing and feeding back on budget and how it develops). Compensation has to be divided at the front side of the budget process. Regent Gil Johnson was interested in recommendations about actions in the budget process. As he has a December deadline to address something about compensation and the budget process, he has met in the last few weeks to see what should be focused on.
- Eric Reed stated that Gil Johnson is congenial, took a lot of notes, and listens well. Johnson seems to agree that if compensation is going to be a priority, then it needs to be dealt with as such at the top of the list. No formal action or promises were made.
- Regent Burch feels that the target date of December is important because it will be brought up at the January meeting. Putting compensation on the front end of the budget means other traditional things will be eliminated/compromised. Regent Burch suggested that faculty need to think about what these eliminations/compromises might be.

- Eric Reed said that regarding a strategic priority, an analogy can be made to money being used to fund scholarships.
- Richard Miller said that there was a \$3.8 million underfunding of scholarships due to overspending. More money is put in the pot but \$15 million is in excess of what was budgeted.
- Eric Reed clarified that he is referring to a cumulative effect of overspending.
- Regent Gil Johnson and President Ransdell are both interested in hearing from the committee about a long-term plan for spending.
- Eric Reed added that they are still trying to determine what the role of the committee members is.
- Regent Burch said that looking on the front end rather than what has already been committed would be a substantial departure.
- Chair Hudepohl asked if there is something that can be provided to Senate for posting prior to the meeting.
- Eric Reed said he is not sure what he can/can't provide but he can certainly come to SEC and report in this fashion.
- Bryan Reaka said that basing budget on increased enrollment in a time of enrollment decline is problematic; it makes sense to plan ahead.
- Eric Reed said that he agrees the model is flawed since enrollment is not increasing. Looking at the process of budget and how faculty compensation can be figured in to future models is a good start.
- Question: did President Ransdell bring up a concept of a smaller WKU?
- Regent Burch responded that Julie Shadoan brought up the idea at a previous meeting.
- A budgeting model in a time of growth is built on extra money from previous years. In declining enrollment, the projected budget does not fit with what was coming. Unloading scholarship money on high-end students was a problem. Pushing hard for priorities and trying to figure out options for implementing it are the consequences of meeting priorities on a macro level.
- Eric Reed said that his personal biggest issue (not reflective of the committee) is transparency and trust.
- Claus Ernst said that regarding scholarship money, more is being spent but the return also helps to meet enrollment goals. There will now be very few high-end scholarships. If we cut this money, do we actually lose these high-end students we are fighting for? Strategic priorities might mean sacrificing in other areas.
- Regent Burch said that this year's model means that fewer students will be on a full ride.
- Richard Miller said that transparency is the key; not all of the money goes to the central budget. Knowing where tuition revenues go is important. Some money goes to sustaining programs rather than to the central budget. He suggested that the SEC consider asking Ann Mead to present to the SEC and the Senate.
- Chair Hudepohl said that we tried that and it did not work.
- Regent Burch said that it did not define what drives priorities and how does it work.
- Richard Miller encouraged a follow-up with Ann Mead.
- Chair Hudepohl said she was glad that Gil Johnson was receptive and attentive. It is

a good sign that the Board of Regents is reaching out and is making this a priority. She added that she wants to see something actually happen.

- Eric Reed said he will try to have Indudeep Chhachhi come to the senate meeting on Thursday, November 19 at 3:45.

Ombudsman:

- Chair Hudepohl invited the Ombudsman to come to talk to the SEC; he will come to the November 30 SEC meeting.

Ransdell Memo re: Confucius Institute Building:

- Chair Hudepohl received this memo after the last SEC meeting but in time to include on the October Senate agenda.
- President Ransdell included notes about the meeting.
- To echo Dr. Burch's sentiment expressed at the University Senate meeting in October, our efforts contributed to a promise of broader campus use/access to the new Confucius Institute Building and a promise that WKU won't have to pay the maintenance and operation costs for the building.
- Chair Hudepohl asked if anyone has any questions or comments about the memo or the attachments that President Ransdell sent.
- Marko Dumančić asked if we will see the revised contract about what was agreed to in the renegotiated contract.
- Chair Hudepohl said she will ask President Ransdell.
- Regent Burch said it won't occur until after he goes back to China.
- Chair Hudepohl asked if it was a formal contract.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said that it is only enforceable if it is in writing.
- Marko Dumančić said that he feels it should be followed up on so it is not forgotten about after three years.
- Regent Burch said the President won't be here for 50 more years.
- Chair Hudepohl said she will ask President Ransdell if he will be bringing back a written revised contract.
- The clauses of contract are supposed to be confidential; Chair Hudepohl stated that she did not post it, but it was an open records request from the Daily News.
- Regent Burch said that the President has not been unwilling to share it.
- Laura DeLancey said he did share it with the Academic Quality Committee, but it was not publicly posted.
- Chair Hudepohl said she will email President Ransdell and ask about the revised contract.
- Can the committee that Janet Applin is on be the same one for building use? Laura DeLancey said yes, this existed before Academic Quality got a hold of it.

Insurance:

- Regarding the insurance follow-up with the matter raised below in the October SEC meeting, Claus Ernst said there was no chance to discuss the sharing of wellness activities because the November meeting was canceled.
- There is continued difficulty with using the "wellness" program website.

- The issue of spousal wellness activity being tied together can be problematic in some instances (ie. divorce, separation, etc.).
- Some people contacted Chair Hudepohl with concerns about having to reenroll and about having a short time to reenroll. There was minimal information in advance of open enrollment. Others expressed that they had issue with the shorter time frame to complete Tier 1 activities (the deadline is earlier). There is concern over the activities for Tier 2 and what counts/does not count for the Alive Center. Why does volunteer activity for the Alive Center count? Hudepohl defined what the Alive Center is. Jennifer Hanley added that it seems exclusionary for people at the regional campuses.
- We did not receive a benefits manual. When going online to enroll, the process was disappointing. The calculator could not be found.
- Claus Ernst said that he has a number of things to bring up. Less information was given out this year. The committee was not consulted on this. There are long-standing priorities. Human resources did not have the staffing to do this. There were too many short deadlines. The premium is set at the last minute.
- A comment was made that this year we have to do more activities; last year we had to do two Tier 1, this year, we have to do three Tier 1.
- Jennifer Hanley said the website was not running until the afternoon of the 18th.
- Chair Hudepohl asked Claus Ernst to report back on November 30.

Collaborate with/support SGA bringing Dr. Bob King, President of the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education to WKU:

- See attachment: handout shared by SGA President Jay Todd Richey from the CPE presentation he attended.
- From Jay Todd Richey email 10/15/2015: “finally as Dr. Burch and Provost Lee mentioned, President King with the Council on Postsecondary Education is extremely passionate and dedicated to more higher education funding in Kentucky. He wants 1,000 students to be in Frankfort on one day to lobby for higher education – and that’s 1,000 students in Kentucky, not just from WKU. He also expressed to the Board of Student Body Presidents that he would be willing to visit any university if he’s requested. I want to bring him to WKU. If you would be interestd in doing so to hear his plan about higher education funding, please email me at jaytodd.richey823@topper.wku.edu The students are mainly concerned with lottery funding.”
- Following SGA President Richey’s comments at Senate, the Senate is working to support SGA to bring Dr. Bob King to campus.
- When reading PowerPoint slides #5 & 6 which outline the declining support from the State of Kentucky (we are now 24th, 41st, 44th), Bob King linked this to declining funding to Higher Education. Dr. King wants 1,000 students in Kentucky to lobby for funding in Higher Education. Chair Hudepohl thinks that Senate should collaborate with this.

Accessing employee? Faculty? Salary information:

- Establishing a firewall for salaries was reported in the College Heights Herald: http://wkuherald.com/news/article_c5044ec8-6d52-11e5-b5e1-db04e96c373a.html
- This is a very clear violation of the discussion from Senate last year. See Dr. Patti

Minter's memo written last year after consultation with external lawyers (as agreed to by Provost Emslie at SEC) presented at SEC and last spring's senate meeting.

- See also attached the Kentucky Opinion of the Attorney General regarding another case on open records and public employees and Mac McKerral's blog post on the issue: <http://westerncivilizationwku.com/>
- Item #6 has to do with information items 3 and 3a. This has to do with putting faculty salary information under a firewall. This question was brought up by former Provost Emslie after the Anthem breach. Patricia Minter brought up concerns with violation of the first amendment. She consulted with two attorneys and Mac McKerral on campus. Is it an excuse to restrict public information from a public institution and made it harder to access?
- Vice Chair Julie Shadoan said her understanding of the statute is that public is public.
- Chair Hudepohl said that Patti Minter's research came up later. Mac McKerral also has a blog. Hudepohl said that her sense is that it is a slippery slope and it could be an excuse to make it more difficult to look up. There is no clear link to what happened with Anthem. People were surprised that it came up again.
- Salaries are important to access for potential employees.
- Social security numbers being posted are different than salaries being posted. Name, position, and salaries are OK, but not social security numbers.
- The Board of Regents Minutes and the home page for Budget are places where salary information can be found online.
- Regent Burch said that only salary changes are reported.
- Julie Shadoan said that some information is already readily available in the Board of Regents minutes.
- A question about the first amendment was that the commentary from the office of the Attorney General was talking about shielding irrelevant information, and training relevant to the position.
- Regent Burch said the concern was over security of information. Salary from year to year and range of high to low.
- Chair Hudepohl said with firewalls in place, there could be a potential screen to make it less transparent in instances of discrepancies in salary increases.
- Claus Ernst said in the past, only listed rank and when hired was listed. Now, the name is published.
- Richard Miller presented the idea of accessing salary information with WKU ID and password on campus. Bryan Reaka argued that potential employees cannot do this.
- Patti Minter's report says it is available through Frankfort.
- Adam West said he does not see how this data is linked to Anthem. Is it just another smoke screen to make it less transparent?
- Chair Hudepohl said that she will post information related to this.

Motion re: SITES from October, 15, 2015 Senate:

- Lauren McClain's motion: "requesting that the Senate Executive Committee discuss SITES at their next scheduled meeting with the possibility of referring the matter to the Academic Quality committee for further review and possible revision."
- Kelly Madole sent the zip drive of collected information/past documents to Chair

Hudepohl and Jeremy Maddox (the Chair of the Committee). These items are posted in information item #4 related to work (final reports and research) by past University Senate groups (Academic Quality and an ad-hoc committee on student evaluations). This is not necessarily all of the relevant information. There are articles pulled on the research; amnesia happens as people transfer off of Senate. This is not the full extent of the research.

- In 4a, one modification by the administration was to take the dates off. The recommendation was made in February 2012 and the timeline was removed when it was presented. The March report took the timeline off. Then the committee got involved with bi-terms.
- Jennifer Hanley suggested to Jeremy Maddox that he contact Allison Langdon to see the most recent research.
- One motion, from Senate, is to discuss SITES and decide if we want to ask a standing committee to further evaluate for possible action.
- One item of concern is the lack of responsiveness of administration to requests, even in terms of pushing back the start date for the online SITES.
- Chair Hudepohl said she does not know that any changes can happen regarding the timing of SITES.
- Jeremy Maddox said that reports will be made available sooner (Fall SITES will be made available in January, and Spring come after that).
- Richard Miller said that Provost Lee asked for assessment of timelines. There was a lengthy email about timelines that was sent back from Institutional Research. Richard Miller said there are some good justifications on why they are so early.
- Chair Hudepohl said this might affect any kind of action we take.
- Jeremy Maddox said the committee does not want to rehash old activities.
- Jennifer Hanley said there were questions in the past about if something was well constructed.
- Laura DeLancey said she worked briefly on it last year. Some members of the committee felt nothing had changed for the better, but they got out-voted. When it comes to junior faculty members, low response rates determine their career. Small classes and low responses are not looked at as stand-alone. Some departments look at it differently and don't see it as a valid instrument.
- Jeremy Maddox added that a broader issue than the SITES themselves is how teaching is evaluated.
- Jennifer Hanley said this is a tool to judge tenure/promotion performance. How can it be more effective and is it valid?
- Vice Chair Julie Shadoan said that after speaking with her area, they suggested three things to focus on: (1) frequency of administration and number of classes per semester; (2) Rank and how often evaluated; (3) come up with own evaluation tool separate that can be designed by senate.
- Fall/Spring/duplicate in Summer in Blackboard classes.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said that voluntary mid-term adjustments in class have no weight for promotion/tenure.
- Chair Hudepohl said other suggestions for evaluation of teaching include self-reports on teaching, including student output, volunteered comments, and inviting senior

faculty members to sit in on classes. SITES are a problem if they are used as a be-all end-all.

- Richard Miller said that the administration looks carefully at how teaching is evaluated; if there is an overemphasis on SITES, they send it back. If SITES do not show a consistent pattern, it is sent back to the department for additional ways of documenting teaching.
- Liz Sturgeon said that her department would like Faculty Welfare to find another method of evaluating teaching.
- Claus Ernst said there is a clear understanding of what SITES cannot do. Different departments have different standards of what constitutes good teaching; this needs to be resolved at the departmental level. He asked what is the clear goal and why do we want to have it done?
- Marko Dumančić said that as long as it is figured into judging someone's tenure, it needs to be addressed.
- Heidi Álvarez stated that unrelated to SITES but related to Marko Dumančić's comment, questions have also come up by faculty about the rubric in annual faculty evaluations. See "New Business Item #5" below.
- If SITES are a piece of the puzzle, can the administration give more feedback on how the SITES are used? More support from the administration might be important. Additionally, peer evaluation should be required.
- Jennifer Hanley said that it is loosely defined and it puts pedagogical faculty at a disadvantage. She suggested evaluating regional faculty on a regular basis and consistently by each department so the SITES are not the only way of evaluating teaching.
- Regent Burch said that SITES are always discussed. SITES do not evaluate teaching. The faculty has the opportunity to discuss what it is going to be. When looking at SITES, the administration looks for improvement across time, and this serves as one piece of the puzzle. Most faculty have to find a way to prove what they are doing is working.
- Richard Miller said that this is why Tenure and Promotion procedures and documents are so important.
- The administration looks for patterns/trends over a long period of time (over a period of years). If there is an issue over time, then the department chair has to be the one to address it.
- This will be on the December agenda. We will discuss it further then.

2. Vice Chair (Julie Shadoan)

- Vice Chair Shadoan stated that the Professional Education Committee needs to be populated. Thad Crews volunteered after the previous University Senate meeting. If someone else is interested, then it will come up for vote in Senate.

3. Secretary (Heidi Álvarez)

- No report.

4. Committee Chair Reports

a. **Academic Quality Committee (Jeremy Maddox): Report attached**

- Jeremy Maddox made a motion to endorse the Academic Quality Committee report as posted with the attachments below (2nd Marko Dumančić).
- Jeremy Maddox highlighted a few items from the report. One was regarding the testimony from the trip to China; property/data security issues were discussed. The committee is seeking information on how to disclose this to faculty. The committee made suggestions on how to enhance the dissemination to faculty.
- Kate Hudepohl asked what happens when the committee makes these recommendations? Where does it go? Is it a motion to enact the item in the report?
- Claus Ernst suggested a friendly amendment to ask the Provost's office to respond.
- Regent Burch asked what the committee's specific charge was. Jeremy Maddox said the charge was to respond to the SEC's motion to look at international travel; this was a suggestion on how to improve. This will go forward to Senate; whatever Senate endorses will go back to the Provost.
- Julie Shadoan asked if we need to convert the language here to make a motion so it can be acted on. Shadoan made the following motion, (2nd Kurt Neely): Motion that Provost Lee review the recommendations in the November 2015 Academic Quality Committee report and take action or refer to the appropriate academic/administrative unit for action and report back to University Senate. (The motion passed unanimously.)
- Jeremy Maddox noted that the International Travel Policy is above the tier of Academic Affairs.
- Regent Burch said that all of the recommendations make sense, but is this responding to what the Senate asked them to look at?
- Julie Shadoan said the charge was to see if we could avoid the situation in the future; to find issues in the policy that were relevant in helping to improve the policy for future endeavors. The grievance is not in the purview of Senate, but resources and information can be provided.
- The Confucius Institute trip terms changed. A flash drive was taken and malware was added. Travel plans changed due to illness and there was resistance to providing assistance in changing plans. There were issues with intellectual property theft.

i. **Item 1a-193.pdf**

ii. **Item 1b-104.pdf**

iii. **Item 1c-78.pdf**

iv. **Item 1d-79.pdf**

v. **Item 2-Notes-HaleMooney.pdf**

vi. **Item 3a-Travel Registry - Scanned Questionnaires and Materials.pdf**

- vii. Item 3b-Travel Registry - Learning Content Items.pdf
- viii. Item 3c1-A Mirror or a 2 Glass.docx
- ix. Item 3c2-Best Practices for Academics Traveling Overseas.pdf
- x. Item 3c3-Elicitation.pdf
- xi. Item 3c4-Foreign-Travel-Vulnerability.pdf
- xii. Item3c5-Project Shield-Academia.pdf
- xiii. Item 3c6-Safety & Security.pdf
- xiv. Item 4-Mooney-Letter.pdf
- xv. Item 5a-09-651 - Retired University...pdf
- xvi. Item 5b-FBIAgenda AA 9-14-11_4.docx
- xvii. Item 5c-Federal Bureau of Investiga...pdf
- xviii. Item 5d-Firm in hot seat at Roth tr...pdf
- xix. Item 5e-J.pdf
- xx. Item 5f-Stanford Export Control Decision Tree.doc
- xxi. Item 5i-What is an Export.doc

b. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee (Jennifer Hanley for Patti Minter): Report attached

- A motion to endorse the October 15 Faculty Welfare Report by Jennifer Hanley was seconded by Bryan Reaka.
- In reference to McClain's motion regarding the active shooting training, Bob Skipper has initiated this. Members of Faculty Welfare will be meeting with Bob Skipper in November about their concerns. Each building needs to have its own plan and processes need to be disseminated to everyone in the building. A suggestion was made to improve the text alert system. The training should be required.
- In reference to issues regarding travel, communication and planning will encourage less distress, as will having full disclosure of who you are working for. Being registered with the State Department is important. The Office of the President should be discouraged from telling faculty to do study abroad; it should be a faculty member's decision. WKU should protect its faculty and staff.

- Jennfer Hanley made the following motion (2nd Heidi Álvarez): Motion that Provost Lee review the recommendations in the November 2015 Faculty Welfare and Responsibilities Committee report and take action or refer to the appropriate academic/administrative unit for action and report back to University Senate. (The motion passed unanimously.)
- The SEC charged Faculty Welfare with examining Scholars at Risk. Jennifer Hanley made a motion to recommend that WKU pursue membership in Scholars at Risk (2nd Marko Dumančić). The motion passed unanimously without discussion.
- The Faculty Welfare Report passed unanimously.

c. Budget and Finance Committee (Claus Ernest): No Report.

d. **Colonnade General Education Committee (Marko Dumančić): Report attached**

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to approve the Colonnade General Education Committee Report as posted (2nd Laura DeLancey). There was no discussion. The report was approved unanimously.
- Michael Smith will come to discuss the “bottle neck” and making proposals more user friendly to faculty. Students have very few choices and no substitutions. In advising, students find it easier to transfer to institutions that have an easier general education process.
- Bryan Reaka said that one issue is personnel/staffing for colonnade/connections classes.
- Jeremy Maddox added that some courses become watered down.
- The professional development funding to create courses did not happen.
- The administration is confused as to why there are not enough courses.
- The Colonnade General Education committee report was approved unanimously as posted.

e. **Graduate Council (Kurt Neelly): Report attached**

- Kurt Neely made a motion to endorse the October 8, 2015 Graduate Council report as posted. There was no discussion. The context is curriculum.
- The Graduate Council report was approved unanimously by Graduate Faculty. The report stands as posted.

f. **Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (Liz Sturgeon): Report attached**

- Liz Sturgeon made a motion to endorse the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report from the October 22, 2015 meeting (2nd Bryan Reaka). There was no discussion. The report was unanimously approved as posted.

5. Advisory Reports

a. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch)

- At the last meeting, a question was raised about what happens when money cannot be raised for athletic scholarships. President Ransdell referred to the Athletic Director and the Chair of the Athletic Committee. President Ransdell said it is the responsibility of the Athletic Department. This was confirmed by the Athletic Director, but no formal vote was taken – either the money will be raised, or the cost goes to the Athletic Department budget.

b. Academic Affairs (Provost Lee)

- Due to the Provost's absence, Bryan Reaka made a motion to table the Policies definitely until the November SEC meeting in order to get the appropriate context (2nd Susann Davis). The motion to table the policies definitely passed unanimously.

D. Old Business:

E. New Business:

1. Policy 1.1012 Consensual Relations Between Faculty and Students
2. Policy 1.2122 Summer Sessions and Winter Term Compensation and Distribution
3. Policy 1.4012 Substantive Change
4. Policy 1.4021 Academic Program Review

5. A motion was brought from the floor by Heidi Álvarez (seconded by Bryan Reaka): **Motion requesting the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee to solicit faculty opinions about the change in the annual evaluation rubric and to share those results with University Senate.**

Álvarez stated that several faculty members in a variety of departments in Potter College approached her in 2014 and 2015 and expressed concern with the language “meets expectations” and “exceeds expectations” in their annual evaluations. Some reported lower faculty morale and decreased motivation with the subjective wording “meets expectations,” particularly in a time when faculty members are not being compensated financially and are consistently expected to do more with less. Others expressed concern about how a mark “in the middle of the board rather than at the top” might be interpreted by voting colleagues in the tenure process. In addition to the low morale and anxiety associated with “feeling like they got a ‘B’”, several faculty mentioned that they were concerned that if merit raises became a reality at WKU, that a mark of “meets expectations” could provide an excuse for the administration to pass them over on a merit raise. Some faculty members wanted to know why the response options were changed, and requested that alternatives in rhetoric be explored. Following discussion, several members of the SEC stated that it would be helpful if Provost Lee could respond with his

perspective on the rationale for this change, which was initiated by department chairs in 2014. The motion to refer this issue to Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities to solicit faculty input passed unanimously.

E. Information Items:

1. Visit with Senate appointed representative(s) to Budget Council
2. President Ransdell Memo re: Confucius Building Contract
3. Dr. Patti Minter memo, First Amendment and Proposed Firewall of Salaries
 - a. OAG Opinion
4. Previous research related to review of SITE evaluations
 - a. Academic Quality 2012 b. SITE Rev Comm 2008
 - c. SITE Comparison March 2008
 - d. SITE Rev Comm 2007
 - e. Student Eval_resolution
 - f. Online Eval Vendors
 - g. 441 (research)
 - h. Anderson (research)
 - i. Donovan (research)
 - j. FAQs (research)
 - k. Feldman (research)
 - l. Response rates (research)
 - m. Online student (research)
 - n. Online course (research)

o. Is student (research)

p. Info on (research)

q. SEEO (research)

5. CPE powerpoint

A motion to adjourn by Bryan Reaka was seconded by Susann Davis. The meeting concluded at 5:20 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Álvarez
Secretary