

Western Kentucky University Senate
Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting
October 3, 2016 -- 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 took place on October 3, 2016 at 3:15 P.M. in the Wetherby Conference Room.

2. A quorum was present: Heidi Álvarez, Amber Scott Belt (guest), Barbara Burch, Susann Davis, Laura DeLancey, Marko Dumančić, Tony Harkins (guest), Kate Hudephol, Andrea Jenkins, Molly Kerby, David Lee, Richard C. Miller, Patricia Minter, Jay Todd Richey, Julie Shadoan, Matt Shake, Liz Sturgeon, Shannon Vaughan, and Adam West.

B. [Approve August 29, 2016 SEC Meeting Minutes](#)

1. A motion to approve the August 29, 2016 meeting minutes by Marko Dumančić was seconded by Laura DeLancey.

2. Two corrections were made to the minutes that were posted:

a. Susann Davis clarified the context of page 5 bullet 5 – she asked if there was a precedent to have an online small group of faculty to meet with candidates through an online platform such as Skype and sign a confidentiality waiver to do so. The committee responded no.

b. Kate Hudephol asked the Secretary to include page numbers in the minutes.

3. The minutes were approved unanimously as amended.

C. Officer Reports

1. [Chair \(Kate Hudephol\): Report Posted.](#)

a. Chair Hudephol said that posted reports will not be read out loud in the meeting to save time. All items will be put in the records. The website is being updated. Reports will be posted ahead of time for the Provost and both Regents. There will also be a reordering of business for all reports to happen last so that the action items will occur first. Provost Lee asked how much in advance of the meeting does Chair Hudephol want the report? Chair Hudephol said that usually one week before the meeting, except for the Provost report, which will have last-minute additions.

b. UAC Candidate - Keri Esslinger (CHHS) Every college has a member of the University Athletic Committee. The Chair notifies the dean, then senate, and then the President will officially chose the member.

c. Motion from May 2016 SEC:

Motion requesting that the 2016-17 University Senate examine the Senate Charter and come up with a formula so that each college and the libraries have at least one senator per standing committee of University Senate.

- Chair Hudepohl asked if we will send this motion to a committee; where will this motion go?
- Vice Chair Shadoan said the reorganization of departments in University College and the reduction of members of University College is disproportionate and gives a burden to these faculty members. Currently, each college has one senator per standing committee; we need to readjust the formula to make delegations proportional to the actual committee representation. This is a charter issue; there are other issues related to the charter as well. Charter changes require two readings.
- Patricia Minter said that in the past, we [the SEC] functioned as a committee of the whole. We made a running list all year and then did the first reading in March. There are at least two things on the table to address. She suggested a motion to set up a time table (for example, first reading at the February meeting, second reading at the March meeting, then everyone would be in place for the April caucus.
- Molly Kerby suggested a smaller group than the SEC to work on it. Two readings for the charter change we will look at the charter to see the details on the reading.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said that the departmental elections have to be done by March 1.
- Patricia Minter said that the at large election is after that; we will adjust the at-large number.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said that a minimum of two will be made up in the at-large category.
- Patricia Minter said that by the next meeting, we can work on charter issues.
- Chair Hudepohl said that a smaller committee is a good point, but the SEC will be more representational of the full committee.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said we will still need a special election for at-large in March.
- Chair Hudepohl said we will need to start on this today and at the next meeting.
- Patricia Minter made a motion for the Senate Executive Committee to serve as the Committee as a whole to propose changes to and to revise the Senate Charter. The motion was seconded by Julie Shadoan.
- There was no further discussion. The motion for the Senate Executive Committee to serve as the Committee as a whole to propose changes to and to revise the Senate Charter passed unanimously.

d. **SITES:**

- Chair Hudepohl reported that a faculty member requested that the Senate continue to look at SITES with a concern that SITES should not be used for tenure and promotion because they are so flawed that they should not even be used. Chair Hudepohl said that the SITES research is included on the agenda; this topic has already been addressed on a repeated basis. Academic Quality's recommendations on SITES from last year were endorsed by the Provost and Doug McElroy.
- Adam West said that last time, we said it is used at the college level and that different departments use it differently.
- Richard C. Miller said it is used in a faculty appeal, but it is problematic in classes with low enrollment. It can give insight of patterns over a period of semesters to legitimize what might be happening over the long term.
- Chair Hudepohl said that we are at the mercy of someone doing the right thing.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said "isn't SITES a SACS requirement?"
- Regent Burch made a personal comment that one of her greatest frustrations as Provost is that the faculty can agree on something better; she said that SITES is a mess any way one looks at it, and it has little or nothing to do with teaching. It gets used the way it gets used because there is nothing else. The faculty control the definition of what "this" is.
- The zip folder of past actions with previous recommendations shows these were not taken.
- Marko Dumančić said that this is the third time in five or six years.
- Claus Ernst said that they SITES tell popularity but not the kind of learning that takes place. This can be addressed by the department's tenure and promotion guidelines. The one-size-fits-all will not work; it needs to be at the department level.
- Liz Sturgeon said that this is the only thing that is looked at in her department; the algorithm of other measures should be looked at.
- Patricia Minter said that this is not a faculty welfare issue; it is academic quality. It is not a one-size-fits-all equation. Four years ago, the Chair of Academic Quality had a different idea about peer evaluation. This speaks to the departments' cultural differences, and Senate cannot resolve this. SITES can be augmented by faculty mentors and other supplemental material. The assessment of student work to display faculty success is dangerous because of differing aptitude levels of students.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said that some departments do not have modifiable tenure/promotion guidelines. This was signed by previous Provost Emslie and the Dean.
- Provost Lee said that something going forward is possible to change. This is not the case for new hires. His understanding is it applied to those who transferred to a new college; it was intended to protect the faculty.
- Richard C. Miller said that when moving to departments with different guidelines, it is intended to protect them.

- Vice Chair Shadoan said that the previous agreement when she moved from Bowling Green Community College to University College was that it was not modifiable. SITE evaluations are to be reported and are part of the consideration. If it is modifiable, that would be wonderful.
- Claus Ernst asked what procedure there is for training Department Chairs for evaluating performance. Richard Miller responded that there was a boot camp and there is an aggressive approach for working with faculty. He cited the Center for Instructional Development as one of those approaches.
- Patricia Minter said that perhaps this person's concern can be dealt with internally.

e. **Medical Center Building Issue**

- Chair Hudepohl said that it seems that our health insurance is part of our benefits, and it seems to be a bargaining chip to get a practice field for athletics. This does not seem to be in the best interest of the employees, affordability, and true choice; this is a problem. In reading the attorney's letter through the College Heights Herald website (open records request), do we want to do something or respond or make a statement?
- Claus Ernst said that as a member of the Benefits Committee, the commitment has to do with how WKU student athletes are treated. He is not sure it has repercussions for WKU's plan. Ransdell and Glisson say it will not have bearing on our own health care, and Ernst thinks it is premature. No member of the Benefits Committee would vote for restriction. We have Anthem or Humana in our state. Neither would restrict us to our hospital only.
- Marko Dumančić said the goal is to keep constituents informed and involved. The choices are narrowing every year; we want to keep constituents involved.
- Liz Sturgeon asked if there was discussion of the Medical Center or Graves Gilbert and Claus Ernst responded "no, we rely on a large company such as Anthem to give provider information; this is constantly fluctuating. We have Anthem to keep these rates as low as possible."
- Liz Sturgeon said she thought when it was announced in August, the Medical Center was the endorsed health care provider for the University.
- Kate Hudepohl said she had questions about what the "incentives" were for this. Does it mean wellness and our time? Will it cost us more to stay with the current provider? She finds problem with bargain shopping to find the cheapest provider.
- Matt Shake reread Tony Glisson's email from September 7. He said that in electing the plan with Enspire - Medical Center, some CHC providers are at a lower rate and others are substantially more. It sounds like there will be a change to those options.
- Chair Hudepohl said the fact that we do not know is a problem, because we are not consulted.

2. **Vice Chair (Julie Shadoan)**

a. **Elections**

- Vice Chair Shadoan is in the process of filling two main committees: Faculty Handbook and University Academic Complaint Committee.
- For Faculty Handbook, two colleges have members who are rotating off; there will be online elections. It took four weeks to get the names. Brandi Fowler will send out the link.
- The University Academic Complaint Committee comes from the names of college committee members. Vice Chair Shadoan will send out a fourth email about this. Student complaints cannot be heard until this committee is populated.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said she talked to Dr. Miller about the difficulty of getting members of this committee; she wants to review the charter so that there are two-year terms instead of one. She also suggested that the existing committee could serve until the new one is formed. Dr. Miller said the faculty could be elected every odd year like the advisory committees. She said that students would need to rotate off every year because of seniors graduating.
- Shadoan's motion to review the term length in the charter was seconded by Marko Dumančić.
- The motion passed unanimously.
- This suggested charter revision will be added to the other charter changes that were discussed.
- Vice Chair Shadoan still has vacancies to fill on several standing committees: Benefits (January); Faculty Mentoring; Faculty FUSE Mentoring; Parking and Transportation (2); Professional _____; and Student Publications. Please contact Julie Shadoan with names.

3. Secretary (Heidi Álvarez): No report.

D. Committee Chair Reports

1. Academic Quality Committee (Ann Ferrell): No report. This committee has not yet met.

2. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee (Patti Minter): No Report.

- The Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee met last month.
- Below are summaries of discussion at the SEC that centered around Title IX recommendations; active shooter training progress; and gender inequity and compression salary studies.

Title IX recommendations:

- The Title IX recommendations from the summer meetings included in the report have not been implemented. Andrea and Ms. Anderson will be holding a meeting with Patricia Minter about this before the next senate meeting.

Active Shooter Training On Hold:

- The Active Shooter Training Committee has had good discussions and developed a video and Power Point training modules. In August, we were told that departments and colleges would have something coming forward. Lauren McClain said that everyone will not be getting the training because of budget constraints. The training will only be on demand, and a department can request it. Therefore, preparing the campus is not happening. For students, it is on hold. Nothing was done for Master Plan. This speaks volumes about the prioritization of money for this year. It is not David Oliver's fault. Patricia Minter welcomes comments/suggestions.
- Provost Lee asked what the budget cut part was. Patricia Minter said she heard it from Lauren McClain; she believes it is related to staffing on the police force. This should be done building by building and the officer will answer questions. The upfront cost was in doing the video (it is already produced) and the Power Point.
- The video is difficult to find. In an emergency, these things are difficult to find.
- Should the committee make a statement?
- Regent Richey asked if there is any indication of how much it would cost? Can it be sent through a student-all email? Patricia Minter said she feels a session with university officials would be more productive.
- The Power Point was supposed to be rolled out this fall.
- Regent Burch asked if Dr. Oliver would know what the shortfalls are. Patricia Minter responded that they were told it was a staffing thing in the police department.
- Vice Chair Shadoan asked if the University Senate can sponsor this for every building. There could be 12 meetings over the course of a month.
- Regent Burch said that this is a risk issue on behalf of the university.
- Patricia Minter said that the consensus of the committee is that there needs to be an officer there and there needs to be someone who knows how to serve and protect.
- Patricia Minter said that she needs advice from the SEC. Does this need to be a priority? Should faculty and staff be trained? Chair Hudepohl said yes, we should put it in writing. Regent Richey asked Regent Burch what the limits are on reserve funding for the university. Regent Burch said it is only used for emergencies, major facilities, major unexpected cuts. Regent Richey asked if part of the \$1.7 million from the state could go toward this. Regent Burch suggested a letter to President Ransdell saying everything is ready to go and thought he might want to know and do something about it. Patricia Minter said this sounds more like a staffing issue than a funding issue. Regent Burch said she thinks there are fewer police officers; this is not a budget issue – it is a manpower issue.
- Molly Kerby made a motion for Patricia Minter to submit a letter to President Ransdell to support implementation of the active shooter training and for this to be included on the Senate agenda. The motion was seconded by Laura DeLancey.

- The motion for Patricia Minter to submit a letter to President Ransdell to support implementation of the active shooter training and for this to be included on the Senate agenda was approved unanimously.

Gender inequity and compression salary study:

- The Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee passed a motion to conduct a salary study on gender inequity and compression. The Faculty Welfare Committee will be collaborating with a subcommittee of Budget and Finance. Step one will be a request to Institutional Research. Step two will be making recommendations.

3. Budget and Finance Committee (Claus Ernst): No Report.

- The Budget and Finance Committee will be participating in the study on salaries.
- The Budget and Finance Committee will be looking at heating and cooling policies. There are some costs on the faculty side.
- There are issues with the process of budgeting.
- The University Budget Committee has not met. Most decisions are made on the Administrative Council. Academics are underrepresented. The committee would like to study this process and have meaningful recommendations by the end of the year.
- Claus Ernst asked if there are any things the SEC would like the committee to look at?
- Johnson specifically mentioned engagement of the Budget Council in the process. They recognized that there was a council and that it was unengaged. This was adopted by the Board. Claus added that Eric Reed said there was not a meeting for the 2016-2017 budget. They did not meet to discuss the current budget. Kate Hudepohl said that Eric Reed and Indudeep Chhachhi are the Senate representatives. She is glad the Budget Committee is looking at this.

4. [Colonnade General Education Committee \(Marko Dumančić\): Report Posted](#)

- Marko Dumančić submitted the September 21 Colonnade General Education Committee report for consideration and approval. The motion to approve the report passed unanimously.

5. [Graduate Council \(Shannon Vaughan\): Report Posted](#)

- Shannon Vaughan made a motion to endorse the attached Graduate Council report. The motion was approved unanimously by Graduate faculty only. The motion passed.

6. [Undergraduate Curriculum Committee \(Liz Sturgeon\): Report Posted](#)

- Liz Sturgeon submitted the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report with the following friendly amendments: (1) The College of Education Program 774 will have a Fall 2017 implementation date; and (2) Geology 308 is changed to Geology 408 and added a date.
- The amended Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Report passed unanimously.

7. Faculty Handbook Committee (Margaret Crowder): No Report.

E. Advisory Reports

1. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch)

a. Presidential Search Committee Update

- Last week, the Board of Regents and the Presidential Search Committee met. There was a brief open meeting (one to two minutes) that included an informal proposal by Mac McKerral that was given to the committee.
- There are a number of candidates applying and it looks like a good pool. There are several pools and the process is going on. Of the names reviewed so far, there are some that the committee wants to pursue.
- The Search Committee will meet again on November 11. Names will be brought forward by the Search Firm. Around eight of those who are serious will have an off-campus interview. Three or four names will be sent to the Board of Regents. Then the Board of Regents takes over. For the finalists (actual candidates), the Board of Regents will discuss the process.
- Concerns about the open search have been passed on to the Board of Regents Chair.
- The next Board of Regents meeting is October 28th. On October 27th, there will be a fairly extensive Board Training by AGB (Association of Governing Boards).
- Julie Shadoan asked about Mac McKerral's proposal. The Chair of the Search Committee did not think it was appropriate. Mac left it with Dr. Bale. It spoke to arguments for an open process and an open meeting. Chair Hudepohl said it will be included if it is endorsed under new business today. Regent Burch added that it was reported in the paper.
- Marko Dumančić asked when the Board will make the decision about an open search. He said that he is worried it will be last minute and we will not have a voice. The parameters of the job search are usually discussed upfront.
- Chair Hudepohl said she wonders if the Board of Regents and the Search Committee are being led by the Search Firm.
- Regent Burch said that the Board of Regents is the only one who has the option to decide how it is going to be. She said last time that she was surprised. The Search Firm has given information on the difficulty of tracking candidates. She understands it is difficult in the middle of a capital campaign. Regent Burch said she does not know what the Board will decide.
- Chair Hudepohl said she feels like it has already been decided.
- Marko Dumančić agreed – he feels most candidates think it is a closed search.

- Regent Burch said the points embedded in the AAUP document are good points.

b. Medical Center Building Project Update

- What was approved is no longer applied because the State said it had to be brought back.
- The President opted to do a RFP (request for proposals). It is up in Documents and it can be pulled offline.
- It is similar but not identical to the first proposal. It speaks specifically proposer and will specify intent to lease. The proposer can submit in various ways and can be negotiated.
- The Board of Regents might discuss processes.
- Regent Richey's motion was seconded by Regent Burch, but this has to now be put in writing as to the exact questions that can be asked.
- The RFP (request for proposal) cannot be discussed while it is still in bid state.

2. Academic Affairs (Provost Lee)

- Provost Lee gave an expression of appreciation on the 5th Week Assessment, particularly in a time when we are concerned about freshman/sophomore retention. It is an important contribution to student success.
- There are two searches: (1) Graduate Dean; and (2) Associate Provost of Research and Creative Activity. The Dean of Libraries search will be underway soon.

F. Old Business:

G. New Business:

1. Policy 1.3032 Student Recruitment Materials Review

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse Policy 1.3032.
- The motion was seconded by Laura DeLancey.
- Provost Lee gave the context of this policy. This addresses Federal and SACS requirements on the accuracy of student recruitment materials. It revisits the policy with hierarchies of responsibility.
- There was no further discussion.
- Policy 1.3032 Student Recruitment Materials Review passed unanimously.

2. Open Search Resolution

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse the Open Search Resolution.
- The motion was seconded by Liz Sturgeon.
- Tony Harkins gave the context of the resolution. Whether it is open or closed, we would want the candidate to know what the university is about. He feels the search firm was hired to avoid surprises. The university is not a corporation and

expectations are different. It is critically important that the faculty, staff, and students should have an opportunity to meet the candidates and the candidates should have an opportunity to know what our campus is about. The belief is that it should be an open search.

- Chair Hudepohl asked if it can go to Senate on October 20th. She recommends a motion that it be approved and sent to the Chair of the Board of Regents and the Chair of the Search Committee.
- Susann Davis said she wonders how well-known the AAUP is for the members of the Board of Regents.
- Chair Hudepohl responded that Margaret Crowder's link to the AAUP statement was forwarded to Regent Burch; Chair Hudepohl asked Regent Burch if it was appropriate to send it to the Board of Regents. Regent Burch did share the AAUP statement with the Board of Regents. Perhaps this can be an accompanying document. Maybe Mac McKerral's letter can also be included.
- Patricia Minter suggested that maybe Regent Burch can mention what the AAUP is at the training with AGB (Association of Governing Boards). In the past, Board training involved supporting the president.
- Regent Burch thinks that the training will be very serious training and the statement has strong collaboration from governing organizations.
- Liz Sturgeon suggested saying what the AAUP is. Patricia Minter accepted this friendly amendment.
- Claus Ernst asked how President Ransdell was hired. Regent Burch responded that it was an open search and the decision was made as a result of the on-campus experience.
- Tony Harkins asked if there were any closed searches for any WKU presidents. Regent Burch said "no."
- Richard C. Miller said that some universities are hiring a CEO type of person as compared to a traditional president. The nature of presidency may have changed in recent years.
- Regent Richey said that he supports the resolution and thinks it is a good one, though he cannot vote.
- The Open Search Resolution with Liz Sturgeon's friendly amendment passed with a majority. The following senators abstained from voting: Molly Kerby, Jay Todd Richey, and Shannon Vaughan.

H. Information Items:

1. [Motion to add language about sexual orientation/gender identity to WKU nondiscrimination policy \(endorsed by SEC on August 29, 2016\)](#)

- a. **[Motion regarding Policy 1.3002 from May 2015 University Senate](#)**
- b. **[Policy 0.2040](#)**
- c. **[E-mail correspondence](#)**

2. [Senate Recommendation 2016_04_07 \(outcome of AQ work 2015/16\)](#)
3. [AAUP Position on Open versus Closed Presidential Searches](#)

I. Motion to Adjourn

1. There was no other new business from the floor. A motion to adjourn by Patricia Minter was seconded by Jay Todd Richey.

2. The meeting adjourned at 5:04 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Álvarez, Secretary