

**University Senate Meeting**  
**Thursday, December 7, 2017 -- 3:45 p.m.**  
**Faculty House**

---

**Called to order 3:50 pm.**

**Attendance:** Lori Alexander, Janet Applin, Kirk Atkinson, Jim Berger, Tim Brotherton, Neale Chumbler (Danita Kelley), Dan Clark, Thad Crews, Aquesha Daniels, Pitt Derryberry, Marko Dumancic, Michelle Dvoskin, Loretia Dye, Timothy Hawkins, Jean-Luc Houle, Andrea Jenkins, Guy Jordan, Pat Kambesis, Stephen Locke, Patricia Minter, Nurehesmeh Morteza, April Murphy, Heather Payne-Emerson, Leslie Plumlee, Beth Pyle, Ron Rhoades, Dale Rigby, Tiffany Robinson, Jo Shackelford, Joe Shankweiler, Kandy Smith, Heather Strode (Angie Jerome), Dana Sullivan, Carol Watwood, Amber Scott Belt (Guest), Doug Smith (guest), Ben Lennertz (Audrey Anton), Kristi Branham, Scott Bonham, Jen Walton-Hanley, Eric Kondratieff, Liz Sturgeon, Andi Dahmer, Susann Davis, Keri Eslinger, Travis Eslinger, Colin Farrell, Jim Fulkerson, Lawrence Hill, Kate Hudepohl, Jarrett Johnson, Donielle Lovell, Mac McKerral, Sharon Mutter, Matt Pruitt, Dianna Ransdell, Matt Shake, Kristin Wilson, Mary Wolinski, Claus Ernst, David Lee, Robert Dietle (guest), Larry Snyder (guest), Ajay Srivastava (amended)

**A. [Approve November 16, 2017 Minutes](#)** Davis, Minter (Approved)

**B. Reports - Part I (non-standing committee and advisory in section F)**

1. Chair – Eric Kondratieff

- The provost search committee has been announced and there are three faculty senators on the committee.
- The January SEC meeting has been moved to Tuesday, January 9, 2018, however, the regular senate meeting remains at its normal date and time: January 18, 2018 at 3:45.

2. Vice Chair – Liz Sturgeon

3. Secretary – Jen Hanley

**C. Committee Reports and Recommendations**

1. Academic Quality: Kirk Atkinson (Report posted; Endorsed by SEC)

**Atkinson:**

- Merrill Price attended the Academic Quality meeting to give context to the Academic Renewal action item included on today's report. Price helped develop the wording of this policy which is a forgiveness policy.
- Beth Laves also attended an Academic Quality meeting to clarify the 5-week academic calendar that has been posted. She explained that the rationale behind this calendar was to offer alternative scheduling for non-traditional working adult students. However, there are still numerous concerns with this alternative calendars because there is nothing stopping programs from adopting this schedule which could raise significant conflicts with scheduling in the future.

- a. [Report](#)
- b. [Action Item: Non-Substantive Change - Academic Renewal](#)

**Mutter: Friendly Amendment--** modify the revision process to include the phrase: from advisor to department head.

**Second:** Pruitt

**Friendly Amendment:** 5 Nays, 55 yes

**Policy Approval:** Atkinson, Mutter, Passed as amended

### **Discussion**

**Atkinson:** This policy was brought forth by University College and addresses an academic renewal program. The revisions would allow students who have earned at least 60 credit hours or who have not attended an accredited university for two years to gain academic renewal.

**Price:** The goal of the policy is to help those students who have amassed sixty hours or more who have had a terrible semester—for example those students whose GPA drops below 2.0—to obtain academic renewal more quickly. Generally, if students suffer a bad semester they do not come back and therefore do not graduate. The current policy requires those students to sit out for two years and then once they take twelve hours they can re-write that one semester. Students can only do this one time in their academic careers. To be clear, this policy only applies to those students who have accumulated at least 60 hours—if students have fewer hours, they need to sit out for two years and take the requisite twelve hours.

**Mutter:** This is a substantive policy. If a student drops a semester and it is stricken from their transcript, won't they need additional credit hours to graduate?

**Price:** Not necessarily. Any general education classes or hours needed to fulfill the major will need to be re-taken.

**Mutter:** For students to gain approval, we should have the usual chain of command: from advisor, to department head, to the dean.

**Price:** In the policy, we had the department head requirement changed to advisor.

**Atkinson:** The advisor is the professional closest to the student who understands their situation.

**Mutter:** We don't allow students to withdraw from courses without the department head's signature. So we should include it here.

**Price:** This policy already adds an additional layer, there isn't need for another one. The registrar is the one who has to actually make this change, which is the role they currently have. If the student qualifies, they will get this.

**Atkinson:** This policy already adds another layer of administration. The current policy only goes through the registrar's office, we are now also requiring the student meet with their advisor before it goes to the registrar's office.

**Mutter:** I want the department head to be a level of approval as well

**Price:** Can we add the department head as a friendly amendment?

**Mutter:** friendly motion: add to the revision process—from advisor and department  
**Pruitt** Second,

Motion Discussion: None, Friendly Nays: 5, Yes the rest. Motion Passed  
Atkinson—just add department chair.  
Pass As Amended--unanimous

2. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities: Patti Minter (Report posted; Endorsed by SEC)

**Motion to Approve Report:** Minter 1<sup>st</sup>, McKerral 2<sup>nd</sup>.

a. Report

**Minter:** There is one action item as well as several ongoing discussions including: a gender equity study, Title IX Clery Act, and working with Staff Council to improve FMLA on campus.

**Action Item**

FWPRC was asked by SEC to craft a statement on merit pay and procedures. In our unanimous discussion, we took into consideration issues of ethics, previous senate work on pay—including the need to get faculty salaries to benchmark before moving to a merit-based structure. The proposal includes language for implementing merit pay.

**Passed With Three Amendments (Final Resolution, unanimous with three amendments)**

- 1) **1<sup>st</sup> Hanley, 2<sup>nd</sup> Maribeth Wilson:** Replace get to benchmark with move towards benchmark parity. (56 yes, 4 noes, passed)
- 2) **1<sup>st</sup> Minter, 2<sup>nd</sup> Jenkins:** Add clinical faculty (unanimous)
- 3) **1<sup>st</sup> Minter, 2<sup>nd</sup> McKerral:** Implement a merit pool in conjunction with benchmark raises. (unanimous)

**Discussion**

**Mutter:** Unless we get cost of living raises, we will never get to merit pay.

**Minter:** That is oversimplified. We are building on reports from the finance and budget committee that were adopted by senate. We need to get to benchmark before implementing a merit structure. Our resolve on this issue was strengthened by the gender equity pay issues and research we are conducting. Our research suggests that merit pools are a big producer of

inequities for underrepresented groups. The general trend is that people are in favor of merit pools until they don't get one. We are using the building blocks developed by the Finance and Budget Committees.

**Kondratieff:** The reason the FWPRC was tasked with crafting guidelines is that President Caboni wants to go straight to a merit-based system and avoid a cost of living raise. This policy gives us a way to have a voice in the merit pay process.

**Minter:** The policy does not say that if we don't get a merit pool we don't get raises. This is a best practices policy that says we need to try to get to benchmark pay first to avoid the pitfalls of a merit pool when we have not had cost of living raises across the board.

**Ernst:** I was the chair of the budget committee and I want to clarify what this policy is actually saying. The estimate of where WKU salaries are in comparison to benchmarks was 91% in 2014-2015 and we have only gotten worse since then. Staff are in an even worse situation—1996 was the last time that a staff pay study was completed. To get a 1% raise across the board, we would need about \$13 million. There is also the philosophical question of how our benchmarks are determined and whether or not we should advocate for what we need. Our income compared to benchmarks consistently places WKU in the bottom 3. To get WKU's salaries to benchmark, you need to spend a higher percentage of the budget on salaries which will require us to cut corners elsewhere. Essentially, we are saying we want something to happen that is impossible before we ask for merit pay.

**McKerral:** If the budget experts are given the directive to create a 4% pool for merit raises, why can't this pool be used to address university-wide compensation issues. We should take the 4% and direct it towards achieving benchmark salary. Everyone understands that we have a revenue issue and sometimes the way to overcome those issues is through spending money. We have endured 10 years of spending money on things we didn't need; and the data in regards to social security and cost of living shows we are losing money in our pay cheques every single year. We need to recruit and convince people to come here and you cannot separate these issues from faculty compensation. How things are operating right now are not fair and equitable.

**Minter:** Senator McKerral is correct—we've paid for the choices made by the previous administration. What we want now is to influence the conversation. Senate has consistently endorsed the idea of a benchmark increase. We have not had a merit pool in eleven years—and consequently, we want to influence the process by which a merit pay is given. President Caboni can accept/reject these guidelines at his discretion. Merit pools are sometimes incredibly inequitable and this is a way for people to be involved in the process and to ensure that teaching, service, and research are all valued. Since our last merit pool we have promotable instructors and pedagogical faculty—ranks that did not exist eleven years ago. Even then, the merit pool was never enough.

**Wilson—Claus,** I was wondering when you calculated the revenue streams from other benchmarks did you take out the salaries for kinds of faculty we don't have here?

**Ernst:** I did not actually calculate anything; this is just an average. If we have a 4% raise--either across the board or for merit--it makes no difference. If we want to have influence on how merit is influenced, we cannot say we don't want merit.

**Kondratieff:** What about a friendly amendment: replace get to benchmark with "move towards" benchmark parity. Hanley, Maribeth Wilson (No 4, yes—passed.)

**Kelly:** Since instructors are mentioned—we also need to include clinical faculty

**Minter:** We are happy to amend to add clinical faculty.

**Mutter:** Language "at this point"—division of ideas. Strike at this point

**Pruitt:** When we say there is a merit pool—that would suggest that everyone would receive a certain amount. Are we juxtaposing this against itself?

**Kondratieff:** We need to recognize that President Caboni is using a corporate model, the average amount in the pool would be 4%

**Pruitt:** back in the 1990s—there is a phase for everyone

**Minter:** Based on the information our committee gathered, people have very different opinions on what a merit pool should look like. We want to avoid the corporate model of a merit pool which is an all or nothing model. The idea that we endorse needs to include provisions to address the fact that we are losing money in our pay cheques. We are not saying we don't want a merit pool; we are saying that there issues that require an across the board motion to improve the lives of faculty who are currently losing money.

**Shake:** What does "at this point" mean with the addition of the amendment to move to benchmark parity?

**Minter:** We are calling attention to the equity—if you take out at this point, it suggests we are losing the spirit of the amendment. This is the framework in which this should take place.

**Shake:** What does "at this point" mean? Does it mean after we get some cost of living changes?

**Minter:** Everything is on the table including a split--the president has made it clear it's not an across the board merit raise.

**Final Resolution with three amendments:** unanimous

3. Budget and Finance Committee: Jim Berger (Report Posted; Endorsed by SEC)

**Berger:** The report lays out the things we are working on—child care services, gathering data, an email on behalf of the Budget and Finance committee for Facilities Management information.

- a. [Report](#)
- b. [Dept. of Facilities Management Info Sheet](#)

**Discussion**

**Mutter:** Don't we already have child care? Is this in addition to?

**Berger:** We are looking to potentially expand or provide additional options. Nothing has been officially determined, we are just exploring ideas and issues. This is just a report, not an action item.

4. Colonnade General Education Committee: Jerry Daday (No Report)

**Report: Move to Approve: 1<sup>st</sup> Daday, 2<sup>nd</sup> Atkinson**

**CGEC World Language Proficiency: Yes, 50; Noes, 9, abstention 1.—Motion passed.**

**Daday:** We have approximately 7,000 students who need to fulfill the language proficiency requirements: either by taking a 102 class or the Stamp Test (ST). When colonnade was implemented in 2014—the idea was that students would take the ST in high school. In the last 4-5 years we have offered about 2500 seats. So we have a requirement on the books that we cannot staff. What we have is a staffing issue which has now become a curricular issue. There is no easy solution. We are offering a two-pronged approach. First, if you are a WKU student who is in any catalogue year and you have 2 years of high school language. We are allowing their high school credits to automatically fulfill the proficiency requirement. If you don't have high school language classes, the requirement still applies. Second, we want to provide time for Modern Languages (ML) and American Sign Language (ASL) to develop a sustainable plan. There are committees on campus working to address the second half of our proposal.

- a. [CGEC World Language Proficiency Resolution](#)

**Discussion**

**Atkinson:** How many of the 7,000 actually have the language?

**Daday:** Of the 3500 who enroll in the Fall semester only 300 don't. Students coming from outside of Kentucky do not automatically have high school language courses. If students do not have a high school transcript, they will have to produce one.

**Clark:** Looking at the data that was sent out: in the last 4 years only 20% of the seats were available. (amended)

**Daday:** Is that the numbers enrolled at census date? The numbers shrank after the census was taken. How many people were in the seats when we took the census?

**Jordan:** I am nervous to think we have a dilution of academic quality. Why haven't these objectives been funded?

**Dumancic:** When the issue arose we tried to triangulate with advising, Colonnade, and ML to find a solution. This is simply the latest iteration.

**Kondratieff:** Dietle spoke to the SEC—when this was established we believed high school students were taking the ST. We believed students were coming here qualified. We are filling in the gap to make students stake ST.

**Dumancic:** Over the past 18 months, some additional staff was hired and members of advising have attempted to figure out ways to expand the ST and other avenues have been explored.

**Dietle:** We underestimated students' resistance to taking the test.

**Daday:** In 2014, the statistics on the ST were as followings: 568 students have taken it-- 141 dual credit, 380 first year, 47 in sophomore/junior year.

**Dahmer:** What is the rationale for clearing the whole backlog for all the way to freshmen?

**Daday:** If we clear juniors and seniors, that still leaves 5000 sophomores and juniors. We have a requirement that we cannot staff and it is holding up student success and graduation. This proposal is an effort to save the requirement, the Requirement is not being removed.

**Dahmer:** Are we hurting students moving forward for graduate programs? Students still need language requirement. Scary precedent—students in recruitment, could be misconstrued.

**Daday:** This still preserves the requirement

**McKerral:** There is a \$35 fee and students are not taking the ST. Stop them from paying fees that don't matter or benefit them, and instead have students pay fees for things that actually do benefit them.

**Wilson:** This is an impossible situation for ML-- no new resources. This is a quick fix but will not offer long term solutions.

**Daday:** We should see a plan in Colonnade by February we wanted something as we approached student orientations for Spring Semester, and Fall Semester registration. The idea is there are a couple of options that will be brought forward to colonnade. No promise that we are picking things on Feb. 15, we are willing to give ML additional time to modify the proposal.

**Dumancic:** This is the beginning of a process, Feb. 15 is a tight turnaround, the group is meeting throughout January

**Johnson:** Can we implement some kind of free exam free developed by these courses?

**Daday:** The committee needs to decide what “proficiency” means. The current ST is \$35 and take 2-3 hours to complete. We need to consider a different kind of test.

**Davis:** We discussed this in SEC. It is possible to develop an in-house test. But we need to remember that proficiency cannot be determined by a multiple choice test. Proficiency is how well they can use language. Faculty member would have to develop a test or WKU would have to pay. Language skills are relevant regardless of major--we recognize the backlog and the need to develop a drastic measure to rectify it. We are disappointed at the position we are in, and appreciate the support. If it is approved puts the future of ML on an unclear path.

**Clark:** We need to recognize that this could be a university-wide problem. Just because you have high school doesn't mean you're good at this.

**Srivastava (amended):** (S)—Can't we come up with something for these students and then develop a better plan in the spring that leaves the language requirement?

**Daday:** Proficiency is still a class or a ST. If there was a new test, your idea might work. Solutions are being examined on how to push students to take the ST. Cleanest way—do number one, give time to work on number 2.

5. Graduate Council: Kristin Wilson (Report Posted; Endorsed by SEC)

**Wilson:** move to approve. (Unanimous approval)

a. [Report](#)

6. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: Janet Applin (Report posted; Endorsed by SEC)

**Applin:** pass new business, approved.

a. [Report](#)

**Applin:** We need to move the proposals on pages 1-12 to old business. We need the tabled information to old business. When we vote, we are only voting on pages 13-end. For this first vote we are only considering new business.

7. Faculty Handbook Committee: Kate Hudepohl (No report)

#### **D. Old Business**

**Applin: Pages 1-12 of UCC report: PR 250**

**McKerral:** Motion that this course proposal and revisions go back to curriculum committee

**Second: Jordan**

**Applin:** The motion on the floor is to discuss this more. The proponents have been trying to get this approved for 2-3 months and have been pulled back and forth. The SEC has seen them twice—it has been vetted as much as a proposal can be vetted



**McKerral:** The Courses that were originally proposed are duplicative of existing courses. The proposals have cosmetic revisions—but they are not actually cosmetics. We should not debate curriculum revisions in senate, we need to take it back to PCAL Curriculum committee. The new proposal has several issues including: duplication, staffing, and content. In October, President Caboni issued an ultimatum: share resources not duplicate, be efficient and make courses interdisciplinary. Under the new budgeting paradigm, we need to count majors in units and students in classes. There's the opportunity for cannibalizing departments and creating new courses that are department-specific. This needs to be vetted with at least 4 changes from original proposal. We need to send this to the PCAL curriculum committee (PCC)--to make sure the vetting debating is done in the correct venue

**Jerome:** This proposal did go through PCC and was unanimously approved. It also received approval at the UCC and last SEC meeting. There were objections raised before the last senate meeting and the proposal was tabled and none of the changes were challenged. PR students need a course taught for their particular discipline. This has been vetted and received no objections from any department.

**Youngblood:** I'd like to voice the same concerns as Mac.

**Motion:** Remand this course proposal and two major proposals back to PCCL

**Motion Failed.**

**Proposal: Old Business passed**

**Jerome:** Motion to approve 350, **Second Atkinson**

**Jerome:** From a disciplinary perspective, Public Relations (PR) students need an ethics course that covers contracts, PR code of ethics, client confidentiality

**McKerral:** Communication brought four changes to the proposal that are directly related to duplicative changes. This is a harbinger of things to come with the new budget model

**Wilson:** We see the same trend in grad courses in relation to a methods course

**Youngblood:** The class has been shared by communication and journalism for a while. Will it affect graduating students?

**McKerral:** For twelve years the journalism classes have worked for the PR majors. Since PR moved, ostensibly the journalism courses have been eliminated for the PR majors except for one. Sterk provided a list of disciplines on this campus that have law classes. Paralegal wanted the journalism course to be 50% ethics, but the book they assigned did not have but one chapter on ethics. PR faculty asked questions about the course's ability to serve the needs of PR students—the law does not change based on jobs. Media professionals need to have good law background.

**Snyder:** This matter was brought to the PCC twice and went through the vetting process. No one is more concerned about duplicating resources than I am. But in instances where individual programs are not sufficient to meet the needs of a course we need to meet the alternate needs.

**Daniels:** The Management department offers a business law course that covers a lot of these issues. This is a duplicative class.

**Jerome:** Motion to approve the revised programs major in ad and PR

**Berger** Second

Discussion: None,

**Vote: Yes, one no**

## **E. New Business**

### 1. [SEC Proposed Revisions to Senate Charter re: Elections Procedures](#)

**Sturgeon:** This addresses the composition of who can sit on senate. We also propose to move elections earlier to make it easier to fully staff committees before the May meeting. We want to avoid the pitfalls of determining who is on senate. This is just a first reading.

## **F. Report - Part II**

### 1. Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership for Higher Education – Molly Kerby

### 2. AAUP representative - Margaret Crowder

### 3. Advisory Reports:

#### a. Faculty Regent –Claus Ernst

I had a meeting with President Caboni and noted that there is a high level of distrust between the faculty and the administration. I expressed concern over the non-transparent strategic committee assignments—SGA, Senate, Staff Council should be independently allowed to appoint committee members. President Caboni was not responsive but said moving forward things might be done differently.

Budget: I noted tht giving everything as merit is a mistake and anything that needs to be done needs to be transparent.

Currently a plan for a Garrett replacement building—if we are having hardship which might lead to lay-offs, this would not go over well. How the new building is financed raises questions about the revenue stream dedicated to this--as this has not worked out well in the past. It will cost \$25 million to construct this building. Ransdell negotiated a contract with Aramark that might not be able to be undone. Aramark is a revenue stream, this contract locks us in with Aramark for 20 years with a new building.

**Wilson:** Has that bond already been issued?

**Ernst:** no, I have not seen the contract. Understanding the Aramark payments are front loaded, don't know if we can change that.

#### b. Provost – David Lee

The department of ML has more majors right now than it ever has before. We focused on the World Language requirement—the 100-level piece, language instruction is alive and well and has a lot of student involvement. Shift from European languages to Arabic, Chinese, and even the Spanish major—South America. Focused on the 100-level, but the department is strong. Appreciate the careful way the Colonnade and SEC and senate have talked through this issue—thoroughness and care, this is the correct decision, but it has been done thoughtfully. “Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.” Jefferson. Whatever you celebrate, the hopeful redemption of human kind or the end of the semester—I wish joy to all of you.

c. SGA President – Andi Dahmer

**Kondratieff (for Dahmer):** Strategic Planning in SGA, legislation, farmer’s ordinance, College Heights herald support.

## **G. Information Items**

Motion to Adjourn: Hanley, Davis

Meeting closed 5:36.