

**Western Kentucky University**

**University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting**

**April 4, 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 was called to order by Chair Kate Hudepohl on Monday, April 4, 2016 at 3:15 P.M. in the Weatherby Conference Room.
2. A quorum was present: Heidi Álvarez, Amber Scott Belt (guest), Barbara Burch, Margaret Crowder (guest, Faculty Handbook Committee), Thad Crews, Susann Davis, Marko Dumančić, Claus Ernst, Kate Hudepohl, Samuel Kim (substitute for Rick Grieve), Jeremy Maddox, Richard C. Miller for David Lee, Patti Minter, Jay Todd Richey, Julie Shadoan, Sandy Strell for Laura DeLancey, Liz Sturgeon, Shannon Vaughan for Kurt Neelly.

**B. [Approve March 7, 2016 SEC Meeting Minutes](#)**

1. A motion to approve the March 7, 2016 SEC meeting minutes by Jay Todd Richey was seconded by Patricia Minter.
2. The March minutes were unanimously approved.

**C. Reports**

1. Chair (Kate Hudepohl)
  - a. There are two information items from the April/May meeting.
  - b. Item #1 (open records response) was seen at the March senate meeting (it was not received in time for the March Senate Executive Committee meeting).
    - President Ransdell conferred with someone at the Attorney General's office, and President Ransdell feels that this meets the needs.
    - Chair Hudepohl will put a link to it on the website.
    - We are supposed to receive a copy of salary and this will be posted on the Senate website.
    - President Ransdell's official letter detailed something more extensive than what we were told last year.

- Patricia Minter noted that a phone call to the Attorney General is not legally binding; this is malleable and can change at any point.
  - Claus Ernst said that in the past, Senate conducted a salary survey of its own that looked at that year along with the previous year. Then, Faculty Welfare went to Academic Affairs and checked for abnormalities and changes that were out of the ordinary.
  - Patricia Minter said that this (quantifying and providing a reason for any faculty raise over \$5000) was done before the Board of Regents Agenda went public.
  - Claus Ernst suggested making it a part of the Senate agenda. Patricia Minter said that this can be linked to the Senate website.
  - Chair Hudepohl said that the Board of Regents agendas are not always an acceptable length. Patricia Minter said they may not have been an acceptable length for about a year. Regent Burch said that she will check on that.
- c. Information Item #2 is the SEC's synthesis of feedback on the President search. It was approved going forward to Dr. Burch.
  - d. The dates are set for two Faculty Forums: Friday, April 15 at 1:30, and April 27 at 4:00. The location will come via email. Please tell your colleagues now and encourage them to attend and give feedback. All members/representatives on the search committee will give the faculty an opportunity for feedback. The Board Chair will be there.
  - e. April is Senator officer elections and caucusing. New at-large members will be notified that they need to be here to rotate new senators on. The nomination of officers and caucusing of colleges will take place. Senate terms are August to July 31.
  - f. Margaret Crowder asked the senate appointees to university committees to give reports at the May meeting; Chair Hudepohl plans to do the same.
2. Vice Chair (Julie Shadoan)
    - a. At-large election results were sent out via email.
    - b. There was a request for vote tallies. Vice-Chair Shadoan reads the Senate charter differently and does not plan to do this unless there is a formal motion.

- c. Dr. Miller wanted the Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure to be more populated. Vice-Chair Shadoan sent two more emails. Ten more departments wrote back, and these names were sent to Dr. Miller. Per the Charter, these committee members are populated by lot by the University Senate. The population of these committees was done by lot at SEC because there is an urgency in populating the committee. Vice-Chair Shadoan put all of the names in a box and Chair Hudepohl drew the following names randomly out of the box. A quorum was present during this drawing. Five names were selected for service on the Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure: Matt Detman, Yvette Getch, Paul Fischer, Paul Woosley, and Edward Yager. Five names were selected for the Advisory Committee on Grievance: Mike Nichols, Walker Rutledge, Amanda Drost, Karin Egloff, and Quin Xiao. Vice-Chair Shadoan will read the names at Senate, and Chair Hudepohl will send an email to the new at-large senators.
  - d. Vice Chair Shadoan suggested that the language in the Senate Charter and Handbook is not clear regarding this process. She suggested that a motion to review it first by the Handbook Committee and SEC from a Charter perspective to make the language clear for next time is in order. Shadoan's motion was "to review the language and process for populating the Continuance and Grievance Committee in order to make the process more clear." Heidi Álvarez seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion to review the language and process for the continuance and grievance committee passed unanimously.
3. Secretary (Heidi Álvarez) -- No report.
  4. Committee Chairs
    - a. [Academic Quality Committee \(Jeremy Maddox\): Report Attached](#)
      - i. [Item a Online Response Rates](#)
      - ii. [Item b Response Rates by College](#)
      - iii. [Item c University Response Rates](#)
- The Academic Quality Committee collected data with statistics on response rates as discussed at the meeting. The Registrar sent an email regarding the timing of SITES. The new recommendation on timing is included in the report.
  - Jeremy Maddox made a motion to approve the report.
  - Chair Hudepohl said thank you for the time the committee took. Jeremy Maddox responded that Institutional Research did it in a few days.

- The Academic Quality Report was endorsed unanimously.
  - b. [Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee \(Patti Minter\): Report Attached](#)
    - i. [Substantive Change Handbook - Academic Experience](#)
    - ii. [Title IX Report to FWPR](#)
    - iii. [Copy of Reporting Spreadsheet](#)
    - iv. [Title IX Best Practices](#)
- Patricia Minter, the Chair of the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee, thanked those who filled out the faculty work life survey, which is open until 11:59. She stated that we have already exceeded last year's population rate, but it is important to get your voice heard by the Board of Regents. Patricia Minter will crunch the numbers and will get a report this week. The results will be on the Senate website. Four versions will exist: (1) The Board of Regents will receive all comments on everything (this is what Patricia Minter sees); (2) The President sees comments about his and comments on the Provost; (3) The Provost only receives comments specific to the Provost; and (4) the Faculty gets a version that has no comments (just aggregate data).
- Lauren McClain revised the survey, and it is a much better document.
- There is one action item; it appears simultaneously on Faculty Handbook.
- The Title IX Report is still in draft form; it took 1.5 years. There are three parts, which are still in draft. Comments will go into the final report. Part one is best practices. Part two is a reporting spreadsheet (there is no standard procedure at benchmark institutions, which is a problem) – there is no clear consensus on how the university should approach it. Part three is a summary statement from focus groups that accurately captures what was said in those groups.
- Regarding the new Title IX training, comments in the cover memo say that the module is a better training than last year. The committee feels it does not teach anything that would change a culture, but that the primary purpose is to avoid litigation. The recommendation is for WKU to copy UNC's Title IX Harassment E.E.O.C. and Sexual Assault policy. The Committee welcomes feedback on the report.
- Patricia Minter made a motion for approval of the report.
- The Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities report passed unanimously.

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

d. [Colonnade General Education Committee \(Marko Dumančić\): Report Attached](#)

- The Physics 201 application was omitted. It will come to the SEC in May.
- Marko Dumančić made a motion to approve the Colonnade General Education Committee report without Physics 201. It is on the cover sheet but not in the body; Marko Dumančić will re-send the cover. The report will have Explorations of Physics 201 deleted.
- The Colonnade General Education Committee report passed unanimously with that one little edit.

e. [Graduate Council \(Kurt Neelly\): Report Attached](#)

- Shannon Vaughan represented Kurt Neelly on the Graduate Council.
- Patricia Minter made a motion to endorse the Graduate Council Report.
- The motion was seconded by Jay Todd Richey.
- There were no questions. The Graduate Council Report passed unanimously and was endorsed as posted.
- The election for seats on next year's Graduate Council will be next week. Please encourage current Graduate Council Faculty to vote.

f. [Undergraduate Curriculum Committee \(Liz Sturgeon\): Report Attached](#)

- Liz Sturgeon made a motion for endorsement of the March 24 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee business.
- Jay Todd Richey said that in one file, the Potter College Curriculum Committee, the date should read March 2016. Fix the date March 3016. This typo occurs on Spanish 386, Sociology, and Comm 200.
- Liz Sturgeon acknowledged that these typos will be corrected.
- Chair Hudepohl suggested a friendly amendment to correct the dates.
- The UCC report was approved unanimously with the new friendly amendment of the dates. The report was endorsed with friendly amendment.

- One member of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee suggested a change of process flow between the Colonnade and UCC to make it more streamlined.
- Discussion about streamlining UCC proposals to make them electronic was suggested.
- The Registrar said the cost will be \$100,000 plus \$15,000. There is not money to support this.
- Shannon Vaughan said that the Graduate Council is implementing this. Collette sent an email. The Graduate School put money aside to do this. It will be starting in August. In Collette's demo, it eliminates the keying in. The faculty member proposing the change types it in and it is viewed electronically. It is currently entered incorrectly in different places; this new way has it entered in one flow. Once something is approved, it is populated consistently – the catalog and banner match because it pulls all from the same place. It goes through the same review process.
- Chair Hudepohl said she is not sure who has the actual access for editing, and feels it should be the proponent and not the chair to make these changes.
- Liz Sturgeon said the changes would be built into the program. Sturgeon feels that there is money for this.
- Marko Dumančić said that April 18 is the last meeting for Colonnade.
- Liz Sturgeon asked if in the old general education program, were courses designed first?
- Patricia Minter clarified that in the former process, the course had to exist before it could go through to Colonnade. So UCC has to be one step ahead; the course has to be completed before going to Colonnade.
- Marko Dumančić said that an exception was made for connections. There was a one-time incentive to make the process parallel. It cut down the application process by 50%. We will go back to the old system that Patti described after this.
- Vice Chair Shadoan asked how did the exception for Connections come about? Was it a policy change?
- Marko Dumančić said that the money and the program came from the Provost's office in coordination with Colonnade.

- There were no other questions or comments.
- g. [Faculty Handbook Committee \(Margaret Crowder\): Report Attached](#)
- i. [Substantive Change Handbook - Academic Experience](#)
  - ii. [Substantive Change Handbook - Faculty Transitional Retirement](#)
    - Margaret Crowder gave the context for the report. Within the report is updated information. The non-issue items will be addressed first. This is the approved wording added to the policy page; it added the “v” placeholder to policy. Amber sent the suggested wording.
    - Moving down, the conversation within Faculty Handbook includes two action items. (1) academic experience and (2) faculty transitional retirement program. Section 9.8 – this piece was approved last summer by the Board of Regents as a substantive change from handbook; it did not go through Senate or a faculty committee.
    - Dr. Miller had a conversation with Deborah Wilkins. This went through as a policy in 1989, but not a numbered policy. When approved, it went through the Board of Regents. This came through so it was a policy change and not a handbook change. Usually, the handbook links to a numbered policy. Since this was not a numbered policy, what needs to happen is the faculty transitional retirement item needs to become a numbered policy. Then the handbook can link it to the numbered policy.
    - The handbook currently differs from the legally accepted piece that was approved by the Board of Regents last summer; the documents are now conflicting.
    - Margaret Crowder said that she feels this should still have come through the senate process as a policy because it affects faculty. It went through the Council of Academic Deans and the Academic Council and did not have faculty governance input. A faculty member contacted senate saying that they conflicted. What is in the report is not what needs to happen; there is nothing wrong with the substantive change, but there is a problem with the method.
    - The SEC recommendation on what to do is make it a numbered policy coming through the correct line of faculty governance. The decision needs to be made on the conflicting documents and what needs to be done in the mean time. The report is separate from the action item.

- Richard C. Miller said that with Deborah Wilkins, he pulled out the January 1985 Board of Regents minutes. The optional retirement policy was established and approved, and it made faculty enrolled in KTRS eligible to continue employment at WKU on a limited basis. In 1989, the Board of Regents revised this policy. Only the Board of Regents can amend their own policy. The Summer of 2015 was a recent change that arose from a recent question about ORP; it was the primary reason for the Board to amend its own policy. The policy numbers did not exist in 1985 and 1989. Only the Board can amend its policy; but Senate can make a recommendation. ORP is now eligible for TRP (Transitional Retirement). The Policy in the Faculty Handbook does not supersede a Board-approved policy. The question is, do faculty want to include this in the handbook or remove it? What prevails is the current board-approved policy.
- Regent Burch said that 1996 is when another optional retirement program was established. The 2015 amendment extended the definition of kinds of assignments faculty could have and enables them to serve in a way that best represents the talent and skill of the faculty member. This provides more options for faculty. Regent Burch suggested updating the handbook so it can benefit more.
- Vice Chair Shadoan asked if there is a repository of these Board of Regents-approved policies that faculty can be referred to? If the Board of Regents does not publish policy, it needs to be so that faculty can access it. Minutes are not sufficient.
- Chair Hudepohl asked why it has not become a numbered policy.
- Patricia Minter said that it is the principle of the matter; the Faculty Handbook is the landing spot, and it is the closest we have to a union contract. People need to be able to go to one place and it needs to be synced. The Faculty Handbook needs to be continuously updated. If a Board policy was ratified by the Board, and CAD and AC were consulted but the faculty were not, this is a problem.
- Richard C. Miller said that CAD was consulted and AC did not approve it.
- Patricia Minter said that if CAD was briefed, the Faculty also should have been. It gets to the conflict of laws issue. Minter said that she advocates for the Faculty Handbook to be approved by the Board of Regents to make the handbook a parallel document with legal power. It is best practice to have the Handbook approved by the Board of Regents. Minter said she hopes the new Provost is open to this



conversation. Policies need to be ratified by the Board of Regents; everyone else does this.

- Richard C. Miller said that the handbook is an advisory document. In the case of a negative tenure decision, an attorney will ask if we followed our own handbook. If it goes to the Board of Regents, then it becomes more of a legal contract.
- Patricia Minter clarified that this is standard procedure.
- Margaret Crowder presented the SEC with three options: (1) pull the item; (2) approve it as a change and send it up the line and follow up with a recommendation to make it a numbered policy; (3) have it come through with future eyes in senate (a place holder and a link).
- Regent Burch asked if the Board of Regents has a number for it.
- Richard C. Miller asked if it is a numbered policy and the Board of Regents amends their own policy, then do they have to go through senate? It is the intent that in order for it to be revised, it has to go through senate? With the repository, with regard to part-time teaching and retirement, link it to the numbered policy.
- Margaret Crowder suggested taking other floating policies and giving a number to them.
- Richard C. Miller said he will suggest to the Provost that Board of Regents policies should be numbered so that they can be referenced. There are many policies that affect faculty that are not in the handbook.
- Margaret Crowder said that if we get it to be numbered, then we can reference it. She thinks we should approve the substantive change and then make a recommendation that it can be a numbered policy and linked to the handbook. She also suggested looking to see what other Board of Regents policies there are that should be linked with the handbook.
- Vice Chair Shadoan suggested approving it to make sure it is linked with the handbook.
- Patricia Minter said she has seven years of Board of Regents minutes that she can look at, and she will do this before the next meeting. Someone else will need to look at the University archives.
- Regent Burch said that one would have to know which minutes and which agenda to look at in the archives. She suggested that Julia

knows. There is no single place – one would have to know the Board of Regents meeting date. She suggested that we have the Board of Regents make these policies more acceptable.

- Jeremy Maddox said he feels this makes it consistent with the Policy on Policies.
- Chair Hudepohl suggested endorsing the report and dealing with the action items separately.
- Patricia Minter made a motion for endorsement of the Faculty Handbook report. The motion was seconded by Julie Shadoan.
- The Faculty Handbook report was endorsed and passed unanimously.
- Marko Dumančić made a motion to approve the substantive changes related to Academic Experience.
- The motion was seconded by Jeremy Maddox.
- Patricia Minter stated that this was approved unanimously by Faculty Welfare.
- The motion to approve the substantive changes related to Academic Experience passed unanimously.
- Margaret Crowder recommended (1) a motion to approve the faculty handbook/transitional retirement substantive change; (2) a motion recommending that it become a numbered policy and take it to the Provost; and (3) a motion to investigate all of the Board of Regents policies to make the handbook consistent – as amended by the Board of Regents to be able to be housed or linked.
- Marko Dumančić made a motion to approve the substantive change regarding faculty handbook/transitional retirement. The motion was seconded by Liz Sturgeon.
- Jeremy Maddox asked if this needs to be in the handbook.
- Margaret Crowder responded that it is something that people would look for, and it has been in there.
- Julie Shadoan asked if we will say who is going to conduct the investigation of the other Board of Regents policies? Will it be the Board of Regents? Will it be the Board Secretary?

- Regent Burch said that it is the Board's policies; either pass it on to the President... Vice Chair Shadoan stated that her point is that it is vague now.
- Margaret Crowder suggested approving the change and make separate motions to clarify.
- Patricia Minter said she is not sure how much we will find – the last eight years should answer. Minter will look at the past 8.5 years. Past 1997 will change because it is a different president.
- Regent Burch feels it is reasonable to ask the Board of Regents to make the policies accessible and retrievable. She does not think the method is a job that the faculty needs to take on.
- Regent Burch and Regent Richey will bring this reasonable request to the Board of Regents.
- Regent Richey asked if there is a specific way, for example putting it on the Board of Regents website as a separate tab for policies.
- Patricia Minter said that part of university policy is the syncing of all documents.
- There were no other comments on the substantive change related to faculty transitional retirement.
- The substantive change related to faculty transitional retirement passed unanimously.
- Patricia Minter made a motion to make this specific item a numbered policy and take it to the Provost to sync past with current policy numbers.
- The request that the Provost make 03-2016 Transitional Retirement become a numbered policy was seconded by Liz Sturgeon.
- Jeremy Maddox asked if Dr. Burch can take this directly to the Board of Regents? It is consistent with the Board of Regents; we only need to let the Provost know.
- Chair Hudepohl asked who will see what future changes are made on the Board of Regents so they can be synced with the Faculty Handbook?
- Patricia Minter said that the Provost's Office will know.

- The motion to to make this specific item a numbered policy and take it to the Provost to sync past with current policy numbers passed unanimously.
- The third item recommended was a motion to request for the President to ask the Board of Regents to move the Board of Regents Policies to a central repository; to ask the President to request that the Board of Regents reconcile any policies previously passed and move to a central repository.
- Marko Dumančić made a motion to ask the President to ask the Board of Regents to reconcile Board of Regents policies previously passed and going forward, ask them to move to a central repository and number them in accordance with the current policy on policies. The motion was seconded by Thad Crews. The motion passed unanimously.

## 5. Advisory Reports

### a. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch)

- The Presidential Search Committee met last Friday for RSP on search firms. No action was taken.
- April 22 is the next Board of Regents meeting. Regent Burch anticipates that action will be taken then.
- The Search Committee is holding open sessions on April 15 at Gary Ransdell Hall Rom 1024 and on April 27 in Snell Hall 1108. Please encourage people to attend.
- The Board met on March 25 for Committee Meetings.
- In Academic Affairs, there are four new certificate programs.
- Most programs addressed how they were meeting workforce needs.
- The targeted intervention Literacy 199, next fall there will be no remedial courses. Everyone under age 20 will have to take it. Research over the past six years showed a positive result of literacy.
- The Finance and Budget Committee shared the external auditors report NCAA. The Television reports are all OK. For the Faculty and Staff Personel actions, there is nothing unusual. The acceptance of the second quarter statement of revenue/expenditures generated discussion. Ann

Mead said that we are down \$2 million in revenue, and she suggested that unused scholarship money will take care of the short.

- The 4.5% reduction of \$3.4 million is what is still on the table for the legislature. The President sent an email about the current state, money for the one-time 4.5% reduction will be taken from the university reserve account. It will be replaced with non-recurrent funding. \$1 million in reserve belongs to DELO. Shove \$4 into successful areas correlating with student success. Cuts proposed at 9% could come July 1<sup>st</sup>. Across-the-board cuts would be devastating. The last two weeks in April will be an important time. Ann Mead said that the debt policy will be broad-based input on the committee. The decline in reserve capacity: fewer sources for dollars to take and save dollars. If there is a need for the base budget, then there is not money to put away.
- Giving back to generating unit was questioned by a Board of Regents member (ie. DELO). DELO was created by Academic Affairs. It was designed to incentive faculty and academics. It was put outside the regular budget. Regent Burch thinks it is important to note that DELO is important and transparent.
- Taking HAF money (Hilltopper Athletic Foundation) supplements athletics.
- The WKU Pathways program is operational. The NAVITAS contract was canceled in the last few months. NAVITAS went through the faculty and was approved by faculty. Spring 2016 is the start of the program is being advertised on the webpage. Pathways reports to International Enrollment Management, which reports directly to the President. Regent Burch thinks it should be under Academic Affairs. A lot of dollars were transferred into International Enrollment Management. Regent Burch is interested in the return on this investment. The President said that the Provost will report on it. He thinks the program will be approved and will be under Academic Affairs. Is it a new program or not?
- Refunding of Bonds – Vice President Mead reported savings resulting from this.
- Todd Misener gave an overview of student engagement and retention study that shows a positive correlation with the frequency of student engagement in activities measured in student affairs and health and wellness related activities and retention.
- The Executive Committee approved the addendum to the Athletic Employment contracts for Coach Brohm and Athletic Director Todd

Stewart. Changes for Coach Brohm involved an increase in base salary and changes in penalties/incentives associated with dismissal or leaving without cause. The changes involved for Athletic Director Todd Stewart involved changes in the section of the contract detailing the different types of incentives and dollars associated with each. There were also changes in penalties/incentives associated with dismissal or leaving without cause. The Hilltopper Athletic Foundation committed in writing for these changes. No additional funds were sought from the university – funds would come from the athletic budget or other sources available to athletics. This use of private donations was likened to endowed professorships. Regent Burch raised questions regarding these items, such as the number of kinds of incentives and increasing the dollar amount in these academic changes, and the use of private donations. Regent Burch had a lot of questions, and without seeing the first contract, it was difficult to determine the changes in the second contract. It was determined that the Board of Regents would need to go into closed session to discuss contract details. The closed session followed because of the discussion of the contract. The committee recommended that these changes go forward after the closed session.

- The report from Robin Taylor was a discussion centered around clarifying the performance funding version proposed by the Senate and the Governor. The Senate proposed a 25% reduction (to be used as a revolving pool). Kentucky State was excluded from the cuts due to their dire financial situation. However, the most you could get out of it would be 25% of your base budget, which is what you would put in. 25% goes into the pool, and only one institution could get the maximum amount, which is 25%. AT no time can the base budget exceed what goes in. The Governor proposed 33% and then, ultimately, two years later, increasing the amount to get 100% in 2020. In both instances, no institution can be funded beyond its base amount. Clarification on the equity funding proposals followed. The Senate would fund ½ of the equity proposed in the second year. The Governor would fund equity funding with ½ in each of two separate years. The Senate and the Governor said that NO capital projects and agencies bonds. The House said no capital projects with some allowance of agency bonds. The Regents observed that “It’s really like the legislature is saying we do not want to support Higher Education, but we are going to give you a way to try and see if you can stay alive.” The plan B for the agency bonds on the student parking garage is to bill the Student Life Foundation.
- The Facilities Report update from Russell said that the Science Campus will be finished in December 2017-- \$48 million was approved a year or two ago but was never released. The Confucius Institute building with be completed in August.

- The Enrollment Report by Brian Meredith showed that graduate enrollment is up for the spring semester, while the overall university enrollment is down slightly for the year.
- Marko Dumančić asked if the senate and governor’s proposals stand for the across-the-board cuts, what else did the President say? Regent Burch said the President said different options have been worked on, but the President has not said anything about them to the Board of Regents. Once we know the final situation, he will share the proposed plans with the Board of Regents. He has said that he will not do across-the-board cuts and he will try to protect the academic programs, faculty, and the mission of the students. The Board of Regents members asked what happens if no budget is approved? Higher Education is not considered essential. President Ransdell said that there is one day where legislators can come to agreement on budget and it can still be vetoed. Richard Miller said that politics are involved with this. Patricia Minter said that the governor has a serious problem with higher education. Regent Burch said that every time higher education is cut, they find some way to keep alive – usually through raising tuition – we cannot keep doing this. We are already operating on much less than we already are; something will have to be cannibalized. Richard Miller said that with the \$48 million in the Science Building, the Confucius Institute Building, and the state-of-the-art alumni center, some legislators are not convinced that higher education is in dire straits. Claus Ernst said that DELO is hurting us because as a trademark from exempting (DELO and Athletics), the exemption game means that our share of the budget is almost a 10% increase. Regent Burch said that many things in Academic Affairs are revenue dependent. She has never understood the athletic budget, and it is not transparent. There is money from the Conference and legal rights. Academic dollars can all be traced, including DELO. Claus Ernst said that unrestricted budget is earmarked dollars; the percentage being used can be protected. Much of Academic Affairs cannot be protected. Regent Burch said that many academic units have been protected -- classroom technology, professional development money, graduate assistants, and travel – through DELO. Claus Ernst said that this is a shell game, because most of the money is protected. It is a game we will all lose. Regent Burch said that the money from DELO in the base budget would be distributed across the institution. In taking away the incentive, she questions the reduction.

b. Academic Affairs (Richard C. Miller for Provost Lee)

- Richard Miller commended the student research presentations over the weekend, both in the quantity (number of people who presented) and in quality (there were many great presentations).

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

1. There was no old business.

#### **E. New Business:**

1. [Budget and Finance Committee Resolution - Prioritizing Wage Increase](#)
2. [Budget and Finance Committee Resolution - Restricting Building Projects](#)
  - The Budget and Finance Committee resolutions resulted from the Senate Straw Poll. Claus Ernst made a motion to put them on the agenda for the next meeting.
  - Regent Burch asked if this would exclude full-private funds from outside the university (ie. private donor funds). She said for example, in the instance of a private donor giving money to renovate a building, this would not allow it.
  - Ernst said that this would require the resolution being amended.
  - Patricia Minter said to be careful about how it is worded in order to avoid the verbal shell game.
  - Regent Burch suggested the friendly amendment “fully privately funded from outside the university.”
  - For the first resolution prioritizing wage increase, Patricia Minter said she thinks it is a good resolution as worded and fully supports putting employees first. Kate Hudepohl said that she is concerned about wages no matter what the cost. Patricia Minter said that the employees have to come first. We have to put our marker down for the future. Claus Ernst said that any changes will weaken the resolution.
  - Patricia Minter made a motion to pass the resolution for prioritizing wage increase. The motion was seconded by Marko Dumančić. The motion passed unanimously.
  - The second resolution for restricting building projects had a friendly amendment (ask Kate or Claus to email it). Patricia Minter asked about Aramark approaching SGA about the renovation of Garrett. She asked if Aramark is talking about funding it themselves, would this preclude the resolution? The revenue has been diverted into building projects. Minter said that this is her only concern, because Aramark is an independent outside contractor. The resolution says privately funded through sources outside the university; Aramark and the Bookstore are on the university books. Richard Miller said is this precluding agency



bonds? There is debt service associated with that. Claus Ernst responded “yes.” Kate Hudepohl voiced concern about outside sources. Regent Burch said that privately contracted vendors are outside the university. Given that it is not uncommon for building projects to be passed on to students, she suggested that construction and renovation projects that are allowed should be fully stated funded or private outside of the university, and in a way that cannot be passed on to students. Claus Ernst said he prefers a short resolution that cannot be interpreted in any way.

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to accept the resolution as originally posted and originally written. The motion was seconded by Patricia Minter. The resolution for restricting building projects passed unanimously.

3. [Policy 1.2092, Policy 2.2092 Faculty Workload and Compensation](#)

- Amber spoke about making the policy coding uniform (guidance code).
- Marko Dumančić made a motion to accept the policy of faculty workload and compensation. The motion was seconded by Claus Ernst. The policy was accepted unanimously.

**F. Information Items:**

1. [President Ransdell response to Open Records Resolution](#)
2. [SEC Synthesis of Preliminary Feedback from Faculty Regarding Presidential Search](#)

**G. Motion to Adjourn:**

1. There was no new business from the floor.
2. A motion to Adjourn by Marko Dumančić was seconded by Patricia Minter.
3. The meeting adjourned at 5:49 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Álvarez, Secretary