

Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting
January 11, 2016 -- 3:15 p.m.
WAB 227 - AA Large Conference Room

A. Call To Order

- A regular meeting of the WKU University Senate Executive Committee was called to order on Monday, January 11, 2016 at 3:15 in the Weatherby Conference Room.
- A quorum was present: Heidi Álvarez, Thad Crews, Susann Davis, Laura DeLancey, Marko Dumančić, Claus Ernst, Kate Hudepohl, Molly Kerby, David Lee, Gayle Mallinger, Richard C. Miller, Jeremy Maddox, Kurt Neelly, Bryan Reaka, Julie Shadoan, Liz Sturgeon.
- The following guests were present: Ann Floresca and Doug McElroy.
- The following members were absent: Barbara Burch, Patricia Minter, Jay Todd Richey.

B. [Approve November 30th Meeting Minutes](#)

- A motion to approve the November 30th Executive Committee meeting minutes by Molly Kerby was seconded by Laura DeLancey.
- Liz Sturgeon requested that page 13, 6th bullet remove the pay rates.
- The minutes were approved unanimously as amended by Liz Sturgeon.

C. Reports

1. Chair (Kate Hudepohl)

- Under information items, the WKU Confucius Institute Annual Report is included because Jay Todd Richey read excerpts at the December meeting. Page 24 was read by Richey at the December University Senate meeting.
- In terms of budget and spending priorities, there is no update yet; Chair Hudepohl plans to talk to Eric Reed tomorrow.
- At the December University Senate meeting, Kelly Madole asked if the University Senate would be interested in assembling a committee to see how a pay compensation increase might happen. Chair Hudepohl said the concern is that if it will happen, it will involve shifting around money in Academic Affairs. The idea of a shell game is concerning because it might mean cuts in programs. She asked the Senate Executive Committee if they had any thoughts on how to follow up. Hudepohl solicited the question and gave feedback to the Board of Regents.
- Molly Kerby said she feels we should wait until the money is there, and thinks that in the future we should make salary increases part of our budget. There are still issues with minority, gender, and power compression. We would need recurring money in order to do that.

- Chair Hudepohl said that she personally thinks we should wait until May when the shortfall amounts are announced. Options include doing nothing, being reactive and writing motions, or doing something radically different.
- Jeremy Maddox asked if this issue was addressed at the Board of Regents meeting.
- Chair Hudepohl responded that Gil Johnson mentioned that it should involve the Budget Council. The big budget will be talked about on January 29th.
- Kurt Neelly said that attempts have been made; Kim Read did come to talk to the SEC. He asked what the plans were for a budget with decreased enrollment and there was no answer.
- Chair Hudepohl said that overspending on scholarships is also an issue. We have been clear about identifying the budget and health care issues. We met with Gil Johnson, and Chair Hudepohl attended the Board of Regents meetings.
- Kurt Neelly said this body has asked the right questions and has made attempts. We cannot control the administrative response.
- Claus Ernst said in terms of going ahead and thinking about raises, it is an unreasonable expectation. There is no state money anticipated. President Ransdell's revising model is a pipe dream. A big increase in enrollment is not likely. 4/5 of budget is in salary. Claus Ernst said he thinks we cannot do any other way besides eliminating positions. He added that the university needs to make compensation a priority and write it in to the Budget.
- Julie Shadoan said she agrees that given the current situation that there will not be money available for compensation; but at some point, the institution needs to face the reality of enrollment. She wants the administration to acknowledge reality and publish a Plan B. What are we going to do besides make cuts in departments?
- Molly Kerby asked what is it we want to do? We cannot be everything to everyone.
- Chair Hudepohl suggested a revision of the mission statement to help focus this. She thinks WKU has overcommitted due to its broad mission statement.
- Julie Shadoan said that clarifying the mission statement is good, but we cannot veer from what the state says we are, a "regional university."
- Chair Hudepohl said that we cannot compete with the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville and should not try.
- Bryan Reaka said that he has never seen the administration publish a Plan B. Do we want to write it and present it?
- Chair Hudepohl said that even being more conservative with choices would help.
- Claus Ernst said that the committee is analyzing budget for the last ten years and is keeping track of how individual categories have shifted in terms of spending allocations for the last five years. Enrollment management is a top contributor to scholarships. Is this overspending? He is not sure. Last fall, enrollment was projected forward; we have not done that. Ernst sees it as reasonable to use enrollment as a base for going forward. In looking at how to accomplish a Plan B, if everyone were asked to teach one additional course, would we really want to do this? Claus Ernst sees no chance that the raise dollars will happen. He said it is not optimistic to talk about raises; he feels it is demoralizing and does not think it can happen.

- Thad Crews said he thinks creating a division about how money we don't have should be allocated is not a good idea. Crews advocates a single unified voice.
- Julie Shadoan solicited opinions on merit vs. across the board raises and the responses were divided.
- Chair Hudepohl said that some won't go above and beyond and are not committed. Downplaying the reality of the shortfall is a problem; 50% of the people using the food bank are WKU employees. Pretending like it is not a problem is not helpful. Hudepohl reiterated that she expects another shortfall will be announced in April or May. She thinks we should think about it before then.

2. Vice Chair (Julie Shadoan): No report.

3. Secretary (Heidi Alvarez): No report.

4. Committee Chairs

a. Academic Quality Committee (Jeremy Maddox): No Report

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

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

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

- Marko Dumančić submitted the Colonnade General Education Committee report for approval. There were no comments or discussion. The report was approved unanimously.

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

- Kurt Neely submitted the December Graduate Council report for approval. There are course revisions removing undergraduate prerequisite courses because it is a violation of policy. The report was approved unanimously with no discussion by the Graduate Faculty.

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

- There is one action item; Tonya Archey submitted a proposal in October to deal with military absences. The UCC has worked on this for a few months and came up with a policy for this.
- Liz Sturgeon made a motion to approve.
- Sturgeon clarified the last sentence of the policy for Provost Lee regarding an incomplete grade.
- The email from Tonya Archey said that she thought it was a good idea so students would have ample time to complete their work.

- Provost Lee made a point that this addresses something that is not there.
- Liz Sturgeon said the written record stays between the student and instructor; both parties have to agree upon the deadline.
- Provost Lee expressed two concerns: (1) it seems restrictive; (2) it references something that is not in the military withdrawal policy.
- Liz Sturgeon said the intent was to refer that you can get an incomplete; perhaps it needs to be reworded.
- Bryan Reaka asked if this can happen in a term in which students are already enrolled?
- Liz Sturgeon responded that they started working on it in October, and she wants it as soon as possible.
- Julie Shadoan asked if the date could be revised, maybe to summer?
- Provost Lee said it seems to plug something in for students under military order that are not stipulated for anyone else.
- Bryan Reaka said that it is 12 weeks from the beginning of the semester.
- Liz Sturgeon said the next meeting is at the end of January; maybe the committee can look at it again.
- Liz Sturgeon made a motion to move this to the action agenda
- Liz Sturgeon made a motion that the Senate Executive Committee endorse everything except for this one piece, the Military absence policy for official military duties and Veterans Administration medical appointments.
- Liz Sturgeon said everything else is consent; we would have to pull it to action.
- Julie Shadoan made a motion to move this item off the agenda (2nd Bryan Reaka).
- The University Curriculum Committee agenda minus that one item passed unanimously.
- Liz Sturgeon agreed to take the Military absence policy item back to the University Curriculum Committee.
- Claus Ernst said he has reservations against the rhetoric “accommodations” depends on the length of time the student misses.
- Provost Lee said the military withdrawal policy says that the student works with the instructor.
- Kate Hudepohl suggested to Liz Sturgeon that Claus Ernst’s concern be brought up.
- Liz Sturgeon said the intent is that the student and instructor will work together; it is not supposed to sound like an ultimatum.
- If the orders are after the withdrawal date, does this mean they can still withdraw?
- Provost Lee said it would be a case-by-case basis.
- Kurt Neely mentioned that extending new mothers beyond 12 weeks can be changed with the faculty member’s agreement; he thinks the military policy should work the same way.

g. Faculty Handbook Committee (Margaret Crowder): No report.

5. Advisory Reports

- a. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch) No report.
- b. Academic Affairs (Provost Lee) No report.

D. Old Business:

1. Continue discussion about SITES (supporting documents from [November 2015 SEC agenda](#) or on the WKU university-wide shared drive: Senate Documents; 2015-2016; SITES Research)

a. [Memo from Tuesdi Helbig, Institutional Research, re: timing of SITES administration](#)

- The items for the SITES discussion are posted in the shared drive and on the November agenda.
- Chair Hudepohl asked if we want to refer anything to the Academic Quality Committee.
- Jeremy Maddox said that he wants specific charges on what the Senate Executive Committee would like the Academic Quality Committee to do.
- Chair Hudepohl said that in looking at historical documents and talking to people, there are a lot of issues, including the timing of it.
- Many students have an idea of what their grade is because of postings in Blackboard.
- Jeremy Maddox asked if eliminating the incentive would destroy the incentive.
- Thad Crews said that students are not supposed to finish early.
- Doug McElroy clarified that some lab courses finish the week before finals. If the faculty member chooses to make grades available prior to SITES, that is a different issue.
- Kurt Neelly said that though the timing is an issue, another issue is that it is an unvalidated test. Do we want to use it? Do the questions actually give feedback?
- Jeremy Maddox said that the Academic Quality Committee can address timing.
- Doug McElroy said that some think moving it earlier is not necessarily bad; some think getting it away from the end of the semester is beneficial.
- Heidi Álvarez suggested making a motion for the Academic Quality Committee to look at timing of the SITES and how to use SITES as an instrument.
- Julie Shadoan added the wording “providing standardized guidance for interpreting the SITES for those who use it in promotion and tenure.”
- Claus Ernst said if it is used statistically appropriate, it is difficult to discern one person from another. He thinks looking at old information from Sally Kuhlenschmidt will be useful.
- Jeremy Maddox said that this link was broken.
- Provost Lee said this material does exist; do faculty members need to see this as well as deans and department heads?
- Kurt Neelly said if the report already exists and it make recommendations, it does not necessarily mean it is the only way to document teaching in the tenure portfolio. SITES

are only one piece of this. Neelly added that he would like to see some kind of official statement from WKU.

- Jeremy Maddox said that some ways of looking at it are not statistically correct.
- Liz Sturgeon asked how other departments evaluate teaching.
- Julie Shadoan said that Patricia Minter is looking at that.
- Richard Miller asked how she got that?
- Julie Shadoan said she asked the departments.
- Richard Miller said those document how do you look specifically at teaching. If an overemphasis on SITES was found, it was sent back to the department.
- Julie Shadoan clarified what he is saying in practice is right; there has never been a department head in her classroom since she has been at this institution, so the SITES mean quite a bit.
- Jeremy Maddox said he does not think this is in the scope of the committee.
- Heidi Álvarez made a motion that the Academic Quality Committee look at these three issues: (1) the timing of the SITES; (2) a recommendation on how to use/interpret the SITES for promotion and tenure (in addition to making sure that the links work and compiling in one place); and (3) reviewing the formatting of the report (in changing from paper to online, the standard deviations are different (mean/median)).
- The motion was seconded by Julie Shadoan.
- There was no discussion.
- The motion passed unanimously.

2. [Policy 1.1012 Consensual Relations Between Faculty and Students](#)

- Policy 1.1012 was pulled in the previous meeting because there was concern that the policy is weak. Yale University summed up their policy as zero tolerance.
- Jeremy Maddox said a conflict of interest still exists; which approach is better?
- Provost Lee said that in 2006, there was a situation that he was trying to deal with; this was an attempt to put something in writing. Department chairs were more comfortable with the discussion “you’re in a relationship with a student and here are the steps you need to take” versus “it needs to stop.”
- Marko Dumančić said that the Yale teacher/student policy deals with staff in the third sentence; this leaves space for interpretation. It is not really zero tolerance.
- Liz Sturgeon said she feels there should be zero tolerance because of students who might be 16 or 17.
- Laura DeLancey said the Yale policy differentiates between undergraduate and graduate.
- Kurt Neelly said nothing in this policy says this.
- Molly Kerby said if you are dating a student, you need to tell someone.
- Julie Shadoan said she does not understand how this WKU policy works in practice, and added that she also has philosophical issues with it. She thinks there are Title 9 issues associated with it.
- Marko Dumančić said it can get complicated quickly, and zero tolerance is appropriate.
- Doug McElroy said this affects the tuition benefits policy for spouses. There are other policies that would need to be addressed.

- Julie Shadoan said she has had colleagues who teach their children; she does not think it should be limited to them being a current student.
- Laura DeLancey asked what do we mean by zero tolerance?
- Bryan Reaka said that in the 5th paragraph, Yale addresses this.
- Julie Shadoan asked if this is considered just cause of termination of tenured faculty?
- Richard Miller said if it says it “will” lead to termination, it is different than it “can” lead to termination.
- Julie Shadoan asked how do you define what warrants termination? There are issues of age, gender, preference, etc.
- Provost Lee said some have come forward and complied with the policy. Generally speaking, this is not a huge problem on this campus.
- Molly Kerby said it becomes morally judging. If this policy is working, then maybe we should not make it zero tolerance.
- Provost Lee said there are situations in how to prove a relationship exists.
- Jeremy Maddox asked what the objective of the policy was.
- Provost Lee said the objective was to provide guidance in writing for those involved in a relationship; their responsibility is to come forward.
- Does the policy help to provide protection and risk in litigation?
- Claus Ernst said that the Yale policy says this should be avoided. In the very least, this should be made clear in the WKU policy.
- Heidi Álvarez suggested having the Title IX coordinator and Human Resources look at this.
- Provost Lee said it is very complicated and sensitive.
- Heidi Álvarez made a motion to refer Policy 1.1012 to the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee to look at possible language alteration and to consult with the Title IX coordinator and human resources department. The motion was seconded by Bryan Reaka.
- Chair Hudepohl said she will include the context with the motion for discussion when presenting it to the committee.
- Jeremy Maddox suggested including why it is discouraged (people get sued, the university could get sued, etc.).
- Susann Davis questioned the language “should” in this policy that is used twice. In addition to looking at the Yale policy, Davis also looked at the UNC policy, which says it is “misconduct, subject to disciplinary action.”
- Susann Davis asked what does “undirected responsibility” mean?
- Provost Lee responded that it would involve a third party.
- Julie Shadoan made an amendment to the motion: “the SEC recommends that the Yale and UNC policies be reviewed first.” Heidi Álvarez accepted Julie Shadoan’s friendly amendment.
- The motion passed unanimously as amended.

3. [Policy 1.4021 Academic Program Review](#)

- Doug McElroy discussed 2d1 and 2D2 (pages 3 & 4) why the language was struck. There was also a numbering issue in part three that has already been corrected by Amber.

- 2D1: the policy was written at the same time CPE was developing guidelines on this policy. He believes our policy was moving faster than CPE's. The language was there because it was under discussion; ultimately, CPE did not do that. Since 1998, we have never reached out to make this a practice. It is not a change in our practice to strike that. There were no questions.
- 2D2: has to do with striking language concerning the election of committee chairs. From 1998-2009, the responsibility of the chair and vice chair was to collect evaluations, assemble, reconcile, and put a report together. The new revision is a more streamlined approach. It is centralized and put on Blackboard, then the committee compiles the PDF's into one large document. There is no need to elect a chair.
- A motion to approve Policy 1.4021 by Bryan Reaka was seconded by Marko Dumančić. The motion passed unanimously.

E. New Business:

1. [Policy 1.4201, Policy 9.4031 Textbook Adoption Policy](#)

- A motion to approve Policy 1.4201 by Molly Kerby was seconded by Gayle Mallinger.
- The Director of the WKU Store, Ann Floresca, gave the context of the Policy.
- There are two dates added for the summer and the winter, which are flexible to weekends.
- She is proposing a few other changes.
- In section four, the note "instructors have not decided on a book" was removed.
- In section five, rollover to use the same book does not take minor changes such as a new edition. Indefinite rollover creates issues. The textbook industry has changed greatly since this policy was instituted; there are other options that need to be addressed.
- Section seven, old editions might not be available. This will help to reduce the debt amount if unused.
- The goal here is to be institutionally run; these changes will help to open communication back up and educate about what is going on in the industry for faster and cheaper.
- Section 8, matching to class registration dates.
- There were no questions or discussion on Policy 1.4201.
- Marko Dumančić asked how many professors submit book orders on time. Ann Floresca responded that since she has been here, there is an improvement of 60-65%. Now it is 90%, but the semester is starting in another week.
- Kurt Neely asked the amount of books purchased through the WKU book store vs. online. Ann Floresca responded that currently 30-38% is purchased through the book store. Students shop around and compare prices. The book store is working to bring money back to the university. The earlier they get orders, the less they will have to charge.
- Policy 1.4201 passed unanimously.

F. Information Items:

1. [WKU CI 2015 Annual Report](#)

A motion to adjourn by Bryan Reaka was seconded by Molly Kerby. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Álvarez, Secretary