

**WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY**  
**UNIVERSITY SENATE**  
**Senate Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Monday, August 29, 2016 3:00 p.m. – WAB 227**

**A. Call To Order**

1. A regular meeting of the Western Kentucky University Senate Executive Committee was called to order on Monday, August 29, 2016 at 3:00 PM in the Wetherby Conference Room.
2. A quorum was present: Heidi Álvarez, Barbara Burch, Thad Crews, Susann Davis, Laura DeLancey, Marko Dumančić, Kate Hudepohl, Molly Kerby, Samuel Kim, David Lee, Richard C. Miller, Patti Minter, Jay Todd Richey, Julie Shadoan, Matthew Shake, Liz Sturgeon, Shannon Vaughan, Adam West
3. The following guests were present: Michael Baer, James Line, Kurt Neelly, Dan Rodas

**B. Approve May 2nd, 2016 SEC meeting minutes**

1. A motion by Molly Kerby to endorse the May 2<sup>nd</sup> Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes was seconded by Marko Dumančić.
2. There was no discussion.
3. The May 2, 2016 Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously as posted.

**C. SEC Meeting with Presidential Search Firm**

**1. Isaacson Miller Executive Search Firm Scoping Invitation**

- Michael Baer and Dan Rodas from Isaacson Miller, the executive search firm retained by the University to assist us in the search process as we seek the next President of Western Kentucky University, were in Bowling Green on August 29. They met with various constituencies and key stakeholders to better understand our organization and the challenges and opportunities our campus is likely to encounter moving forward. They met with the WKU Senate Executive Committee at 3:00.
- The majority of the time that was intended to focus on the position itself and what we feel to be the important challenges facing whoever is hired as the next President of WKU.
- Members of the SEC were thoughtful about the future of WKU and the ways in which we can measure the outcomes and successes of the person in this position.
- The major categories of topics the search firm is interested in are:

**1) Objectives for the new president.** What do you want the new president to accomplish? What are the desired outcomes for the role and for the University? How will you know in three to five years that the right person was hired? What will have happened?

**2) Qualifications and Experience.** Based on the objectives identified, what do you think are the qualifications and experience of an ideal candidate? What is essential and what might be helpful?

**3) Personal Qualities.** What are the personal attributes most important for this role?

**4) Source and candidate recommendations.** Finally, who should the search firm contact in the outreach to identify candidates? Obviously, they will draw upon their own networks but they want to tap into ours as well. This certainly means suggestions of possible candidates, but just as important, suggestions of good sources who might lead to strong candidates.

- Once the search firm has had an opportunity to meet with us, they will synthesize all that they have learned from our interviews and from our organizational material. Important aspects of what they learn will be helpful as they have discussions with potential candidates. What they learn will enable them to offer the Committee advice when they are preparing to interview individuals and as they evaluate their skills and experiences.

## **2. SEC Synthesis of Faculty Comments Solicited/Compiled Spring 2016:**

- The WKU Senate Executive Committee Shared the Synthesis of Preliminary Faculty Feedback on Presidential Search:
  1. Demonstrates commitment to principles of academic freedom, tenure, and shared governance
  2. Values faculty and allocates appropriate resources to support faculty work
  3. Demonstrates proven academic leadership and experience as teaching faculty
  4. Possesses experience with successful budgeting and planning including implementing a strategic and realistic budget that prioritizes the academic mission
  5. Exhibits commitment to consensus building as to WKU's mission and place in Kentucky higher education
  6. Demonstrates commitment to inclusive excellence and transparency in all processes as core values that enhance the educational mission

## **3. Senate Executive Committee Discussion with Michael Baer and Dan Rodas on August 31:**

- Members of the WKU Senate Executive Committee spoke with Michael Baer and Dan Rodas from 3:05-4:05.
- Michael Baer first summarized what the Issacson Miller Search Firm does and why. He stated that they come to the campus to meet with a wide array of constituents to learn about the culture and to hear what is important and what the major challenges are. They gather printed information on the website and gather an institution profile.

They watched the three open forums that were held in the spring. They met with individuals on campus and drafted a draft of the profile. They wanted to meet with the faculty and students for an open forum, and that happened today (August 31). They stated that 45 people attended. They also met with the Student Government Association Executive Committee. In forty-five days, they will finalized the draft of the institution's profile and will begin using it for approaching individuals on the phone for the position. Individuals will look at it to see if it is a good fit. There will be a forty-five minute phone screening to measure capabilities and interests to see if they fit the institutional needs. Once the pool is narrowed to twenty or twenty-five people, then there will be face-to-face interviews. Then, the committee will look at it. It is a contract of what the firm and institution are looking for.

- Liz Sturgeon asked what the Board of Regents is thinking that the next president needs to do. Michael Baer responded that at the initial meeting, they discussed moving the institution forward academically and fundraising; working with the state legislature, governor, city, county, and surrounding counties; improving the academic experience; serving students (ie. high-quality education, extracurricular, becoming academically successful).
- Regent Burch stated that in the morning forum, the Board recognized that different times require different individual strengths. In dividing traits/characteristics of the president -- twenty years later -- what are we looking for? Regent Burch said that she will compile the notes from this morning.
- Marko Dumančić shared some ideas about what some of the faculty's priorities will be for the next president: finances and prioritizing academic quality and integrity; degrees granted vs. actual meaning of degree; transparency of finances. He stated that it is a problem that athletics and infrastructure are prioritized, and that the faculty has been reinforcing academic quality with less financial support.
- Chair Hudepohl said that academics are viewed with an emphasis on special problems rather than the cure.
- Marko Dumančić said he would like to see the search firm and search committee have an emphasis on hiring an academic who understands academic quality in the broadest possible sense.
- Michael Baer said that he heard this both from the forums today and from the spring, and also from the search committee. He said that laying out a long-term vision of the university and having a plan for where we will be will help to lay out those individual things and to pull them together.
- Laura DeLancey said that she wants the vision to be realistic and sustainable. She wants a concrete vision that is not in crisis.
- Molly Kerby said she wants someone collaborative and believes in consensus leadership.
- Marko Dumančić said that currently, there is a solid core that things keep being added on to, rather than working on existing strengths.
- Patricia Minter said that the crisis situation is demoralizing and makes it difficult to do what the legislature expects us to do [performance-based funding].
- Patricia Minter added that January is when the criteria will be established; this is not an ideal position.

- Marko Dumančić said that in the crisis situation, staff positions are not prioritized. The faculty and staff are not valued by the institution. He stated that people need to be prioritized over the infrastructure. Patricia Minter added that no ownership is being taken for this.
- Dan Rodas said that most people applying for the position will come from the faculty with a university background, and there will possibly be a few others.
- Patricia Minter said that she attended all of the forums. She wants someone who understands the job from the bottom up.
- Patricia Minter asked about the process and the timeline.
- It will be a board decision on bringing one candidate to campus. Of 40-50% of the people who are approached for the position, 30-50% of that 40-50% will pull out at the time of the campus visit because of issues with loyalty of the candidate and faculty interest. In public universities, this affects fundraising.
- Regent Burch said that she understands the confidentiality of the candidates in the search process. She asked about on-campus finalists as a faculty member. In most searches, bringing candidates to campus for the community to see the candidate occurs. The culture of the community is seeking openness on campus. She asked if most campuses our size bring candidates to the campus for input, and added that she senses tension on not bringing the candidate to campus.
- Michael Baer said that he understands that faculty members would want to see the candidate, but the role of president and of university funding have all changed over twenty years. It would be great to have a group of finalists to bring to campus, but it would have to be a closed search. It could result in a failed search, because people could withdraw. He said that the firm is already contacting candidates. He said that Miami of Ohio did a closed search and brought just one candidate to campus.
- Marko Dumančić stated that he does not understand how this can work out for the faculty. The irony is that one of the major issues with the current president is transparency.
- Julie Shadoan said she echoes Marko's concern. She asked if there are processes in place that preserve anonymity and still let the faculty get a sense of who that person is?
- The University of Iowa had a totally open search, and the Board chose someone totally different.
- Patricia Minter said as the previous Faculty Regent, she feels it does matter to the alumni and the campus community. Bringing a candidate in this time will be important to the campus community and community at large. She added that President Ransdell's on-campus interview was what won him the job.
- Chair Hudepohl asked if there is a way to have a modified closed search because of the perception of it being the "Board's President"?
- Patricia Minter said she wants a person who can stand up to the tough legislature and tough governor. People like the idea that searches are inclusive and compliant.
- UT did an open search and the people are not happy with it.
- Shannon Vaughn asked if the pool will be limited if the search is open. Michael Baer said that there are many sitting presidents who are being considered and they want a closed search.

- Patricia Minter said that public performances may change the perception of the Search Committee.
- Regent Burch said that the Search Committee screens the candidates and gets it down to about three or four. The full Board of Regents makes the final decision.
- Patricia Minter said that given the current board dynamic, this is troubling.
- Michael Baer said he will talk to people/references and gain an unvarnished view of the candidate. They want to probe things that the Search Committee and Board have questions about. There are 60-70 pp. of referencing. By Federal Law, references can be asked but have to be confidential. The references generally give more information than the actual interview.
- Susann Davis asked if the faculty can sign a confidentiality waiver.
- Michael Baer responded that a small number, but he has not been involved with a search of this type.
- James Line said since faculty and students are not voting, the list of criteria from the students and the university committee reflect their mood to the Board. The student perspective is that a forum or something of this nature is important.
- Thad Crews said having the best pool will have a huge impact on the quality of the candidate, and this is important. He leans toward getting the best pool and hopes that the problems of the Board won't get in the way.
- Jay Todd Richey asked if it will be the candidate's decision if they want to come to campus.
- Michael Baer said that he needs to know the Board's view in the next few weeks. If all finalists agree, it might be changed. He added that this is unlikely.
- Marko Dumančić said in finding someone who is best for us, if they don't want to be here, it is mystifying. Having no faculty voice is very troubling for him in a process that is already not very democratic.
- When the finalist is announced, an offer has not been made at that point.
- Patricia Minter said she is not an alumna, but has a sense of the pulse of the community, and it suggests that the campus is supported by a wider community. It would be troubling to those who would give gifts if they are shut out of the process. Michael Baer used Catholic universities as an example. Dan Rodas spoke about effective fundraising. Patricia Minter said that we depend heavily on a regional market for fundraising.
- Richard C. Miller said that it is an interesting conversation. The decision is based on the culture of the institution and a transparent process.
- Michael Baer said the Search Firm will operate under an assumption of what the Board tells them. If something changes, they need to decide soon.
- Julie Shadoan asked who it is up to and when will we know?
- Regent Burch said that it is under discussion. She did not realize a decision was made. She thought we understood that people would not stay in the pool. It was talked about, but she did not know a decision had been made.
- Michael Baer said it will be unlikely to get a good pool unless it is a closed search.

## **D. Officer Reports:**

### **1. Chair (Kate Hudepohl):**

- a. Website Update:** Chair Hudepohl began updating the website near the end of the summer. The 2016/2017 salary statement is posted under “documents.” She lengthened the SAI link to the state website to look up salary search. She began loading actions in motions (items forwarded to the senate, provost, etc.) and this will go up on the website. New business from the May Senate meeting will be on the September Senate agenda because of loss of quorum at the May Senate meeting.
- b. New Medical Center Building:** Documents related to the new medical school will be posted on the senate website.
- c. Organization of Posted Documents:** The Curriculum Committee Chair’s workload -- along with where do documents live on the shared drive – all need more conversation. A part-time administrator is needed for Senate. Patricia Minter said she will go back and look at that. Marko Dumančić echoed this, and said that Colonnade exists in three different places. Liz Sturgeon said that in the UCC, when a new chair comes in, it is the blind leading the blind in trying to update it. Chair Hudepohl said that Graduate Council coming under the umbrella of Senate is also an issue.

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

- a. Standing (and other) Committee Membership:** There are many spots to fill on standing and other committees. We will talk about this at the Senate meeting and Vice Chair Shadoan will send out another email about it.
- b. Senate Charter Language Related to Chairs of Standing Committees:** Vice Chair Shadoan said that the Charter language related to Chairs of Standing Committees has one interpretation that is the chair of the committee also being a senator; vs. a senator has to be a chair of the committee. Patricia Minter said that you do need to be a senator to be a chair. Chair Hudepohl said in the case of Academic Quality and Francesca Sunkin, she is an at-large member of a standing committee (not a senator). There was as discussion of #4 and #5 on page 13 of the Senate Charter.

### **3. Secretary (Heidi Alvarez): No Report.**

## **E. Committee Chair Reports**

### **1. Academic Quality Committee: No Report.**

**2. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee (Patti Minter): Report**

**a. Faculty Worklife Survey 2015-16 (posted on Senate website):**

The aggregate data is posted on the senate website. There were 454 respondents. This is a larger response rate than last time. Patti Minter urges the faculty to read it. There are four versions: The first is posted on the senate website and to the campus, without comments on the President, Provost, and Board of Regents. The Chair of the Faculty Welfare, The Chair of the University Senate, and the Chair of the Board of Regents received a copy. Patricia Minter sent a copy to Board Chair Higdon last week and he will forward it to the Board of Regents. The full version goes to thirteen people. President Randsell sees his comments and Provost Lee's comments. Provost Lee sees only his comments. A question was asked why it is done with means and standard deviation? It is apples to apples; it is the way it was run in previous years. It is for tracking results over several years. Molly Kerby said she will put this question in writing; without the mean and standard deviation, it is hard to read. Adam West said a simple median would be good.

**b. Active Shooter Training:** The Active Shooter training is on its way and it will be building specific.

**c. Title IX Meeting:** The Faculty Welfare Committee and Chair Hudepohl and Vice Chair Shadoan met with Andrea Anderson, Joshua Hayes, Michael Crowe, and Deborah Wilkins to discuss the Title IX report. They will have a follow-up meeting. The report was offered in the spirit of something meaningful to the campus and to keep people on campus safe and informed. The current website is not usable or searchable. Questions were asked about how do we expect someone to find the right person and how are people expected to know how to do their jobs? The faculty suggested a single place to land on. No suggestions made have been implemented. They will ask for a follow-up meeting. The changing campus culture on EEO issues was not received well. Chair Hudepohl said for Academic Quality and Faculty Welfare, a suggestion was made for including a statement in syllabi. Deborah Wilkins said that not everyone filled out the training. It was taken down before summer. Requiring it and a usable website were discussed. Patricia Minter suggested putting something on the syllabus when the website goes up.

**3. Budget and Finance Committee: No Report.**

**4. Colonnade General Education Committee (Marko Dumančić): No Report.**

**5. Graduate Council (Shannon Vaughan): Report posted**

**a. May 2016 Grad Council Agenda**

- b. Shannon Vaughan, the new Chair of Graduate Council, presented the Graduate Council Report for Consideration on the Senate agenda. Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse the Graduate Council Report. The motion was seconded by Molly Kerby. The report passed and was endorsed unanimously by graduate faculty.

**6. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (Liz Sturgeon): No Report.**

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

## **F. Advisory Reports**

### **1. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch)**

- Regent Burch stated that it was a busy summer. The Board of Regents met a number of times (committee meetings, board meetings, and the board retreat).
- The primary thing she wanted to report about is related to the new agreement with the Medical Center that was passed a week ago. She said that she learned about this at the Board of Regents retreat. It was an interesting retreat in terms of understanding academic matters on campus. She said that she can brief the Senate on the skeleton of it and how the decision was made.
- Chair Hudepohl said that she went to the meeting and it was a very different meeting. The Board of Regents spoke up and addressed points related to issues. She will post the public documents related to the deal. She asked Regent Burch if she would speak about the pros and cons of this deal.
- Molly Kerby asked how did we get from a medical building with the University of Kentucky to all of the other stuff?
- Regent Burch said that she learned about it at the July 22 Board Meeting. The Chair and the Finance Chair presented a discussion with the President and Athletic Director Chair that had taken place over several months. WKU leases the third floor of the Medical Center Complex space. The second floor is Nursing. The third floor is the Doctor of Physical Therapy. The President posed to give up the third floor for the University of Kentucky's Medical Program in Fall of 2018. He got the Medical Center to agree to pay for and build a structure that will cost \$22 million. It will be located between the baseball stadium and the indoor practice facility for the baseball team and intramurals. 80% will be used by WKU and 20% will be used to house the new orthopedic sports medicine program of the Medical Center.
- Gains of this project include: a new indoor practice facility without a bond; recruiting for Conference USA; space for baseball operations; opportunity for the Medical Center to symbolize ongoing relationship with WKU; within the 99-year lease period, it could become a gift. She added that this is not about a gift – it is as business deal. The Medical Center will have the convenience of UK's medical program. The Medical Center has a place to develop their new orthopedic program. They will benefit from the shared cost of maintenance and operations.
- Regent Burch briefly noted the contents of the letter of intent and the summary of the board discussion. Originally, it was discussed in a closed session; on August 19, it



became an open board meeting. The 99-year lease is for \$1. The space will be used for the Doctor of physical therapy (moved from the Medical Center Complex), baseball offices; Medical Center Orthopedics Practice; training, and a sports program center. It will look like a big gym with artificial turf. It looks like an indoor practice field. It is an indoor practice facility that is also used for Physical Therapy purposes. If they move out, they can gift it to us or they can have a wholly-owned subsidiary there. They have branding rights. There was a lot of back and forth discussion regarding the extensive branding rights to the Medical Center and its subsidiary and if terminated, WKU will lease or purchase the facility. Medical Center Health and Enspire Quality Partners is the new mission of the Medical Center; they will be recognized as official WKU health partners. They will be the official orthopedic provider or official health care provider of WKU Athletics. WKU Athletics will ensure that current and future sponsors with marketing contractors, and future health care providers, refrain from entering into a sponsorship that might lead to confusion as to the Medical Center's status. WKU will refrain from allowing any other health care provider to purchase advertising or sponsorships on campus. The Medical Center has naming rights and branding on the interior and exterior of the facility; two sides of Preston Center; and branding on WKU health plan enrollment and medical plan materials. The Medical Center and affiliated entities may use the WKU logo and a tag line recognizing it as WKU's official healthcare provider. The Medical Center has exclusive right to operate a WKU on-campus healthcare clinic in a reasonable and customary manner; similar to current operation. This will transition no later than January 1, 2017. Our current contract extends to January 2018. WKU will not enter into a relationship with another medical services provider for provision of health services to its employees, students, or faculty without first offering the opportunity to provide said services to the Medical Center. Effective January 1, 2018, the WKU Employee Health Plan will include the Medical Center and Enspire Quality Partners and affiliated entities as preferred providers. Regent Burch said that she spoke with Tony Glisson, and employees will have incentives. An employee cost structure will be maintained so that employees receive incentives when using the referenced providers. The described employee incentives shall not limit nor interfere with employees' right to choose other providers and facilities as desired with the Health Plan's designated provider network and plan structure. Regent Burch had questions about the legality of the incentives. The plan design provisions are subject to modification based on any regulatory or compliance requirement. WKU will continue to choose its third-party administrator. There will be a dedicated parking lot adjacent to the building, and designated parking in the Keen Hall parking lot. Parking is sufficient to provide adequate support for the Medical Center's operations in the complex, and at no cost to the Medical Center for as long as it owns the sports medicine complex. WKU is responsible for Maintenance and Operation expenses associated with the space dedicated to the WKU Doctor of Physical Therapy program and its Training and Sports Programs. The Maintenance and Operation for baseball will be transferred to the new building. The Medical Center will assume responsibility for Maintenance and Operation expenses associated with space dedicated to the Medical Center Health Care Programs, and also all maintenance, repair, and/or replacement of building systems, and structural capital renewal to the facility. Also, WKU will relocate the Doctor of Physical Therapy from the Health Sciences Complex of the Medical Center to the new facility. WKU continues

responsibilities for the space it occupies in the Health Sciences Complex. WKU subleases to the University of Kentucky for the College of Medicine. The sublease rent will be used to meet WKU's obligations under the Health Sciences Complex lease. If the University of Kentucky discontinues its lease, WKU remains obligated for payment of rent as provided in the Health Sciences Complex lease and for rent of space in the new building. WKU gets the benefit of TIF financing regarding the space sublet to UK. The Medical Center Orthopedics will serve as the exclusive team physicians for WKU's sports programs. The Medical Center Orthopedics will assume responsibilities related to football at the end of the 2016-2017 season and all other sports, thirty days from execution of agreement, or sooner at WKU's request. The Preston Center will have scheduling responsibilities. The Letter of Intent expires on October 30, 2016, or another date as agreed upon by parties involved.

- A question was asked if the Board of Regents looked at and talked about the details and terms. Regent Burch said that discussions were ongoing and occurred through the closed sessions up until the Board of Regents meeting on August 19. Points of discussion included: the lease details and term; branding; perceived risks; medical services provider implications as "official health care provider; the on-campus health center contract with Graves Gilbert; parking issues on campus becoming exacerbated; implications of exclusivity; community concerns; cost effectiveness of health care; the priority regarding this building (for whom); the real costs to WKU; lack of sufficient information; lack of inclusion/transparency on campus and in the community; timing and the process concerns – shared governance – ongoing partnerships and long-term relationships; concerns over disruption, trust with partnerships, and decades of relationships in the community; transitions – presidential search; a gift that is not a gift; elements of the business deal; policy matters /considerations presented with the recent UK situation of selling branding rights on campus and the private sector access trend as a source of income – "the private sector is willing to invest serious money to gain access to business that marketing and access in a campus community provides." There is a need for review of the implications regarding "preserving institutional autonomy" in terms of giving marketing and access to our campus.
- Regent Burch said that she has now heard from many people both on and off campus. Based on the realities and comments, the President has the Board votes to move forward and negotiate the lease. There are many unknowns, and we need to be attentive and vigilant to implementation. Many concerns were discussed by the Board. Concerns over what it means regarding community impact included partnerships; collaboration; support; and fundraising. Other concerns and seeking of assurances over retaining the health provider options (affordably, accessible, and convenient, as well as having choices) that support the needs and desires of the campus community. For faculty, staff, and students, there is a need for a commitment to keeping out-of-pocket expenses from increasing, as well as assurance that the provider choices of employees remain in-network. Other concerns include branding implications; other costs that are to be determined; the presidential search and the priorities of the next president; the University of Kentucky's immediate vs. long-term plan, and retaining reasonable and independence of choice regarding partnerships and health care providers.
- Discussions were serious and strong opinions were presented. The governor-appointed regents' terms expire on July 1. Two new board members were sworn in at this meeting.

The procedure was different. The Chair of the Board of Regents knew where everyone stood and made sure everyone had a chance to speak. Much of the debate went on before the meeting.

- Chair Hudepohl said she will post links related to this issue on the Senate website.
- Liz Sturgeon said that with health insurance, employees were told they could use whoever they want, but they will need to pay more. Tony Glisson did not think there will be a significant change. Regent Burch suggested sending this on to the Benefits Committee and the Budget Committee.
- Chair Hudepohl stated that she advocates a resolution/statement about this decision, and added that it is clear that there is no working together.
- Matthew Shake said that there is no choice. There are different tiers of providers. In doing so, physicians are pressured to join their network. Graves Gilbert would not do this. The costs were almost double to continue with those out of network. He has personal experience with this strategy of isolating/pressuring physicians to join the network. \$22 million is a drop in the bucket for the long-term. It is a great deal for the Medical Center.
- Regent Burch said that in all her years of higher education, she has never seen such rigorous discussion on this campus. She suggested being forthright with concerns with what we want to protect with health care.
- Molly Kerby and Chair Hudepohl discussed the Preston Center.
- Regent Burch said it is important that we ensure that we don't give up what is important to us on campus.
- Marko Dumančić stated that the current health care is a pay cut. He said this new project is like last year's Confucius Institute building agreement; it is déjà vu. Chair Hudepohl said that the Advisory Board for the Confucius Institute had no traction. She suggested talking about it and letting people know what is going on.
- Regent Burch said that the transcription of the Board of Regents meeting will go on the website.
- Patricia Minter, former Faculty Regent and current Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, said "we absolutely need a public statement on this."
- Patricia Minter asked about the swearing in of the two new governor-appointed members of the Board of Regents. She asked "regarding both regents appointed by Governor Bevin, did the six-hour board training take place before being sworn in?" Regent Burch said that she does not know. Patricia Minter expressed concern that they [the two new regents] were not part of the closed session. Regent Burch said that they were copied in the emails.
- Matthew Shake said that Greenview is good for orthopedics, so this new deal positions the Medical Center very well in a competitive economic environment. In the long term, the Medical Center will squeeze out Graves Gilbert and Greenview and will ultimately incur higher costs. Sam Kim said something about competitive choices.
- Regent Burch said that the Faculty Regent, the Staff Regent, the Student Regent, and John Ridley voted "no." Phillip Bale abstained from voting due to a conflict of interest but was strongly and vocally against it. Gil Johnson, Frederick Higdon, Julie Henson, David Porter, Cynthia Harris, and Jason McKinney voted for it. Of the six who voted in favor of it, four were existing regents and two were new. There had to be six votes of yes as a minimum in order for it to pass.

- Chair Hudpohl said that she will put more in writing regarding this.

## **2. Academic Affairs (Provost Lee)**

- Enrollment is just under flat. We are down 200 or so from last year, and this is concentrated in sophomores. In terms of what defines a sophomore, some have twelve hours of dual credit, and some become sophomores in the second semester of their freshman year. The university will be addressing retention.
- There are forty-five new faculty hires. The staffing plan phase one is underway, and Provost Lee will meet with the Deans about it. Last year, we took a significant blow with Phase Two staffing; Provost Lee cannot promise that this will not happen again.
- Provost Lee said that he is optimistic about enrollment.
- It is the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the creation of the Faculty Senate. This was an enormous step in faculty governance. 1977 was the first year that the Senate was in operation.
- Over the summer, there was a long discussion about changes to the continuance process. The SEC voted narrowly to support these changes. The University Senate approved it by only one vote. This has the impact of every tenured faculty member, and he suggested that we should look for something that will have the broader support of the Senate. It impacts every tenure eligible faculty member.
- Regent Burch asked if we are really down sophomores. Provost Lee said he thinks we need a new label; he said the tendency is to think once people get to 25-50 hours, students need to be more addressed. Maybe we are taking too much for granted. Molly Kerby asked if all have started here as freshmen. Provost Lee said he is working on a report on this now to get a stronger sense of how to act next.

## **G. Old Business**

1. Reminder: All items posted under “New Business” at May 2016 Senate will be included on the September 15, 2016 Senate agenda (call of quorum ended May meeting early)

## **H. New Business**

### **1. Policy 1.2250, 4.2250 Guidelines on J-1 Visiting Scholars**

#### **a. Draft of new policy showing changes from HR policy**

- Amber Scott Belt gave the context of the Policy. The state department instituted a proficiency for Visiting Scholars. This outlines the HR policy and marries them as a joint Academic Affairs policy. It speaks to J-1 Visiting Scholars. It needed to go into effect in June or July and was completed over the summer. It brings us back to government regulations. It has already been approved out of order to become compliant with Federal law.
- A motion by Molly Kerby to endorse Policy 1.2250, 4.2250 Guidelines on J-1 Visiting Scholars was seconded by Marko Marko Dumančić. Policy 1.2250, 4.2250 Guidelines on J-1 Visiting Scholars passed unanimously.

## **I. New Business from the Floor**

1. Patricia Minter brought new business to the floor. She said that it is “old business coming back around” and passed out a handout for members of the SEC to review. She said that in Spring 2015, the University Senate brought this forward to amend the statement on equal treatment of students. It was amended at the meeting to include “sexual orientation and gender identity.” It was approved by the Senate, by Provost Emslie, and by the President. Then it was posted on the website. The Campus Pride Committee recently discovered that this was no longer posted. Patricia Minter thanked Amber Scott Belt for her 36 pages of background. The policy went up. Deborah Wilkins held that it is in conflict with another policy that has a zero on it. The zero policy supersedes it and voids it. The Campus Pride Committee was unhappy and decided to send it back to Senate to once again approve a more inclusive definition of gender identity. Amber Scott Belt said that the university policy supersedes it; it was an error on behalf of Academic Affairs that they failed to take it off the website. Academic Council cannot act on this because the zero policy nulls it. Patricia Minter said that amending the zero policy on the spot could have fixed this; or it could have been communicated back to the body. It would be a modified policy to the zero policy, and would ask that the zero policy be amended to reflect this change. She said it might need to take the form of a resolution. Policy 1.3002 was removed because that policy is superseded by the zero policy. Patricia Minter added that this falls under Title IX compliance. Policy 0.2040 deals with Discrimination and Harassment. Patricia Minter is asking that the University Senate once again approve the Policy 1.3002 and amend the Policy 0.2040. The motion is for President Ransdell to amend Policy 0.2040 Discrimination and Harassment to allow the incorporation of the Senate Policy 1.3002 as approved in May 2015 by the University Senate, going through as a reference point for all members of the university campus “gender identity expression”. Molly Kerby asked if we need to pass it again. Amber Scott Belt said “no” because the zero policy will make it compliant. Liz Sturgeon made a motion for this new business to go forward to the University Senate to request that President Ransdell amend Policy 0.2040 to incorporate the language in Policy 1.3002. The motion was seconded by Patricia Minter. The motion passed unanimously. It will go forward to Senate. Patricia Minter said she will work on a one-page summary to get the Senate up to speed.

## **J. Information Items**

1. Reminder: All items posted under “New Business” at May 2016 Senate will be included on the September 15, 2016 Senate agenda (call of quorum ended May meeting early)

## **J. Motion to Adjourn**

1. A motion to adjourn by Marko Dumančić was seconded by Molly Kerby.
2. The meeting adjourned at 5:42 P.M.

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**Heidi Álvarez, Secretary**