

Western Kentucky University
University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting
January 9, 2017 -- 3:15 p.m.
WAB 227 - AA Large Conference Room

A. Call To Order

1. A regular meeting of the Western Kentucky University University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Kate Hudepohl on Monday, January 9, 2017 at 3:23 P.M. in the Wetherby AA Large Conference Room.
2. A quorum was present:
Heidi Álvarez, Amber Scott Bell, Susann Davis, Marko Dumančić, Claus Ernst, Ann Ferrell, Kate Hudepohl, Molly Kerby, David Lee, Richard C. Miller, Julie Shadoan, Matt Shake, Sandy Staebell for Laura DeLancey, Liz Sturgeon, Shannon Vaughan.

B. Approve November 28, 2016 SEC Meeting Minutes

1. A motion by to approve the November 28, 2016 Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes by Marko Dumančić was seconded by Molly Kerby.
2. There was no discussion.
3. The November 28, 2016 Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously.

C. Officer Reports

1. Chair (Kate Hudepohl)

a. Senate Budget:

- Chair Hudepohl previously gave a handout with a long, complicated senate budget.
- Chair Hudepohl met with LaDonna Hunton and gave a handout of last year's budget along with this year's budget. Chair Hudepohl digested it and will double check a few things in italics.
- The incoming money is the same for both years, but last year had more expenses.
- Going forward, the Chairs and Vice Chairs (Senate Chair and Vice Chair, plus Chairs of Committees) should get a thumb drive and copies of Sturgis. That edition of Sturgis is the "newer one."
- Acrobat Pro will be a repeated purchase, but some are not (ie. Sturgis). The tea and coffee service is a large purchase.

- Copying has now gotten transferred to the Senate budget (it is no longer covered by the department).
 - The UCC Recorder: a large part of the salary is fringes and benefits.
 - Only \$700 was left last year after these expenses.
 - Carry forward was an estimate from last year.
 - LaDonna walked through more complicated budget sheets; the carry forward is broken into parts (3 or 4 disbursements per year – more is released throughout the year).
 - The recorder job was someone out of Academic Affairs.
 - Chair Hudepohl asked if there were any questions. The numbers on this sheet may change a little by the end of the January senate meeting.
- b. Social Media Policy
- Chair Hudepohl said that she does have a few questions for Provost Lee about the Social Media Policy.
 - There was some information about this in the Herald, and several are concerned about what it means.
 - Four or five years ago, it was something about what we put on Facebook.
- c. University Budget
- There is a substantial shortfall in academic affairs and Chair Hudepohl has some questions about that for Dr. Lee (see Provost Report below).

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

3. Secretary (Heidi Alvarez): No Report.

D. Committee Chair Reports

1. Academic Quality Committee (Ann Ferrell): No Report

2. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee (Patti Minter): Report posted

a. Policy 1.1013 Consensual Relations Between Faculty and Students

- Patti Minter is in England for a Study Abroad. Lauren McClain is filling in for her.
- Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility Committee Report. The motion was seconded by Lauren McClain.
- The main changes in the Policy 1.1013 Consensual Relations were highlighted: In Section 1, the 3rd line was changed “expressly prohibited” later in the policy, it says “need to be reported immediately to supervisor”; in Part 1, “expressly prohibited” was changed to

“strongly discouraged.” This was mirrored in Part 2. The correct version was posted today.

- Molly Kerby made a motion to approve Policy 1.1013. The motion was seconded by Andrea Jenkins.
- The original wording was discouraged, then changed to expressly prohibited, then changed to strongly discouraged. Other points were also edited. The point in adding pre-existing relationships because of those who have spouses or other types of qualifying relationships that need to be disclosed.
- Julie Shadoan wants to know what the change was; she wants to know what changed in the discussion that put strongly discouraged back in. She agrees that it should be “expressly prohibited” and thinks it should be consistent. But she likes the stronger language.
- Lauren McClain said that there was a discussion that zero tolerance might not allow for wiggle room. This allows leeway in handling situations and is not a one-size-fits all.
- In the blue part, can it be taken out or be consistent with “strongly discouraged”? Several on the committee felt there could not be an absolute because they knew people in their department who had conflicts.
- The HR policy says that the university “prohibits” relatives of employees who might be hired where one might use influence over... it uses the word “prohibit.”
- Lauren McClain said she doesn’t know if that policy is what they referred to.
- Amber Scott Belt referenced the definition of “otherwise qualified dependent” Policy 4.2302 Employment of Relatives. It defines what those relationships are. It requires disclosing to the dean and giving an alternate arrangement. It says the university needs to be aware to protect the faculty member.
- Chair Hudepohl asked if the Administrative Council will pass the language “strongly discouraged.”
- Amber Scott Belt said that they did already approve the language “strongly discouraged.”
- In blue, the second line, remove the “expressly prohibited” language to be consistent.
- Claus Ernst said he does not see any reason to remove it.
- Lauren McClain said if it is a pre-existing relationship, it needs to be handled, because they are subject to the same reporting requirements.
- Chair Hudepohl asked if we need a friendly amendment to make the blue paragraph “preexisting relationships are subject to...” This takes out the “expressly prohibited.”
- There was no more discussion of Policy 1.1013 Consensual Relations.
- Policy 1.1013 passed, with two opposed and one abstention.

3. Budget and Finance Committee (Claus Ernst): Report posted

- Claus Ernst brought forth an idea that the Budget and Finance Committee is kicking around; it is not an action item. The goal is discussion and it will become more formalized next time.
- The discussion was centered around compensation of those leading offices in Senate. This will become a proposal.
- \$6000 is in the Senate budget. It pays for beverages and the recorder, with next to nothing left over.
- The proposal is (1) to formally give course release or a stipend for work; and (2) a designated person to pay for the website running, collecting curricular policies; it is in the very least a half-time position.
- The Curriculum Committee chairs sent a summary of their duties. Chair Hudepohl sent the summary to Provost Lee. This is adding to the conversation we have already had.
- Provost Lee said he has read it but does not have anything specific yet. He hopes to have a response soon.
- The Chair has a very heavy workload and the standing committees also have heavy workloads; especially the UCC, Colonnade, and Graduate Council.
- Lauren McClain said there are seen standing committees – what is the rationale for only two?
- Chair Hudepohl said that those two have the most amount of work. Service is part of our job; but these two go above and beyond.
- Chair Hudepohl added that the Faculty Regent cannot be compensated because of state law.
- Claus Ernst said he is not opposed to adding Colonnade but perhaps this will die down. Those represented faculty in political interests, and some are for the curricular process at the university. The report is reimbursed in the budget – people do it voluntarily. The loose agreement on a course release but doesn't know it is in writing. Ernst feels it should be formalized and compensated – it is the right thing to do. In some situations, faculty members cannot be replaced and can get a stipend.
- Provost Lee said that the expense can be reimbursed by the college.
- Claus Ernst suggested making it to the equivalent of a summer course.
- Kate Hudepohl and Molly Kerby said that \$3000 is an overload amount during the semester.
- Claus Ernst stated that similar negotiations went on when the Senate was founded.
- Shannon Vaughan said that in the Graduate Council, taking over the Graduate Curriculum Committee is a huge job. A stipend or course release would be great. The staff support is also very important because of the time and because of the expertise needed. Having a consistent person is important.
- Chair Hudepohl said that the Graduate Council Chair and the Graduate Curriculum Chair is two people.

- Shannon Vaughan said that continuity and requisite skills/expertise are important.
- Molly Kerby said that having one consistent person to do the websites is important. How will we proceed?
- Chair Hudepohl brought this up with Dr. Lee last spring.
- Claus Ernst said that he can either (1) leave the document with the Provost; or (2) make a formal proposal for vote.
- Molly Kerby said that if we do a formal proposal, we should put a price tag on it.
- Chair Hudepohl suggested adding the Graduate Council Curriculum part and clean it up to have a better sense of administrative staff.
- Molly Kerby said she thinks there should be a formal proposal and a price tag.
- Chair Hudepohl said that all of this helps to give a sense of what the duties are and what it would entail.
- Molly Kerby said that #2 is a little harder to put a price tag on.
- Chair Hudepohl said that Academic Affairs already picks up Jessica Steenbergen's job and she does the Senate website. This is very helpful. This is another hidden cost.
- Julie Shadoan asked what Jessica Steenbergen's stipend is.
- Her stipend and UCC would be removed. Julie Shadoan asked for this number.
- In the request for chairs, Shadoan would like to see this list.
- Chair Hudepohl said that we also have to recognize that the institution is in a bad position financially.
- Would this person be brought in at the Office Associate level?
- Claus Ernst said the person needs to be independent, and savvy to maintain a website. He believes it should be at that level, if not higher. He does not see a reason to cut it back.
- Richard Miller said that \$4,800 is the summer stipend amount.
- Chair Hudepohl said that how much they pick up will affect #1, and how many course releases (if any).
- Provost Lee said he cannot stretch to six figures, but we can come up with something and cobble some things together. This is very helpful.
- Chair Hudepohl said she feels a formal statement in the record is important.
- Julie Shadoan made a motion for the benefits committee to bring back a proposal supporting leadership of the senate, either in the form of a stipend of a course release, to include consideration and to incorporate a possibility of a full-time staff position (or higher) as well.
- The motion was seconded by Heidi Álvarez.
- There was no further discussion. The motion passed.
- Chair Hudepohl will send a copy of the motion to Claus Ernst.
- Claus Ernst said that it will not be ready by the February meeting, and Dr. Lee might have something to say before then.
- Jessica Steenbergen is paid \$4800; it is \$400 a month over 12 months. It is paid through Academic Affairs. Shirley Jones (UCC) is paid \$1752, and the

total is spread over 9 months. The \$1752 is just her compensation and not her fringes; this is probably not the total total.

4. Colonnade General Education Committee (Marko Dumančić): Report posted

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

5. Graduate Council (Shannon Vaughan): Report Posted

- Shannon Vaughan submitted the Graduate Council report for consideration (2nd Molly Kerby).
- There was no discussion.
- The report was approved unanimously as posted by Graduate Faculty only and stands approved as posted.

6. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (Liz Sturgeon): Report Posted

- Liz Sturgeon submitted the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report for approval.
- At the end of the report, there is a proposal to create a new course -- this is a new form that the committee worked on this fall. It is at the very end of the report, p. 46, section 4.
- The main thing is that this is the new process for incorporating new colonnade courses. New courses go through Colonnade Committee first and then they go through UCC after that.
- The other is that if you go to p. 39. At the last UCC meeting there was heated debate over SUS 110. It is a course similar to the course Pam Petty teaches. After much debate, the committee voted to accept the course. There will be heated debate at the next senate meeting. The problem is that the literacy program is nationally known. The concern is over creating something similar to 199; 199c was concerning. Chair Hudepohl's understanding is that this fills the gap that Literacy 199 is not addressing. Liz Sturgeon said that this is a heads up that there might be extended discussion in January.
- Provost Lee added an annotation: he was quoted as being enthusiastic. He met with Merrell Price and Dawn Hall about the course and is receptive to a possibility. He feels curriculum is a faculty matter and does not want to get that involved. He thinks if there is a gap, it needs to be addressed, and he hopes we can come up with something that addresses curricular needs.
- There was no more discussion.
- The report was approved unanimously as posted.

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

8. Ad Hoc Committee of Senate Charter Revisions: Draft Posted

- There was a point on the November Senate floor that in doing the math on helping smaller colleges and libraries, it hugely increases the number on senate and would make it dysfunctional.
- This change would be allowing smaller colleges to have at-large senators serve on the standing committees; they would have special spots on the standing committees. Upping the % to 11% was changed back to 10%. The yellow highlights clarify the special spot that is reserved; it is a special at-large position; they are not a senator. Any faculty member can serve on the standing committee and would have voting rights on that committee but not on senate. This gets around increasing the senate numbers but addresses the representation on the committees.
- Marko Dumančić said that the next line says at large senators are voting member on senate.
- Chair Hudepohl agreed that the language is confusing.
- Vice Chair Shadoan suggested calling it something different.
- Molly Kerby said that in the yellow part, it can say “is not considered and at-large position.”
- Sandy Staebell said that for Special Collections, people were not in favor of the previous change, but this will be supported by the libraries as a whole.
- Molly Kerby asked if we should clarify that they cannot be chairs of standing committees.
- Chair Hudepohl said we would want to find that section and make the language parallel.
- Lauren McClain said that the language “at large” is confusing.
- Chair Hudepohl said that the last sentence of the yellow highlight summarizes Lauren McClain’s point. Every college has a spot on standing committees. This allows for any faculty member to serve on the committee.
- Claus Ernst suggested putting this information on page 6, “Filling Standing Committees of Senate.” Before listing the standing committees, show how they would be made up.
- Thad Crews asked if they say how the committees are made up.
- Chair Hudepohl said that every committee has a slightly different makeup and populates its committee in different ways.
- Susann Davis said that this area we are talking about starts on page 14 and goes on to page 15. It is point 5.
- Thad Crews asked if it would become #5 and #5 becomes #6? Chair Hudepohl responded “yes”. The highlighted section will be lifted. Take out “under this formula” and move down to page 15 as #5.
- Liz Sturgeon asked if these are historically the same.

- Julie Shadoan said that Gordon Ford used to be; and is not now. University College and University Libraries are. It fluctuates from year to year depending on the number of faculty.
- There was a third change – dates of election. The changes were reiterated, then the motion. The yellow highlighted part in 2A4 minus “Under this formula” was moved to p. 14 and make it #5. Then #5 becomes #6.
- Molly Kerby made a motion for Chair Hudepohl to make this change. The change was seconded by Heidi Álvarez. There was no more discussion.
- The motion passed unanimously.
- The first reading will be at the January Senate meeting.

E. Advisory Reports

1. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch) No report. Both Regents Burch and Richey are doing “super secret job stuff”.
2. Academic Affairs (Provost Lee)
 - Provost Lee said he has no information on enrollment for the winter term and the spring term and will give this information in February.
 - He is planning surgery #4 on his eyes.
 - Chair Hudepohl said that some people are concerned about a social media policy. There was an article in the paper that said the policy may be created or tightened. Provost Lee said that nothing is under active consideration that he knows of. He will look into it and will follow up.
 - Chair Hudepohl said that she heard there is a substantial shortfall in academic affairs. Provost Lee said that there is a tuition shortfall and it will impact the entire university. He is not ready to say what it will be for individual colleges. After the spring enrollment projections, he will comment on it. Provost Lee said that it is more than \$100,000. Marko Dumančić said that the word on the street is that it is around \$5 million. Provost Lee said that it could be \$4 or \$5 million, but he is not sure. We will hear more about this soon.
 - Molly Kerby said that if there is no social media policy at the university, how did someone get demoted? Provost Lee said he does not have a direct connection with that. It may be another issue.

F. Old Business:

- There was no old business.

G. New Business:

1. Policy 1.1303 Sabbatical Leave

- A motion by Molly Kerby to approve Policy 1.303 Sabbatical Leave was seconded by Susann Davis.

- Provost Lee said that the CV materials for the sabbatical review process are now added to the application. This seems like a sensible thing to do.
- Chair Hudepohl said that a department head contacted her and feels like it should come from Academic Affairs; because the committee for travel is comprised of multiple disciplines, it made it difficult to determine. Giving it to the sabbatical committee might not be that helpful.
- Claus Ernst asked how much a college committee can do in this process. People are so diverse, and we are not experts in their area. His criteria would be success in terms of their area (ie. publications) and asked if the college committee is the right place to make these decisions. If the department head say the sabbatical makes sense, he does not see how it is necessary to have a committee.
- Provost Lee said in looking for a balance between individual scholar and a committee of scholars, he feels there is value in explaining our work to one another. In explaining the overall game plan to the Board of Regents and why the university supports it, having multiple levels of review is of value to that conversation. With the department head to the dean, he would like to see an additional faculty voice in that. The role of the faculty in that group is important in showing that we take the applications seriously and they have a rigorous review.
- There was no more discussion.
- The motion passed.

2. Policy 1.1334 University Distinguished Professor

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse Policy 1.1334 University Distinguished Professor.
- The motion was seconded by Claus Ernst.
- Provost Lee said that last time we discussed “and collegial” – the deans were “jake” with that in 2A1D. This is the only change from the last time we saw it.
- Claus Ernst said that we had a discussion of Emeritus/Emerita. Amber is working on this.
- Ernst said that he appreciates moving collegiality and personally thinks it should be removed. Patti would have been opposed to it. He feels defining it is important.
- In adding 1D, looking at A, B, C – all departments have a familiar system in place. With 1D, the commitment to WKU through professional behaviors – departments will need to define this so people can submit evidence to illustrate this. He is not sure how this is different from service. He personally does not think it adds anything. The process begins with tenured faculty. Several University Distinguished Professors did not see why it needs to be added.
- Andrea Jenkins said that criteria in her department addresses D in terms of “organizational citizenship: 1. Collaboration and coordination; 2. Professional conduct; 3. Professional relationships.

- Julie Shadoan said that D is difficult to document.
- Chair Hudepohl said that the University Distinguished Professor is more than someone who has hit 1,2, and 3. D makes you articulate it.
- Provost Lee said it is more than a check the box kind of process. The Faculty Hand book requires evaluation of other areas – these additional dimensions – professional behaviors that promote the common good. This is more important in some departments than others. Professional collaboration is crucial. He used theatre and dance as an example.
- Richard Miller said that professional ethics are critically important. If activities are questionable from an ethical standpoint, it is important at this level.
- Thad Crews asked if there is a way to make “D” optional.
- Provost Lee said he is not sure; it’s either in or out.
- There was no additional discussion.
- Policy 1.1334 passed with a majority; there were 3 votes of no. The policy goes forward.

H. Information Items:

I. Motion To Adjourn

1. There was no new business from the floor.
2. A motion to adjourn by Marko was seconded by Sandy Staebell.
2. The meeting adjourned at 5:04 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Álvarez, Secretary