

**Western Kentucky University
University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting
November 28, 2016 -- 3:15 p.m.
WAB 227 - AA Large Conference Room**

A. Call To Order

1. A regular meeting of the Western Kentucky University Senate Executive Committee was called to order in WAB 227 by Chair Kate Hudepohl on Monday, November 28, 2016 at 3:20 P.M.
2. A quorum was present: Heidi Álvarez, Barbara Burch, Thad Crews, Susann Davis, Laura DeLancey, Marko Dumančić, Claus Ernst, Ann Ferrell, Kate Hudepohl, Andrea Jenkins, Molly Kerby, David Lee, Patricia Minter, Jay Todd Richey, Julie Shadoan, Matt Shake, and Liz Sturgeon.

B. Approve November 7, 2016 SEC Meeting Minutes

1. A motion to approve the November 7, 2016 meeting minutes by Patricia Minter was seconded by Liz Sturgeon.
2. There was no discussion.
3. The November 7, 2016 meeting minutes were approved unanimously as posted.

C. Officer Reports

1. Chair (Kate Hudepohl):

a. Senate Budget:

- Chair Hudepohl provided the Senate Executive Committee with a financial statement for the University Senate for the Fiscal Year 2016, and through November of Fiscal Year 2017. The spreadsheet was printed and give to each member of SEC.
- Chair Hudepohl will meet with LaDonna Hunton to go over the numbers.
- There are questions about rollover from year to year; it did not all seem to come back to Senate.
- The 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 expenses will be reported after Chair Hudepohl's meeting with LaDonna Hunton (this will occur in December or January).
- Last year's numbers were inherited from Margaret Crowder.
- For the UCC recorder, much of that money goes toward benefits.
- A copy of the Adobe software program will be needed for the next Chair.
- The thumb drive will pass to the next Chair.
- Printing costs -- \$70 will be shifted to Senate instead of the Department.

- Chair Hudepohl's understanding is the \$5800 is the annual amount. There is very little left after the UCC recorder, software, and printing.

b. Discussion on creating a new staff position for Standing Committees Recorder:

- Molly Kerby asked if there is hope that we can get the money for the Chairs of standing committees. Chair Hudepohl said the Chairs of the Curriculum Committees will assemble a summary list of their activities to get an idea. Making this workload more equitable is a priority for her. The Curriculum Committee Chairs are working on this. Chair Hudepohl will assemble this and give it to the Provost's Office.
- Liz Sturgeon added that we need to consider continuity from year to year; she thinks it needs to be at least a half-time job.
- Chair Hudepohl said that shadowing would also be helpful.
- Molly Kerby said that on Graduate Council, it is difficult to keep up with the minutes.
- Chair Hudepohl said that Graduate Council functions differently and it is hard to get a grasp of it. The larger community should know how to find the forms, processes, and information about their meetings. Academic Affairs knows it is a problem and is working hard to find the money.
- Marko Dumančić said that these committees meet at different times. That person could just go to all of them.
- Chair Hudepohl said that if the websites were uniform, it could also help.
- The list will be put together and will be sent to Academic Affairs by the end of the week. Conversation about this will continue into January. A summary report will be given to Senate.

c. Charter Revision

- The charter revision is set to move forward. The first reading was at the November Senate Executive Committee meeting. The second reading is set for the December Senate meeting.
- Vice Chair Shadoan issued a handout regarding the At Large Senator Elections and the pending charter change.
- At the November University Senate meeting, a senator asked a question about total numbers in the university senate. It is about equity and fairness of workload regarding the number of senators in proportion to the number of committees. There are seven committees plus graduate council. The total number of departments and at large senators shows that every college should have at least six. The numbers are based on the numbers from the last at-large election. In terms of the senator's question of how big it will make the University Senate, the rough estimate is from 70 to 100; we are increasing it from 70 to 100. Six in libraries takes it to 22% (see page 3 of handout). Chair Hudepohl said she underestimated the number of standing committees. There are seven, but we don't count Graduate Council; the number is based on six. In raising the library up to five, $27 \times 11\%$ is three; by six is 22%. We currently have 72 senators; the growth number will be 100. Part of the 72 is

the current at-large. The number of new senators next year, including At Large, would be 100 more. Chair Hudepohl said 9 At Large to 26 At Large, and 12 Departmental. Vice Chair Shadoan said that 148 would be the new total. The intent of At Large is proportional representation. Laura DeLancey made a few points, stating that the problem is that we would never have quorum and there is not a room this big. There were a few proposed solutions:

- Option #1 is to take this out of the charter reading completely.
- Option #2 is to make it not mandatory that everyone be represented on each committee.
- Option #3 is to have three At-Large spaces on standing committees. These spots can be reserved. The cannot chair a committee but can be on a committee.
- Patricia Minter said that Laura DeLancey's point is good. If there are no relievers, than it solves nothing. If it does not solve the problem, and we don't have willing people, then maybe it should not be done proportionally. Perhaps three can be added; add plus three across the board.
- Molly Kerby said she thought three across the board was what we were doing.
- Laura DeLancey said this works because we will have more to tap. We are still adding 21 people.
- Claus Ernst asked what is the percentage of people we want to have in general? He said he thinks 10% is good. Suppose we add 21 more people? What does it add to the functionality of senate? He stated that he is in favor of discarding proportionality. Up to 10% or at least as many for each standing committee is what he suggested. He suggested a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 10%.
- Patricia Minter said that this throws the proportion off. She thinks this is not equitable and not passable. If we are going to make a change, we want it to pass.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said that we are maintaining a voice.
- Patricia Minter said the proportion issue is inequitable.
- Claus Ernst said there still will be an inequity; there is a lot of problem of organization. It calls for a reorganization. Small colleges are what create the problem.
- Patricia Minter said that these discussions are important, but we want to emphasize faculty unity.
- Regent Burch said she has lost sight of why we are doing it; the faculty want a more meaningful opportunity in shared governance. It's not just size in department; do we want more people to fill a slot or do we want people to be more meaningfully engaged? It is the process. Bigger might require more structure. The answer might not be in the numbers.
- Laura DeLancey asked if instead of overall size, can these senators serve on the Curriculum Committee but not on Senate? The libraries keep 3 senators but have 3 others who serve on the small committees only.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said the problem is getting the reports up the channel; she would be concerned about information flow.

- Patricia Minter said that we could allow colleges to have three non-senators to put on committees. This would be part of the caucus and the vice-chair's job. This would allow the other three spots to be filled by non-senators.
- Chair Hudepohl asked the Senate Executive Committee if this is a good solution – allowing members of smaller colleges to have De Facto at-large positions on those committees.
- Patricia Minter suggested that colleges with not enough representation may add an at large member to the committee so every college has a member of that committee. This individual could not vote on Senate and could not chair the committee.
- Chair Hudepohl said maybe we can look at this because it keeps the numbers down.
- Claus Ernst said that up to 10% is also a good solution; it would only add a small number.
- Laura DeLancey said she prefers to have it proportional.
- Patricia Minter said it solves the problem and does not throw the proportionality out.
- Chair Hudepohl asked if we should work on the language and discuss it in the January Senate Executive Committee meeting.
- Laura DeLancey will be copied on it because it was her idea.
- The Charter will not go forward in December as originally planned.
- Patricia Minter suggested pulling of the representation piece and doing a second reading so the other items can go forward. Claus Ernst stated that he thinks we should pass it as a whole. Patricia Minter said we will have to withdraw the whole thing and start over again, and said that charter changes can happen in pieces.
- **Patricia Minter made a formal motion to withdraw the proposed charter changes before the second reading in order to make one change regarding representation for all colleges and libraries in order to have sufficient representation for standing committees.**
- **The motion was seconded by Claus Ernst.**
- **The motion passed. There will not be a second reading of the Charter in December and is withdrawn from further Senate consideration at this time.**

Senate Statement on Tolerance/Inclusivity on Campus:

- There were comments on the side about whether senate feels it can/should say anything about tolerance/inclusivity on campus. There have been comments from colleagues who are unhappy about the belated response from the administration.
- Chair Hudepohl asked if the University Senate wants to make a statement. She is curious about whether the Senate Executive Committee feels we should act on this.
- Patricia Minter said she has many thoughts on this; she was on a panel discussion on campus. 150 people were present, including President Ransdell

and Lynn Holland (the Dean of Students). Patricia Minter attended as a representative of ACLU. James Line from SGA was there, among others. The panel discussion lasted for 2.5 hours. The response from students of color was related to xenophobia and acts of violence toward students of color. The Police Chief was not there. There was a ten-minute call out to President Ransdell and Lynn Holland. It was done politely and framed in history and civil rights. The University's response was inadequate. President Ransdell was shouted out. Lynn Holland invited a one-on-one conversation. The students said they wanted a response now.

- Patricia Minter said she is happy to draft a hard-hitting response; otherwise, we need to stay silent.
- Jay Todd Richey said that the Student Government Association would want to cosign the letter. People of color have given numerous reports that there is a distrust of the police. The Student Government Association responded with the Safe Walk to make students feel welcome on campus. Students would appreciate comments from their professors and would like professors to define what safe space means.
- Chair Hudepohl said she realized it is more widespread. Title IX took away our ability to talk about it.
- Marko Dumančić said that it is the morally right thing to do. He feels it is important to let our new president know what kind of campus the faculty want it to be.
- Chair Hudepohl added that having different groups to celebrate and letting it be in the paper is important. She said that maybe we can make a list of suggestions.
- Molly Kerby asked what our statement would look like.
- Patricia Minter said that people want a strong statement. Students were very direct; they want us to have people thrown out and arrested. Nothing less should be expected; they want those who commit acts of violence against minorities to be thrown out.
- Molly Kerby said some were threatened and some saw it as anti-white.
- Claus Ernst suggested an amendment proposal to the syllabus related to gender/misconduct; racial discrimination of any kind is unacceptable.
- Patricia Minter said that we need to have a policy to back this up. It is a good time to do this now and to have it ready for January.
- Chair Hudepohl asked besides a syllabus statement, what are some concrete things are that we can do to promote tolerance and exclusivity?
- Patricia Minter said that students want action and the faculty should stand in solidarity with the students. We are calling on the university to rise to the occasion.
- Jay Todd Richey said that there are resources for Black Lives Matter on the website.
- Marko Dumančić said that it has to be the students' movement and it is their time. We want them to know the faculty support them.
- Patricia Minter said that the students want action; they want more than being nice.

- Andrea Jenkins asked if there is more power in the senate giving a language and allowing the faculty to choose to put it in their syllabus?
- Laura DeLancey agreed. DeLancey asked if this is something we need to address to the students or do we need to target the administration?
- Patricia Minter said that it is two-fold and have to be compliant with Federal law. We call upon the administration and also support the students.
- Jay Todd Richey's statement was written with President Ransdell.
- Chair Hudepohl said she agrees that we need to keep the ball rolling.
- **Heidi Álvarez made a motion for Patricia Minter to draft a preliminary statement for the University Senate to consider endorsing that embraces the discussion. The motion was seconded by Ann Ferrell.**
- **Heidi Álvarez accepted a friendly amendment by Jay Todd Richey that the University Senate collaborate with the Student Government Association on this statement.**
- Thad Crews suggested considering a syllabus statement that is different but not required.
- Chair Hudepohl said she wants this to be a working draft that the Senate Executive Committee gives input on.
- **The motion with friendly amendment for Patricia Minter to work on a preliminary statement in conjunction with the Student Government Association for Senate to consider and endorse regarding the current campus climate passed unanimously.**

2. Vice Chair (Julie Shadoan):

a. elections

- Vice Chair Shadoan sent two more emails to finalize populating senate and or university committees. There were nine names for the Benefits Committee that will go forward to President Ransdell. The Faculty Mentoring Committee needs representatives for Ogden and Gordon Ford. FUSE needs a representative from Gordon Ford.

3. Secretary (Heidi Álvarez): 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. Proposal for Syllabi Statement

- Patricia Minter said that she is sorry it took something like the OSU event to show that we need the Active Shooter Training. The New York Times and Twitter followed it today; students stacked desks against the door. Building-specific trainings are very important. Minter stated that she is increasingly frustrated that real problems on this campus are not addressed when we need them.
- She said that the broken link to Title IX will be fixed on the syllabus statement.
- The website is not ready to go; she is not sure if it is what the committee wants it to say. She feels it is important that every student know about this.
- **Patricia Minter made a motion for approval of the Syllabus Policy.**
- **The motion was seconded by Laura DeLancey.**
- Provost Lee asked about the different typeface; is it all of it down the page?
- Patricia Minter said that it starts at WKU and goes to the bottom of the page. There will be a Title IX website link there as well.
- Chair Hudepohl asked why it did not come through on the policy on change to syllabi.
- Patricia Minter said that the Title IX team brought two things to the Faculty Welfare Committee and this was one of them. This one is ready to go. It would be mandatory for faculty.
- Laura DeLancey said it would need to be added into Policy 1.4060.
- Provost Lee said it would be endorsing the addition of this.
- Chair Hudepohl said she agrees that if it passes, it will need to be added to the policy.
- Molly Kerby said it is from 2011.
- Susann Davis said she understands this and does not understand why it has to be on the syllabus.
- Patricia Minter responded that it is Federal law. The language is not negotiable.
- Provost Lee said are you skin gif the syllabus is the best way to get this information out?
- Marko Dumančić said he feels the faculty should be trained in how to address this issue with students when going over it with students.
- Patricia Minter said they want a real training; we want something meaningful. The collaboration will continue.
- **The motion to approve the syllabus policy passed unanimously.**

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

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

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

- Molly Kerby presented the November Graduate Council report for approval (Shannon Vaughan was absent.).
- The November Graduate Council report passed unanimously.

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

- Liz Sturgeon made a motion for endorsement of the November Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report.
- Chair Hudepohl asked if anything was done about the summer one-time only course.
- The November Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report passed unanimously.

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

8. Ad Hoc Committee of Senate Charter Revisions: No Report

E. Advisory Reports

a. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch)

- The Presidential Search Committee has had a good pool of applicants and candidates. A lot of people are out there looking. Finalists will be determined by January. The Board of Regents will be meeting with the Administrative Council. This is unprecedented. They will inform the Search Committee about what they think is important going forward.
- Claus Ernst asked what happened to the resolution on the open search.
- Regent Burch said the reason given for it not being open was a fear of losing candidates. She thinks it will get discussed and it has not yet been determined on whether or not it will be an open search.

b. Academic Affairs (Provost Lee)

- Provost Lee said that it has been ten days since his last report; the university was only in session for three of those days.
- He is working on the Graduate Dean search process.
- Someone asked how his Thanksgiving speech went; he responded that there were fifty extra people there, so he gave a short ten-minute summary of the history. Most listeners were not completely there.
- Marko Dumančić asked if we have a sense of the new state funding and budget allocation for January. Provost Lee responded that the committee had its last meeting in Frankfort today and its report is due December 1. Then it will go to the General Assembly in the Spring. Whatever came out of today is probably what we will have to work on.

F. Old Business:

There was no old business.

G. New Business:

1. Policy 1.1034 Emeritus Status

- **Molly Kerby made a motion to approve Policy 1.1034 Emeritus Status.**
- **The motion was seconded by Marko Dumančić.**
- Provost Lee said this officially establishes an emeritus title of university distinguished professor. It creates a designation on an official basis.
- Molly Kerby asked if we still go by gender (emeritus and emerita).
- Provost Lee responded ye, but he is willing to reconsider this.
- Regent Burch said she also wondered about this.
- Amber Scott Belt said we can pull it.
- Provost Lee said he is game to look at this; the board is conferring “emerita.”
- Amber Scott Belt said that “emeritus” designates a retired professor.
- Marko Dumančić said it is not neutral; it is masculine.
- Provost Lee said that we will come back and look at a more comprehensive fix on this.
- **Policy 1.1034 was approved unanimously.**

2. Policy 1.1334 University Distinguished Professor

- **Claus Ernst made a motion to approve Policy 1.1334 University Distinguished Professor.**
- **The motion was seconded by Marko Dumančić.**
- Provost Lee said that 2a policy eligibility D, there are many dimensions under which people are evaluated for performance. Under B, terms of appointment, the record goes to the Board of Regents instead of the department. This is a change that says the department has to act on this before going to the Board. Under C, 5-year phase active member, the passages in yellow clarify this.
- Regent Burch clarified that conferring at the department level will happen before it goes to the Board of Regents.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said that 2A1C reads certain newly-created faculty would be ineligible because they do not have research/creative activity. Provost Lee said that it probably needs to be revisited.
- Regent Burch said that people are judged on more than what they do for tenure; they are only two per year and it is competitive.
- Vice Chair Shadoan said that ranks and tenure and promotion being created in which they cannot be considered for other things is a problem. Provost Lee said he is willing to look at this and thinks it is not an immediate concern.
- Matt Shake said he wondered by 2A1D is being added. How is collegiality measured? There needs to be an objective way to measure it. Collegiality cannot be empirically measured. Intuition about what constitutes collegiality is not always correct. The AAUP put out a statement earlier this year opposing collegiality as criterial. He then shared this information with the SEC:

- the AAUP statement opposing the use of collegiality as a criteria in evaluating faculty: <https://www.aaup.org/report/collegiality-criterion-faculty-evaluation>
- In response to the AAUP, one research paper that makes an attempt, using item analysis, to develop an objective measure of collegiality (which Shake stated that he personally found this document to have both strengths and weaknesses): <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ976454.pdf>
- He shared these links in order to give some context into the increasing push from administrators at many universities to add “collegiality” as an evaluative criterion. Debates about the viability of collegiality as a tool for measuring faculty performance have resulted in lawsuits at some universities, particularly in cases where there is a belief that “collegiality” has been used to exclude people on the basis of being different than some social norm.
- His point was that if we add that criteria, it is important to show how it is measured. He is not sure what 2A1D adds.
- Provost Lee said that several tenure documents include collegiality (but not all). If someone makes it to Full Professor, then it is presumed this process is already being done here. He understands that a collegiality index or score is important.
- Liz Sturgeon said that this index exists in Nursing.
- Matt Shake said he is happy to pass one around. There have been some that have been attempted. Four in his department are opposed to adding 2A1D because of the AAUP concerns; they feel it can be misused and feel it can be rejected.
- Regent Burch thinks it has always been there and sees it in a different way, as evidence through behaviors that promote the common good. She thinks a University Distinguished Professor needs to be about more than self.
- Laura DeLancey said she feels collegiality get used against people and has also been used against people for “fit.” She feels it works against women and minorities. She would like to move away from it in general.
- Chair Hudepohl is more concerned about it in the tenure and promotion document than this.
- Matt Shake said that AAUP revised its statement this year and advised against using it to evaluate faculty in general. Many units do not use it objectively. He would like collegiality to be more defined.
- Provost Lee said we are all condemned to live together; this means tenured faculty are together for thirty years. Finding ways to work together is important.
- Susann Davis asked if a friendly rewording professional “contributions” would work (this takes out collegiality). Provost Lee suggested voting on it.
- Chair Hudepohl said that Susann Davis would need to make a motion within a motion.
- Claus Ernst said that going on record with this means only what you do within the discipline matters. That does not look good for the university. He said that he does not object to whether this criteria is there or not there, because the work itself does not go away. There are instances where there does not have to be hard core research, but he thinks if someone uses it (collegiality) to make a decision, as far as he is concerned, that can be dropped.

- Matt Shake asked how do you document 2A1D in a portfolio and how does someone on the committee evaluate it? How is this factored in?
- Marko Dumančić said that as Claus said, people will examine it based on their own vague standards in their discipline. Components in other categories are equally vague.
- Regent Burch said whether or not you think 2A1D is important, it is a painful process to select. Everything in A, B, and C is looked at, but if someone has a sustained record but those who bad mouth others would not make it that far. The intangibles are what influence the committee vote because everyone is that good who goes up. Regent Burch argues to keep it because it is the very highest honor; a person who is good at all things that define a professor but has something more. If you had a choice, you would pick the one who is professional and collegial; in defining it, you know it when you see it. Regent Burch thinks it is important and it is a university honor.
- Matt Shake said that as a psychologist, collegiality is a vague term. We need to have indicators.
- Are we OK with professional behaviors? This is going on what AAUP says. To leave it as is reinforces this criteria.
- **Susann Davis made a motion to amend, striking “and collegial” from 2A1D.**
- **The motion was seconded by Liz Sturgeon.**
- **The motion passed.**
- This action does not change the text.
- **Provost Lee said he can either accept it as a friendly amendment or not accept it. He has the ability to withdraw it and take it back to CAD.**
- Provost Lee urges that a stampede to avoid collegiality on this campus could be detrimental. He realizes the potential for abuse, and thinks that collegiality needs to be considered. He stated that collegiality will not be the same in every department. There are ways some people need to work together. It is complicated.
- Chair Hudepohl said that we need to vote to make it official. Provost Lee cannot withdraw it because a motion to approve it is on the floor.
- **Claus Ernst withdrew his motion. There was no vote.**

H. Information Items:

1. [Senate Charter Revision - 1st reading on November 17, 2016. 2nd reading scheduled on December 8, 2016.](#)

I. Motion to Adjourn:

1. There was no other new business from the floor.
2. A motion to adjourn by Marko Dumančić was seconded by Andrea Jenkins.
3. The meeting adjourned at 5:27 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Heidi Álvarez, Secretary