

Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting
Monday, November 27, 2017
3:15 p.m. -- HELM 108-B

[Copy of Agenda](#)

Attendance: Jen Hanley, Janet Applin, Jim Berger, Elizabeth Gish, Matt Shake, Colin Farrell, David Lee, Susann Davis, Andrea Jenkins, Joe Shankweiler, Jerry Daday, Kristin Wilson, Olivia Mohr (Guest), Andi Dahmer, Kirk Atkinson, Liz Sturgeon, Eric Kondratieff, Liz Sturgeon, Sylvia Gaiko (guest)

Call to order: 3:20 pm

A. Approve minutes of November Meetings: 1st Atkinson, 2nd Berger (Approved as amended)

Amendment: **Sturgeon**—there is a minor error on number 2 in the Vice Chair report: it should read: one senator from PCAL and two from CEBS

1. [SEC 11-6-17 Meeting Minutes](#)

B. Reports

1. Chair (Eric Kondratieff)

No report

2. Vice Chair (Liz Sturgeon)

Electronic election beginning Wednesday for special at-large senator election for PCAL. There are four nominees and voting takes place from 8:00-4:30. There are some proposed charter revisions under new business.

3. Secretary (Jen Hanley)

4. Committee Chairs

a. **Academic Quality Committee (Kirk Atkinson; Report Posted):**

-Motion: 1st **Berger**, 2nd **Gish** (Approved)

i. [Report](#)

Atkinson: At our last meeting we invited Beth Laves to attend to explain the five-week course schedule format that appeared under the 2018-2019 academic calendars. Laves explained that this new schedule is targeting non-traditional adult

learners. But, the committee pointed out that there could be unintended consequences for current students being asked to take courses in this format. For our second project we worked with Merrill Price on a proposal from University College (see report) and adjusted the wording to gain consensus. This particular proposal addresses the concerns of students who have accumulated more than 60 hours having to sit out two full years after poor academic performance. We are trying to work to lessen the length of time students need to sit out. This policy is still under revision as there could be interpretation issues. Additionally, this proposal does not address the issues related to students who have less than sixty hours who might have one bad semester—perhaps changed majors, health issues, etc. This proposal is still being researched and findings will be addressed in 2018.

-Policy still needs adjustments, could be interpretation issues

-Leaves one group—students who might have less than 60 hours but who have one bad semester, perhaps they've changed majors, they are still examining this issue will be addressed in 2018

ii. [AQS Action Item: Non-Substantive Change re: Academic Renewal \(Dated 11-15-2017\)](#) (Approved, 1st Berger, 2nd Gish)

b. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee (Patti Minter; Report Posted)

i. [Report Minter, Atkinson](#) (Approved)

Minter

At the request of the SEC, the FWPRC crafted a statement about merit pay—specifically answering the question: if there is merit pay, what should it look like?

Some of the concerns raised by FWPRC in relation to merit pay centered around gender pay equity—merit. Their concern, based on research into the question of gender pay equity, is that merit pools are one of the areas where gaps in pay equity start to arise. If we implement a merit pool, we need to do so in a way that is transparent and avoids the pitfalls of gender bias.

Action Item: Merit Pay: Gish, Hanley (Approved)

Discussion:

Kondratieff—Why wasn't an application process included?

Minter—For departments that are functioning, applications work great. For departments that are non-functioning, applications become problematic

Ernst—Part of this plan requires the university moving faculty salaries to benchmark levels prior to implementing merit pay. How much will it take to get us to benchmark levels?

Minter—We based our analysis and crafted the proposal using data obtained from benefits committee

Ernst—This proposal seems to suggest we don't implement merit pay until we are at benchmark-- our funding is below benchmark, so we can't meet that standard which, in turn, means we cannot ever get to a merit system

Kondratieff—No one denies we have a serious funding problem, but we want to make sure President Caboni recognizes how far below our benchmarks faculty salaries are currently.

Minter—We want to stress that if the administration had made better financial decisions all along, we would not be in the financial circumstances we are right now. This proposal essentially calls for a general re-assessment of what this university values. If we do merit, this is how we do it, we should get to benchmark

Shake: Regardless of a merit pool, there needs to be a cost of living raise cost implemented. We need to recognize the variances between faculty salaries and how a 4% increase would range across the board.

Kondratieff—we've all fallen behind—we will take money

Minter—This is a philosophical statement too—we want to make our priorities clear and we hope to influence the process.

Kondratieff—faculty morale is low and most faculty have expressed that their pay has become increasingly inadequate. What we are deciding right now is if we as a committee like the statement the FWPRC crafted and is the message it sends is the correct one?

Ernst--this a bad decision

Minter—In this policy we are taking all aspects into account for merit. This is not a research-only policy, it allows for people who do different work to also be rewarded. In this respect, it is a value statement, not a policy statement. There is a broad sense of how this policy would be implemented and has separate standards for instructors and pedagogical faculty—there will be specific guidelines for each.

Atkinson: May I ask a question about the committees discussed in the policy? How are you envisioning this?

Minter—It has been 11 years since WKU offered merit pools. There are crazy inequities and various committees will provide a checks and balances system to make sure the distribution and processes are fair. Merit pay is the number one way that inequity shows up so to avoid this, we are recommending implementing what many universities already have--salary committees to create accountability.

c. Budget and Finance Committee (Jim Berger; Report Posted):

i. [Report Motion: 1st Atkinson, 2nd Wilson \(Approved\)](#)

ii. [DFM Info for Distribution](#)

Berger: We are looking at three issues: 1) child care, 2) the university budget, and 3) heating and cooling issues on campus.

- 1) Child care: We are investigating the possibility of providing additional child care on campus. In our vision we want to expand the facility and make it revenue-dependent to alleviate the financial obligations to the university.

Minter—Are you talking about expanding the Jones Jagers day care?

Berger: Do you mean do we want a second day care?

Minter—The Jones Jagers day care has no space to expand, what they need is the space--if they could take over Jones Jagers they could alleviate the space problem.

Berger—I'll bring it back to the committee, this is still under investigation

Wilson—Often the non-traditional students cannot afford day care, a new organization could provide important services—like drop off child care.

Minter—We need to be careful because that does not meet the definition of child care—babysitting has different issues

Jenkins—single parents who have child care issues, it makes it difficult for them to take classes

Minter—We need language clarification—babysitting versus day care center. But there is demand if we opened up the space

Berger—let me return to the committee

Shake—quality is not the only issue

- 2) The committee is working to have Anne Meade meet with the budget committee to hold an open forum to discuss the budget and budgetary concerns. This will be an informal meeting with no agenda to enhance open dialog.
- 3) We are also working with Facilities Management working to ensure rooms are comfortable in terms of heating and air conditioning. Please see the document included with the report for further details. Are there any questions?

Atkinson—Why is the notation of 60,000 calls relevant?

Berger—To show the scope of the problem FM is dealing with. These issues include serious budget cuts and they are struggling with a serious lack of resources.

Ernst—FM heating and cooling—they don't tell us when they update things with ASTRA

Kondratieff—Yes, they did—they told us they perform updates on Wednesday and Friday, no ad hoc

Ernst—we should tell them that is something that we want changed

Kondratieff—this is a massive system

Ernst—ASTRA is an electronic system, questionable practices

Kondratieff—budget is a concern, they've needed an upgrade for 10 years

- d. Colonnade General Education Committee (Jerry Daday; No Report):

i. [CGEC World Language Proficiency Resolution - Final \(revised since 11-6-17 SEC\)](#) **Vote: Approve 5, Nays 7, abstention 1—Motion failed**

Motion to modify 1st Daday, 2nd Wilson

Daday: Sylvia Gaiko looked at the ICAP system to determine if students were finishing their degrees on time. What she discovered is that an increasing number of students were falling behind and were not taking the STAMP Test (language proficiency.) The question is: why are students not taking the Stamp Test? This committee recommends a two-pronged approach: if students have completed a world language sequence in high school, we are going to automatically award them the proficiency they need to graduate and they would, therefore, not need to complete any language courses or proficiency tests. We would apply this amnesty to students through the 2017-2018 catalog. The second prong is that Modern Languages, PCAL, CHHS, and others will take the time allowed by the amnesty to devise a strategic plan to avoid another backlog of students who were missing the language requirements. Colonnade committee will then review the plan and determine its effectiveness. Each fall semester, we have determined, that of the 3,500 freshmen on campus, only about 300-400 students have not completed some language instruction in high school.

Hanley—According to your data, in the Fall 2015, 2016, 2017 semesters there were 92 students total who took the Stamp test, out of a potential 60 seats per month. There are opportunities to take the STAMP test--not all spots were taken. I believe Susann (Davis) noted there were the possibilities of offering larger sections if there was the demand for it.

Davis: We can proctor more if the demand is there

Gish—This sounds like an advising problem

Daday—students lack confidence which deters them from taking the Stamp Test. They are supposed to have their proficiency completed by the time they reach 60 hours, but they don't.

Atkinson—Are students forced to take 101?

Davis—No, they can take 102. Previously we didn't realize that students didn't do as well. We will accept a STAMP test from any previous point—high school, transfer, etc. We will even accept results from tests taken before they were in college. One of the problems is that these scores are not being reported from high Schools

Dahmer—Why can't this be implemented into TOP?

Daday—admissions removed testing, from the admissions process

Dahmer—Adding it to TOP seems like a feasible solution

Gaiko—UK does not require the state exam, only Arts and Sciences majors so smaller numbers

Shake—We need to tell students to take the optional test to determine language proficiency, to see if they need to take a foreign language class, we are asking students to do something they don't want to do, numbers suggest people are passing so it's a confidence issue. We need to re-shape how we market and recommend this test.

Ernst—The Stamp test is not free-- is it possible for the language department to develop their own testing?

Davis—Developing a proficiency test is difficult and evaluation is complicated. The reason there is a fee, is to cover these costs.

Daday—We need market the stamp test more

Shake—We need to frame it differently—if you take the Stamp Test, you can save money

Daday—There are almost almost 2000 juniors and seniors who don't have their language requirements. We need to fix the backlog and then devise a solution

Berger—If we take out the backlog what does that do to enrollments?

Daday—Modern Language enrollments will crash in the spring

Berger—Given our budget concerns, I worry this will add to the problem.

Daday—If we are student-centered then we need to give them a fresh start

Hanley—Are we doing students a disservice—will this make them less competitive for national graduate programs? This could lead to a slippery slope and lead to the undermining of the entire colonnade program.

Minter—There are ways to reduce the backlog if we want to. There is a disconnect between enrollment, etc. We upcharge for stuff all the time—market it differently. We have many things we have not tried. We are setting up a system where we have an elite group or hyper motivated students, we haven't tried to fix the structural problems. We are not doing them favors by letting them procrastinate

Dahmer—dual language major, we can procrastinate on other courses

Atkinson—You cannot argue against a second language in business. We have a problem—a step down—what if we set it up so there is a pseudo forgiveness program—reduce the proficiency to a 101 level instead of a 102? Give people the option to pursue the 102 level—we do this so we don't trash an entire program

Davis—90% or more start in 102

Gish—There are thousands of students not at 102

Kondratieff—If someone is just doing 101 are they proficient?

Davis—novice, intermediate, advanced, distinguished—each level is subdivided into three levels, novice is answer waiting for the right question

Kondratieff—where does 101 get them?

Davis—101 novice mid, to novice high

Lee—staffing is going to be a challenge—we have trouble getting majors into 101 and 102, getting students into 102 is a problem, concerned that it's an obstacle to graduation

Jenkins: Can we clarify what we are voting on?

Daday: The colonnade language proposal

e. Graduate Council (Kristin Wilson; Report Posted):

Motion to approve—1st Wilson, 2nd Berger (Approved)

i. [Report](#)

f. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (Janet Applin; Report Posted):

Motion to Approve: 1st Applin, 2nd Hanley (Approved as posted with the three items re-added)

i. [Report](#)

Applin: the report has old and new business. There were three proposals pulled off the consent agenda to the senate—PCAL PR—these were two program revisions and one new course. The proponents asked they be pulled off and tabled.

Official guidelines note these need to be sent back to the committee and then sent back to SEC.

g. Faculty Handbook Committee (Kate Hudephol; No Report)

5. Advisory Reports

a. Faculty Regent (Regent Burch [continuing] and/or Regent-Elect Claus Ernst [Incoming])

Claus – He is meeting with President Caboni tomorrow. Please let him know if there are any issues that you would like for him to bring up at the meeting.

Jim Berger moved for adjournment at _____PM. (Sorry I did not capture the time).

b. Academic Affairs (Provost Lee)

Provost Lee – The search process for the Provost and Dean of CEBS should be more visible soon. He stated that he did not know who will be on either search committee.

c. SGA (Andi Dahmer)

Dahmer noted that SGA has been very productive this semester with 31 pages of legislation and they are meeting during finals week too. They are working on resolutions 1) to support a fairness ordinance, and 2) to require grades on Blackboard prior to the withdrawal date. A meeting at the centennial mall is planned in regards to the new tax reforms that will impact Graduate Assistant stipends.

B. Old Business:

D. New Business:

1. [SEC Proposed Revisions to Senate Charter re: Elections Procedures](#) 1st Sturgeon, 2nd Berger (Approved 12 yes, 1 abstention)

Kondratieff—how many committees meeting between January 8. 2 items moved from the 8 to the 9th? The January SEC meeting will be held January 9.

E. Information Items:

Motion to Adjourn Berger

Meeting ended 5:51 pm.