

**Western Kentucky University**  
**University Senate**  
**Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting Minutes**  
**10 September 2018, 3:15 p.m.**  
**Helm 108B**

**A. Call to order**

- A regular meeting of the SEC was called to order by Chair Kirk Atkinson at 3:16.
- Members present (substitute): Janet Applin, Kirk Atkinson, Terry Ballman, Jim Berger, Jason Bergner, Susann Davis, Carl Dick, Claus Ernst, Colin Farrell, Elizabeth Gish, Larry Hill, Jim Lindsey, Stephen Mayer, Patti Minter, Joe Shankweiler, Heather Strode, Mary Wolinski
- Guests present: Amber Belt, Assistant to the Provost; Greg Hackbarth, Doug McElroy

**B. Approve August 2018 minutes**

- C. Dick motioned to approve. J. Berger seconded. Unanimous approval.

**C. Officer reports**

- *Chair – Kirk Atkinson*

- 1. I'm a member of WKU Tobacco-free task force

- Had first meeting
      - Task force looking for resolutions of support (SGA, Senate, etc.)
    - One of the few schools to receive \$20K grant
      - Create task force to look at smoke- or smoke/vape- free campus
    - Wanted to gauge temperature from SEC on this issue
    - J. Berger – this has been a process that's already in place
      - Taken away the stands outside my building
      - Under former president, it was proposed (Benefits or SGA?) and supposed to be phased in
      - Not sure where we are on the timeline, but we should be moving towards smoke-free
    - J. Applin – thought it was supposed to go fully in effect last January
    - The task force read the memo by President Caboni
      - He doesn't want it to appear to be an edict, but would rather it have grassroots support
    - There are multiple groups of people this affects (e.g., contractors)
    - How do we enforce it?
      - C. Dick – any discussion on this
      - K. Atkinson – not yet...working more toward education
    - C. Ernst – going on for a very long time, Benefits Committee has recommended for at least five years
      - Former president has blocked it

- Enforcement has been endlessly discussed
  - There's nothing new here
  - It will be accomplished by peer pressure
  - K. Atkinson – I understand the history. This is different because it's being led by a task force that's been formed.
  - S. Davis – Daily News reported 1<sup>st</sup> phase was started in 2015
    - Started with ambassadors (volunteers) for spotting offenders
    - Nothing found about a “phase 2”
  - K. Atkinson – There has been no policy put in place campus wide
    - We still have them outside GFCB
  - J. Berger – WKU has already started the process. The task force should review the history.
    - Do they need to simply continue the phase-in process?
  - K. Atkinson – The task force is looking for groups (e.g., SGA) to have resolutions to support this.
2. Question from emailer: Do new Colonnade course proposals not fall under the freeze? It's unclear what they were asking for new courses or amending existing courses
- T. Ballman – If they are in the Connections category, they can be reviewed (university is desperate for seats)
    - Limit it to this category due to the need
    - Could be brand new courses
  - E. Gish – Have heard from two different department chairs that they weren't aware that new Connections courses could be proposed
    - Good idea to send out an email about this
  - T. Ballman – I guess we can send something out.
  - E. Gish – Is everyone going to be required to increase the seats in their Connections courses?
    - T. Ballman – no one has said that
      - Concern that we have a lot of courses that are listed as possibilities for Connections courses, but they aren't being offered, or perhaps they were offered once but haven't been offered since then
      - Concern is that we're down over 1000 seats for **seniors** [her emphasis] that need these courses to graduate
      - This is an emergency situation
      - Has told the Deans to look at the schedule carefully and try to find support for Connections courses
  - E. Gish – So it's possible that a capped course could be overenrolled in order to help with the situation?
    - T. Ballman – Hopefully not

### 3. Ron Rhoades email

- Email sent to Provost (K. Atkinson was copied)
  - Wanted to set it up so freshmen and sophomores were not put in early classes due to their sleep patterns
- Concerned that it came from a sitting senator
- It should have come through the ranks of the Senate as a proposal and allow the correct channels to work on this
- J. Applin – first thought is that we're under pressure from industry to develop soft skills
  - Not requiring them to be there by 8, 9, or even 10 doesn't help them prepare
- P. Minter – Organizations that I work with say their #1 difficulty with interns is getting the interns to adjust to a normal work schedule
  - Public schools let out around 2:30, and pushing classes back would cause difficulty for faculty with families
  - It's well-intentioned but shouldn't be pursued
- D. Clark – concerns about work-life balance
  - Our last class on TR ends at 4:20 now. If we shift everything back two hours this will be a huge difference for faculty with families.
- C. Ernst – I question the underlying premise. My 30 years of experience suggests this isn't true. Math classes that are early often contain better students.
- J. Lindsey – surveyed my students (over 100)...mixed results...students have different needs (e.g., jobs in the afternoon)
  - The research the emailer quotes is interesting
  - Do we have the resources to offer more sections or push things back?
- T. Ballman – reading a book on sleep, people are pre-programmed for their sleep (this isn't really changeable)
  - Some industries are skewing later with work start times
  - There's variation and it's not likely that there's a one-size fits all solution
  - There is substance to the research
- C. Farrell – I think the emailer is asking for a committee to be formed (doesn't seem unreasonable)
  - K. Atkinson – he is asking the Provost to form a faculty/administration joint committee
    - My issue with the email is that it should have come through the Senate as a proposal
- P. Minter – If anyone does want to form a committee, there's always an existing committee structure (Faculty Welfare committee and Academic Quality committee)
  - It would be a significant work-life shift

- We also have considered the diversity of our student body (e.g., working students, students who are parents)
    - There are many variables
  - J. Berger – If we were to suggest a committee, the adjusted start times and why students selected the early courses that are offered now should be looked at (I don't have the data)
  - D. McElroy - He also pitched this same idea to our Policies and Procedures work group (we do have the data)
    - This is a very diverse campus. It's logistically very problematic to do this.
    - Historical enrollment patterns show that students vote with their feet. Departments know which courses are best offered at what times.
    - 100 hours (approximately) of classes each day at 8:00. There are 200 hours (approximately) at the 9:00. There aren't enough classrooms on this campus to move all of these.
      - You could push the entire schedule back, but then you would start to run into night courses.
      - Until you are willing to go until 11:00 at night, you are talking about compressing the schedule.
    - Our group felt like this is more of an advising issue with students.
  - K. Atkinson – What does the SEC want to do? To do nothing would probably be a mistake
    - P. Minter motioned to refer this to Academic Quality and Faculty Welfare committees for further study and make a proposal to the Senate, if needed. C. Farrell seconded. Unanimous approval.
4. G. Hackbarth speaking (Assistant VP for IT)
- Not a lot of IT governance at WKU
  - Does the SEC see value in more communication with IT on various issues (project, priorities, strategies, etc.)? Is there an existing committee that I could come to in order to discuss these things? Would the Senate be interested in appointing members to a governance committee that I might set up on my own?
  - J. Berger – there was a committee (Tech Advisory Group, ATAG) that has gone through different iterations under different directors
    - These have had various representation with faculty and staff
    - Went through the various aspects of the old committees
  - G. Hackbarth - Feedback aspect of such a committee would be good. What are the priorities/needs of the various departments? I don't want IT to hold up any projects that faculty are trying to get done.

- J. Berger – Advisory addressing global issues is better. Creating a mechanism for departments to complain (i.e., “holding up faculty”) as a central function wouldn’t be as effective.
    - There should be a process for concerns, but it shouldn’t be a central focus of the committee
  - K. Atkinson – Do you (G. Hackbarth) want us to pursue an ad hoc committee to address these issues? Do you want to go back and look at having an advisory group?
  - G. Hackbarth – Are committee members selected by appointment or volunteers?
    - K. Atkinson – There are generally volunteer.
  - C. Ernst – numerous committees on campus which have a faculty and staff representation and then you would fill it out with administrative positions
  - G. Hackbarth - Had asked for advice on how to do this
    - Was told to go to an established body first rather than re-creating the wheel
  - J. Applin – As a faculty member, I appreciate you asking
5. Doug McElroy document
- Policy that was passed by this body last year
  - Extension of class meeting times policy that was formalized in April 2018
    - Creates expectation of when classes would be offered for certain types of classes, creates exceptions for other types of classes
      - In the process of implementing this for Spring 2019
    - Some faculty are saying the master class is incorrect
    - Registrar proposed we allow a one-time cleanup to avoid mass curricular proposals come through the Senate
      - This would not open the door for people making a pedagogical change
      - This is a coding issues (some courses are coded incorrectly)
      - There are nearly 100 requests across six or seven departments (clustered – 400/400G, for instance)
        1. Most of these make sense (listed as lecture but should be experiential, for instance)
        2. As these have been coming in, we have been questioning some
      - Only things that made sense would go through. Things that didn’t make “sense” would be sent through the normal channels of the Senate.
    - K. Atkinson – timeline?

- D. McElroy – The Registrar has already started working on this
  - K. Atkinson – vote for endorsement by SEC to take to the full Senate
    - Some changes will have happened by the time we get to the full Senate meeting
    - D. McElroy – We’ve only made about 8 changes. We could go back and undo them if need be.
  - K. Atkinson - Motion to endorse this action so can we put it on the Senate agenda?
    - E. Gish motioned. J. Berger seconded. Unanimous approval.
- 6. HURON group schedule to come to full Senate in October meeting.
  - Trying to schedule at end of meeting so all other items can be taken care of first
  - HURON will try to have a representative at the October SEC meeting as well
- *Vice Chair – Dan Clark*
  1. Working on filling committee spots
    - Will announce at next Senate meeting
  2. Looking at Senate charter
    - Make it a bit more formal about who’s responsible for the list of senators
- *Secretary – Jason Bergner (no report)*

**D. Committee Chairs**

- *Academic Quality Committee – Heather Strobe (no report)*
  1. Set up dates for the rest of the year
  2. Will have things for the SEC in October
- *Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee – Patti Minter (no report)*
  1. Will have something in October
  2. Next week we will take faculty work-life survey to the faculty;
- *Budget and Finance Committee – Jim Berger (no report)*
  1. Set up meetings for later this month and regularly thereafter
- *Colonnade General Education Committee – Mary Wolinski*
  1. Collonnade report – M. Wolinski. No second needed. Unanimous approval.
  2. Should have deadlines posted for proposals
  3. Approved a couple of new courses for Connections
    - Questions from folks about whether a new course would be allowed (it will) for Connections
- *Graduate Council - Carl Dick*
  1. GC report – C. Dick motioned. No second needed. Unanimous approval.
  2. Formally elected our committee memberships and chairs
    - Will have curriculum for October

- *Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Janet Applin*
  1. UCC report – J. Applin motioned. No second needed. Unanimous approval.
- *Faculty Handbook Committee - Kate Hudepohl (no report)*
  1. No meeting called yet

#### **E. Advisory Reports**

- *Faculty Regent – Claus Ernst (no report)*
- *Academic Affairs – Terry Ballman*
  1. Continue to attend events and getting to know people
  2. Minutes for CAD are posted
  3. Meetings with departments for CAPE (program review)
    - Make recommendations for programs to be expanded, maintained, or suspended
  4. No provisions for faculty benefits for family members (leave)
    - There will be that for staff, faculty need the same
  5. Pastries with the Provost
- *SGA – Stephen Mayer (no report)*
  1. First SGA meeting last Tuesday
  2. Looking at Student Code of Conduct
    - Line 15 – wording is concerning about possibly being too broad
  3. Students should have right to record in class
  4. J. Bergner – KY is a “right to record” state?
    - S. Mayer – Yes. As long as one party knows, someone can record without disclosure
    - P. Minter – no disclosure of recording is required
    - A. Belt – Does this include classes?
      - P. Minter – Yes. The statute says that you can record people without their knowledge. This isn’t the case in all 50 states.
    - C. Farrell – When is it not ok to record?
      - P. Minter – Basically only if you are in jail.
    - J. Berger – You have to be one of the parties, correct?
      - P. Minter – Correct
    - A. Belt – Is a student recording and then sharing that recording a violation of the professor’s intellectual property?
      - P. Minter – That’s an interesting question that would have to be tested through litigation for the statute would have to be revised.

#### **F. Old Business – none**

1. Texas Council of Faculty Senates Invitation: Action item
  - K. Atkinson – I’ve done more investigating
    - Cost will be \$50 (fee + lunch) plus the travel
    - Details on this group can be found in August 2018 minutes
    - Group has 50 schools signed up already

- Is this something that we should attend? Who should the representative be?
- J. Applin – Is the first meeting?
  - K. Atkinson – not in the state of Texas, but it is the first for schools outside of the state
- J. Applin – prefer to wait and see how the first year goes
  - Perhaps review conference materials
- M. Wolinski – if someone wants to go could go and report back on the meeting
- S. Davis – What is the state of our budget?
  - K. Atkinson – a bit less than \$6000
    - Primarily used for beverage service at Senate meetings
- S. Davis – Did we lose carryover?
  - K. Atkinson – I don't know that we had any.
- K. Atkinson – Should there be a course load reduction for certain officers?
  - Academic Affairs has provided some support (J. Steenbergen, web site)
  - I'm willing to fund this out of my own professional development
- C. Dick – What's the benefit?
  - K. Atkinson – being on the ground floor of a potentially national Senate organization
- S. Davis – I think it's worthwhile, and you should go for it if you are willing to spend your own money.
  - J. Applin – I agree.
- M. Wolinski – I'm sure that university administrators have national meetings and conferences, so it makes sense for other senates to do the same
- C. Ernst – I think the Provost's office should fund that.
- K. Atkinson – Move to endorse my attendance?
  - S. Davis motioned, D. Clark seconded. Unanimous approval.

## **G. New Business**

### **1. Craig Martin**

- Looking for new members to the Athletic committee
  - Meet monthly and advises the Athletic department
- Has already passed two names (recommendation from the Deans of the two colleges)
  - GFCB – Dr. Dennis Wilson
  - Ogden College – Dr. Larry Alice
- J. Berger motioned to approve the discussion of this item. J. Lindsey seconded.



- P. Minter – concerned with the process as it should be generated by the Senate, not the Dean’s council
    - We always send up three names and everyone that has interest has the opportunity to put their names in
  - D. Clark – Even if this isn’t the current process (coming through the Senate – an open process), it should be
    - This happened at a former university and I’m uncomfortable with names just appearing
  - P. Minter – There are lots of people who are involved with athletics and would likely be interested and have experience
    - The process should be open.
  - K. Atkinson – The process should be followed.
  - K. Atkinson – If we vote these names down, we should be prepared to put forward (three) names.
  - C. Ernst – How long are the terms?
    - K. Atkinson – three years; the letter says they need the Senate needs to recommend names, but he has recommended the two above
  - C. Farrell – What’s the ramification of rejecting this motion? Do we have to have three names right now?
    - P. Minter – The alternative process would be to reply to this message and state the proper process, which is that we pick three names from each school and submit them
    - K. Atkinson – We need to vote on the motion on the approval of the two submitted names.
      - Motion failed unanimously. K. Atkinson will contact C. Martin to gather interest and follow proper procedure.
2. Math department – Registrar’s Office issues
- C. Ernst – We have many courses with prerequisites. The registrar replaced the wording with “can be taken concurrently.”
    - The registrar said it had to be this way because students need to be allowed to register for the next course while they are still in the prerequisite in the current semester.
    - Everyone needs to check their own courses in their departments in TopNet.
    - Student would win appeal (most likely) if TopNet disagrees with the course catalog.
3. UG registration hold issues
- Need motion to discuss. D. Clark motioned. J. Berger seconded.
  - T. Ballman – President Caboni said we need to do something about the holds. There are a lot of holds for UG students that are keeping them from registering.
    - Students will be still be advised every term.
    - The change streamlines the types of holds while still honoring the Senate policy.

- J. Applin – Can you give an example of what might be deemed “of sufficient importance” to put a hold on (referencing #5)
    - T. Ballman – I don’t know. I think they just wanted leeway. This was only for UG’s, not graduates.
  - A. Belt – Request to waive hold will go through CAD.
  - C. Dick – Are there not times when a student is subject to law enforcement that they would make it to student code of conduct (referencing #3)?
    - J. Applin – I see what you are saying.
  - J. Berger – another example could be someone abusing library privileges?
    - A. Belt – Library is not currently doing this.
  - J. Applin – I see a lot of parking fees with the students I work with, along with past due tuition fees
  - K. Atkinson – the wording seems vague, but perhaps that’s a good thing
  - Resolution approved unanimously
4. Senate Charter modifications
- K. Atkinson – most of the issues relate to the University College and how senators are named
    - Will delay to October meeting
    - Will work with D. Clark to get some proposals together
      - C. Dick – I’m willing to help
      - J. Applin –will also work on this
    - J. Berger – sending these out in advance would be great; even a one-page summary would be helpful
  - C. Dick – Our bylaws flow from the Senate charter. Having one fewer college takes away our flexibility.

## **H. Information Items**

### **I. Adjournment**

- J. Berger motioned to adjourn. C. Farrell seconded.
- Meeting adjourned