

Western Kentucky University
University Senate
Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting Minutes
8 April 2019, 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 3:15.
- Members present: Janet Applin, Kirk Atkinson, Jason Bergner, Dan Clark, Carl Dick, Claus Ernst, Colin Farrell, Jim Fulkerson, Elizabeth Gish, Larry Hill, Jim Lindsey, Stephen Mayer, Lauren McClain, Joe Shankweiler, Cheryl Stevens, Heather Strobe, Mary Wolinski
- Guests present: Kate Hudepohl, Caryn Lindsay, Mac McKerral, Matt Pruitt, Amber Belt

B) Approve March 2019 minutes

- C. Dick motioned to approved. E. Gish seconded. Passed unanimously.

C) Reports

- **Chair – Kirk Atkinson**
 - 1) I want to say how proud I was not only in the Senate body, but also in the professionalism and the way things were addressed. I was very proud of our students as well.
 - 2) Board of Regents social is this Thursday at the President’s house.
 - This is an attempt by Board to reach out and collaborate with faculty.
 - 3) Dr. Aaron Thompson, CPE President Speaker at April Senate meeting
 - 4) This room [Helm 108B] is going away. When the university does the WKU Commons, we’ll need a place to meet. I could have passed this on to the next president, but I am working on it. I don’t want the equipment in this room to be ignored since most of it was purchased with Senate money.
- **Vice Chair – Dan Clark**
 - 1) Selection of Compensation Study Committee members
 - PCAL representative elected Mac McKerral
 - GCFB representative elected Chris Brown
 - OCSE representative elected Katrina Burch
 - 2) Election of new officers (President, VP, Secretary) at April Senate meeting
 - 3) Caucus for standing committee membership at April Senate meeting
- **Secretary – Jason Bergner**
- **Committee Chairs**
 - 1) **Academic Quality – Heather Strobe (no report)**
 - We are going to bring up the withdrawal policy at the next Senate meeting.
 - 2) **Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities – Lauren McClain (report posted)**
 - L. McClain motioned. Unanimous approval.
 - I appreciate all of the feedback from the surveys that were sent out and will continue to speak out on issues important to the faculty.

- While the event of last week [the resignation of Provost Ballman] show that the faculty was heard, people had a lot more to say in the surveys than just the issues surrounding the Provost.
- The faculty work-life survey has had the highest response rate ever.
- We're still working on the Faculty Leave policy.
 - We are looking at what other universities are doing and will meet with Tony Glisson. We plan on having something to move forward next month.
- At the last meeting, we had a resolution that didn't pass the SEC. We were asked by some people to bring it up as New Business at the next Senate meeting. Mac McKerral gave some suggestions/edits, and we plan to bring it up at the next Senate meeting.
- Action items (voted on separately from the report):
 - Consensual relations between faculty and students
 - L. McClain motioned. L. Hill seconded. With friendly amendments included [grammar and E. Gish]. Motion passed unanimously.
 - I have a friendly amendment for a grammar error in the first line. [the word "for" was left off in the first line]
 - I think it's important to think about not only students getting into relationships with faculty, but also to think about getting out of that relationship
 - C. Dick – I see the idea about students and faculty not dating each other as a good idea. What about extending this to dating by faculty/staff?
 - L. McClain – We have separate policies for that.
 - C. Dick – Consequences of this? Suspension of student? Termination of faculty member?
 - L. McClain – This is a faculty policy, so the issue would be on the faculty side.
 - H. Strobe – This policy is a faculty policy, not a student policy.
 - C. Dick – If the faculty member is terminated for this, what's the probability of a lawsuit?
 - L. McClain – I haven't spoken to our legal counsel.
 - J. Applin – When I first heard of this policy, I was shocked we didn't already have a policy prohibiting this [types of relationships].
 - L. McClain – We also have it in the policy where both parties [faculty and student] should report the relationship to their respective deans.
 - J. Applin – I think where it could get tricky is if you have a couple that are married or in a long-term relationship where one person decides to take a class [and thus becomes a student].
 - L. McClain – This is covered under the policy. A husband and wife [for instance] would just have to let people that they're married. All efforts should be made to not have someone supervise their spouse.
 - M. Pruitt – So anytime a spouse takes a class, there's going to be a statement made to alert someone that this person is married to someone who works at the university?

- C. Stevens – My understanding is that if you are in an evaluative position, then it has to be disclosed. If that evaluative relationship isn't there, then I'm not sure it has to be disclosed.
- L. McClain – The proposal says that [she reads at this point] if a relationship **develops** [her emphasis to distinguish from existing relationships] between a student and faculty that are not in a supervisory relationship, that relationship needs to be disclosed.
- J. Applin - So the only thing that is strictly prohibited is new relationships between student and faculty that are in a supervisory position?
 - L. McClain – Yes
- C. Ernst – I have a problem with the way the last line in the policy is currently worded. Suppose you have a non-traditional student and they're taking classes in a different college than the person they're dating. I don't think there's any need to disclose that relationship at all. I actually think it's a violation of privacy. I feel like these people can do whatever they want. You should restrict this to only people that are in a supervisory position.
 - D. Clark – The discussion we had in the committee is that the students don't always understand the structure and hierarchy of the university. So, a student dating a professor in another department/college might be under the impression that the professor they are dating might be able to contact a professor in their department and do something [harmful].
- E. Gish – This [the reporting requirement] is preferable to have is because I'd rather have older students having to report in order to protect the younger students, since it's more likely the younger students in relationships who are likely to experience this power differential. I'd rather have a more protective policy for students that are more likely to be manipulated.
- L. Hill – This is a faculty policy. I think having both parties report gets outside of this policy area. This should be strictly a faculty issue. Just have the faculty report.
 - L. McClain – I'd be ok with that. I was thinking that if I was a student and wanted to break up with the professor, I would have someone with knowledge of the relationship that I could go to.
- M. McKerral – In the state of Kentucky, you are an adult at 18. It's doesn't matter if you are 18 or 40. It doesn't matter if you are a non-traditional student or not.
- E. Gish – Offered friendly amendment to say that if a non-supervisory relationship develops between a student and faculty member, the faculty member must report the relationship to their department head.
- C. Dick – I'm not opposed to this policy, but I do think it has the potential to clash with constitutional rights to privacy and personal autonomy.

- J. Applin – If you look at related policies (e.g. Title IX), I think we would be remiss if we didn't have policies that address these situations which could contain harassment.
 - Policy on Policies
 - L. McClain motioned. D. Clark seconded. Includes friendly amendment to state that the officer *must* send written statement to the involved parties. Motion passed unanimously.
 - This motion adds language to the policy stating policies that aren't supported by the faculty should not move forward. If those policies are moved forward, then the appropriate officer should make a statement as to why that decision was made.
 - K. Atkinson – I'm offering a friendly amendment that it be a written statement.
 - C. Farrell – How do we know who the response has to be sent to?
 - L. McClain – We could add that it should be sent to the involved parties.
 - Proposal for evaluation and compensation
 - L. McClain motioned. C. Dick seconded. Motioned passed unanimously.
 - This proposal originated outside of our committee. This was worked on by J. Berger (and others) who were tasked with addressing the issues surrounding merit pay. We want to make it clear what we're expecting the university to do / what we're looking for when merit pay is available.
 - Administrative appointments with faculty rank
 - L. McClain motioned. D. Clark seconded. Motioned was referred back to the committee.
 - L. Hill – I like the idea, but I don't like the mechanism. Unless you are in the highest paid department in the college, it will still ratchet up the salaries, especially for interim/temporary people.
 - L. McClain – This is only for regular appointments, not interim.
 - A. Belt – This would only be for deans and higher.
 - J. Applin – What about the timing? I would motion to table this until the new provost has a chance to review. C. Dick seconded. This motion includes a friendly motion to refer it back to the committee. Motion to refer back to committee passed unanimously.
 - D. Clark – I don't think that the former provost knew about her situation before she submitted this proposal.
- 3) ***Budget and Finance Committee – Jim Berger (no report)***
- 4) ***Colonnade General Education Committee – Mary Wolinski (report posted)***
- M. Wolinski motioned. Unanimous approval for report.
 - We approved five new courses
 - We unanimously approved the addition of the international component to the Colonnade requirements
 - Action items:
 - M. Wolinski motioned to approve international component of the Colonnade program. H. Strode seconded. Unanimous approval.

- M. Wolinski motioned to change guidelines for applying to Colonnade. D. Clark seconded. Vote passed with one no vote.
 - The original Colonnade suggested that Colonnade courses should be taught three times. The motion would change this guideline to strike the “three times” provision.

5) Graduate Council – Carl Dick (report posted)

- C. Dick motioned. Unanimous approval.
- We have a new certificate program in emergency management science.
- We revised our grad council guidelines to fit with recent changes to the Senate Charter.
 - With the reduction from six colleges to five, we’re revised the guidelines so that committees can have two reps from a college instead of one

6) Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Janet Applin (report posted)

- J. Applin motioned. Unanimous approval.

7) Faculty Handbook Committee – Kate Hudepohl (report posted)

- D. Clark motioned. L. McClain seconded. Unanimous approval.

• Advisory Reports

1) Advisory Report, Faculty Regent – Claus Ernst

- What happened last week was an institutional failure. The president wants to create a Provost’s Council. This body should make a recommendation for that.
- I have not seen the CAPE recommendations. How should I vote on this?
 - C. Dick – My thinking is that the CAPE process is in limbo.
 - J. Applin – All of us on the committee are wondering whether our work was for not?

2) Advisory Report, Provost – Cheryl Stevens

3) Advisory Report, SGA President – Stephen Mayer

D) Old Business

E) New Business

1) Senate Charter revision proposal (Senator McKerral)

- First readings:
 - Motion to change the University Senate to the Faculty Senate failed and will is not endorsed by the SEC.
 - The change to add wording emphasizing the importance of the academic mission of the university was endorsed by the SEC.
 - Adding to the duties of the secretary for making sure the audio recordings of the meetings are archived was endorsed by the SEC.
 - Motion to eliminate term limits was not endorsed by the SEC (vote tied).

F) Information Items

G) Adjournment

- H. Strode motioned. Unanimous approval.