

**Western Kentucky University  
University Senate  
Meeting Minutes  
21 March 2019, 3:45 p.m.  
Faculty House**

**A) Call to order**

- A regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Kirk Atkinson at 3:45 p.m.
- Members present (substitute): Lawrence Alice, Janet Applin, Kirk Atkinson, Melanie Autin, Terry Ballman, Leslie Baylis, Jim Berger, Jason Bergner, Scott Bonham, Tim Brotherton, Dan Clark, Margaret Crowder, Aquesha Daniels (Mariah Yates), Susann Davis, Pitt Derryberry, Carl Dick, Michelle Dvoskin, Loretta Dye, Claus Ernst, Colin Farrell, Stacey Forsythe, Dawn Garrett-Wright, James Gary, Elizabeth Gish, Dominique Gumirakiza, Lance Hahn, Lawrence Hill, Jean-Luc Houle, Angie Jerome, Guy Jordan, Pat Kambesis, Kim Link, Lauren McClain, Mac McKerral, Patti Minter (Jen Hanley), Kurt Neelly, Leslie Plumlee, Matt Pruitt, Dianna Ransdell, Mark Schafer, Jo Shackelford, Joe Shankweiler, Christy Spurlock, Ajay Srivastava, Heather Strode, Toni Szymanski, Carol Watwood, Aaron Wichman, Mary Wolinski  
Guests: Liz Sturgeon, Kate Hudepohl, Lester Archer, Marko Dumancic, Jay Gabbard, Danita Kelley

**B) Approve February 2019 minutes**

- J. Berger motioned to approve. C. Dick seconded. Passed unanimously.

**C) Reports, Part I**

- *Chair – Kirk Atkinson*
  - 1) University CAPE committee
    - Has made all of its recommendations to the Provost
  - 2) Senate budget
    - New one allocated by Academic Affairs has been posted
    - Have heard from both sides, including faculty
    - Now will fund course release for certain members of Executive Committee instead of relying on the colleges to fund it
    - Also have an increase in discretionary funding which allows us to spend money without having to ask permission from Academic Affairs
  - 3) Hopefully you have seen my response to the recent BoR meeting
    - It's not on the Senate web site – there's no action required on it.
    - I did address this with the President
      - I was told the AD's salary was not a market adjustment but was part of his contract
      - The President has a contract that contain metrics allowing for increases. He took a slightly lower salary starting out with a bonus for meeting those metrics.
      - If academics gets cut, where are the corresponding cuts in other programs that aren't the core focus of the academic mission?
        - I haven't made any progress in getting an answer to this question.

- M. McKerral – I appreciate your response [to the BoR]. I think it reflects the Senate’s position on these matters. Just because people have money offered in their contracts doesn’t mean they have to take it. This reflects poorly given the financial condition we’re in.
- 4) Smoke-free speaker – Mr. Dennis Chaney to speak
- Mr. Chaney distributed a handout to Senate members.
  - Part of my responsibility is to facilitate conversation about improving the health and well-being of all of us.
  - One of the things I was asked to do last summer was to facilitate a conversation with a group of about 25 people to talk about tobacco policies on campus.
    - After a SWOT analysis and a breakout into small workgroups [8-10 months], the policy group drafted a policy for tobacco use on campus. There have been questions about compliance. Policies such as this tend to be self-enforcing. In my experience with other groups, there have only been a couple of instances that required a confrontation with someone about violating a policy.
  - My purpose for being here today is to present information and get feedback.
    - C. Dick – One of things I think about with these policies is the effect of international students. They come from cultures where smoking is the norm. Are we sending a message that says “Welcome to WKU. Now, go off campus.”
      - D. Chaney – That concern has been brought up. We could speak with other universities to see how they handle this. That’s a good point.
- 5) I met with President Caboni. We are within weeks of implementation of movements on recommendations from the committee on Title IX.
- ***Vice Chair – Dan Clark (no report)***
    - 1) Elections for the August 2019 – July 2021 term for senator elections should be ongoing.
    - 2) Make sure there are actual elections going on. Everyone should have a chance to participate.
    - 3) You may have seen the request from President Caboni to form a faculty compensation committee. We are going to see an email from us tomorrow. If you have interest, look for that email.
  - ***Secretary – Jason Bergner (no report)***
  - ***Coalition of Senate/Faculty Leadership for Higher Education – Molly Kirby (no report)***
  - ***AAUP Representative – Margaret Crowder (no report)***
- D) Committee Reports and Recommendations**
- ***Academic Quality – Heather Strode (report posted, endorsed by the SEC)***
    - 1) H. Strode motioned. Unanimous approval.
    - 2) We are pulling the change to withdrawal date. There needs to be a couple of things finalized, and we’ll bring it up in April.
    - 3) Next month we’ll have a proposal for the academic renewal policy.
  - ***Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities – Lauren McClain (report posted, endorsed by the SEC)***
    - 1) L. McClain motioned. Unanimous approval.

- 2) Provost Ballman came to our last meeting. Provost Ballman has an idea for handling the issue of how to handle the salaries of administrators moving back to the faculty. This is on the agenda for our next meeting. If you have questions, you are welcome to come to our next meeting.
- 3) We've been working on prioritizing academic affairs in the budget. The Academic Quality and Faculty Welfare committees approved a resolution, but it was defeated at SEC.
  - The main concern is that it was a value statement and didn't ask for anything specific.
- 4) We are continuing to work on shared governance, parental leave, and consensual relations policies.
- 5) The faculty work life survey has gone out.
- 6) Comments:
  - M. Wolinski – Last year, senators were asked to send a message to their departments. After we did that, participation went up dramatically. That's an idea that might work for you.
  - M. McKerral – I don't think resolutions have to be measurable. We need to be consistent and persistent about academics being a priority. It's my understanding that any senator can bring a resolution. We don't need SEC approval. I saw the resolution. I would bring it to every meeting.
  - L. McClain – Heather [Strode] and I spoke about bringing the resolution today to the floor.
  - J. Lindsey – The reason I voted no is that there needs to be something specific that administration can respond to.
- ***Budget and Finance Committee – Jim Berger (report posted, endorsed by the SEC)***
  - 1) J. Berger motioned. Unanimous approval.
  - 2) We have a description for the RAMP model (thanks to Aaron Wichman) that has been vetted by Ann Mead's office and HURON. We hope to put this up on the web site.
- ***Colonnade General Education Committee – Mary Wolinski (report posted, endorsed by the SEC)***
  - 1) M. Wolinski motioned. Unanimous approval.
  - 2) Approval of three Colonnade courses.
  - 3) Subcommittee on the International Colonnade category has defined its student learning objectives. In our next meeting, we'll look at the proposal. At some point we will vote, and then we'll present it to the SEC.
- ***Graduate Council – Carl Dick (report posted, endorsed by the SEC)***
  - 1) C. Dick motioned. Unanimous approval.
  - 2) We're revising our bylaws pursuant to the Senate charter changes. I will summarize this for you next month.
- ***Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Janet Applin (report posted, endorsed by the SEC)***
  - 1) J. Applin motioned. Unanimous approval.
  - 2) J. Applin offered a friendly amendment. The Emergency Management Program has a new certificate program which said 15-18 hours in the proposal, but it was only

supposed to say 15 hours. The correct number of hours was approved at the UCC level, but this correction didn't get changed for the Senate report.

- M. McKerral – Has the moratorium been lifted on new programs?
  - J. Applin – Yes
  - K. Atkinson – I don't think the moratorium has been lifted, but just for changes.
  - T. Ballman – That's correct.
  - A. Wichman – Am I correct in that this is possible because this is a change to an existing program?
    - J. Applin – No. It's a new certificate program that petitioned to be approved and was done so by Academic Affairs.
    - M. Price – There are four exceptions, and this program met the exception for pressing need.
- **Faculty Handbook Committee – Kate Hudepohl (report posted, endorsed by the SEC)**
  - 1) J. Hanley motioned. D. Clark seconded. Unanimous approval of the report portion.
    - K. Hudepohl – My main report summarizes the three February meetings. At the bottom of the report, there's a list of upcoming agenda items. This list is modified because we've received one or two new items. We're meeting again this Monday.
    - K. Atkinson – Of the new items below [in New Business], #'s 11 & 12 will be pulled.
  - 2) M. McKerral – Can I make a motion to handle the non-substantive changes [in new business] *en bloc*?
    - K. Atkinson – Yes.
    - M. McKerral motioned to handle these changes *en bloc*. L. McClain seconded.

#### **E) Old Business**

#### **F) New Business**

##### **1) Senate budget revision**

- L. McClain motioned. E. Gish seconded. Passed with one abstention.
- C. Dick – Could you summarize a few of the concerns?
  - K. Atkinson – Why now? Could this money have been used elsewhere given the budget crunch? [from the faculty]
    - K. Atkinson - The intent of this was to get money in the budget to reimburse the college for a course load reduction.
    - K. Atkinson – I have a question about whether someone not taking the load reduction could get paid as an overload.
- C. Dick – If we approve this, would all of these questions be resolved at a later time?
- J. Hanley – This came up in the Senate several years ago. Any reason why it wasn't approved at that time?
  - M. McKerral – The provost at that time was insistent on the chair getting a course reduction. The reason I'm happy about this being in writing is because it hasn't been in the past. The issue about ability to afford course reductions...I could not when it came up for me. I think we should continue to seek overload pay.

- J. Hanley – I’m a little concerned because I don’t want leadership to be pressured to comply with admin’s requests with this money/compensation.
- K. Atkinson – I haven’t felt any sort of pressure. Other than the restricted funds, we doubled our unrestricted funds, too.
- L. McClain – We are constantly being asked to do more with less, and I finally feel like we’ve been heard. We didn’t ask for this, and we got more than we asked for. I’m all for it.
- M. Crowder – I was curious about UCC chair getting a course release. Is assistance still being provided to the UCC chair [grad student].
  - K. Atkinson – Yes, and J. Steenbergen is in the budget.
  - M. Crowder – She’s worth every penny. I am divided on the issue of pay. A course load reduction is an excellent idea. For the pay issue, I’m a little concern about the possibility of undue influence. In a conversation I had, the issue was raised that this is bad optics for it to happen right now. We have an all-male leadership position right now, and some feel it’s odd that it’s happening right now.
    - A. Jerome – If someone is willing to sell their soul to admin for \$1800 (what they’ll see after tax), then go ahead. They deserve the money. Let it go.
  - A. Srivastava – Is there an end to this budget? Could it be taken away in the future?
    - K. Atkinson – It does not roll over, but it’s an annual number. Yes, it can be taken away in the future.
  - J. Hanley – I’m very uncomfortable with paying an overload.
  - T. Ballman – I have been faculty senate chair. I know how much work that takes. In order to support faculty governance, faculty governance should be supported. The Senate can decide to do with the money whatever they want. I take great exception at some of the comments made here today.
  - L. Hill – We’re voting on the budget currently on paper. I propose we vote on the current budget.
  - C. Ernst – I think this is a very big deal, and I’m gratefully to the provost that someone finally heard us. This has been a 20-year struggle. History shows that the leadership has usually been untenured. This should be an incentive for tenured professors to step up and take these leadership roles.
  - M. Autin motioned to call the question. L. McClain seconded. Vote to call the question was unanimously approved.

## 2) Faculty Handbook action items

- All non-substantive changes were approved unanimously *en bloc* via the motion above.
- 01-2019 – substantive change: Appendix – Faculty regent election
  - M. McKerral motioned for approval. J. Hanley seconded.
- 02-2019 – non-substantive change: Foreword
- 03-2019 – non-substantive change: I.B.2 – Graduate council
- 04-2019 – non-substantive change: II.K – Course syllabi and student performance procedures

- 05-2019 – non-substantive change: II.N – Grade reporting
- 06-2019 – non-substantive change: II.P – Academic advising
- 07-2019 – non-substantive change: II.W.1 – Extra university consulting
  - L. McClain motioned approval for numbers 8 through 10. J. Berger seconded. Passed unanimously.
- 08-2019 – Substantive change: IV.C.2 – Faculty complaint
- 09-2019 – Substantive change: II.A.2 – Lecturer appointment
- 10-2019 – Substantive change: III.F.1 – Promotion application deadlines

## G) Reports, Part II

- ***Advisory Report, Faculty Regent – Claus Ernst***

- 1) When I ran for regent, one of the important that I stated was really important to me was the academic budget. While we all have felt the budget crunch, there is no data that supports the argument that budget cuts in academics has been worse than other areas.
- 2) Votes the BoR took at the last meeting
  - President's contract – The contract was negotiated by the prior Board. I felt the obligation to uphold this contract. He was evaluated according to his contract and he received a raise equal to the average percentage of the faculty. He's also due a performance incentive, which could be 10% of the salary, dependent on the evaluation of the Board. I supported this because of the RAMP model because it pushes more control to the academic side. There are faculty members on these committees. In the past, the President's council met and did whatever they did [there wasn't transparency].
  - Now, there is going forward a study on evaluating faculty compensation compared to benchmarks. This would provide evidence and justification for moving on this.
  - The way the Board is doing the business is changing. From my position, this is a positive thing.
  - The AD issue: This is HAF money, not E&G. If this would have been E&G money, I would have voted no. But it's not. The HAF can do whatever they want with their money, but the Board has no say in how they do so.
  - There was an article about Board expenditures. I was caught flat footed by a reporter. I made a mistake. What I was quoted to have said is completely untrue. To set the facts straight, the budget of the Board is \$100K, the majority of which goes to salaries. I misspoke and have apologized.
  - Questions / comments:
    - M. Pruitt – I was told within the last year, student athletes now receive stipends. HAF said they would cover it, but they came up short and \$3-5M came out of the E&G budget. Am I wrong about this?
      - C. Ernst – I don't recall reallocation of monies to athletics. The RAMP model will make this explicit. This will be a vast improvement.
    - A. Jerome – My concern in talking to a number of faculty is that maybe the money is coming from different places, but I wish you would have voted no to anything more than 4%.

- J. Applin – Since the HAF is supplying the raise to the AD’s base, do they do that every year?
  - C. Ernst – That’s my understanding, but I will keep an eye on it.
- M. McKerral – The RAMP gives more control to the colleges. I’m not convinced the RAMP model prioritizes why they get what they get. With regard to foundation money, perhaps the Board doesn’t have control. The reason why it’s going to cost us more for athletic admins is that people keep getting raises which ups the bar. The Board can control the foundation money. The Board could cut the E&G money to athletics. I wish you would vote the way the faculty wants you to.
- D. Clark – When the different auxiliary and support units submitted proposals to us (of which athletics is one), they had to justify increases. We ranked them and sent them up to the Executive Budget Committee. That process is still ongoing. If we saw a unit get increases above what they were approved for, I think the committee would take that into consideration and deal with it accordingly the following year.
- A. Jerome – [regarding the AD] – My issue is that they say “If we wouldn’t have given him this raise, he would have left, and it would have been more expensive to hire a new AD.” I would have asked for proof of that. There have to be some young, hungry, assistant AD’s who can be as mediocre as we’ve been [in athletics] and would cost a lot less.
- C. Ernst – My understanding is the whole of the revenue goes to the colleges. Out of this, they have to pay certain percentages to the auxiliary units.
- ***Advisory Report, Provost – Terry Ballman***
  - 1) I want to thank those of you who have provided feedback for the dean searches.
  - 2) I have received the CAPE recommendations and have begun to review those.
  - 3) SGA has requested a review of academic fees. A task force has been formed and is beginning to look into questions surrounding these fees.
- ***Advisory Report, SGA President – Stephen Mayer***

**H) Information Items**

**I) Adjournment**

- J. Berger motioned. Unanimous approval.