

Western Kentucky University
University Senate
Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Meeting Minutes
11 March 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 (substitute): Janet Applin, Kirk Atkinson, Jim Berger, Jason Bergner, Dan Clark, Susann Davis, Carl Dick, Claus Ernst, Colin Farrell, Jim Fulkerson, Larry Hill (Eric Conte), Jim Lindsey, Lauren McClain, Joe Shankweiler, Heather Strode, Mary Wolinski
- Guests present: Amber Belt, Kate Hudepohl

B) Approve February 2019 minutes

- S. Davis motioned to approved. C. Dick seconded. Passed unanimously.

C) Reports

- *Chair – Kirk Atkinson*

- 1) University CAPE committee

- Activity still going on this week...most of the information went out to departments (e.g., initial recommendations) based on the best available data provided
- Some of the numbers on some units had gone down but are starting to come back up
- Committee is yet to vote on this. Once the final recommendations from CAPE are ready, they should be shared with the public.

- 2) Senate budget

- K. Atkinson distributed proposed Senate budget for next fiscal year. [K. Atkinson reviewed some of the previous budget numbers and explained the creation of the new budget along with the line items.]
- C. Dick motioned to approve budget. L. McClain seconded. Unanimously approved.
 - C. Dick – The money for these release times...it would be moved to that faculty member's department?
 - K. Atkinson – To the college, yes. LaDonna Hunton does that. The Provost didn't think it was fair for the colleges to bear the expense. This is a university service.
 - J. Applin – What happens if someone doesn't take the course release? Does the department lose that money?
 - K. Atkinson – I don't know. The money is restricted for this use. I don't think you could take the cash (as an overload).
 - J. Berger – I imagine there's precedent for when a course release is offered but not taken.
 - C. Dick – Could these turn into administrative stipends if the course release is taken?

- J. Berger – I think the university would be reluctant to pay them as stipends. If you don't take it as a course release, they may only offer you an overload, which reduces the amount [listed on the budget].
 - K. Atkinson – I can certainly check and see how the Provost's office wants to handle this.
 - C. Ernst – We were asking about this long ago. When this was originally proposed, a stipend was discussed. The feeling is that the people who are stepping up to do these things are devoting a fair amount of time, so the course release would be the right thing to do. However, no reason a stipend couldn't be done. We do any number of one-time stipends on campus.
 - K. Atkinson – If it rolls back to the Senate budget [if someone doesn't use the course release], then the money wouldn't roll over to the next year. Hopefully, we could spend it.
 - S. Davis – Because a lot of travel comes out of our pocket, this money could be made to support professional development.
 - J. Berger – I've asked that before and been denied.
 - K. Atkinson – I think there's some sticky IRS regulations regarding that, but I'll ask. I think it's a fair question given the fairly extensive travel budgets some have on campus.
 - L. McClain – On the "one per year" course release, does the faculty member get to choose?
 - K. Atkinson – That would certainly be between that senator and their college.
- 3) Smoke-free speaker to next Senate meeting
- 4) Senate chair response to recent BoR meeting
- K. Atkinson read a draft of a response he had formulated to the BoR.
 - J. Lindsey – I support it. I think it's well written.
 - L. McClain – The Academic Quality and Faculty Welfare (and also Budget and Finance) committee worked on a resolution that is on the agenda for today that speaks to this issue (the Budget committee tabled its vote on it). The athletic director received a 32% increase. Faculty got (at most) 6% and were lucky to get a 2% cost of living increase. What justification is there to give a single person this much money? This is why morale is so low. We keep being told the budget situation is dire, and they [re: admin] go and do things like this. It's like a slap in the face. I really like what you said [in the letter].
 - S. Davis – I think it's obscene to cap faculty raises at 6% and have administrators get huge raises like this. I understand these are fantastic administrators who could find better paying jobs elsewhere, but we also have fantastic faculty that can do the same, and we're losing a lot of them. We're going to continue to lose them, and we need to put the focus on our mission.
 - C. Dick – The AD was a base salary increase? The president's was a one-time bonus? Was there any rationale given for the necessity of this?
 - K. Atkinson – The BoR did this.
 - C. Ernst – There are two different items. The president has a contract that stipulates up to a 10% bonus depending on the evaluation of the Board.

For me, this issue is that the Board evaluated him very highly and fulfilled the contract, which allows for a 10% of salary bonus. His contract says that his base salary cannot be adjusted by than the average faculty raise (4%), and that's what happened. I [as Faculty Regent] voted for this because I think he has done a great job. The athletic director is different and is the thing I wrestled with the most. I was prepared before the Board meeting to vote no. Here is the issue: I would have voted no if this was from E&G money (i.e., the money could be used for other purposes). This money comes from the athletic foundation, and they had already approved this. If the Board voted no, then a murky situation follows: the foundation cannot make this part of his base salary, but they could have given money to him anyway. Their money is not under the control of the Board. For me, the crux of the issue was the lack of alternative use of the money.

- J. Berger – Then why was the Board voting on it [the athletic director raise] in the first place?
- C. Ernst – We're looking at it. This happens all the time, where the Board votes on things after they happen. For instance, the Board voted in March to approve raises that were given in January. This is the way the Board has operated for years.
- J. Berger – I guess the assumption is that they can always pull it back.
 - C. Ernst – I would think it would be very difficult to pull it back.
- C. Ernst – We vote on contracts that have been executed all the time. I voted for the president because it was a fulfilling of a contract. The athletic director's money couldn't be used for anything else. This bonus puts our athletic director up to the median of the conference in terms of salaries. I expressed my concerns to Caboni that we should not do any market adjustments until the completion of the Simpson study. I think that's a more effective way than being a single no vote.
- L. McClain – That raise is part of his raise. So is the foundation going to pay for his raise every year?
 - C. Ernst – That's my understanding.
 - L. McClain – Could that money have been used for students (scholarships, etc.)?
 - C. Ernst – Yes, but I don't have any control over what they do with their money. This is a huge problem in the way the university is set up. There are all sorts of foundations around campus that we don't have control over [the money].
- J. Applin – I'm sure it's true that HAF is paying for that part of his salary. As faculty, we're always told the money is coming "from a different fund/index." I'm not sure when that's true and when it's not. There are other cases where the E&G subsidizes athletics. I just don't think there's enough transparency there.
 - C. Ernst – That's why the RAMP model is so important. The RAMP model, for the first time, will publicly disclose a number. That's the number going into the future that we need to track.

- J. Berger – That’s only for funds that’s going through E&G. The HAF isn’t going through the RAMP. To Janet’s point, her point will stand even after RAMP.
- K. Atkinson – E&G is not being reduced by that amount, right?
- J. Berger – Correct. It’s not.
- L. McClain – Why didn’t they take that money and put it into the university so the rest of the university doesn’t have to subsidize it?
- M. Wolinski – The good thing about RAMP is that it will allow you ask questions like “why is the university putting so much money into athletics?”
- C. Farrell – If we [university] don’t control the money, then even if we know that we’re subsidizing them and by a specific amount, why would they change what they’re doing? They’ll say that you are already subsidizing us, and you can’t tell us how to spend our money. Now it’s just a matter of knowing how much goes in, but they still don’t do anything.
- L. McClain – [to C. Ernst] This isn’t about this particular issue, but I think I’ve heard you say once or twice that you might have voted a certain way because you would have been the lone vote. I would encourage you to vote the way faculty want you to vote, and not be worried about being the only no. That vote goes on record. Even if the vote goes against what the faculty wants, they could look back and see the support of the Faculty Regent and feel like their voice is being heard.
 - C. Ernst – If this would have been E&G money, I would have voted no.
 - K. Atkinson – I was in the room watching the broadcast of the BoR meeting when President Caboni got a standing ovation. The people who had lost their jobs or are fearful of their jobs felt like their graves were being danced on. I could see the faces of these people. Why did this have to be done now?
- **Vice Chair – Dan Clark (no report)**
 - 1) Senator elections
 - The list of senators is up to date on shared drive.
 - Sent an email to all department chairs for senator elections and the results are due by March 31.
- **Secretary – Jason Bergner (no report)**
- **Committee Chairs**
 - 1) **Academic Quality – Heather Strobe (report posted)**
 - H. Strobe motioned. Unanimous approval of the report, including the proposal discussed below. The vote on the proposal is to give the committee permission to move forward with the recruitment/retention *ad hoc* committee.
 - Want to propose to the SEC about an *ad hoc* committee for recruitment and retention
 - Efforts to recruit and retain adult learners (age 25+)

- This population has shrunk on campus, but as the 18-22 population declines, we can potentially tap into this population to increase the population
- To work with students who just have a couple of courses left to earn a credential
- We want to study these issues and make recommendations to the university
- L. McClain – Have you talked to Chris Jensen about any of this? They are probably already working on this, but if not, they would be the ones implementing this, so it would be good to have them in from the beginning to get their buy in.
 - J. Berger – I have not.
 - C. Dick – I would suggest that Chris Jensen be contacted about this.

2) Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities – Lauren McClain (report posted)

- L. McClain motioned. Unanimous approval.
- Provost Ballman came to our last meeting. There are currently three policies that deal with admin salaries (promoted from faculty to admin, hired in as an admin). The problem with the way these policies have been implemented is that admins that return to the faculty often bring their (much higher) admin salaries with them. The Provost wants to replace the policies with a single policy. The new proposal would replace the current salary + admin stipend with a formula. This is on the agenda for our next meeting.
- At the special December meeting, one of the items that was referred to us was shared governance. The Faculty Handbook is legally binding, but the policy on policies basically says that for any policies we have, faculty are just consultants and admins can basically do whatever they want. We want to change the policy on policies (not all of it) to change the language to give faculty more of a final say in things. We are going to work on it and are welcome to ideas on this issue.
 - C. Ernst – This issue of admin salaries. Both the president and provost are in favor of having the salaries goes back down if admins go back to the faculty.
 - J. Applin – I went back to faculty after being Associate Dean, and I took a 40% pay cut. So not everyone keeps the higher salary.
- The faculty work life survey goes out tomorrow.

3) Budget and Finance Committee – Jim Berger (report posted)

- J. Berger motioned. Unanimous approval for the report and the RAMP description within the report.
- We have a description for the RAMP model that has been vetted by Ann Mead's office and HURON. We hope to put this up on the web site.
 - K. Atkinson – I asked Jim to bring the RAMP description to the SEC before putting it up on the web site.
 - M. Wolinski – Library is classified as a support unit because they don't bring it students. But libraries are closely tied to teaching. They aren't the same as other support departments that don't provide direct academic support. Libraries always get hit very badly in budget cuts. I wish there was some protection for the more academically-oriented support units.

- J. Berger – I absolutely agree.
 - We're still working on salary comparisons. We hope to have that done shortly.
 - We spent a great deal of time talking about the resolution that will be presented later in this meeting. We ultimately decided to table a vote on it.
- 4) ***Colonnade General Education Committee – Mary Wolinski (report posted)***
- M. Wolinski motioned. Unanimous approval.
 - Approval of three Colonnade courses.
 - 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.
 - K. Atkinson – I've heard a lot of discussion on this around campus. The talk has been positive.
- 5) ***Graduate Council – Carl Dick (report posted)***
- C. Dick motioned. Unanimous approval.
 - We're revising our bylaws pursuant to the Senate charter changes. We should vote on that at our next meeting.
 - J. Applin – I wanted to ask about the emergency management program.
 - C. Dick – It was tabled two different times due to a lack of information from the people proposing the program.
 - J. Berger – Can you provide a brief summary of the discussion of the white paper?
 - C. Dick – The white paper incorporated a few comments made by graduate council members. One of the things that was suggested was that there be stronger language about the graduate dean being in regular and synergistic contact with the regular academic deans. This was a tough issue, but a lot of people feel that the graduate dean has been a “sub dean” and been run over by the regular academic deans. They wanted to make sure the provost delineates roles and responsibilities of each, and we've made her aware. That's been approved and is in the provost's hands.
- 6) ***Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Janet Applin (report posted)***
- J. Applin motioned. Unanimous approval.
- 7) ***Faculty Handbook Committee – Kate Hudepohl (report posted)***
- New business items below
- **Advisory Reports**
 - 1) ***Advisory Report, Faculty Regent – Claus Ernst***
 - 2) ***Advisory Report, Provost – Terry Ballman***
 - K. Atkinson – I was asked at an earlier meeting to follow up on why the Senate had not received a written response to two resolutions that we passed earlier this year. For the resolution regarding the provost (the letter initially sent out to instructors about changing the policy for the date of notification to not rehire), Provost Ballman said she was not going to formally respond with a written statement since she a) sent out a campus-wide email and b) addressed the matter in person at a Senate meeting. The other resolution was about the merit process. I haven't heard from the president, and I haven't had a meeting with him yet, either.
 - 3) ***Advisory Report, SGA President – Stephen Mayer***

D) Old Business

E) New Business

1) Joint subcommittee resolution to make academic affairs top priority in the budget

- L. McClain – presented a resolution
- L. McClain motioned to approve the resolution. J. Berger seconded. Resolution failed, 4-5 with two abstentions.
 - K. Atkinson – Should I keep my earlier statement separate?
 - L. McClain – I think it's better to have two separate messages. It makes an additional statement to have something from you and then something separate from the committee.
 - L. McClain – This resolution is idealistic. We didn't come up (during the resolution process) with specific measurables for this resolution. It was going to be impossible in the meeting to come up with specific measurables. The resolution is a starting point, and we want to follow up with specific resolutions. We have a question on the faculty-life survey asking for ideas on measurables. We are also considering sending out a separate email as well. The committee was split as to whether to just gather info from the survey or to do both (survey and email). We want to know what it would specifically look like for academic affairs to be the priority of the budget.
 - C. Dick – I question how beneficial this will be without some requests.
 - L. McClain – That's why we want to follow up with more resolutions after this. Perhaps one next month, then another, etc.
 - K. Atkinson – The president is not big on resolutions. They [re: admin] don't know how to respond if we don't give them something specific to respond to.
 - H. Strode – [to J. Berger] What was some of the concerns of your committee [who tabled this resolution]?
 - J. Berger – Part of the conversation was that they didn't like the numbers (which have been removed in this version). Part of the conversation was the new budget model should help. My take on it was that the conversation was that we're in a new budget model and that this may (over time) promote a greater emphasis on academic affairs.
 - C. Ernst – I have high hopes that the RAMP model will help. How have we actually fared? Somewhat surprising to me, the percentage of the budget spent on instruction has gone up from the 2015 to now. I have no problem with this resolution, but what do we hope to achieve? Whatever we say, I would want us to have numbers to back it up.
 - M. Wolinski – Based on a prior meeting, I think the issue is not the dollar amounts spent on academics but the percentage of the budget.
 - J. Berger – [to C. Ernst] Are the numbers you have based on dollars or percentage?
 - C. Ernst – Percentages.
 - J. Berger – How did others fare comparatively?
 - C. Ernst – Research, public service, libraries, and others have declined. Academic support and some others have gone up. It's a mixed bag. We

haven't had instructional positions were eliminated. We've had some support positions eliminated, but no instructional ones.

- J. Berger – We've had a number of faculty lines that we not re-filled once vacant. Those lines no longer exist. A lot of those positions that were eliminated were faculty lines.
 - C. Ernst – No they weren't.
 - J. Berger – I'd have to go back and look at that report again.
 - L. McClain – At the start of the meeting, I also had some of Jim's [Berger] concerns about the potential impact of the RAMP model. However, we felt like we needed to make a statement now. I was there at the November meeting. This is why morale is the way it is. We need to be a constant reminder. Some in the room thought there is value in doing this. Others thought that since we were asked to do something about this in December, and coming up with specifics is going to take time, and since we're already in March, we want faculty to know that we're hearing them and we're trying to move forward.
 - H. Strode – The thought process was that this was bigger than the 60 people that were in that room. We didn't want there to be a lack of response or a significant lag.
 - K. Atkinson – If we pass this, I'm going to be asked what they [admin] are supposed to do with this, since it makes a statement and is not asking for anything.
- 2) Policy change – audit & withdrawal date adjustment
- H. Strode motioned to approve the changing of the audit and withdrawal dates. Proposal was presented. Unanimously approved.
- 3) Faculty handbook action items
- 01-2019 – substantive change: Appendix – Faculty regent election
 - H. Strode motioned for approval. J. Berger seconded.
 - S. Davis moved for a friendly amendment to remove the provision of excluding an election on Fridays. Unanimous approval of motion with the friendly amendment.
 - 02-2019 – non-substantive change: Foreward
 - H. Strode motioned. J. Fulkerson seconded. Unanimous approval.
 - 03-2019 – non-substantive change: I.B.2 – Graduate council
 - C. Dick motioned. J. Berger seconded. Unanimous approval.
 - 04-2019 – non-substantive change: II.K – Course syllabi and student performance procedures
 - J. Berger motioned. H. Strode seconded. Unanimous approval.
 - 05-2019 – non-substantive change: II.N – Grade reporting
 - J. Berger motioned. C. Dick seconded. Unanimous approval.
 - 06-2019 – non-substantive change: II.P – Academic advising
 - J. Berger motioned. C. Dick seconded. Unanimous approval.
 - 07-2019 – non-substantive change: II.W.1 – Extra university consulting
 - L. McClain motioned. C. Dick seconded. Unanimous approval.
 - 08-2019 – Substantive change: IV.C.2 – Faculty complaint

- L. McClain motioned. J. Berger seconded. Unanimous approval.
- 09-2019 – Substantive change: II.A.2 – Lecturer appointment
 - J. Berger motioned. L. McClain seconded. Unanimous approval.
- 10-2019 – Substantive change: III.F.1 – Promotion application deadlines
 - C. Dick motioned. H. Strobe seconded. Unanimous approval.
- 11-2019 – Substantive change: IV.B.2 – Notice to new faculty
 - C. Dick motioned. J. Berger seconded. Unanimous approval.
- 12-2019 – Substantive change: III.D.1 – Criteria for promotion recommendation
 - J. Berger motioned. C. Dick seconded. Unanimous approval with friendly amendment from C. Dick to add “Proposed Wording” above the relevant section.
- S. Davis – The Faculty Handbook does not have dates by which instructors have to be notified. Is the committee looking into this?
 - K. Hudepohl – Yes, but the policy is the more important document.

F) Information Items

1) Status of NCFS

- Still ongoing and moving slowly

G) Adjournment

- J. Berger motioned. Unanimous approval.