I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the WKU Senate was called to order on Thursday, October 20, 2011 at 3:45 p.m. in the Faculty House by Chair Kelly Madole. A quorum was present.


Alternates present were: Danita Kelly (John Bonaguro), Jill Brown (Charles Borders), Andy Ernest (Blaine Ferrell), Paul Woosely (Becky Gilfillen), Allison Andrews (Suellyn Lathrop), Darren Smith (Beth Pyle), Samangi Munasinghe (Huanjing Wang).

The following members were absent: Mike Binder, Nathan Bishop, Erika Brady, Diane Carver, Vladimir Dobrokhotov, Kinchel C Doerner, Sam Evans, Jim Fulkerson, Dennis George, Brandon Gifford, Sonya House, Molly Kerby, Ed Kintzel, Alex Lebedinsky, David Lee, Ingrid Lily, Mac McKerral, Gustavo Obeso, Gary Ransdell, Kateri Rhodes, Michael E Smith, Billy Stephens, Evelyn Thrasher, Di Wu, David Zimmer.

II. Approve September Minutes

- September minutes approved as posted.

III. Reports:

A. Chair – Kelly Madole
   a. Chair Madole thanked the Senate body for the help with the Regents election. Congratulations to Patty Minter on winning the election.

B. Vice Chair – Francesca Sunkin – No report.
C. Coalition of Senate & Faculty Leadership for Higher Education (COSFL) Representative- Molly Kerby - Absent

D. Advisory

1. Faculty Regent – Patti Minter (see report)
   - In chronological order –
     o On behalf of all Faculty and Staff Regents, thank you for the unanimous resolution, that advocated the right of the faculty to determine who represents them on the Board of Regents. Thanks to SGA who passed a unanimous solidarity resolution of support as well. The Faculty Regents across the state unanimously endorsed a resolution drafted by Peg Monk again took the language from your very nicely worded resolution. And all of those things were presented to President Ransdell and BOR Chair Higdin. When I saw the report, I was pleasantly surprised to discover that staff council drafted a memo that reversed their decision and signed on to agree with faculty resolution. Therefore the report President Ransdell presented to Chair Higdin, made it clear that the it was not the will of the faculty or staff that the board proceed with the bylaw limitation and there will be accordingly, no bylaw limitation. It is a dead issue.
     - COSFL report – The CPE annual trustees conference on Sept 22 and 23. Spoke about faculty regents issue with COSFL reps. Working on a report with other reps to prepare for faculty. Will be available for November meeting.
     - CPE conference – summarized – Dr. King and retention. Retention; statewide growth is flat now. Growth is flat except in Moorehead State U.
       - Dr. King felt that the report / presentation by outgoing auditor ?? was important and passed to every Regent in the state. In her presentation, she argues that trustees have to move away that we pass everything that is presented. Must scrutinize everything and make smart choices.
     - October 21 at 8am BOR will gavel to order.
     - And finally, thank you for re-electing me.

2. Provost – Gordon Emslie
   - Four recommendations from senate all approved. 20110901 Grad council 20110902 UCC, 20110903 regarding access to personnel files; 20110904 - Faculty awards and new timeline accepted recommendation and moved it forward.
   - Enrollment – not official enrollment report – pretty good news. Despite previous reports which show decline, as of last Monday, we are up 24 new freshman. We are down 111 sophomores (retention issue). Up in Juniors and Seniors. Have 72 Navitas students, Overall up 257; 293 are dual credits in the high schools. We are within 100,000 dollars are so within reaching the Fall budget.
   - Efforts to continue retention – conducted a math-works survey over a period of a few weeks. 57.5% response rate. Giving away free tuition as a prize! 2200 freshman participated in survey and have good data to go on.
   - Have developed a set of criteria to put students in moderate, medium, etc categories. Identified all students for one thing or another who are, according to historical records, at risk. Some intervention needs to be applied to keep them returning in the coming semester. If there is something you can do to intervene please do so.
   - A lot of discussion in regards to the drop date. A lot of discussion in regards to students are dropped for non payment, then Blackboard, should they be reinstated at a later date? Senate unanimous in saying no. Not yet that easy to decide when that date is going to be. This semester the date is Nov 11. No payment accepted after Nov 11. Moving forward, I would like to move that date to published October 18 day. As of October 4, 1800 students out of 21000 were on list to be dropped. 400 had some sort of protection hold (funds coming) 400 almost immediately reinstated, a week later 350 more were reinstated, left 650. Expect 150 to show up reinstated about now. That leaves about 500 historically, approximately 450, are no-shows. Leaves 50 students, residuals, who have become reinstated much later, they are being contacted. Trying to streamline this process.
   - Staffing plan – had Phase 2 last week. We had approximately 60 vacancies last year. Combination of Tenure/nontenure and staff spots. Phase 1, 75% filled at total cost of 2 million dollars we had three
executive level positions, 32 tenure track faculty, 6 non-tenure track faculty when we started about a month and ½ ago. Phase 2 look at this from university level perspective; take slots left 1.1 million dollars worth. Added money from Delo, retirements, full retirements, unit productivity reports taken out of budget, found 8000 in a couch somewhere – end of result budget positions almost total $2.22 million dollars. He added another $1/2 million plus benefits and one time money. End result searching for 73 faculty positions; 4 non faculty, plus initiated minority hiring plan even though no enrollment growth money. One remaining piece is the mortgaging of positions – will add up to another 20 faculty positions. We could be searching for 80-90 positions, 70 of which are tenure track. Net increase of 30 faculty overall. He does that overall in response to increasing tenure eligible faculty.

- Of the 70,000, 1/3 was used in cluster hires. Slots already in Deans list we saw in the Dean’s list that had strategic value. Wants to stress these are not new slots – one in aging, on in social work, one in FACS, one in ?food? Trying to turn as much one time money into base as he can. Looks forward to the results of these searches.

3. **SGA President** – Billy Stephens--absent.

### IV. Standing Committee Reports:

a. **Graduate Council** – Nevil Speer
   i. Nevil Speer moves for approval with one editorial change. Proposal for HCA 459G – under course catalog listing need to add sentence that reads, “Course repeatable once for a total of 6 hours.”
   ii. Motion to send the grad council report forward to Provost is approved.

b. **Undergraduate Curriculum Committee** – John White
   i. Move to approve the report (John White)
   ii. Motion to send the report forward approved.

c. **General Education** – Eric Reed
   i. Update- been reviewing the task forces report for 6 weeks or so now. Had a final consideration Tuesday. Voted to support it unanimously. Means for the Senate we will have recommendations on how you should handle it as well as the plans from task force itself publicly. Proposing 2 readings in November, vote in December. Proposing task force Larry Snyder, organize at least 2 university wide forums between now and when we vote on it for faculty and students to ask questions.

d. **Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee** – Richard Schugart
   i. Items being reviewed: Pedagogical faculty track, Faculty Regent voter eligibility, standing committee on faculty handbook, employee handbook. Any thoughts? Send input to Mac or anyone on committee. Next meeting is Mon Nov 21 in MMTH. 9:30

e. **Academic Quality Committee** – Guy Jordan
   i. Been discussing issue of how to resolve dual credit classes. Working on a document now, will be finalized during Nov meeting. Will bring before SEC and then probably in December before the full senate. Any input on assessing the dual credit courses, please send to him or Molly Kerby.

f. **Benefits Committee**
   i. Benefits Committee – health care reserve fund in solid shape. In 5.2 million and 220,000 has been added this year to the funds. There has been some conversation in committee about making the spousal tuition remission policy consistent with the dependent child retention remission policy. Trying to make those the same. HR is doing some research. Wellness Coordinator Wade Pinkert gave a great presentation to the committee this week.
g. Athletics Advisory Committee --
i. Athletics Advisory Committee – Major conversation – changes coming forward from the NCAA this week in terms of graduation rates.

V. University Committee Reports

VI. Unfinished Business:

a. Policy 1.1181: Faculty/University Awards

VII. New Business:

a. Information Items
   i. Faculty Awards Timeline (for 2011-2012)

b. Action Items

   i. Unfinished Business
      1. Faculty Awards Timeline (permanent)
         a. Move to approve John White / Second Richard Dietle
         b. Motion passes.

   ii. New Business
      1. Policy 1.5040: Department head selection and review
         a. Move to approve John White / Second Applegate
         b. DS: Motion – Steve Miller. Section 3.a.3 There is a mention that the review process may include tenure and tenure track faculty. In the last sentence where it talks about the secret ballot, it does not mention tenure and tenure track faculty. Feels it would be wise to encode that. If we are going to have a secret ballot for 3.a.3, then it would also make sense for there to be faculty input by secret ballot by internal and external search. The amendment in each case would be the bolded terms in 3.a.3, 3.b.4, 3.b.5. Prior to the selection of an internal candidate, the Dean shall solicit the input of the tenured and tenure track faculty of that department in a secret ballot, indicating the acceptability of that candidate to the voting departmental members.
   c. 2nd Daday.
   d. Friendly amendment to add the word “voting” before the phrase “departmental members.” Phrase would now be “…acceptability of that candidate to the voting departmental members.” by Haynes-Lawrence
   e. Robert Dietle proposing an amendment to the original amendment – move to amend to word it such that it is clear that the acceptability is on each candidate who is interviewed for the position. Amend the bold print, “Indicating the acceptability of each candidate interviewed to the voting departmental members.”
   f. Second Haynes-Lawrence
   g. Matt – feels amendment is restricting
   h. Provost – none of these things preclude what has to happen.
   i. Steve - feels Roberts amendment changes what he had intended.
   j. Robert not withdrawing
   k. Daday – is this policy something that happens in every college (faculty body – says no).
l. Dietle – what happens if the dean picks someone and the department says no and the Dean says I’m going with this candidate anyway?
m. Jerome – Intention? After or before?

n. Steve – after decision, but before it has been finalized.
o. Robert Dietle withdraws the amendment.
p. Randy Kinnersly – what Robert is talking about is required by human resources. (Provost - true of search committee, this goes beyond human resources search committee)

q. Now discussing Steve’s Amendment.
r. Moore – Bold only adds a layer if the Dean chooses “a” in the sentence before your bolding.
s. Steve- but at some point you would get to the whole. If you did ‘c’ it is covered in 5. If you did ‘b’ some point down the line would be covered.
t. Motion to accept the bolded amendment
   i. Motion passes (one no)
   • Motion to accept amended policy
   • All in favor of recommending amended policy
      a. Motion passes.

2. **Policy 1.5132: Administrative Stipends**
   a. Move approval Applegate / second White
   b. Motion passes.

Motion to adjourn Haynes-Lawrence

Meeting adjourned at 4:56
Respectfully submitted by Darbi Haynes-Lawrence, Secretary