

University Senate Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 15, 2014 -- 3:45 p.m.
Faculty House

Call to Order:

- Chair Margaret Crowder called the regular meeting of the WKU Senate to order on Thursday, May 15, 2014 at 3:45 pm in the Faculty House. A quorum was present.
- **Members Present:**
Heidi Álvarez, Shahnaz Aly, Lauren Bland, Jill Brown, Mike Carini, Ashley Chance-Fox, Robert Choate, Ismail Civelek, Krystal Clayton, Bruce Crawley, Margaret Crowder, R. Tucker Davis, Robert Dietle, Karin Egloff, Gordon Emslie, Joseph Evans, Jody Evans, Ann Ferrell, Barbara Fiehn, Lloren Foster, Steven Gibson, John Gottfried, Jennifer Hanley, Don Hoover, Jeffrey Kash, Stephen A. King, Alison Langdon, Sonia Lenk, Qi Li, Sean Marstin, Greg McAmis, Lauren McClain, Steve Miller, Patricia Minter, Samangi Munasinghe, Ngoc Nguyen, Yvonne Petkus, Attila Por, Matt Pruitt, Beth Pyle, Tammera Race, Mark Reeves, Jeff Rice, Julie Shadoan, Jonghee Shim, Beverly Siegrist, Michael Smith, Cheryl Stevens, Dick Taylor, Rico Tyler, Tamara Van Dyken, Adam West, Aaron Wichman, Blairanne Williams, and Dawn Gannett Wright.
- **Alternates Present:**
Danita Kelley for John Bonaguro, Janet Applin for Sam Evans, Tadayuki Suzuki for Nancy Hulan, Holly Payne for Angela Jerome, Andrew McMichael for David Lee, Janet Tassell for Pam Petty, Seth Church for Janet Nicki Seay.
- **Guests Present who signed in:**
Colette Chelf, Sylvia Gaiko, Michelle Hollis, Laura McGee, Richard C. Miller, Merrall Price, Douglas C. Smith, Helen Sterk, Michelle Trawick, Michael Ann Williams.
- **Absent:**
Cain Alvey, Keyana Boka, Kristi Branham, Imelda Bratton, Christa Briggs, Chris Brown, Amy Cappiccie, Diane Carver, Yining Chen, Christopher Costa, Brittany Crowley, Laura Delancey, Patricia Desrosiers, Amanda Drost, Marc Eagle, Frieda Eggleton, Connie Foster, Ron Gallagher, Marilyn Gardner, Dennis George, Becky Gilfillen, Frederick Grieve, Samantha Johnson, Dean Jordan, Jeffrey Katz, Richard Keaster, Suellyn Lathrop, Ling Lo, Gayle Mallinger, Alexandria Manglaris, Catherine Martin, Doug McElroy, Richard Miller, Isabel Mukonyara, Jane Olmsted, Inma Pertusa, Shura Pollatsek, Gary Ransdell, Kelly Reames, Eric Reed (for Mary Wolinski), Kateri Rhodes, Nancy Richey, Nancy Rice, Janice Smith, Dana Sullivan, Janet Tassell, Kevin Thomas, and Carrie Trojan.

A. Approve April 2014 Minutes

- A motion to approve the April minutes was made by D. Taylor was seconded by J.

Hanley. The minutes were approved unanimously as posted.

B. Reports:

1. Chair – Margaret Crowder

- Chair Crowder brought attention to the information items.
- The CIT program moved from University College to Ogden College. There was a proposal to suspend the program. Because students were enrolled in it, the program was transferred. The memo is included. A conversation with Greg Arbuckle showed that the faculty was able to handle this transition. At the UCC, the CIT program withdrew the suspension of program proposal.
- President Ransdell's response to the prayer policy in the form of a memo showed that the Administrative Council chose not to endorse the resolution. Some faculty have already had responses.
- Provost's committee members have been chosen.
- Some colleges still need representatives for standing committees; each college should have representatives on committees, and incoming senators should fill these spots prior to the first meeting in the fall.

2. Vice Chair – Jennifer Hanley (no report)

3. Secretary - Heidi Alvarez (no report)

4. Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership for Higher Education – Molly Kerby (absent, no report)

5. AAUP Report – Eric Reed (absent, no report)

C. Advisory:

1. Faculty Regent – Patricia Minter

- Regent Minter represented the WKU Chapter of AAUP at the state meeting in Lexington. She stated that she learned a lot about faculty rights and that the speaker was one of the National Redbook Committee members. The AAUP will meet next fall in a workshop. The theme of his talk and the panel that Minter served on was that faculty governance means action, not just reaction. Though we are the best at faculty governance when in crisis mode, we need to stay ready for action and keep committees strong. She encouraged senators to keep faculty governance at the forefront, and to keep faculty voices strong and relevant. She stated that we can work to make things better by identifying problems and working hard to solve them. We have the active (not passive) role to safeguard our rights.
- The Board of Regents will be working on the budget in June.
- The Board of Regents retreat is in July.
- It is essential to academic freedom and academic integrity and the preservation of democracy that we work together.
- Have a great summer; recharge the batteries and come back with action to avoid reaction.

2. Provost – Gordon Emslie

- All policies and recommendations were approved.
- The third regional campus was taken to the Administrative Council on Monday. It will be moved and will be brought back in the fall in a more generalized form.
- Last December's amended UCC report was also approved.
- The Provost's advisory committees have been formed. The Budget committee meeting on Monday discussed long-term planning. Institutional spending was looked at in reference to benchmarks. The space committee will include three regional campus representatives, facilities management, construction, and IT.
- Summer enrollment is staying steady. Freshman enrollment is up for the summer.
- Fall enrollment +4 in new freshman last time he looked, and this will raise this summer.
- To develop and reconsider the second to last in terms of state appropriation to student, the Provost plans to look at a performance-based and historical model this summer. He will keep faculty updated.
- The CHHS search will use a search firm and the search will recommence this summer for a spring appointment.
- Reviews on academic programs for departments and colleges: concern expressed at the state level is going. There will be an internal review and will be reported to CPE by the end of June.
- There are four commencements this weekend. The Glasgow Campus commencement was last weekend, along with other regional commencements.
- The Gatton Academy is in the works; the announcement will be soon.

3. SGA President – Nicki Seay

- The SGA banquet was last Tuesday and Nicki Seay, the new SGA President, was sworn in. She has a double major in agricultural economics and mass communication with a minor in political science.
- SGA is looking for PR director applicants; please send ideas.
- The SGA retreat is next week. Goals for next year will be discussed, and the SGA is open to ideas and suggestions. The SGA is looking forward to working with the University Senate again next year.

C. Standing Committee Reports and Recommendations

1. Graduate Council (Tammy Van Dyken for Beth Plummer): Report posted; endorsed by SEC. Tammy Van Dyken submitted the April graduate council report. The report was approved unanimously by the graduate faculty.

2. University Curriculum Committee: Report posted, endorsed by SEC
Ashley Chance Fox requested a motion to approve the April 24 UCC report. The report was approved unanimously. The 7 policy items also passed unanimously.

3. Academic Quality (A. Langdon):

- A. Langdon made a motion for approval of the April 28th Academic Quality Report.

- L. McClain (Sociology) likes the idea of changing, but due to a concern with the recommended change for #5 (because it makes it sound like a progress report), suggested ending it after the word “feedback”.
- A. Wichman responded to the same item, saying that “timely” and “constructive” feedback does not always go together.
- There was no more discussion or comment on the proposed changes.
- A motion to alter #5 by A. Wichman (2nd L. McClain) was followed by a motion to approve items 1-4 and send back #5 for review.
- A. Langdon asked if it could be approved today.
- A. Wichman made a motion to approve #1-5 with an amendment to change #5.
- The first vote to amend #5 by A. Wichman (2nd L. McClain) with the amendment “my instructor provides constructive feedback” was clarified.
- The first vote is the amendment. The 2nd vote is to vote on all 5.
- The first vote in favor of the amendment for #5 passed unanimously.
- The second vote, the approval of all five items and the amendment to item #5, was also passed unanimously.

4. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility (R. Tucker Davis):

- T. Davis made a motion to approve the April 28th report.
- Discussion centered around the issue of promotion of instructors of different ranks.
- It was forwarded as an information item to faculty welfare.
- This was the only time the committee had discussed it.
- R. Dietle said that the report includes the resolution.
- The first vote is to vote on the faculty welfare report. The report was approved unanimously.
- T. Davis made a motion for the resolution. Discussion followed.
- A. Wichman said that the university is an elite institution that requires world-class professors. He feels that discussing tenure for instructors diminishes the qualifications. If we want excellence in what we do, we need the leading people in the world; otherwise, we are moving in the direction of a community college. He stated that he does not think tenure for instructors is acceptable.
- M. Reeves thinks that a mass dismissal of instructors should be kept in mind; it could result in the opposite effect.
- T. Davis said the intent of the resolution as to find a way to address promotion for instructors who had no upward mobility (it would address rank) and to give long-term security. When looking at multi-year appointments, the faculty member is continued until otherwise notified with the premise that “no news is good news”; but it does not lock them in. Instructors who had proven themselves could be terminated at any moment. The option exists that they could be terminated; the committee wanted them to feel locked in and valued. The Faculty Welfare committee knows it will require more discussion.
- Question from the floor: can we have three-year appointments?
- T. Davis: the multi-year option exists but it is left up to the departments.
- S. Lenk: thinks the problem was that a search had to take place every three years; the University and SACS standards would have to be met, especially in terms of

qualifications. S. Lenk would like to see security for those who do an amazing job and who serve many students. Early identification would help, using Modern Languages as an example.

- Can the positions be converted into pedagogical searches?
- D. Taylor: Professional in Residence has a multi-year option. Instructors have no multi-year option. Tenure track would offer security to members of the “25-year club”. At the end of the first year, employees should be notified by March 1st, then December 15 in consecutive years. Is the “pink slip” area being used?
- T. Davis clarified that Policy 1.2000 reads that they only have to be notified if they are being terminated. The resolution is only the beginning of a process.
- R. Dietle made a motion to amend (2nd A. Wichman) “Whereas, continuing appointment full-time instructors are of value to the university mission and the education of our students; Therefore be it resolved that the university work on a system to provide promotion and greater job security to instructors.”
- R. Dietle added that it will need to be studied and thinks we cannot vote for tenure without an idea of how to get there.
- P. Minter asked if it is implicit that it will go back to Faculty Welfare.
- R. Dietle said that the senate should follow up in the fall.
- No further discussion. The vote on the amendment and the resolution with amendment were unanimous.

5. General Education: (Lloren Foster) No Report.

6. Colonnade: (Robert Dietle) No Report.

D. University Committee Reports

1. Legislative Committee Report: added as a third item. A. Wichman wanted to read it; P. Minter said it was a summary of what she delivered at previous meetings. M. Crowder said these are annual informational reports. The separate section shows that these reports are being done. M. Crowder said she will post it after the meeting.

2. Campus Library Advisory Council Annual Report (posted)

2. Benefits Committee Update (Claus, Kelly, Rich): C. Ernst said the summary is in the notes and elaborated that next year we will see the most changes. In 2013, \$2 million was taken out of the reserve to balance the health care account. 2014 is slightly positive but could change. 7-8% inflation rate over the last 10 years means we cannot take out \$2 million again; this is equivalent to a 1.5% raise. impact medical inflation rate. The hired new consulting company is quite clear in what they want to do. This is unofficial, and we cannot tell numbers because the premiums are calculated at the last moment in August before the Senate reconvenes. Things have to be done by the end of the summer: 1. Cost between employer and employee; 2. Be competitive with benchmarks (flat rate at WKU vs. competitors). Giving more plan choice than the current PPO with a difference of copay and maximum out of pocket. Under the HSA plan, the university provides upfront funding that gets put in the account. Everything up to a certain point is out of pocket. This makes conscientious consumers. They would like to increase wellness and want the amount to be increased. Currently, there is a flat copayment. This moves to full insurance up to a certain cost. Non-smoking policy promotes a healthy campus. With a smoking

surcharge, this decreases annual cost. Senate can help through endorsement of a non-smoking campus. The bottom line is that many changes will be taking place and we will be more involved in health care decisions. Preventative remains free. The committee will try to put steps in place to balance out. K. Reames (benefits committee) emphasized greater participation in wellness, health savings option, HRA option. This doubles the money for participation in wellness. These plans are consumer driven. The bottom line is that we will be paying more and so will the university. R. Dietle said with the shift from institution to individual to be careful with multiple possibilities that it does not become a smoke screen for the university diminishing a more rapid shift in cost to employees. C. Ernst said the current plan in the works asks the university to step up their contribution. By the time the senate reconvenes, it will be a done deal. M. Pruitt asked why haven't there been any forums/information sessions on campus? C. Ernst said it is currently a plan; if the model is employed, then people will become educated. M. Pruitt asked how can we be in agreement without being educated about it? C. Ernst stated that it will take a several-hour session and it cannot be done at this time. Ernst said "please rely on the work of the committee". K. Reames said that yes the education will take place later. The Committee makes the recommendation and the President reviews it. M. Pruitt stated that he is concerned about this. C. Ernst said that with a \$2 million dollar hold, we cannot finish business as usual. M. Pruitt wants the larger campus community to know what the committee is working on. Would higher risk things than smoking be surcharged? This seems not sound in a time of decreased enrollment to tell prospective students they cannot smoke. C. Ernst said this would be a place where the Senate would need to make a resolution. M. Pruitt said he thinks it is a bad decision. J. Brown said she was also concerned about the smoking policy and is concerned that someone who quit smoking 20 years ago would have that reported on insurance. C. Ernst said that the committee has made the recommendation and added that it is all self-reported. These are all ideas that have not been approved by anyone. E. Kondratieff (History) asked if the increase in contributions, copay, medications is a pay cut. He said that flat rates will affect junior faculty more, and that the impact will be greater for those younger faculty. This could serve people to move to other universities. Is there a tier for percentages of those with less income? C. Ernst said regarding the tier status, a flat contribution rate will be addressed first. When he came in the fall, he said this would be the case unless the faculty has a strong resolution. Overall, the average has remained the same, and aging is not an issue. A. Langdon said that concerns among faculty could be addressed in a special session to give a sense of transparency. She would like the Benefits Committee to talk about options vs. being dictated. D. Taylor said that the Human Resources Department and Wellness Program as we take down the reserve, the US government will take us into the free market without a certain cushion being maintained. C. Ernst said that self-insured means that we are losing money and the university has to come up with money. The reserve only has a certain amount. He said this thinking [in reference to D. Taylor's comment] is false; we would have to pay rates to the state, plus incoming costs. There is a lag time for the first three months to pay the new plan and the old plan. 25% of business has to be in the reserve. We are now below this. This is internal. \$250,000 per year – the insurance kicks in and lessens the risk that we take on. D. Taylor asked what the alternative is if we do not move on. C. Ernst responded that the insurance fund is already depleted. We still have to pay the plan premiums for this year. R. Dietle proposed a resolution (2nd M. Reeves), stating that it is time for us to stop taking a whipping financially, and we have to stop being quiet about it: "The University Senate calls upon WKU to increase its contribution to employee to return WKU to the the top 1/3 of colleges and universities." The resolution passed unanimously. M. Crowder stated that the

timeline for a forum would have to be in the next few weeks. L. McClain (2nd Hanley) made a motion to have the benefits committee hold an open forum for faculty and staff in the coming weeks to learn more about the proposed changes to make an informed decision to support changes or not". The motion passed unanimously.

3. P. Minter said that a recap of all things that the legislation did (funding for retirement, idea of substitution of foreign languages for computer languages) was defeated.

E. Old Business

No old business to report.

F. New Business:

1. Motion for approval of the entire slate of Colonnade courses: D. Taylor (2nd A. Langdon). The entire slate of colonnade courses was approved.

2. M. McKerral: substantive revisions to the Faculty Handbook. McKerral thanked the committee for their hard work; they have met once a month and completed their work in less than two years. There was a check for quorum; the count was around 42.

a. Lecturer appointment (revised): this item was sent back previously due to the language in the statute not allowing voting every three years; essentially it is being brought back. The data is that it affected 3-10 people over the last five years. The change in the handbook does more good than harm. The vote is only every three years, and not many would be affected by it. It is a matter of trying to take the lesser of a few evils. L. McClain asked in regard to "documentation as", could a letter from the university suffice in saying that the degree has been completed while waiting for the transcript? This could be a difference of next academic year vs. next pay period. The Provost said that approval of official documentation was discussed at CAD. A complete report from the Registrar and transcript are required for SACS. Regent Minter said that personnel actions are approved quarterly by the Board. R. Dietle asked if the committee had a way to preserve the vote. Y. Petkus said that this is a statute (legislative) problem. R. Dietle said that this is a university program, a name change from "lecturer" to "instructor"; calling people something different is the problem. A motion for approval of the handbook change by A. Wichman (2nd D. Taylor) passed with 24/25 yes, 15 no, and 4 abstained.

b. Instructor ranks: Motion to approve by A. Wichman (2nd T. Davis). A second motion to refer to Faculty Welfare by A. Wichman (2nd J. Shadoan) for numerous reasons, including (1) the promotion guidelines will be different than tenure track due to faculty instructor criteria and educational requirements; (2) there is not rationale for underrepresentation; (3) instructors from other departments might not be qualified to review; (4) route for appeal; (5) uncertainty about where the money would come from to fund changes in salary/benefits. The motion to refer this item to Faculty Welfare passed unanimously.

c. Board of Regents: Motion to approve by A. Langdon (2nd Reeves). McKerral stated that the committee was divided on this. The faculty senate sent it last year and it was not accepted. The same proposal is being sent now. This situation has to be resolved. The Board of Regents approval of this document is within their purview. The critical point is that it is in the Board of Regents duties under statute. Very polarized opinions exist. Y. Petkus stated that the committee was divided. The Provost stated that the question was on how the shift in the chain of how things get approved. It would go to the Provost and the President. R. Dietle said that the Board of Regents voted and approved and voted on it. This is done by the majority of universities in

the state and they are still functioning. The reaction to the President's memo seems over-reactive. A. Wichman said he likes the sense that we can be in more control of day-to-day procedure. L. McClain said that self-determination exists when we vote on the handbook. The Board is just the final say on it (for example, promotion, tenure, etc.). Ultimately, the Board of Regents gives the final say. McClain thinks it should be consistent that the Board should have the final say. R. Dietle said that once they vote on it, it cannot be changed except by another Board vote. He feels that this is one more protection. P. Minter added that self-determination on the faculty handbook can only go forth if the Senate approves it. Anything that goes to the Board will not change anything that this body [The Senate] passes; it is just an up and down vote. She does not see any reason that they would vote no. Self-determination is locked in by the Board vote. A. Wichman stated that as long as the board supports the Faculty Senate, then we are OK. M. McKerral asked if the President can put something to the Board and say that he does not support it? P. Minter said that all policies stop at the President. Dr. Ransdell would not take something to the Board that he does not support. If he doesn't like it, then he sends it back to the Provost. The same thing happens to the Senate; this is the way the approval process works. Best practice is to constitutionalize it and protect our rights as faculty. We cannot change something mid-year. S. Lenk called the question. The vote in favor of the approval was all in favor except for one opposed.

d. Motion to approve the next item by D. Taylor (2nd Hanley). Discussion followed. L. McClain asked for the definition of "sustained". M. McKerral said the committee was moving toward the use of the same language. The definition is determined by the department. R. Dietle said he wanted to hear the Provost's definition of "sustained". The Provost said the term would be defined during the departmental tenure and promotion requirements. It does not say continuous, it says sustained. A consistent record over a sustained period of time (ie. since the last promotion). A. Wichman said he knows someone who went up for Distinguished Professor who had periods of health issues. Are we giving permission for parents or people with health/medical issues who have a blip in their productivity? Wichman stated that tangible is a one-time, short-time burst of productivity, and sustained can be interpreted as continuous progress toward goals. M. Crowder stated that this allows for flexibility within the department. R. Dietle asked if the committee could strike all qualifiers. M. McKerral responded "no"; this was originally proposed as a non-substantive change; he does not know if there is any perfect language. The department is going to review the way they are going to review, and it is purposely vague. Y. Petkus said the committee was worried that it is vague until it is not. She likes Dietle's idea of taking out the words tangible/sustained. M. McKerral said that we cannot edit on the floor. M. Pruitt said it allows someone to do something early on and then do nothing. Some departments push for more sustained. M. McKerral said we bring and you tell us. With regard to the handbook, there is no way to policy away every scenario. The hard decisions will get made by somebody; you cannot policy away every tough decision. D. Taylor said sustained is defined as continuing for an extended period or without interruption, and said that he things tangible might be better. S. Miller said underlying is that a promotion package can go all the way to the Provost but there could be instances where the decision is different. The Senate wants a fool-proof method but does not think the Provost will always concur with the decision. L. McClain said sustained could be used against others. T. Van Dyken said that the Handbook Committee cannot make amendments. Getting rid of murky terms/modifiers is a step in the direction of avoiding negative situations. J. Shadoan said the criteria has immense subjectivity among two different committees. J. Shadoan made a motion to send this item back to the

committee (2nd Hanley). 35 voted in favor of sending the item back to the committee, with 2 opposed and one voter abstaining. The motion to send the item back to the committee passed.

e. Language between the charter and the handbook on when the Senate can act; this allows the Senate to act at any time. The new language allows the Senate to act now. Motion to approve: R. Dietle (2nd J. Hanley) was approved unanimously.

f. A motion to accept a non-substantive change (D. Taylor, 2nd J. Hanley) passed unanimously.

g. Draft of the 20th Edition of the Handbook: Motion to accept (R. Dietle, 2nd D. Taylor). Specific motion (Hanley, 2nd D. Taylor). The motion on the floor was approved.

3. Budget Committee: charter draft, 2nd reading. Motion to accept (M. Pruitt, 2nd Hanley) was approved unanimously.

4. Resolution on President's Salary: due to limitation of resources, SGA feels that it would be a good demonstration of solidarity with 4.8% tuition increase (Motion Reeves, 2nd D. Taylor). The resolution passed with a majority. There were 6 votes of "no" and one voter abstained.

F. Information items:

No further business.

A motion to adjourn by D. Taylor was seconded by J. Hanley. The meeting adjourned at 5:51 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Heidi Álvarez, Secretary