

Western Kentucky University
University Senate Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 17, 2016 -- 3:45 p.m.
Faculty House

A. Call To Order

1. A regular meeting of the Western Kentucky University Senate was called to order on Thursday March 17, 2016 at 3:48 P.M. in the Faculty House.
2. A Quorum was present.
 - a. Members Present: Heidi Álvarez, Jim Berger, Barbara Brindle, Jill Brown, Barbara Burch, Thad Crews, Susann Davis, Martha Day, Lisa Duffin, Marko Dumančić, Claus Ernst, Travis Esslinger, Ann Ferrell, Marilyn Gardner, Barrett Greenwell, Frederick Grieve, Timothy Hawkins, Anne Heintzman, Kate Hudepohl, Michelle Jackson, Pam Jukes, Molly Kerby, Stephen King, Eric Kondratieff, Fenghelen Liang, Ching-Yi Lin, Kelly Madole, Gayle Mallinger, Sean Marston, Lauren McClain, Andrew Mienaltowski, Megan Miller, Patricia Minter, Kurt Neelly, Anthong Paquin, Bryan Reaka, Jeffrey Rice, Jay Todd Richey, Tiffany Robinson, Julie Shadoan, Beverly Siegrist, Michael Smith, Sandy Staebell, Rebecca Stobaugh, Heather Strode, Liz Sturgeon, Joon Sung, Dick Taylor, Tamara Van Dyken, Aaron Wichman, Dawn Garrett Wright, and Zhonghang Xia.
 - b. Substitutes Present: Michael Carini for Keith Andrew, Heather Payne-Emerson for Dora Babb, Danita Kelley for Neale Chumbler, Amanda Drost for Laura DeLancey, Lauren Bland for Richard Dressler, Michelle Trawick for Jeffrey Katz, Stuart Burris for Jeremy Maddox, Deven Richardson for Nolan Miles, Julie Barber for Shura Pollatsek, Alice Lawrence for Nancy Rice, Matt Pruitt for Doug Smith, and Margaret Cool-Newell for Adam West.
 - c. Guests Present who signed in: Amber Scott Belt, Margaret Crowder, Sylvia Gaiko, Eve Main, Mac McKerral, Eric Reed, and Janet Tassell.
 - d. Members Absent: Cathy Abell, Farhad Ashrafzadeh, Erika Brady, Kristi Branham, Patricia Desrosiers, Robert Dietle, Loretta Dye, Sam Evans, Connie Foster, Dennis George, Said Ghezal, Don Hoover, Tom Hunley, Muhammad Jahan, Dean Jordan, Hanna Khouryieh, Soleiman Kiasatpour, Thomas Kingery, Dominic Lanphier, James Line, Ling Lo, Joshua Marble, Doug McElroy, Richard C. Miller, Belly Mukonyora, Evelyn Oregon, Katherine Pennavaria, Gary Ransdell, Jonghee Shim, Melloney Simerly, Larry Snyder, Cheryl Stevens, Kevin Thomas, Rico Tyler, Tanya Vincent, Blairanne Williams, and Elizabeth Winkler.

B. Approval of February Minutes

1. A motion to approve the February meeting minutes by Dick Taylor was seconded by Marilyn Gardner.
2. A friendly amendment by Kate Hudepohl to correct the letters in the outline (Repeated D on page 10 was corrected to E, F, G, H.
3. Jim Berger noted after the March 17th meeting that his name was omitted from the minutes, but he was present at the February meeting.
4. There were no other corrections.
5. The February minutes were approved unanimously as amended by Chair Hudepohl and Jim Berger.

C. Officer Reports:

1. Chair – Kate Hudepohl

a. Workshop on Information and Data Security

- Chair Hudepohl reminded the faculty that Provost Lee sent an email about an informational workshop on data security.
- These events have been scheduled for two sessions on Thursday, March 31st.
- Chair Hudepohl encouraged the faculty to attend one of the two separate sessions on Thursday, March 31st.
- Session 1 will begin at 2:00 P.M., and information in this session will be specifically directed toward faculty, staff, and graduate assistant instructors. The presentation will last approximately 30 minutes, followed by a question and answer session.
- Session 2 will begin at 3:45 P.M., and the information session will be specifically directed toward Graduate Assistants, Graduate Students, and Undergraduate Students.
- If you are unable to attend the session that addresses your group, please feel free to attend another session.

- Following an informal show of hands, about four members of the University Senate said they planned to attend.
- There is a registration link available.

b. President Ransdell's response to Open Records Resolution

- Chair Hudepohl forgot to post President Ransdell's response to the Resolution (see March SEC meeting minutes).
- A description is posted as an informational item; President Ransdell's response to open records that was forwarded to the Kentucky Attorney General. His summary of the Attorney General's response is an attachment that says that WKU is compliant with the requirements, and that what WKU is planning to do (5 items) is sufficient.
- The procedure (which Chair Hudepohl believes has some added steps since the time Senate passed its resolution) includes the following: (1) Produce a book with all employees' names and salary information and provide copies to Senate, SGA, and Staff Council; (2) Place two hard copies of the book in the WKU library; (3) honor all open records and freedom of information requests by providing a hard copy of information requested; (4) all WKU students and employees have direct and full electronic access to the salary information on the website by providing a WKU password; (5) submit salary information to Kentucky's Open Door website salary search portal, created by Governor Beshear, following a recommendation of a Transparency Task Force he created.
- Chair Hudepohl will post a link to state salary website on the senate website.
- The policy won't change, and an open records report costs money.
- Michael Smith asked who has the password and who has access to the salaries password protected website? Chair Hudepohl said that the process changed on campus, and her understanding from Item #4 to the Attorney General is that all WKU students and employees have access. Patricia Minter said that it is not through TopNet. Mac McKerral said to go to the WKU website Budget Page, and on the left-hand side bottom is a link. Click on the link. Log on with WKU ID and password.
- McKerral added that not being addressed by the Attorney General is that some people can access records for free and some have to pay. He suggested downloading and posting it everywhere for free.

- Chair Hudepohl said that in the state database, you can look up any name and it will tell you their salary. It does not tell by unit. At WKU, salary information in the past was organized by unit.
- Patricia Minter said there may be some caveats. Faculty and Senate need to see the letter from the Attorney General. If it is an open record and binding, she would like to see it be put on the website.
- Chair Hudepohl said she wondered if it was not in writing.
- Patricia Minter said if it is not in writing, then it is not binding. This is a pretty grey area.
- Mac McKerral said to download it and put it on the Senate website; it is a public record.

c. Budget Issues

- Regarding the budget, President Ransdell sent out messages in February or March to WKU faculty, staff, students, and alumni asking them to contact their legislators about cuts to higher education. Chair Hudepohl's understanding is that presidents of all of the public universities did so as well.
- The latest news out of Frankfort is that the House nixed the cuts to higher education. This is not the final word because it has to go to the other house and then to Bevin.
- The link to obtain your legislator's contact information is on the Senate website.
- Monday, March 7 was the COSFL meeting. Molly Kerby and Margaret Crowder both attended and will give a report. We can come back to this with Molly Kerby's report for COSFL.

d. President Search

- The SEC has been acting in its role as an ad-hoc committee to generate a synthesis of faculty feedback on the presidential search.
- A draft was generated in the SEC's second meeting (they met twice), and it is not a resolution.
- Other opportunities for feedback to Dr. Burch will be later.

2. Vice Chair – Julie Shadoan

a. Online at-large senator elections are on the website and are open until midnight tomorrow (Friday, March 18).

b. Any technical concerns regarding the election should be sent to Brandi Fowler in institutional research.

3. Secretary – Heidi Alvarez (no report.)

4. Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership for Higher Education – Molly Kerby (Report attached)

a. Draft CPE Strategic Agenda

b. The report and draft agenda from CPE are posted; ask questions now or via email.

c. COSFL is not organizing a group action at this point because of time.

d. On the second page of the report on March 7, the bullets are from Jay Morgan from CPE.

5. AAUP President - Margaret Crowder (no report.)

D. Advisory Reports:

1. Faculty Regent – Barbara Burch

a. The Presidential Search Committee Members and the Board of Regents were asked to sign a confidentiality agreement.

b. Regent Burch assured the faculty that the process will be transparent.

c. Right now, the Search Committee is discussing process.

d. Regent Burch got a call from Dr. Bale (the Chair of the Search Committee). Dr. Bale assures the faculty that the Search Committee and Board are committed to inclusion. Chair Bale will be in touch about holding hearings for faculty on campus to give an opportunity for faculty input. He plans to give plenty of advanced notice.

- e. Regarding the budget, President Ransdell is hoping for an equity adjustment.
- f. The committee meeting for the Board is March 25. The agenda has not come out yet.

2. Provost – David Lee

- a. Provost Lee reminded the faculty that there will be informational sessions on traveling internationally; go to whichever one works best for your schedule.
- b. Regarding the budget, the pendulum swings wide between the governor's 9% cut in equity and 33% of the budget being performance-based – the other side wants 0 cuts, 0 equity dollars into the biennium. In the in-house budget, there is funding for mezzanine debt. This would be a big plus for the institution. Once it goes to Senate, we will see what happens.
- c. Enrollment for spring is absolutely flat; we are down 24 students. Census day is next week.

3. SGA President – Jay Todd Richey

- a. SGA President Jay Todd Richey said he found an ode to St. Patrick's Day: "May the roof above us never fall in, and may we friends gathered below never fall out."
- b. SGA President Richey has class at the time of the University Senate meeting, so he gave a brief report and then needed to excuse himself to go to his class.
- c. Richey stated that he is honored to serve on the Presidential Search Committee with Dr. Burch. He is expecting to learn a lot and face some unique challenges, but is personally very proud of the strong relationship this year between faculty and students. A SGA senator and President Richey are working on a SGA resolution that would be an official charge to the SGA President as to what the students want to see out of our next University President. That resolution should be finished in two weeks.
- d. SGA has been very active this semester with a variety of initiatives: (1) The Sustainability Committee has been gearing up for Earth Day in April. (2) MyCampusToo hosted a few forums for Black History Month and will be having a forum on LGBT Student Life. (3) SGA will be partnering with the Counseling and Testing Center and the

Office of Institutional Diversity and Inclusion to focus on raising awareness for sexual assault (and hopefully formulating a plan to end sexual assault). SGA hopes to have a panel discussion about the issue and engage SGA in the events that CTC has already planned.

- e. SGA President Richey said he is very happy to hear of the Kentucky House's budget proposal that rescinds all of Governor Bevin's budget cuts to higher education. He knows it is not finished, but is happy to see the progress so far. Also, Richey has not heard about any restoration of lottery funds to need-based financial aid, but he is trying to find out if there has been any positive change.
- f. SGA President Richey asked the faculty if they had any questions for him. There were no questions from the floor.

E. Committee Reports and Recommendations

1. Graduate Council: Kurt Neelly (Report posted; Endorsed by SEC)

- a. Kurt Neelly made a motion to endorse the Graduate Council meeting minutes from the February 11th meeting.
- b. There was no discussion.
- c. The Graduate Council report was approved unanimously by members of the Graduate Faculty.

2. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: Liz Sturgeon (Report posted; Endorsed by SEC)

- a. Liz Sturgeon made a motion to endorse the minutes from the February 25th meeting.
- b. There was no discussion.
- c. The UCC report was approved unanimously.

3. Colonnade General Education Committee: Marko Dumančić (Report posted; Endorsed by SEC)

- a. Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse the report from the February 29th Colonnade General Education Committee meeting.

- b. There was no discussion.
- c. The Colonnade General Education Committee report was endorsed unanimously.

4. Academic Quality: Jeremy Maddox (Report posted; Endorsed by SEC)

- a. AQa Sites
 - b. AQb SITE 20
 - c. AQc Report
 - d. AQd Bench
 - e. AQe UK
 - f. AQf Stark
 - g. AQg Stat
- Mac McKerral made a motion to endorse the Academic Quality report. The motion was seconded by Dick Taylor.
 - Discussion of the two recommendations followed.
 - Lauren McClain asked about the email from Tuesdi Helbig; in the 2nd of 3 courses of action, the 2nd seemed reasonable. She wanted to know who was responsible for checking into that.
 - Mac McKerral responded that Doug McElroy explained why the dates were the way they were. The committee felt it would be detrimental to change them.
 - Lauren McClain said that grades could be entered into TopNet so early compared to the closing of SITES. This would give more time to push the SITES back. She asked if we could look into that (pushing back the entering date) with the Registrar's office. The date is earlier than finals week.
 - Matt Pruitt said that the response rate would not change much, even with a third week. He is concerned with getting a response at 100% through the course and would like to move the window back. He suggested shortening the time frame with more emails to students, pointing out that this could yield a similar response.

- Mac McKerral said he leans toward longer as well, but the committee's position was to not switch the calendar around. He added that the alleged incentive is to get grades earlier.
- Matt Pruitt said that students do it earlier than later because of the emails they get and encourage them to do so. We have to think about response rate vs. validity and quality of data.
- Mac McKerral said that he agrees, and when he was in SEC, some of the things that have come to fruition were predicted. He said that the faculty is welcome to reject the report.
- Chair Hudepohl said that another option would be a motion from the floor to have the committee reconsider the dates.
- Patricia Minter made a motion to reconsider the time line for SITE in light of the discussion at the March senate meeting.
- The motion was seconded by Lauren McClain.
- Lauren McClain said that the discussion could start with the Registrar's Office.
- Kelly Madole said that pertaining to discussion on the motion, we are working on speculation. She asked how many submit grades early. She suggested doing this on the basis of data vs. speculation. Mac McKerral agreed that if there is data, it is a better way.
- Dick Taylor brought up that those who keep their gradebook on Blackboard have grades available throughout the semester. He asked what the erosion of response rates is with electronic posting, and added that his are decaying.
- Mac McKerral said he was told that they are the same or better. He said he guesses there is no data because nobody asked. Dick Taylor said that he would like to ask.
- The majority of the senate voted to pass Patricia Minter's motion. There were 7 nays.
- Lauren McClain asked in the second recommendation what "modified for sufficient data" meant. She asked if it meant mean/median. Mac McKerral said yes.

- Mac McKerral said that since 2005, the SITES issues don't go away. His concern is that if they are flawed, it is problematic because they are used so heavily in evaluation of the teaching area. He said the committee is looking at developing best practices in terms of what it means to be an effective teacher. He then asked if we need to approve of the 2nd recommendation embedded in the report.
- Heidi Álvarez suggested using the pamphlet on teaching that was published by Sally Kuhlenschmidt. She said that the content of Kuhlenschmidt's pamphlet was helpful to her as she prepared the teaching section of her tenure documents.
- Mac McKerral said that good stuff was around and disappeared when FaCet disappeared. Putting something together across the university (guidelines that departments can use) would be helpful; McKerral said that he champions uniformity.
- Julie Shadoan said that Academic Quality has been looking into Kuhlenschmidt's pamphlet. It was removed from public access because University Counsel thought it too closely resembled policy. The committee is trying to come up with "best practices" to be used by all involved in the performance evaluation process.
- The report passed unanimously.

5. Budget and Finance Committee: Claus Ernst (Report posted; Endorsed by SEC)

- a. Supporting documentation: 2003-2015
- b. Supporting Documentation: All Years
- c. Resolution (endorsed by SEC)
- d. Recommendations for discussion
 - Claus Ernst said that the resolution will be dealt with separately.
 - Claus Ernst made a motion to endorse the Budget and Finance Committee report. He added that it is a lengthy report and a complicated matter. He said that the over all budget is declining, and the number of faculty and number of employees is declining. The report includes the average salary aggregate, all WKU retirement in an aggregate number.

- Kelly Madole thanked Claus Ernst and the Committee for the remarkable job that they did on the report. She asked about one sentence “extended years by division” from 2004-2015. Under #2, the 2nd section “central to academic affairs.” She said that one problem is that loss in dollars and the status of academic affairs. She feels that there is a marginalization of academic affairs and wants to highlight that.
- Chair Hudepohl agree that there were many faculty comments about wanting a president who values academics.
- The Budget and Finance Committee report was approved unanimously.
- The Budget and Finance Committee Resolution was presented at SEC and was unanimously endorsed by the SEC. Kate Hudepohl read the resolution to the University Senate and made a motion to approve the resolution.
- Michael Smith asked about the split into items to discuss and the resolution because of the timing with the budget draft.
- Claus Ernst said that academic status is declining. Enrollment management is no longer a part of academic affairs. Since passing the resolution, it was pointed out with proportionally allocated cuts that certain items have been protected from the cuts. Academic Affairs excludes certain items from the cuts.
- Chair Hudepohl said that the central budget shortfall was caused by internal choices. Academic Affairs absorbed 70% of the cuts. An agreement went on based on enrollment growth that we would get 70% of that. With increased enrollment, money was supposed to go to academic affairs; but it might have flowed to maintenance and operation or bonds. The resolution is coming from the point that we should absorb 50% instead of 70%.
- Provost Lee clarified that if enrollment grew, 70% should come to Academic Affairs per the agreement. It did not address what to do if enrollment declined. He equated it to the idea of stock. 57-58% was not unusual in the past to absorb a larger number. It is roughly what happened in the past
- Molly Kerby made a motion to endorse the resolution (2nd Dick Taylor).
- The Budget and Finance Committee resolution passed unanimously.

- The second item is a series of recommendations for discussions. There are four items that the committee wants from the body at large for ideas going forward. Claus Ernst said that there will be winners and losers.
- Discussion item #1: is there a way to eliminate decisions academic affairs has made?
- In #3, former Provost Emslie tried to have a policy where we only got 75% of retired positions back.
- #4 pertains to stop the building of buildings and debt service and concentrate on what we have.
- With the discussion of the four recommendations, Chair Hudepohl said that we may want to wait and see what happens with the budget, and keep it going forward.
- Michael Smith asked what points would be measured? Student productivity hours? Claus Ernst said that in some universities, everyone gets a piece, and if new money comes, it gets redistributed. The new process would lead to inequities. There is no rule or procedure. The process would be time consuming and painful.
- Chair Hudepohl said that this came up in SEC; if we go this way, what is the rubric and possible result? Who will be given the power to make these decisions?
- Kelly Madole thinks it is one of the most important recommendations on here, but it will be time consuming. It would be worthwhile to know we are being evaluated and see an outcome. It is not a bad thing to say what we are doing and what the goal is. The fear of process should not stop us.
- Chair Hudepohl said she agrees with clarity on the metrics, and is thinking of unintended consequences and the weakening caused by cuts in units.
- Lauren McClain said that after reading the report, she thought it meant units of the university; she read it as budget allocations and spending based on a whole unit; academics as a whole, but not departments.
- Claus Ernst said that the recommendation intended to open it up to all divisions; a large department is the equivalent. The intention was whole budget, not just academics.

- Marko Dumančić said it is realistic that budget will have real power with shaping and scope.
- Chair Hudepohl said that we still have to absorb the second part of the cut from last year's budget. Absorbing one-time monies is a useful tool for deans to have. The SEC made a friendly recommendation to #2 – ear marking from lapsed positions ie. delayed search.
- Claus Ernst said the process is different; money already spent in the budget cannot be lapsed. Claus Ernst asked if we want to support a resolution on item #4? The majority of senators supported a resolution on recommendation #4.
- Eric Kondratieff said that for recommendation #1, he suggested that the recommendation be that the committee do more research on zero-based budget, and to move forward with the idea of what it would entail. More research is what the committee would do; they would explore the ideas at this point. They could also do a cross-benefit analysis of great things that WKU puts resources into that also have a great cost (ie. Gatton and Honor's College, ie. cost of scholarships vs. actual benefit).
- Dick Taylor said that another suggestion is to clarify what "unit" means as part of the research.
- Claus Ernst said that this research would be a long-term project and cannot be done this year.
- Chair Hudepohl clarified that this is more informal feedback.
- Matt Pruitt said that due to the uncertainty due to the legislature, he is not sure how much we should investigate this in light of how many significant changes will take place in the coming years.
- Regent Burch said that if performance-based funding is coming, defining what is important is important -- figuring out a way to learn about different performance models and how to balance performance funding and what is important to the mission. At Harvard, every unit has to generate its own revenue. A legitimate question is how much does each program cost? She suggested that someone might want to take this on.
- Molly Kerby clarified that each university is responsible for this formula for performance-based funding.

- Provost Lee said it was a mix; some metrics could be selected and some were set.
- Molly Kerby said she feels performance-based funding will happen. In the same way, she feels we should look at some of this now. She added that transparency is important.
- Claus Ernst said that performance-based funding is not the same thing as zero-based funding. The size of the university and how many employees.
- Dick Taylor said that 32 states in the United States have performance-based models, and this is the direction the country is going in. Not all division have a performance-based outcome, but we are looking at the university as a whole. The total outcome has to be looked at and this is why he asked about units.
- Chair Hudepohl said that we might want to look at this for next year so we can be better armed.
- Marko Dumančić reiterated that zero-based and performance-based are different things. He thinks zero-based would be bad for the faculty.
- Eric Kondratieff asked if we should consider a straw poll on #1 and a motion to look at performance-based separately?
- Chair Hudepohl said she does not think a motion is necessary; the discussion is whether or not the committee should address and prioritize the recommendations.
- Regent Burch said there is criteria for effectiveness in all areas of the university. She referred to the book “Teaching Naked” and thought the faculty might want to read this book.
- Aaron Wichman suggested separate straw polls for performance-based and zero-based because they are huge tasks.
- Chair Hudepohl said that some don’t understand the difference between the two.
- Aaron Wichman clarified that one requires a complete reworking of the budget from ground up. The other alternative is that we look at things how they are.
- Molly Kerby suggested putting it all together; investigating point one as written reassessing and revising of the budget.

- The straw poll results were 20 in favor of exploring recommendation #1 and 11 against exploring #1.
- Discussion then moved to the earmarking of eliminating positions for compensation.
- Someone asked what the alternative was. If money does not flow back to the department, it goes back to compensation? Claus Ernst said that in a vacant position, it goes back to academic affairs and the department and college do not get the position back.
- Provost Lee said he thinks about it in terms of money but not positions. Vacant lines roll to academic affairs. 75% of the money is returned to the college dean, who makes decisions about new positions and new programs. What might happen with #2 is the 25% is locked up for either compensation or accumulated for a few years and then used for compensation.
- Kelly Madole said that one thing she does not like is that it pits new positions against raises. She would like to see the committee focus on something else.
- Aaron Wichman said that this would take potential faculty lines. 25% for raises vs. faculty lines that might not happen anyway. The faculty would appreciate a raise.
- Claus Ernst said there is no writing for 75/25. Emslie might have instituted it; Ernst believes it can be split any way. He believes funding internal money for raises in this way would be painful, as would be identifying what area it will be taking from. Ernst said he thinks this will not happen. Cutting positions for a raise means we will have more students per credit hour.
- Matt Pruitt said that in cannibalizing positions to increase compensation, where is this money housed?
- Provost Lee said it would be housed in academic affairs. For example, \$500,000 in year one, \$500,000 in year two, \$500,000 in year three – at the end of year three, \$1.5 million would be used as a salary pool for academic affairs. He added that this would only fund raises for faculty, and not staff. This merits discussion. The first and second year could be spent for other stuff; the third year would have to go to faculty raises.

- Claus Ernst said that President Ransdell would never go for separate raises for faculty and staff.
- Regent Burch said that this has been true for the last 20 years. It reverts back to the division and every division controls its money. She said to keep up with the carry forward. She urged the faculty to take a long time before considering taking money from the division for salary. She said to look at priorities; it is taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another. With the objective for more resources for the unit, she does not suggest taking money out of your own budget. She added that travel stayed intact through DELO. Regent Burch suggested prioritizing discretionary DELO money and making sure it does not go away.
- A straw poll on recommendation #3, whether or not to support the elimination of positions for compensation, resulted in the majority opposed.
- A straw poll on recommendation #4 followed; the majority were in favor.
- Claus Ernst said he will bring resolutions forward, and said to email members of the Budget and Finance Committee with feedback.

6. Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibility: Patti Minter (No Report.)

- The faculty worklife survey is available until March 31. Voices are needed in this difficult time.
- Patti Minter noted the revamping of the survey; she said that Lauren McClain helped to eliminate the double-eared questions. Minter thanked the committee for their work.

7. Faculty Handbook Committee: Margaret Crowder (Report posted; Endorsed by SEC)

- a. NSa (outline formatting; non-substantive)
- b. NSb (clinical wording; non-substantive)
- c. NSc (policy revision placeholder; non-substantive)
- d. Continuance Flow (substantive)

- Marko Dumančić made a motion to endorse the Faculty Handbook Committee report as submitted by Chair Margaret Crowder.
- The motion was seconded by Aaron Wichman.
- Matt Pruitt made a motion to separate the action items from the report for separate consideration.
- Pruitt’s motion was seconded by Lauren McClain.
- The motion passed unanimously. The report passed.
- Patricia Minter made a motion to consider the non-substantive items as a bundle.
- Minter’s motion was seconded by Aaron Wichman.
- Margaret Crowder then gave the context. There are non-substantive changes of formatting of the outlines, and there was drafting of language to be consistent. All other non-substantive changes came from the Provost’s Office. In the links to the policies, the last number is reflective of the most recent revision of the policy. The handbook would not have to change this last number every time. Letter “v” represents whatever the latest version of the policy it is.
- There was no discussion on the non-substantive changes.
- The non-substantive changes were approved unanimously as a bundle.
- A motion to endorse the continuance document file by Aaron Wichman was seconded by Dick Taylor.
- Margaret Crowder gave the background/context for discussion. The item has been bouncing around for two years; it was already looked at a number of times. It is taken in the context of the rest of the handbook. She then made some points. In regard to other discussions that have already occurred, in the current version of the handbook, there are potential problems/hurdles. For example, the response from the candidate, the pinching of the timeline is very limited. This is already built into the handbook. The current version already says department head to dean, copy of evaluation with opportunity to respond. There is already a pinch, but there are no dates for the response. The candidate’s timeline to respond is not in the current version. The committee is trying to get at the transparency as a process. Departments have different processes. Continuance should not be nebulous.

- Michael Smith referenced the three days to write the letter. He said if five people are going up for tenure/promotion at the same time, this is a short time to respond.
- Margaret Crowder said that the current version already has one piece built into it. Some department heads already have something written ahead of time because it is separate from the committee.
- Lauren McClain said that with the dates and having only three days to write, the candidate has five days to respond. This allows two days for the Chair to move to the Dean. She does not see why the department chair only has three days to do this very important task.
- Mike Carini said that three days is not enough, especially if it is for a thoughtful response to the candidates. He added that in the case of a weekend, if the memo comes on day four, it is grounds for a grievance. This diminishes the process of the institution. A solution could be to make five days for the chair and less for the candidate.
- Aaron Wichman said that he thinks ten days has been working, and suggested maybe make it go forward to the dean in 20 days.
- Margaret Crowder said that there are major issues with timing down the line with that idea.
- Claus Ernst said that he reads it as “by a certain date.” If there are a lot of things going on, it can be arranged by the department. The department could do it three weeks earlier.
- Patricia Minter clarified that we don’t edit on the floor. We either vote it up or down, and if we need a change, we send it back to the committee, because it is binding. If the timeline is a concern, it cannot be edited on the floor. It would need to go back to the committee. There are some good points made by the chain of command. It went through Faculty Welfare last year and it barely passed; then it did not pass in Senate. With the issue of the memo from a faculty member signing off puts them in the chain of command; it is a major responsibility for those not trained. It is well intentioned for transparency. In difficult situations, the faculty on the committee will send forth a bland memo. Minter urges voting it down.
- Kelly Madole said that the dates were compressed earlier by former Provost Emslie. The dates have only been here 4 or 5 years. There is no reason why the dates cannot be amended in the favor of those who are doing the bulk of the work (the committee and the department chair). It is a time-consuming task at a very busy time of year. Madole said she would like to see it go back to the committee to revise the dates.

- Kelly Madole made a motion: “recommendation to send the substantive change back to the committee in consideration of the discussion and comments here.”
- The motion was seconded by Michael Smith.
- Margaret Crowder said she was curious to how it is functioning at present, because it is working within the timeline that is already set. February 15 was pushed back to February 17. It is currently working.
- Crowder then commented on the second piece; in regard to the memo going forward, that item came out of Faculty Welfare. It was not voted down at SEC. Crowder forgot to present it to SEC again. The memo piece was the same and in language approved at SEC. It broke down because it did not make it back to senate.
- Patricia Minter said that there is a motion on the floor – a motion to send back to the committee.
- Dick Taylor clarified that this is in the charter.
- Madole’s motion to send back to the committee passed with one opposed.
- Mac McKerral reminded the senate that the work on this section of the handbook has been for 2.5 years with 3 different handbook committees. Faculty Welfare has looked at it. It will never be perfect for every department. He suggested thinking in terms of “good” vs. “perfect.” In quibbling over dates, we all have very pressing issues to deal with.

F. Old Business

- There was no old business.

G. New Business

- There was no new business from the floor.

H. Information items

1. President Ransdell response to Open Records Resolution

a. University Senate Open Records Resolution

I. Adjournment

1. A motion to adjourn by Dick Taylor was seconded by Matt Pruitt.
2. The meeting adjourned at 6:01 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Álvarez, Secretary