

Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities

Faculty Senate Committee Agendas, AY 2024-2025

Members Present: Stephanie Riehn- chair (CHHS), Dan Clark (OCSE), Kelly Reames, Xingang Fan (At Large), Sungjin Im (CEBS), Rob Hale (AA), Todd Seguin (Lib.), Pinky Rusli (GFCB)

Members Absent: Brandon Barber (At Large); Larry Owens (Reg)

Guests Present: Shane Spiller, Faculty Regent; Eric Kondratieff, Budget and Finance

Minutes: February 21, 2025; 3:00 PM via Zoom

1. Approval of minutes
2. Old Business:
 - a. Rob Hale:
 - i. Emeritus Status Policy Revision: A definition was added for “retiree” with the notion to honor individuals at the end of their career, and the definition should be consistent with verbiage of other university documents and not program based.
The revisions remove “assistant professor” and clearly outlines all ranks. “Adjunct” faculty is being amended to “Affiliate” faculty to allow for faculty who are doing work for the institution to have access to resources without restriction, and this will protect all faculty. Suggested changes to this document is aiming to provide clarity and guidelines for faculty who wishes to apply for Emeritus status.
[Emeritus Status 02-21-25.docx](#)

Adjunct Faculty Policy Revision: Currently IT must grant access to university resources and their verbiage includes “affiliate” faculty in current documents. Proposed revisions aims to remove “adjunct” as an effort to clarify what affiliate status currently entails to create a more streamline process in allowing affiliate faculty access to vital resources.
[Adjunct Faculty Revision to Affiliate 02-21-25.docx](#)
 - b. Faculty Welfare Survey
 - i. Guest: Shane Spiller, Faculty Regent
 1. The staff engagement survey and faculty welfare survey is viewed by Faculty Regent and President Caboni. It is possibly perceived that Faculty welfare and concerns with workload is always presented as being related to money or comes across as money driven. Shane explained that the staff has shifted to a tone to focus on fixable issues versus money and staff has presents more attainable actionable items. Co-chair of BEC works with faculty to share budget information and that looks different among departments. Several questions were presented to the committee such as:

- Is faculty participation and feedback allowed by the Deans?
- How well does faculty feel educated about the budget and role in their respective college?
- Difference of education and role. Ask about workload outside of salary? What can the colleges do to help alleviate challenges or class sizes?
- Is junior faculty supported throughout the tenure process to promote successful tenure?
- How is AI helping in your job?

It was presented that content analysis from the faculty welfare annual survey would be helpful if it was summarized and solution based. The challenge is there are many additional comments provided at the end of the survey by faculty, and it is a challenge to present all ideas that would be representative of the faculty as a whole without leaving out comments provided by a few number of the faculty. Previous summaries and reports from the survey includes massive amounts of data, and it is felt to be challenging to sift through all the information for the administration. It is felt the previous committee and chair of faculty welfare provided a comprehensive report and the most commonly suggested comments on the previous survey results were addressed. The committee expressed that money is still an issue among faculty and how do we reach a solution-based approach when we are at the bottom of the benchmark data. The faculty welfare survey is data collected from the body, and the report would need to be representative of such data without minimizing the heart of what the faculty is expressing as needs.

3. New Business:

a. Guest: Eric Kondratieff, Budget and Finance.

Faculty Welfare has been asked to consider providing a position statement in conjunction with the budget and finance committee on the following issues:

- A salary increase or lack of thereof.
- The importance of a COLA.
- Internal salary equity
- External salary equity
- Merit pay
- Recruiting Ph.D. program salaried faculty
- Consultant-led compensation
- Strategic initiatives
- VSIP

It was discussed for the need of data that shows realistic benchmarks when making a position statement. It is thought that the current benchmarks have not been updated for years and we have been compared among institutions that don't match our enrollment, and this appears to show manipulated and skewed data. The committee requested to see current benchmark and realistic data, as well as administrative data and benchmarks. The committee also expressed it is not just

lack of pay, but it is also how faculty are valued and treated. The question was posed “What could the University do to ensure the faculty feel valued?”. The committee did not come to a resolution about supporting or providing a position statement, and we will evaluate information and explore this item moving forward. The concern of supporting is the fear nothing will change from making a position statement, and as a committee we need to be solution based moving forward. To do so, we need more information and data.

- i. Resources presented to the committee for consideration of a position statement.
 - PEDS data: <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/use-the-data>
 - AAUP: <https://data.aaup.org/ipeds-ft-faculty-salaries/> (same IPEDS data plus their annual compensation survey, and nice visualization tools)
 - WKU Salaries and Budget: <https://www.wku.edu/strategyopfin/budget/>
 - WKU Benchmarks: <https://www.wku.edu/instres/benchmark.php>
- b. Additional items for discussion: No additional items were presented by the committee. The next meeting is 3/14/2025 at 3:00 via Zoom