

FACULTY SENATE NEWSLETTER

VOLUME VIII, NUMBER 2

September 20, 1984



MEETING SUMMARY

After a reception for new senators and our new academic vice president, Tom Coohill got the meeting underway with a series of announcements, including an eminently obscure and forgettable explanation of why the current body is Senate VIII, not IX.

Coohill also announced yet another migration of the senate office, this time to what may be a permanent location. The senate has taken over the old Credit Union office in the Faculty House and hopes to remain there indefinitely. The telephone number remains the same, 5325.

Committee on Committees

Joan Krenzin announced the appointment of the following new members to the Athletic, Campus Beautification, and President's Advisory committees:

Athletic Committee: Pat Hooper, Joyce Rasdall, Nancy Solley, Jim Thompson.

Campus Beautification Committee: Nancy Baird, Chuck Forrester, Betty Fulwood.

President's Advisory: Mary Crisp.

Communications Committee

Joe Glaser had two things to say, both concerning the editorial policies of the Newsletter: 1) Senate reports, motions, oratorical flourishes, etc. intended for publication and all other submissions should be submitted in writing; 2) contributors of any sort should realize that their material will probably appear in edited form. Anyone wanting a contribution to appear verbatim or not at all is welcome to make that stipulation; others should realize that their submissions may be reworked, perhaps liberally.

Political Activities Committee

Senator Robe unveiled a new plan for political action. Each faculty senate in the state is now responsible for a wider legislative region than its own backyard. Working together, the senates hope to reach each state legislator and even each

candidate for legislative office in the approaching elections. This scheme will require additional political activists. Anyone (senator or not) who wants to help should advise Harry as soon as possible at the Department of Psychology, CEB, 2697. Persons with roots or contacts outside the immediate area of Bowling Green will be especially welcome.

Professional Responsibilities and Concerns

Margaret Howe reported on her committee's survey of faculty concerns. In order of descending frequency, here are the issues faculty mentioned: 1) defining faculty responsibilities; 2) salaries; 3) department heads; 4) evaluation, promotion, and tenure; 5) general education requirements, advising, and academic probation; 6) administrative affairs; 7) football and other sports; 8) the graduate college; 9) morale; 10) physical plant.

Faculty Status and Welfare

Barry Brunson (3651) wants ideas from anyone who can think of a way to improve the ongoing salary survey; for example, such things as listing administrative salaries separately or including years of service with each salary figure, two changes his committee is already considering. If you have other changes to suggest, contact Barry.

Old Business--Evaluation of Administrators

Margaret Howe reported that last year's evaluation of the administration's evaluation of administrators (talk about accountability!) established that faculty were generally satisfied with the instrument but wanted to evaluate several people not presently included in the process, including library and physical plant administrators, assistant and associate deans, and the president. The senate took one step toward a more complete evaluation by voting 34 to 6 to recommend that assistant and associate deans and the president be included in the next administration-run faculty evaluation of administrators.

New Business

The Senate's Own Evaluation of Administrators

Senator Tom Coohill was concerned about the status of the faculty senate-run evaluation of administrators, arguing that a role still exists for this faculty-generated evaluation. One possibility, he thought, was that the senate could sponsor an evaluation of administrators, specifically assistant and associate deans and the president, not presently included in the administration's own procedure.

The senate disagreed by a narrow margin, voting 21-19 to keep its own evaluation of administrators in limbo at least until we find out whether the current process will be broadened to include additional administrators, as recommended in the previous vote.

Western in the TV Business?

Discussion followed of a rumored plan for a WKU TV station and whether the cost, including an estimated half million dollars up front, could be justified. Vice President Haynes reported that the TV issue is still unsettled--all we are doing now is deciding whether or not to stay in the running for a potential license. The senate voted to have Chairman Coohill find out what is going on.

Purdue or Not Purdue?

Margaret Howe drew the senate's attention to the report last year of a committee appointed by Jim Davis, chaired by John O'Connor, and charged with reviewing the Purdue Cafeteria evaluation of faculty. At the O'Connor committee's final meeting (a meeting at which only 7 of the 13 members were present) it recommended that 1) the Purdue system continue to be used but that 2) each department select its own core items, 3) training sessions be run to instruct administrators in legitimate uses of evaluation results, and 4) that reliability and validity studies be conducted. Recommendation 1 has come to pass. Recommendations 2-4 have not.

In light of all this the senate voted to recommend that this year's evaluation be scrubbed until some action is taken on the widely-neglected features of the O'Connor committee's report.

Faculty Regent's Report

Mary Ellen Miller briefly discussed the recently approved policy on faculty promotions. Copies are not yet available, but she did say that several particulars of the final document were shaped by faculty responses to the earlier draft. All faculty reactions that came in were channeled to the Board through her, Tom Coohill, and Rich Weigel.

In the Pipeline

Tom Coohill wants this senate to address at least one major issue on campus in each of its meetings, and the senate invites anyone with a special interest in one of these keynote topics to make a special effort to attend, whether it's to contribute or merely to

listen. The special issue for our next meeting--Thursday, October 11, in the Garrett Ballroom--will be sports and their role at Western. Future topics will include support for faculty research and creative efforts.

WORKLOAD GUIDELINES

Barry Brunson, of the Department of Mathematics, wants to remind us all of the AAUP "Statement on Faculty Workload," which was adopted as official policy of the Association in 1969. This policy statement is particularly relevant now, as Western moves toward redefining what it expects from its faculty.

The document is fairly lengthy, but here are some portions Professor Brunson finds especially relevant:

Maximum Loads

In [the AAUP's] judgment the following maximum workload limits are necessary for any institution of higher education seriously intending to achieve and sustain an adequately high level of faculty effectiveness in teaching and scholarship:

For undergraduate instruction, a teaching load of twelve hours per week, with no more than six separate course-preparations during the academic year.

For instruction partly or entirely at the graduate level, a teaching load of nine hours per week.

[emphasis AAUP's]

This statement of maximum workload presumes a traditional academic year of not more than thirty-two weeks of classes. Moreover, it presumes no unusual additional expectations in terms of research, administration, counseling, or other institutional responsibilities. Finally, it presumes also that means can be devised within each institution for determining fair equivalents in workload for those faculty members whose activities do not fit the conventional classroom lecture or discussion pattern: for example, those who supervise laboratories or studios, offer tutorials, or assist beginning teachers.

The Research Factor

If [the institution's] expectation is only that of "general preparation" . . . no additional reduction in faculty workload is indicated. Usually, however, something beyond

that general preparation is meant: original, exploratory work in some special field of interest within the discipline. It should be recognized that if this is the expectation such research, whether or not it leads to publication, will require additional time. It is very doubtful that a continuing effort in original inquiry can be maintained by a faculty carrying a teaching load of more than nine hours; and it is worth noting that a number of leading universities desiring to emphasize research have already moved or are now moving to a six-hour policy.

If it is original work which is expected, but the institution fails to state candidly whether in practice scholarly publication will be regarded as the only valid evidence of such study, the effect may well be to press one part of the faculty into "publishing research" at the expense of a "teaching research" remainder. Neither faculty group will teach as well as before.

In short, if research is to be considered a general faculty responsibility, the only equitable way to achieve it would seem to be a general reduction in faculty workload. If the expectation is that some but not all of the faculty will be publishing scholars, then that policy should be candidly stated and faculty workloads adjusted equitably in accordance with that expectation.

Note that in all these provisions the AAUP is talking about maximum loads and minimum adjustments to balance out universities' non-teaching expectations for faculty. The ideal situation? The full statement makes it clear that the Association would much prefer to see a standard undergraduate teaching load of nine hours per week and a standard load of six hours for faculty involved in graduate instruction, even in cases where research and service requirements are not particularly high.

Anyone who would like to see the AAUP statement in its entirety should contact Professor Brunson, who has offered to make it available.

YOUR NEWSLETTER

The next time you come across something your colleagues should know about, jot down an account of it and send it to Joe Glaser, English, 3043. We want to keep the Newsletter a forum for faculty opinion and concerns, not just a record of senate proceedings.



FACULTY SENATE
communications committee
NEWSLETTER

Office of the President
Wetherby Administration Bldg.