

FACULTY SENATE IX
March 1986

RESPONSE TO ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE REPORT ON RELEASE TIME

The March 20, 1986 meeting began with Vice President Robert Haynes responding to last year's Senate report on release time. In that report, the Senate recommended 10 percent release-time faculty. Dr. Haynes said he felt there should not be a restriction on the amount of release-time faculty, and therefore any ceiling that had been placed on release-time faculty has been removed. He also said he prefers to refer to this as "special assignment time." Dr. Haynes said special assignment time will be based on two factors:

1) a desire of faculty to engage in activities other than classroom instruction, that in fact would enhance classroom instruction.

2) a closer attention to accountability--faculty are required now to report on what they do during the time of special assignment; deans report to the vice president on special assignment activities of their faculty.

Dr. Haynes said, in response to a question, that the number of faculty on special assignment is above 3.5 percent, but below 10 percent, and the figure varies from college to college. He added that the university tries to accommodate those who request continual release time on a project that takes longer than one semester, but a semester report is due from the faculty member each semester the special assignment time is granted. Concerning the chair's question regarding the writing of a textbook as constituting scholarly research, Dr. Haynes said that the judgment should be made in the college or department, based on the factor of the textbook making a "significant contribution to the field." Dr. Haynes said he feels the university guides on rank and promotion address that question, also.

REPORT ON ATHLETIC EXPENDITURES

Sen. Norman Hunter summarized the Senate's Report on Financing of Intercollegiate Athletics. All senators have a copy of the six-page report. Sen. Hunter said that on page two of the report, the committee suggested that the conclusions and recommendations of the Senate's 1985 report are still appropriate for 1986. He said the information for the report came from pp. 126-143 of the WKU Budget, available in the library, and acknowledged Dr. Paul Cook's help in examining and interpreting the information.

Page 3 of the report contained the following information:

Comparison of Budget to Expenditures and Budget to Revenues, :

| | 1983-84 | 1984-85 | % of change |
|--------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Budget | 1,704,048 | 1,940,004 | +13.8 |
| Expenditures | 2,085,497 | 2,276,973 | +9.2 |
| Deficit | 381,449 | 336,973 | -11.7 |
| Expenditures | 2,085,497 | 2,276,980 | +9.2 |
| Revenue | 946,217 | 1,039,717* | +9.9 |
| Deficit | 1,139,280 | 1,237,263 | +8.6 |

*Includes \$492,773 in student registration fees and student athletic fees

Page six lists four main points:

- 1) The athletic budget continues to be in a state of crisis.
- 2) Expenditures continue to exceed budget and revenues.
- 3) While revenues for 1984-85 have increased a modest amount (9.9%) compared to 1983-84, unrestrained spending kept pace by increasing 9.2%. The deficit with respect to budget did decrease slightly (11.7%) in 1984-85 compared to 1983-84, but this appears to be a result of a significant increase (13.8%) in budget, rather than any attempt to restrict spending. The deficit of expenditures with respect to revenue for 1984-85 is actually 8.6% larger than in 1983-84.
- 4) While football has played a major role in creating an unhealthy situation, it appears that both baseball and women's basketball have caught the fever of overspending budget.

Sen. Robert Otto told the Senate that the Senate should try to get a response to this report from the Board of Regents or the administration. He added that no department would ever be allowed to overspend its budget as is the case in athletics.

Dr. Paul Cook, executive vice president, said that actually other departments at the university do overspend, and that the budget report should be viewed only as a guide. Dr. Cook continued to explain various parts of the report, in regards to figures that do not necessarily reflect the actual budget allocations or appropriations for the year. The chair responded that the real question is whether it is proper to spend this much money for athletics, given the resultant costs to academic programs.

COSFL

The chair reported on the COSFL meeting in Frankfort earlier in March. He felt two items merited notation:

- 1) From a session on university governance, the Senate could consider establishing a question period with invited guests, as a part of regular meetings in order to make inquiries of administrators.
- 2) It is proper for university faculty to be involved with lobbying or "educating" of legislators, especially in the off years in which the legislature is not meeting.

MOTION ON FACULTY EVALUATIONS PASSES

The Senate discussed and voted on a resolution proposed at the February meeting as a result of the report from the Faculty and Welfare Committee. The motion reads:

Resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the concept of anonymous student evaluations. Such evaluations should be reported only to the individual faculty members until the Senate and university administration together develop additional ways of appraising teaching which are appropriate to the various disciplines.

Sen. John Parker pointed out that the Senate is not opposed to student evaluations, but raised the question that if department heads do not use student evaluations, what should they use?

Sen. Carl Kell observed that this motion says that the faculty have a choice as to whether the evaluations will be used.

Sen. Chuck Crume said he felt the Purdue form is inadequate, and that more definite criteria are needed so that faculty know how they will be evaluated.

Sen. Parker noted that the Senate evaluates administrators, but do not think students can effectively evaluate faculty.

Sen. Barry Brunson said he felt the average numbers for each question of the Purdue evaluations were meaningless statistics. He said no one believes that students are not able to evaluate faculty, but something else that is better needs to be used.

Sen. Otto said the faculty know that faculty evaluations are used in promotion/tenure matters, but the faculty never know what happens with the administrative evaluations once they are completed.

Sen. Joe Glaser asked that if the department does not use the Purdue form, then how will students' opinions be included in evaluations?

Sen. Brunson noted that no one on the committee advocated not participating in faculty evaluations. The committee asked, "Should it be done? How? How should it be used?"

Vice President Haynes said that what we should be talking about is not evaluation, but faculty improvement of classroom teaching. He said a student evaluation should never be used to make sharp distinctions. Rather than university standards, Dr. Haynes asked the faculty to establish departmental norms to answer, "What is it we expect to happen in the classroom?"

The motion passed with a voice vote.

APRIL MEETING

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be at 3:20 p.m. in the Ballroom of the Garrett Conference Center on Thursday, April 10.



FACULTY SENATE
communications committee
NEWSLETTER