



FACULTY SENATE
communications committee
NEWSLETTER

Executive Committee

Chair Fred Murphy said the executive committee is looking into making the Tom Jones Symposium a biennial event instead of annual.

President Kern Alexander will speak at an open forum for **all faculty** on Wednesday, April 13, at 3:30 in Garrett Auditorium.

By-Laws Committee

Recent Senate elections have been completed. Those re-elected or newly elected for the next two years are:

Elected from colleges at large:

Academic Services: Elaine E. Moore, public services

College of Business: Brian Goff, economics; David M. Shull, finance

Ogden College: Stephen Jacobs, math; Donna Bussey, nursing; Ed Dorman, physics and astronomy; Robert Baum, health and safety; Virginia Eaton, computer science; David Coffey, agriculture

Potter College: Joan Krenzin, sociology, anthropology and social work; Richard Weigel, history

Elected in departmental elections:

College of Business: Gabriel Buntzman, management and marketing

Ogden College: Doris Thayer, allied health; Thomas Yungbluth, biology; Earl Pearson, chemistry; Kenneth Kuehn, geography and geology; John Russell, industrial and engineering tech; Hope Richards, math; Irene Powers, nursing

Potter College: Joe Glaser, English; George Bluhm, government; Fred Murphy, history; Michael Ann Williams, modern languages and intercultural studies; John Faine, sociology, anthropology and social work

Institutional Goals and Planning

Questionnaires regarding research services at WKU have been distributed to all Senate members to give to every faculty member. These should be returned to Karlene Ball in psychology immediately.

COSFL

The recent COSFL meeting did not draw as many legislators as planned, according to Paul Campbell. Chair Murphy gave details on last month's annual COSFL meeting in the name of Sen. Campbell, who was not able to attend the Senate meeting.

Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee

Rose Davis moved that WKU return to transcribing student comments on evaluations, even if it causes delays in returning the evaluations. The motion read as follows:

The Faculty Senate urges that, in the future, we return to the practice of transcribing student comments, even if there is a delay in returning the evaluations to the faculty.

The motion passed to consider the original three items separately, to be voted on at the next Senate meeting:

First motion:

Discussion centered on the ability of students to effectively evaluate teaching. Bob Reber said he thought the preface was the most important part of the document. He said research shows no apparent correlation between student opinion and academic gain. Therefore, only if valid measures of academic gain can be developed/found should the evaluations be used/relied upon. He suggested several options be available and utilized vs. using one method. Joe Flynn said he was concerned with the broad and imprecise nature of "academic gain" and how that would be measured.

Mel Borland said teaching or teaching effectiveness is very difficult to measure or define, while academic gain, while difficult to measure, may be more easily understood.

Second motion:

Jim Wesolowski said the question at hand was one of philosophy and not of measurement. The danger is that we directly relate academic gain and teaching performance. He said this removes the student from the learning process in the sense that it implies that the student learns because of what the instructor does and not because of what the student does.

Third motion:

The question was asked regarding the cost of transcribing students' comments, and what happens to students' comments once they are transcribed. Both answers were unavailable.

New business

Barry Brunson presented the following motion:

Especially in a time of critically tight budgets, all components of a university should be financially well-managed and accountable.

Academic freedom is a standard which must be upheld in poverty as well as in prosperity. No actions should be taken which have the effect of abridging or curtailing the editorial independence of the press, including the College Heights Herald and the Talisman. Student editors, reporters and staff, once selected, should be under no faculty or administrative editorial constraints, but under only the constraints of responsible journalism.

Discussion centered around the role of the student press, and the duties a faculty adviser as opposed to a faculty editor would have. Primary concerns were financial accountability, and pay for serving on publications vs. receiving credit hours.

Rich Weigel noted that President Alexander also suggested that editors cover national news, etc., noting that this was something other than or in addition to the above two concerns.

Gene Meyers said that perhaps the Senate should not be reacting so quickly, but allow the Executive Committee to deal with the matter. He moved a substitute motion that the Senate expresses its concern and urges President Alexander and the Executive Committee to meet with each other to clarify any misunderstandings that exist. The motion failed.

The motion will be voted on at the second reading at the April meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Special meeting, March 22

President Alexander began the meeting with a statement, saying the issue of the proposed publications changes had been "misconstrued." The president praised the Talisman, Herald and department of journalism, and expressed his views supporting the freedom of the student press. He explained the history of university publications at WKU and the need for job descriptions for the publications advisers and the need for a budgetary plan. The president used numerous overhead transparencies to compare the ad hoc committee's suggestions with his suggestions.

Questions followed from those attending, regarding the president's coverage by local media, and the language and terms used by Alexander.

The next meeting of the Senate will be Thursday, April 14, at 3:20 in the Garrett Baslroom.

Response from Dr. Paul Cook

In your letter to me dated Feb. 24, 1988, you requested information for the Faculty Senate Newsletter regarding facilities for a fraternity row. A fraternity row, if built, would be constructed and operated as a part of the auxiliary operation as any other student resident facility.

Auxiliary operations are supported through the revenues generated by the users of the services. If fraternity houses were a part of auxiliaries, the cost of construction would come from a bond issue and the debt service on the bonds would come from fees paid by students residing in the houses. The cost of operating the houses would also come from revenues generated by the students residing in the houses.