

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

AUGUST 29, 1994
3:30 pm

1. Introductions/Announcements
2. Senate Rosters, Committee Lists, and Replacements
3. Old Business before Senate: 1993-94 Log of Resolutions
 - A. "Evaluation of Teaching" resolution
 - B. Other Unfinished Business?
4. Brief Statement by Chair on Proposed Thrust of Senate in 1994-95
5. Consideration of New Matters of Concern to Faculty (in no particular order below; collectively, we can discuss priorities and likely strategies to address)
 - A. Any decisions made by Administration over summer or points made by President at Aug. 23 meeting with all faculty
 - B. Instructional/Academic proportion of Budget
 - C. Senate Response to elements of "New Level" Paper?
 - D. "Wiring" of campus concerns
 - E. Revisions of Faculty Handbook?
 - F. Open
6. Preparation for Sept. 8 Meeting

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes, August 29, 1994

Marvin Leavy, Senate Chair, presided over the first Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting for 1994-95. Also in attendance were Larry Snyder, Vice-Chair; Sylvia Pulliam, Secretary, Joan Krenzin, Parliamentarian; ~~Ray Mendel, Faculty Regent~~; and Joyce Wilder, Ed. M. Yager, Glenn Lohr, Eileen Williams, Gene Evans, Bart White, Roy Cabaniss, Fred Murphy, Nancy Baird, and William Traughott.

Leavy reminded members that Snyder had prepared a log of last year's resolutions, which should help us to follow through with last year's activities for this year.

Snyder reported that there are 3 known vacancies in the Senate, all of them at-large positions: Carolyn Eichenberger, College of Education, and Patricia Lockett, Potter College, have left the University, and Rita Hessley, Ogden College, has resigned from the Senate. Wilder, Elections and Bylaws Committee, will review the returns from each of these colleges and identify the next candidate from each college; she will telephone them to see if they accept and then follow through with a letter. Leavy will also select a replacement from Potter College for Lockett's committee position.

We addressed the last resolution from the 1993-94 Senate:
Resolved, that the Faculty Senate create a committee to re-evaluate the process by which instructors and courses are evaluated at Western. Leavy's preference is to turn such requests over to standing committees, rather than to create ad hoc committees, and it was agreed that this was within the purview of the Professional Responsibility and Concerns Committee. The group mentioned that this may tie in with the president's plan to move to a higher level. The point was generally made that student evaluations were originally designed and intended to be used only for personal improvement and were not intended to be an instrument for evaluation of faculty. ^{HP} Since the College level responses for the Higher-Level document are due on October 15, it was agreed that the Senate's response should be submitted at about the same time. So, we should direct the committee to have a report to Senate for a vote at the October 15 meeting, and some comment should be made concerning this at the September meeting. Members felt that we may want to air some concerns about the Higher-Level document at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Under other unfinished business, we addressed ^a the resolution from 1993-94: The Faculty Senate requests that the Board of Regents undertake a study of other benchmark institutions to determine the percentage of budget spent on instruction. Mendel, Faculty Regent, ^{has} said he would present his request to the Board of Regents. Two such studies have been made, one of 15 benchmark schools in the region, and another of 2 benchmark schools (1 in Kentucky and 1 outside Kentucky), and the understanding is that WKU falls below the average. However, the results of the studies are confidential, possibly because of other data in the studies; but we would like to see the results "published."

ded from
OCT 13
← Was this done in
Sept?
F.S. Hear?

We
defer to
Mendel!
Effect
S
Report

Leavy indicated that he would like each committee chair to give a brief summary of committee activities at each Senate meeting.

Leavy also gave a brief statement expressing his thoughts: The Senate has a reputation of being vigilant. It is the prime pipeline between the faculty and the president, although the AAUP helps in this regard. It is also appropriate to monitor the faculty -- we should be concerned about collegiality, ethics, responsibilities. Self-monitoring enhances our respectability -- it is better for us to address our own problems than to have administration define them for us. He is also concerned with academic integrity of the institution and faculty rights. Wilder commented that she approves the idea of being pro-active rather than reactive. Traughott compared our work to a camera, we should apply all three elements of appropriate focus, light, and speed to our work. Leavy said that he is not interested in fighting futile battles, but he is interested in standing up for important principles, even against the odds.

In considerations of New Matters: The Senate agree that the "Moving to a New Level" paper from President Meredith is an unsettling document and that many of the suggested programs seem to be steps backward rather than steps forward.

Wiring of campus for computer networks was another concern as several members stated that they currently have no computer access at all, and in some cases their buildings still have no wiring.

Another concern was the creation of the WKU foundation. It has been presented as a "done deal" which Mendel said appears to have been orchestrated in private and in violation of the open meetings law, since much had "already been taken care of" prior to the faculty regent's first exposure to the foundation proposal at a regents' meeting. Faculty are concerned about controls and safeguards, and who pays for what. The College Heights Foundation still exists; the two may be merged eventually. The VP should be asked to address the Faculty Senate and explain the foundation to us.

05
3

Aug 15 '94

VP Rutledge / Steve Catron

Traughott pointed out that we need to pose questions and expect answers, that we should prepare questions before the meeting and give them to invited speakers before the meeting. For example, we might ask Rutledge to speak to the Senate about development. Leavy suggested that the Executive Committee prepare and review questions for Rutledge regarding the Development Committee. Wilder suggested that we leave this open to other subjects, as well.

Fiscal Affairs?

Leavy requested that motions of more than one sentence should be typed ~~and distributed~~ with copies to the President and Secretary.

for distribution of

What should be the Senate response to the "New Level" document? We should request that the Senate be given copies of the report from each college [by the Vice President of Academic Affairs] as soon as the Vice President receives these reports October 15. In the interest of time, appropriate committees should investigate issues in the document before the Senate receives the document. Leavy offered to review this with the

if he can!

+ Academic Affairs

chairs of the Professional Responsibilities and Faculty Status and Welfare committees and to ask them to subdivide the concerns and report back to the next Executive meeting. One concern is that the document only seems to suggest that faculty need to make improvements, but not other branches of the University.

Asks welcome motion on membership of President's Committee.

Pres.
Meet

Krenzin presented three concerns that people have expressed earlier. She pointed out that she has heard only one side of these issues, and that such responses are really more of an ombudsmen nature, which is intrinsically reactive to a problem, rather than pro-active.

1. Use of faculty selection committees. One committee member states that the committee submitted 3 names for a position, but that a different person was selected.
2. Dennis Smith's position was lost in admissions. This may be gender bias.
3. Mike Dale may have been booted to a new position to be the "fall guy" for the Ann Murray situation.

TO ask of SM

Again, it was pointed out that she has heard only one opinion on these matters.

each of

Pres.

Another concern was with Institutional Advancement. They will now pay students for phonathon work, rather than using volunteers. The pay for workers will now be taken out of donations before the money is given to the designated department or program. One question was whether this means that the University will now follow this pattern of paying selected people to do jobs, rather than training others who are willing to work. White also suggested that we should monitor the results closely to see whether this plan really pays for itself.

The Senate will need to select ^{one} representative for the COSFL at the September meeting. Marv Leavy will serve ^{as one} ~~in this position~~, and Charles Bussey may be interested in continuing as ~~representative~~. _{The other}

Pres.

Several people expressed dissatisfaction with the faculty ID cards. The Big Red on the card is not dignified. In fact, some institutions which require faculty identification for admission to libraries or other facilities refuse to accept the Big Red ID as a legitimate faculty identification.

The Executive Committee will meet Wednesday, September 7, at 3:30 pm in the President's Office, with President Meredith, unless someone notifies us that the time has been changed.

Respectfully submitted,
Sylvia Clark Pulliam