LEAVES FLY AND OCTOBER SENATE MEETING GOES INTO OVERTIME

An issue-swollen agenda spilled over from the regular October 11 session of the Faculty Senate onto the 18th of the following week. Several important proposals were passed or presented for consideration in November.

The Director of Library Services, Dr. Earl Wassom, stood before the Senate for 40 minutes, but was unable to convince the members that his action on journal non-renewal was academically responsible. The Senate voted to deplore not only the reductions in journals but also the arbitrary manner which the action was carried out.

The business portion of the meeting saw the passage of the constitutional amendment which changes the date of the election of Faculty Senate officers from March to May, thus affording a smoother transition with more continuity. The Senate voted that a resolution of support for parity funding in KTRS be sent to the leadership of the Kentucky legislative committees on education. Senator Buckman informed the Senate that prospects for passage of this bill seem good. Chairman Jones reported that Senator Zacharias has been lobbying for it. The Promotion Policy proposal did not reach the floor this month as expected due to the hospitalization of Senator Parks. The work of the sub-committee on benefits was reported to be delayed by the initial refusal of Mr. James Tomes of Personnel Services to release letters of experience filed by our current hospitalization carrier. The Fiscal Affairs Committee reported that its attention is being directed to travel funds, the lab school, athletic program costs, and the College Heights Foundation. A resolution was passed to place in the Faculty Handbook a list of rights and privileges of persons with emeritus status (see below). A resolution (to be acted upon in the November meeting) was introduced proposing that the Faculty Senate support the non-teaching faculty in its request for an equitable load reduction commensurate with that given the teaching faculty. The November session will also vote on the proposal to establish a University ombudsman, and a plan to revise the general education requirements and the duties of the several committees now concerned with them (see below).

Senator James Davis asked the Chair to appoint 6-8 faculty people who, together with student and administrative representatives, will develop the forms and procedures for a faculty evaluation this spring semester. Voluntary and experimental this spring, the evaluation will become regular and required. Its results are to remain privy to the instructor and department head. The Senate countered by passing a proposal to study the time and manner of the next administrative evaluation. The By-Laws, Amendments and Elections Committee was charged to consider the suggestion that larger departments by given more than one Senator and that the office of At-Large Senator be abolished.
A FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

The Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee has moved for the appointment of a University ombudsman. Your senator has the text. Chairman Al Petersen explains below the intention of the proposal.

At present there is not a single word in the Faculty Handbook (9th edition 1978) that suggests a method or procedure by which a faculty member may redress a grievance other than termination of contract.

The Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee is working on a faculty grievance procedure within the context of a campus wide "ombudsman." Webster defines "ombudsman" as one that investigates reported complaints, reports findings, and helps to achieve equitable settlements. It is envisioned that an ombudsman could concern him/herself with any controversy, dispute, or disagreement between faculty members and/or between a faculty member and an administrator...to be sure, perhaps, even between administrators.

Writing for myself, and not the entire committee, I feel that one advantage to the ombudsman approach is that a person who believes he or she has a grievance can approach the ombudsman and, at least to a certain point, can remain anonymous. This is a very controversial point with many people who feel that every faculty member ought to speak out directly to his or her department head or whomever. We all know that every administrator--from department head to president--has an open door policy. Thereby hangs the tale...in theory perhaps we do not need a grievance procedure. Many use the argument that in some departments anonymity is impossible; so a faculty member might as well directly confront that person with whom he or she has a grievance. These points and others will come out on the Senate floor. I cannot give definitive answers to the above questions.

As I see the ombudsman role, it is one in which the person will act as a fact finder that can, if necessary, report directly to the President. It is therefore necessary that the ombudsman be appointed by the President from a list of candidates submitted by the Faculty Senate. There must be a limited term of office to allay the fears of "another" administrative post.

I do not know how such a position will work out, but I think it is worth a try, especially for those faculty who are concerned about speaking out directly on a felt grievance for fear of some kind of reprisal...this may not be you, but there are such individuals on this campus and some of them are administrators.

OVERHAUL OF GENERAL EDUCATION GUIDELINES

Senator Peterie, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, summarizes here the committee's reasoning behind their proposal to change the University's Guidelines for General Education. Your senator has the text of the proposal.

The Faculty Senate Constitution gives the Academic Affairs Committee the prerogative to recommend that the FS initiate action
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on academic policies which it thinks should be considered by the Academic Council. The AAC proposal to revise the general education requirements was made for the following reasons. Possible changes in the University's role in society plus changes in student goals justify a re-evaluation of the GE requirements at WKU. Again, some members of the AAC are concerned about the possibility that many of the current GE requirements resulted from favoritism shown through the Academic Council toward certain departments by present and/or former members of WKU's higher administrative levels. The Revolving Faculty Exchange Program has revealed that the GE requirements at other participating institutions provide more freedom, simplicity and fairness than do the GE requirements at WKU. The Academic Affairs Committee proposal to establish each department at WKU as the final level at which courses are approved for general education was made in the belief that faculty and administration from outside a particular department are unqualified to judge if a specific departmental course does or does not meet the General Education Course Guidelines as they now stand. Our committee also believes that allowing each department to have final approval of GE courses will provide more freedom of selection to the students and more equality among the departments. The proposal is intended to defuse the issue of which specific courses contribute to the general knowledge deemed appropriate to a holder of a college degree, and comes at a time when many departments might be more concerned about their enrollments than the sound design of general education.

NOTES FROM THE CHAIR--Tom Jones

There are a couple of items regarding the Congress of Senate Faculty leaders. I attended the meeting here at WKU of the CHE in my capacity as chair of the group. It was the first time I've attended a meeting of the Council. It was fascinating. And depressing. Also, I have been invited to attend a meeting--"a luncheon for community Leaders supportive of teachers in Kentucky"--by KEA President June Lee on Monday, October 29. I think I should probably go, since now seems an impropitious time to appear not supportive of public school teachers. I met Miss Lee at the CHE meeting and was happy to hear her say that the KEA does not oppose parity in funding for retirement programs. One other "faculty togetherness" item: the president of the state AAUP has invited the COSFL to an April leadership workshop, and I expect we will attend.

Regarding your Senate, I am in the process of appointing members to two committees: one to work with Jim Davis on developing a faculty evaluation device, and one to develop another administrator evaluation. Concerning the latter, I am pleased to report that President Zacharias told me on Friday the 19th that he has no problem at all with such evaluations and that they serve useful functions. So I hope that an evaluation done next spring will have an even higher (than the 72% of the last one) participation rate.
The Ogden College of Science and Technology exists for instruction, research, and public service; probably 95% of its energy is expended on instruction. The college consists of seven departments - Agriculture, Biology, Chemistry, Engineering Technology, Geography and Geology, Mathematics and Computer Science, and Physics and Astronomy. During the past school year the college faculty included 140 regular or visiting full-time university personnel and seven adjunct professors; 90 of these had an earned doctorate, and 95 had attained tenure; 51 held the rank of professor, and 43 were associate professors.

Student enrollment in the college has remained constant in recent years, due primarily to increased enrollment in two departments having good opportunity for postgraduate employment. Total degree and preprofessional program enrollment in the spring of 1979 was 2,168; the student-faculty ratio was 18.8 students per faculty member, compared to 16.5 in the university.

I think the strength of Ogden College lies in its well-trained and capable faculty, as evidenced by the success of its students in graduate and professional schools. However, its research and public service capability has never been realized. Research activities have been poorly supported throughout the university, and there has been little incentive to be productive. This has changed somewhat in recent years with the reduction of teaching loads for some faculty involved in research and the establishment of faculty research grants. However, the recent administrative procedure used in terminating subscriptions in the library can only result in reduced morale and lessened incentive.

The college dean has advocated a Resources Management Institute within the college, but there is concern among the faculty that the expense for such a multipurpose operation might come from funds presently used for essential college expenditures; the amount of $10,000 was budgeted for R.M.I. this year, and the capital budget for the college was reduced by $17,000.

The Ogden College faculty has appreciated the opportunity to participate in the selection of new faculty and department heads and the freedom to develop courses and programs. The dean's office has provided us a degree of freedom not found in some other colleges on campus. At the same time most faculty members seldom have contact with the dean's office and feel that day-to-day support of the college on campus could be stronger. Facilities for the most part are adequate, although Snell Hall, constructed in 1924, cannot be fully utilized and is greatly in need of renovation.

The original Ogden College was proud of its academics and accomplishments. A similar pride exists on the old campus today. With predictions of decreasing student numbers and shrinking budgets for the years ahead there is guarded optimism that Ogden College can continue to adjust and be successful in its major goal of serving the student while at the same time continuing a modest program of research and public service.
During the last several years the Faculty Senate and the ASG have spent a great deal of time studying the feasibility of a student evaluation of faculty at Western. In April of 1979 the ASG Faculty Evaluation Committee, composed of three ASG members and two Faculty Senators, submitted to me a "Report on Student Evaluation of Faculty." I took no action on this report until our new President, Dr. Donald Zacharias, had had an opportunity to study it.

As I reported to the October 5 meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the October 18 meeting of the Faculty Senate, I am now appointing an ad hoc committee composed of eight faculty members chosen by Senate Chair Tom Jones, two to four members of the ASG, and two department heads to review the recommendation from the ASG Faculty Evaluation Committee concerning the evaluation instrument to be used and the procedures required to implement the evaluation. During the spring semester of 1980 each faculty member at Western will be given the opportunity to participate in the evaluation, and the results will be given to the faculty member only. In the fall semester of 1980, and on a regular basis thereafter, each faculty member will participate in the evaluation, and the results will be given to the faculty member and the department head. This should prove beneficial in the faculty member's continuing professional development, which is the major purpose of the evaluation.

WHERE THE WORK IS DONE: THE SUBCOMMITTEES
Subcommittee on Insurance of the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee --by David Rivers

A Health Insurance Benefits study was initiated by the Faculty Senate during the 1979 spring semester. The need for the study was indicated by a lack of competitive bidding during the previous ten-year interval. Three nationally prominent industrial and academic health insurance carriers were contacted: Mutual of Omaha, Prudential, and Metropolitan Life. Representatives of all three companies requested information regarding age, sex, and dependent status of the faculty and staff, as well as the benefits experience of Blue Cross, the present carrier for WKU. This information was compiled during the Summer and is being prepared for submission for bidding. We are requesting bids for health, dental, and optical insurance. When the bids are received they will be analyzed and a report made to the Faculty Senate.

RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF WKU EMERITI

The ad hoc Committee on University Emeritus Faculty Relations confirmed and gathered into a list certain privileges granted those tenured personnel retired from teaching, research and administration. The Senate has proposed its inclusion in the next Faculty Handbook.

Personnel with emeritus status are entitled to the following rights and privileges: to be included in faculty lists in University
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bulletins; to receive a University identification card; to have faculty library privileges; to be eligible to apply for research grants; to be allocated office space upon request when it is available; to purchase a parking permit for one vehicle upon request; to use University recreation facilities upon presentation of identification; to have the dental and medical services available to other faculty members; to purchase tickets to academic and athletic events at the prevailing faculty rate; to enroll in University classes and to make purchases at the University Bookstore at the prevailing faculty rate; to hold membership in the University Credit Union; to attend, without voting privileges, meetings of the Faculty Senate and Academic Council; to participate in academic processions; to be appointed to represent the University at academic ceremonies at other institutions; to receive notices of all University events; and to take part generally with the faculty in all ceremonial functions of the University.

POLICY FOR ABSENTEE VOTING ESTABLISHED

In response to requests from faculty members, the By-Laws, Amendments and Elections Committee has decided to provide absentee ballots for faculty members who must be out of town at the time when a Faculty Senate election is being held.

The following procedures should be followed by a faculty member requiring absentee voting privileges.

1. Obtain the necessary form from the BAE representative in member's college.
2. Return the completed form to the BAE representative.
3. Obtain absentee ballot from the BAE representative.
4. Return ballot, in sealed envelope, to the BAE representative prior to the election.
5. Absentee ballots will be counted only in the first election and not in any run-off elections which may be necessary.

CORRECTION: The September Newsletter listed on page 5 the name William H. McMann. This should have read William H. McCann.
QUESTIONS I'VE ALWAYS WANTED TO ASK

Should the University physical plant still be maintaining a house and grounds for a president who retired over ten years ago but continued to draw a salary from the College Heights Foundation?

Is it really necessary to eliminate tennis by locking the gates during home football games?

Who is served by beginning the Fall semester on Tuesday with a TTh week?

Why is it necessary for multiple numbers of physical plant employees to work together to replace light bulbs?

Why is it impossible for a student to get a receipt for an I.D. card from the cashier at Wetherby?

This feature is an experiment. It is designed for you to advertise things that puzzle you about campus life. The only answers you should expect are action by a committee, sympathy, or a sigh. We hope to hear from you. Address to: Communications Committee, Faculty Senate, Ivan Wilson 270.

(The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid for from state funds KRS 57.375.)