President Zacharias addressed the Faculty Senate at the April meeting and discussed the fiscal situation of the University. The following is the text of those comments.

As the Council on Higher Education plans for making its decisions regarding the budget for 1981-82 at its regular meeting on April 9, I should like to share the following observations and information with you:

1. Governor Brown has announced a 5.5 percent appropriation reduction for higher education's budget for the coming fiscal year. The Finance Committee, a Sub-committee of the Council on Higher Education, has voted unanimously to recommend the adoption of the Council staff's recommendation (Alternative No. 2) that would reduce Western Kentucky University's appropriation by 6.3 percent for a total of $1,879,200.

2. The impact of budget reductions is significant for every university, and the reduction in Western's resources for 1981-82 remains significant although the proposed tuition increase if adopted on April 9 will lessen this impact.

3. The Council staff's procedure for calculating the reduction at Western and other universities amounts to a redistribution of the state appropriation and, through its process, affects the use of tuition generated at some institutions to reduce the impact of the 5.5 percent appropriation reduction at other institutions. The lower the total appropriation per FTE student is at an institution, the greater the extent to which tuition increases at that institution are used to offset appropriation reductions on other campuses.

4. The material prepared by Dr. J. C. Powell, President, Eastern Kentucky University, was distributed at the Finance Subcommittee's meeting on March 27 and shows the effect of the Council staff's recommendation upon each public institution in Kentucky. The Finance Committee unanimously adopted the CHE staff's recommendations. They endorsed the concept that this procedure accurately reflects the original budget adopted by the General Assembly and the Governor during their last legislative session.

5. The executive budget as adopted by the General Assembly provided for Western Kentucky University an appropriation level to continue current programs with 9 percent for salary and wage increases, and $404,300 for increases in fixed costs and inflation.
These amounts, plus anticipated allocation from the salary adjustment pool, would have provided an appropriation of $31,294,000. The recommended procedure would reduce this by $1,897,200 or 6.3 percent.

NOTE: In essence there will be an additional cut of 1.2 million dollars resulting from non-recurring revenue which came to the University in fiscal year 1980-81, but which is not anticipated for 1981-82.

John Long reported on the meeting with the Committee on Higher Education in Kentucky's Future. His in-depth report can be found elsewhere in this Newsletter.

Chairman Bailey gave a progress report on the Faculty Senate Grievance Forum and the Rank and Promotion Document. Both have been forwarded to Vice President Davis for his review and recommendations. The Executive Committee will meet with President Zacharias and Vice President Davis on the afternoon of April 10 to discuss the Rank and Promotion Document.

There was an article distributed concerning the continuing participation in Social Security. Chair Bailey called for comments from the faculty on this matter. All interested faculty members should contact their Senators for further details.

Chair Bailey recommended reading the article "Political Myths" by Senator Glaser published in the College Heights Herald, March 31 issue.

Senator Leonard, Chairman of the By-Laws, Amendments and Election Committee, brought to the attention of the Senate the following items which will be discussed at the next BAE Committee meeting. The items are: the need for faculty to present their ID card for Faculty Senate elections, assessment and possible rewriting of Faculty Senate committee descriptions, COSFL membership and the relationship of Faculty Senate to COSFL, voting privileges for observers at Faculty Senate meetings, and establishment of written provisions for first and second readings of matters of substance. A straw vote was taken of those members present to determine they approved extending voting privileges to observers.

Senator Pearson presented two resolutions and a motion arising from the Senate's actions on the Rank and Promotion document and subsequent actions of the Executive Committee. All three items were passed. They read as follows:

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University is most strongly in support of a promotion policy which encourages academic excellence as
Resolution (cont.)

the basis for promotion in rank. Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate expresses appreciation to the administration of Western Kentucky University for requesting additional comments to be used in the final formulation of this important policy document.

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved that actions of the Faculty Senate which are transmitted to the President of Western Kentucky University as the official position of the Senate be transmitted in the exact form approved by the Senate without any additions or deletions.

MOTION

I move that a revised copy of EC 002.1A Rank and Promotion Requirements be prepared and transmitted to the President deleting the sentence in paragraph 4 on page 4, "The department head may also initiate the promotion process by recommending the candidate to the department Rank and Promotion Committee," and that a cover letter explaining that the revised document represents the official position of the Senate be attached.

Chair Bailey reminded the Senators that election of officers will be held at the April 30 Faculty Senate meeting. Any Senator wishing to run for an office was asked to notify Chair Bailey.

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR--Don Bailey

There are two issues which I wish to address, both of immediate importance.

First, the Senators of Senate V will benefit from knowing in advance of the April 30, 1981, Senate meeting who is running for each of the Senate offices. Please let me know by April 20, 1981, if you are running for an office. I will see to it that a list of all candidates for each office is sent to each Senator a week in advance of the election. Of course, this offer will not preclude a person's announcing his candidacy at a time after the 20th.

Second, the message President Zacharias brought to the Senate was not good news. The proposed allocation for Western is far better than it might have been (or may yet be); but that good thought does not take away from what can only be classified as an intentional injustice to Western (and especially its students) and other Kentucky universities by the Council on Higher Education. Consider carefully the following three columns of figures.
The first column indicates the percent of the $324,620,600 total which was the 1980-81 recurring base for each university. Western's share was 8.50% of the total. The largest share of course went to U of K (40.77%). U of L received 21.99%, and Eastern was slightly above Western.

The second column reveals that the governor's budget for 1981-82 recommended an increase of $39,587,300 for the state universities, and that Western's share of that would be 7.82%. Notice that the share (%) of the increase for each of the universities with the exception of U of K is smaller than their base percent. The rich thus are provided a means whereby they may legally become richer.

The third column indicates that the increased revenues from the projected tuition increases (1981-82) should be about $6,629,300 total. Now here's where you need to sit down and prepare in whatever way you can to be slapped in the face. Note that good old Western, with 8.50% recurring base, would receive only 7.82% of the governor's budget increase, but would be expected to raise 12.39% of the tuition revenues. And look at Eastern--the same incongruous situation is obvious (8.98% of recurring base, 8.19% of increases, but 13.59% of the tuition).

Well now, can we possibly figure out who would be the benefactor of this marvelous scheme? By now I should not have to point this out, since the number differences are so large--but look what would be the story over in Lexington. An institution with 40.77% of the recurring base, would receive 45.65% of the increased funds for 1981-82, but would only raise 27.76% of the tuition money. Someone at the council and in the governor's office ought to spend more time studying math and fiscal morality or publicly admit that he perpetrated an "intentional injustice."

I hope all 13,000 students at Western (plus all those at Eastern, Murray, etc.) will write the governor and tell him they don't want any part of what they pay for tuition either directly or indirectly going to U of K, or even that little bit that goes to KSU. I hope the students will want to join with the faculty in one great big "cry baby" emphasis. Besides, to the "cry baby" the other guy always looks like a bully--and I'm about to decide which I'd rather be.
Proposed allocations referred to here (reduced slightly) will be voted on by the Council on Higher Education at its April 9, 1981, meeting.

SOME NOTES FROM COSFL

The Congress of Senate Faculty Leaders continues to gain visibility and recognition among state leaders. Some name-and-face recognition was evidenced by a recent letter to COSFL Chair Tom Jones from Finance Secretary George Atkins. It read in part: "It was good to see you in the audience during the Council on Higher Education meeting, and I am sorry that we did not have the opportunity to visit any that day," and "If I can be of help to you or if you need any background information, please don't hesitate in calling." Jones says of the letter, "Obviously if he bothered to write a friendly note like this, he -- hence the Governor, etc. -- is noticing COSFL."

Most of the COSFL representatives from the various universities were among those faculty members invited to appear before the Committee on Higher Education in Kentucky's Future to respond to its draft reports.

The COSFL study on continued participation in Social Security continues.

The planned COSFL/university presidents meeting has been postponed until the presidents are out from under the budget-preparation crunch.

The next meeting of COSFL will be at Morehead in the near future, but the date has not yet been set.

FACULTY MEMBERS MEET WITH "BLUE-RIBBON" COMMITTEE--John Long

The Committee on Higher Education in Kentucky's Future met at Kentucky State University at Frankfort Kentucky on March 20, 1981. Four of the six members of Western's delegation attended the meeting (Don Bailey, Tom Jones, Joan Krenzin, John Long). The other two delegates, William Buckman and Lowell Harrison, were unable to attend.

The Draft Report itself consisted of five reports submitted from three subcommittees designated Subcommittee A, Subcommittee B, Subcommittee C.

The five subcommittee reports were on the subjects: Educational Quality and Programs (from subcommittee A), Research and Public Service (from subcommittee B), Non-Traditional Education and Professional Enrichment (from subcommittee B)--this report had an addendum on medical, dental and legal education--Faculty (from subcommittee C), Financial Issues (from subcommittee C).

After the meeting was called to order, each delegate was called upon to state his/her name and school and to voice the worst fear or greatest hope concerning the future of higher education in Kentucky.
Thereafter, each of the five reports from the subcommittees was considered.

At the outset, no little concern was expressed about the matter of a "system" of higher education in Kentucky. The fear, here, was that all of the schools would become "the University of Kentucky at . . ." with the resulting loss of autonomy. After hearing this concern no less than three times, Mr. Prichard spoke up to say that he knows of no attempt to reorganize higher education institutions into such a system.

When the six WKU faculty members were notified that they were invited to attend this meeting, they met together to go over the reports in order to identify ideas, statements or matters that would fall into four areas:

   a) things for which we could compliment the committee;
   b) things which we supported;
   c) things either stated or implied to which we objected;
   d) things which had been omitted.

The comments that I then prepared were digests of matters that we discussed as we prepared for the meeting.

We began by saying that the draft report of this committee shows good comprehension of the fundamental and far-reaching troubles that beset higher education today, as well as an understanding of and appreciation for higher education and its vital role in the development of the Commonwealth. We commend and express thanks to the Committee on Higher Education in Kentucky's Future for the fact that it genuinely cares and for its evident expenditure of time and effort to produce the draft report.

There may not be agreement with all of the points made or, presently, answers for all of the questions raised; nevertheless, this draft constitutes a framework within which faculty, students, administrators, and citizens may work with directed effort to grapple with these matters to resolve them.

In Subcommittee A's report, p. 12, there is stated:

   We are concerned that services called "remedial" or "developmental" education be provided when necessary to fulfill basic requirements of equity and fairness and to enhance each student's chances of success.

The question must be raised whether or not "remedial" programs for the so-called "under-prepared" student may turn out to cheat the "prepared" student. As more and more funds are put into remedial programs, less and less money is available for the students who have entered the higher education institution with an adequate background of preparation. If higher education is to be responsible for remedial education, there should be separate funding.
In Subcommittee B's report, Nontraditional Education and Professional Enrichment (p. 7), the statement is made that:

There are no weekend colleges for undergraduates in our public universities.

The students in the 1980's may respond quite differently from their counterparts of the 1960's to such an opportunity as a weekend college, for in the 1960's Western Kentucky University offered courses in a weekend university. The program died for want of students.

In the same report (p. 8), concern is expressed that programs be offered closer to the places of residence or employment of the non-traditional student. Yet, the teaching that we do in areas closer to the places of work or residence of the non-traditional student turns out to be the most expensive teaching that we do. The cost of traveling to and from now having become unbearable. Moreover, the facilities for the students, not only classroom facilities, but also, and especially, the library facilities and resources are unavailable to the students.

Subcommittee B's report, Research and Public Service, has much of its emphasis on funded research. This research, however, is not typical of the research done by a large segment of the faculties.

Also, there is some concern voiced about duplication or unplanned and inappropriate duplication which can be wasteful of financial and human resources (p. 3). Agreed: there may have to be some consolidation and cutting of programs; yet, there is need to point out that there is at least one false conclusion that may be drawn: namely, that elimination of an apparently duplicate program at an institution will result in increased enrollment at the institution where the program is retained. Moreover, duplication tends to occur in the graduate and professional programs.

In subcommittee C's report on Faculty (p. 9), there is the statement:

There is a common public perception that the principal criteria for tenure and research resulting in publication of books and articles in refereed journals and acquiring grants. Outstanding teaching and public service are often only secondary considerations.

We believe that this statement is based on the model of the University of Kentucky, which is understood to be the commonwealth's major research university; this model, however, is less suitable for many of the other state universities.

Still in the report on Faculty (p. 8), we call attention to the question:

Beyond promotion through formal ranks and salary increases, what other kinds of reward and recognition should be considered?
We contend strongly that faculty cannot--nay, should not--be content with anything less than an adequate salary. Adequate salary is the sine qua non.

In the report of Subcommittee C on Financial Issues (p.3), we find this statement:

The state must learn to manage service institutions for performance. The higher education system in Kentucky needs to define its purpose and what it should be, and, consequently, what its performance will be. . . . A clear definition of mission . . . will determine goals and objectives for the system.

We lay before you three things for your consideration:

a) no mission statement will solve all problems;
b) more basic to the problem of definition is what a clear definition of what is meant by "mission" is needed;
c) if a mission statement is too restrictive, it eliminates creativity.

In the same report (p.5), is the statement:

Funding formulas were not devised to take into account increasing marginal costs.

We remind the Committee that the universities have had a number of extra functions and programs added to their basic ones. If we are to continue with these extras, then they must be funded adequately so that the basic task of the universities not be undermined.

On p. 10 we find this:

Regarding effective management, the 1970's also saw many of the management functions of public universities . . . assumed by state governments for the sake of "accountability" and control. Universities became, therefore, twice accountable--once internally and once externally--for many management tasks. The efficiency of this doubling of management responsibilities must be examined.

We agree that "this doubling of management responsibility must be examined," for there may have come about, in the name of effective management, a doubling of administrative personnel for accountability's sake, which is a very ineffective form of "effective management."

At the last, we have some apprehensiveness over what the sub-committee has in mind when it speaks of "the system of higher education."

We believe firmly in cooperation; we do not believe in unification. We need be aware, when considering any unification, that we may fall victim to the "convoy effect"--the rate of speed of a convoy is that of the slowest member. Much of the development of the schools of the Commonwealth has been because there is the opportunity for creativity and a reasonable and healthy amount of inter-school competition.
Too, we fear that unification may just sow the seeds of unionism—equal reward regardless of the amount of work done.

At the worst, systematization becomes a strait jacket. The faculty may become apathetic or become bitterly hostile.

NOTE: Since the meeting described above, Mr. Robert Sexton has written the participants to remind them that faculty members are invited to send written ideas or comments to the committee. Should you wish to see the draft reports and respond, the participants listed above have copies. Responses should be sent to:

Mr. Edward F. Prichard, Jr., Chairman
Committee on Higher Education in Kentucky's Future
Council on Higher Education
U.S. 127, South
Frankfort, KY 40601

They may also be sent to Mr. Prichard at his law office: P. O. Box 782, Frankfort, KY 40602.

** * * * * * * * **
COMMITTEE REPORTS
** * * * * * * * **

COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE--Pauline Jones

This is the last edition of the Faculty Senate Newsletter for Senate IV. The primary work of the Communications Committee has been to publish the Newsletter each month, and our year-end report is quite simple: we have done it. We hope our work has been of benefit to the faculty.

What we, the Communications Committee, have done has been by its nature more readily visible than has the work of all the other committees. We therefore asked each of those committees for an "end-of-the-year summary" for this final Newsletter. Those reports are below.

BY-LAWS, AMENDMENTS AND ELECTIONS--Bill Leonard

The two major responsibilities of the By-Laws, Amendments and Elections Committee were to conduct the Faculty Regents Election during the fall semester and the Faculty Senate Elections this spring. The Faculty Regents Elections were held on October 15 and 16, 1980. Bill Buckman was re-elected to that position. The total vote count from Academic Services was ruled by the committee not to be considered as there was a serious voting violation in that area. The election was not contested. During the week of February 9 through 13, the departmental elections were conducted for the Faculty Senate, and on February 25 and 26 the at-large elections were held in Potter, Ogden, Applied Arts and Health and the College of Education. A run-off was held on March 4 in Potter College.

The results of those elections were published in the last two issues of the Newsletter.
College caucuses are now being held to establish the composition of the Standing Committees for next year. The committees to date are as follows:

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Pat Bowen, Academic Services  
Glenn Duffy, Applied Arts and Health  
Bill Davis, Business and Public Affairs  
Mary Crisp/Carl Kreisler, alternate, Education  
Carroll Wells, Ogden  
Richard Weigel, Potter

**BY-LAWS, AMENDMENTS AND ELECTIONS**

Jo Kibbee, Academic Services  
Jimmie Price, Applied Arts and Health  
Juanita Hire/Joanne Verner, alternate, Education  
Doug Humphrey, Ogden  
Pauline Jones, Potter

**FACULTY STATUS AND WELFARE**

Connie Foster, Academic Services  
Frank Kersting, Applied Arts and Health  
Joel Philhours, Business and Public Affairs  
Bill Smith/Robert Melville, alternate, Education  
Martha Watson, Ogden  
Fred Murphy/Mania Ritter, alternate, Potter

**PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONCERNS**

Jo Kibbee, Academic Services  
Richard Mason, Applied Arts and Health  
Eula Monroe/Robert Melville, alternate, Education  
Earl Pearson, Ogden  
Jackson Kesler, Potter

**INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND PLANNING**

Nancy Solley, Academic Services  
Ruby Meador, Applied Arts and Health  
Dorinda Clippinger, Business and Public Affairs  
John Jones/Carl Kreisler, alternate, Education  
Ron Seeger/William Beard, alternate, Ogden  
Michael Klein, Potter

**FISCAL AFFAIRS**

Ed Counts, Academic Services  
Imogene Simpson, Applied Arts and Health  
Dorsey Grise/Harry Robe, alternate, Education  
Robert Hoyt/Charles Henrickson, alternate, Ogden  
Raul Padilla, Potter
BY-LAWS AND ELECTIONS (cont.)

During the 1980-81 term no by-laws, amendments or major policy changes were made. In September, the committee re-edited the constitution to include past changes. This new edition was requested by the chair for publication in the revised Faculty Handbook.

Presently the committee is considering the following:

1. Voting status for observers to the Faculty Senate
2. Provision for first and second readings for matters of substance
3. Determination of matters of substance
4. COSFL membership; Faculty Senate relationship to COSFL
5. Assessment of standing committees with possible re-writing of committee descriptions
6. Question need of ID presentation for Faculty Senate voting.

The committee dealt individually with many eligibility questions during the two elections and were requested to ask Senators who could not meet regularly to either drop their Senate membership or to have observers sent in their place. These items were handled without the need of committee meetings.
FACULTY STATUS AND WELFARE--Dale Wicklander

In recent months, the FSW Committee focused its collective well-meaningness on several areas where changes might enhance faculty benefits: summer overload pay; sabbatical leaves; contingency teaching positions; bargaining alternatives; and salary increments for attaining promotion. Insufficiencies of state funding, however, have mooted the practicality of most of these projects for now.

Still, gains in some basic areas may still be feasible and forthcoming. A questionnaire by Senator Eula Monroe elicited over a hundred faculty responses to issues surrounding insurance coverage. These findings, plus FSW committee suggestions, will be forwarded soon to the University Insurance Committee for consideration.

And the salary trends study completed by Senator Jim Parks is available to the faculty through departmental and at-large senators, as announced in the last Newsletter.

May the FSW committee and the other agencies of the Faculty Senate enjoy fairer financial winds to sail by into the new session ahead.

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONCERNS--Neil Peterie

1. Undertook the study of forms and procedures used by department heads in the evaluation of faculty. Copies of evaluation forms from each college were obtained and analyzed, and the committee composed a list of 22 specific questions to be asked in a survey of department heads. The study was postponed in November 1980 because the PRC committee had been charged to propose a faculty grievance procedure. It is recommended that the next PRC committee resume the study.

2. Wrote PRC: 001.1: 12-11-80 Faculty Grievance Procedure. Did not move passage of the document because the proposed rank and promotion policy contained a similar procedure. A copy of PRC: 001.1: 12/11/80 was placed on file in the Faculty Senate office.

3. Proposed PRC: 002.1: 2/12/81 which provided for the PRC committee to act as a forum for faculty grievances. Passed by the Faculty Senate on March 5, 1981.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS--Joe Glaser

Like the rest of the university, the Academic Affairs Committee has been caught up in the uncertainties generated by the state's budgeting problems--problems which seem sure to have a direct but so far unforeseeable impact on several of the committee's current concerns. In particular, our inquiry into the academic effects of underprepared students and remedial programs has been overtaken before it was fairly started by the proposal for entrance requirements and the appointment of a university-wide committee to make recommendations in this area. We will keep track of this committee and try to cooperate with them, but it now seems that policies on remedial programs and students have moved out of the academic arena and will be finally treated as part of a university-wide economic retrenchment.
The committee did draft and win Senate approval for a statement on student academic rights which is now being considered for adoption by the Academic Council. And we worked with the Graduate Council to bring about an evaluation of Western's policies on graduate examinations. The biggest project we have currently underway is a survey (not to be confused with the crazy quilt published in the College Heights Herald) of grading trends from 1970 to 1980. The results should be ready for distribution next fall.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY/STUDENT RELATIONS--John Long

The Faculty/Student Relations Committee would like to have responses to this idea: that each faculty-staff member be host to a group (numbering 6 to 8) of the incoming freshmen for about 1½ hours during the second week of the fall semester.

The format of such meetings would be informal; the purposes would be:

(a) To help to make incoming freshmen familiar with life at Western in an informal personal setting
(b) To acquaint the new students with at least one faculty-staff member and, in turn, to acquaint the faculty-staff member with a few of the new students in a situation other than the classroom or the office
(c) To enable the students to make additional student acquaintances
(d) To communicate that Western is interested in its students.

A faculty member's responsibilities would be:

(a) To see to the pickup and delivery of the students to the campus
(b) To talk with the students about life at Western
(c) To answer some of the questions that a first week of school engenders.

This personal touch may be one step toward solution of the general retention problem. There are 670 faculty-staff members; were each one to host 6-8 freshmen, that would more than cover the expected numbers of incoming students. This also means that couples which are employed by the university need not host twice as many students. Specific students would be assigned to each participating faculty-staff member. The suggested date and time for these "faculty firesides" is Monday, August 31, 1981, from 7 to 8:30 p.m.

Please let the committee know what you think of this idea. The faculty-staff members on the committee this year are: Pat Bowen (3951), John Long (3136), Sam McFarland (2695), John O'Connor (2695), and Bob Wurster (3043). Please call us or, still better, drop us a note with your opinions about this, or with other ideas.

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