The Faculty Senate newsletter, a product of the Senate communications committee, is designed to communicate the issues and concerns of the Senate to the faculty. I hope these concerns and your concerns, as we are elected to represent you, our faculty colleagues.

Although you may not always agree with the views presented by the newsletter committee or by the Senate itself, it is hoped that both will generate productive dialogue that will assist in finding answers to the complicated issues facing our faculty this academic year.

Please present your concerns to your elected departmental or at-large College Senator and help our system work. The Senate does make a difference in decisions that are made at high levels and that directly affect you.

Bart White
Chair, Faculty Senate
Associate Professor
Communications & Broadcasting
STATEMENT ON EDITORIAL POLICY
OF THE
FACULTY SENATE NEWSLETTER

Realizing that we all get much too much unwanted paper across our desks, the FS Newsletter issues during this thirteenth Senate will concentrate on the business of the Senate, the state of the University, and on the situation of the faculty, and the politics implicit in all that.

The Newsletter will be, also, the forum in which the entire faculty can present and debate ideas and concepts regarding all aspects of academic life, especially the long-term prospects of the University, her future, needs, and direction.

In these two concerns the Communication Committee will strive to make the Newsletter as comprehensive and complete as possible. As we try to analyse our situation and to articulate our concerns we wish to generate debate. Out of the debate we expect consensus and, consequently, policy of the faculty to rise. This vital evolution to the self-assertion of Western's faculty depends on your participation, i.e. here and now, on your contributions to the coming issues of the FS Newsletter.

This first issue of Volume XIII comes out under the double number 1 & 2 because of its unusual scope. We felt that both features in the opinion and editorial part were timely: John's on the Faculty Regent because of the imminent election, and mine on the conditions and chances of the faculty, too, since some orientation of this kind is needed at the beginning of a new academic year, when we have to make up our minds, before we come to deliberate and decide on actions we might take.

Conform to the policies adopted last year, signed articles express the opinion and positions of the author, and are not necessarily those of the faculty senate.

The Faculty Senate Committee on Communications is made up of John Bruni, John Russell, John Stallard, and

Georg Bluhm

(as temporary chair)
Faculty Senate Session on September 14, 1989

Highlights

At 3:33 p.m. the Chairman Barton White calls the Senate to order. After a short discussion the Minutes of the last session on April 25 (Senate XIII, 1), as corrected, pass. Chairman White then calls on President Thomas Meredith to address the meeting.

The President elaborates on a number of topics.

Enrollment: The count stood on the preceding day at 14,694. This shows substantial growth for the second consecutive year. This includes an increase of 600 full-time students. "So that means quite a few more people in your classes...." However, he expresses hope that there will be not too many big classes, i.e., classes with more than 35 students.

President Meredith then outlines his concept of the Faculty Regent: He has two roles to play, one is to represent the faculty and their concerns, interests and ideas to the Regents and to the President. "But when it comes to voting time and to the board meeting itself, and it's time to assume the role of the Regent, my assumption would be that that individual would then become a Regent just like all the other regents. They would not be voting to protect or to bring forth a special interest. They would become a Regent whose decisions would all be based on: What's best for Western Kentucky University as a whole? My rationale for that? I don't want Joe Iracane to make his decisions on the board of Regents based on the interests of the Governor.... In my opinion, ... that's what I assume the role of the Faculty Regent should be, as well. ...." 

Insurance: At the beginning of his presidency last year he initiated an inquiry into the insurance situation by a new ad-hoc committee. They opened all books and went through all the sources. It proved the assumption wrong that Western had not handled the problem a right: "The fault was not with Western, the fault was with the insurance industry." Their costs and the premia were just sky-rocketing. Then the decision was made that we would restructure our insurance offerings, and rebid this fall. The restructuring was aimed at "Not to give you a better deal, but to give you better options." For instance by offering much lower premium costs if you choose significantly higher deductibles. ..... Now we wait for bidders. Last year we waited, and opened up, and extended, and got in the end one bidder. This time we send the bids out and hope for the best. In December everyone will have to decide which insurance option to choose.
Purchase: Past grievances have been investigated and shortcomings corrected. Soon a report will be finished and sent to the faculty and "I think you will all be pleased with the changes we have made...", all the way from transportation to purchasing to the graduate assistants...

Department Heads and Chairs: After long deliberations President Meredith had sent to the Vice President a draft on this matter, received his recommendations and expects to have his draft finished "next week probably". That will be sent to the deans and to the senate executive committee. Another faculty-wide discussion seems not necessary, "we all have been through that already". Then the feedback from there will be worked into the final proposal. "And I think you will be pleased" with the final result from this process. About the final product of this lengthy gestation, President Meredith ventured as much as: "... it doesn't have to be a Head or a Chair, - these are two extremes..." but he revealed no more.

Athletic Budget: He didn't go into this that day, because it would take all the time. Referring apparently to the "Vos Report" he stated that many more studies and data are coming in. They all are carefully reviewed and studied, and in the end he expects "to put a group of people together", who would work through all this information and "filter it through" and "come up with some sort of recommendation about it". Yet currently nothing definitive can be said about it.

Graduate Assistantships "were on Vice President Haynes' priority list last year, but it didn't survive. We run out of money before we got to it on the list." It would have required additional $30,000.

Tuition Waiver Why can't we do it? We might have to do some tuition waivers for competition, some day. "It's a double lick." Waiving tuition means you don't get the income. But when the state calculates formula funding last year's income is the basis for "expected income". Thus, waived tuitions are not only income that didn't come in, rather, the state calculates it as real income of the university, therefore reducing by that amount the university's need and claim for allocations of state funds.

This concluded President Meredith's address. It was followed by questions-and-answers.

He was asked with precision and persistence what time frame he has in mind between his presenting the draft of the "Head vs. Chair Issue" to the deans and the senate executive committee and the production of its definitive text. He replied that it is not very long, three or four pages. There is no point in stirring up the entire faculty in another
round of consultation, so he mentioned: "Three days to a week, — perhaps ten days."

The implications of the uncommon size of the freshmen class was raised and addressed with reference to the relief expected from the Community College. In this context he mentioned that our enrollment is up 30.5% over the size four years ago.

The talk about tuition increase, as opposed by the students' representatives, he stated, was also rejected by the universities' presidents. However, with stagnant operation costs, the review of the universities income situation, including its tuition part is natural. "We talked about not pushing (the tuition question) before the General Assembly met. Because if we had full formula funding, we would not need a big tuition. ... For us, full formula funding would be this year eight million dollars. ...."

Problems and implications of further growth at Western were touched upon, especially prospective changes of the institution's character when the enrollment would exceed 15,000.

The Head:Chair conundrum resurfaced once more. President Meredith admits to a liking of the "chair"-concept; yet he wants to consider the position not in entirely collegial terms. There ought to be some element of leadership, he connects with that office the ideal of a 'Mentor'. "There has to be a lot of faculty involvement in policies concerning the department, that's how academia works. .... I don't like, and it won't be in my recommendation, for internal election, ... to see who is to be the chair, next." Only "in extenuating circumstances" he sees an internal search and election justified. It would be dependent on the consent recommendations of the dean and the vice president. As a matter of principle, that position ought to be given "to the best" who could be found. This line of argument led to the inevitable questions, how long the position should be held by any individual, and by whom and through what processes "the best" for the position of chairhead would be identified.

President Meredith replied to these objections that the selection process would be essentially a faculty affair. He could not involve himself in that business, nor would the vice president. The search committee would be "primarily the department's faculty, although there would be additional people on that so that you get a little more open view ...." He hesitates to speak of "terms" for the "chair" position, like four years or so. There have to be annual evaluations. "I don't want people to assume, because they have been appointed 'chairs' that they automatically get four years." However, it would be impractical to operate, and to get people on one-year contracts, the normal expectation would
be a four-year "cycle" of service, —as every four years also
the evaluation ought to be much more comprehensive and
thorough.

That ended his address and the ensuing discussion.

The chair moved on with the agenda, changing the anticipated
sequence in order to complete ‘old business’ while the
quorum lasted. The second reading of the "By-laws" engen-
dered a lengthy discussion on grammar, syntax, and semantics
of the present text which was finally satisfactorily settled
and passed as amended (see below).

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

The Senate voted to change the wording in Bylaw VI. The Bylaw
will now read "The Chair of the Faculty senate shall declare
vacant the position of any elected senator who is absent without
a substitute from three regularly scheduled senate meetings
during a senate year. The vacancy will be filled in accordance
with Article III C4 of the Constitution."

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive Committee, Bart White, Chair

The Chair indicated that since President Meredith discussed the
main issues taken up in the Executive Committee, no additonal
report was necessary.

Bylaws, Amendments, and Elections—Alan Yungbluth, Chair

Committee will be active in Regent's election as well as election
of senators who resigned during the summer. The Department of
Health has already elected a new senator, Dr. William Howard.
The Department of Libraries will elect a new senator during the
week of September 18. An entire College of Business election
will need to be held to elect a Senator at-large to replace David
Schull, who has left the university. This election will take
place on September 21.

There was a great deal of discussion regarding who is eligible to
run for the Regent's election. Discussion centered around
whether Military Science, Library Science, and Media Services
faculty are eligible. Military Science faculty are not eligible
to run but can vote; Library Science and Media Services faculty
are eligible to run since they are evaluated in the same manner
as regular faculty. The state Attorney General's office will be
contacted to ensure that the interpretation of eligibility
requirements conform to Kentucky Statute.

Academic Affairs—Elaine Moore, Chair

Committee concluded old business for last year. No new business
has come before the committee during this academic year.
Faculty Status and Welfare--Joyce Rasdall, Chair

Art Shindhelm reported for the Chair. The committee will continue to conduct the faculty salary survey. Report will contain same information plus one new item. Administrators will have a separate listing so that they can compare the percentage increase for their respective group. There will be overlap since department heads are considered administrators and are also considered in the faculty salary survey.

Open hearings will be conducted around Thanksgiving or early December for the university's insurance plans. The committee will continue to study insurance problems and will look into retirement plans such as TIAA-CREF in addition to the present system. As time permits, the committee will study the 10-year merit pay evaluation forms (or lack of them). The suggestion was made to have multiple locations on campus where faculty could discuss their insurance with representatives from the industry. Should faculty have suggestions on a more efficient way to conduct the insurance situation, let your senator know.

Fiscal Affairs--Arnold Redman, Chair

Major focus of this committee is on extension of report from last year in terms of accountability of athletic budget and expenditures. Another goal is to look at expenditures of academic units and administrative spending. Committee would like to present these type of data periodically through the newsletter or whatever mechanism is appropriate. Redman invites suggestions from senate members and faculty as to procedures for disseminating such data.

Professional Responsibilities and Concerns--Jim Weslowski, Chair

Items for consideration this year include policies and procedures for faculty grievances and procedures for faculty evaluation. Weslowski stated that the university has already adopted a policy for periodic review of administrators beyond the departmental level. According to Weslowski, the university has adopted a policy to name an ad hoc committee external to the university to evaluate administrators at the deans and academic vice presidents levels. The committee questions whether that policy has in fact ever been carried out. The committee also strongly recommends that the Senate as a whole should study the President's plan on the question of departmental chairs. According to Weslowski, ample feedback should be given to the President on this matter.

Committee on University Committees--Sylvia Pulliam, Chair

Committee has made nominations for an advisory committee to the Academic Vice President. This committee will continue faculty interest surveys similar to those conducted the past two years.
Faculty Regent's Report--Gene Evans

The Regent's report primarily centered on the state of affairs with athletics and the athletic budgets. Regent Evans reported that the Board collectively has an open mind about scaling back the athletic budget. However, he cautioned the Senate and faculty about whether this will become reality--having an open mind and reconsideration of the athletic budgets does not necessarily mean that the regents will take action.

In a statement made later in his report, he said the Board had heard a great deal about athletics and athletic budgets and the Board is committed to progress in the reallocation of athletic spending.

Regent Evans continues to keep the Board apprised of happenings in big time athletics as indicated in various news media. He mentioned specifically the North Carolina State situation. The Regent believes a knowledge of happenings in other state universities could have direct implications for Western's program.

Dr. Evans gave a brief report of a meeting he attended with Bart White and Paul Campbell. Representatives from all institutions of higher education in Kentucky were in attendance. The outcome of the meeting was that next year's higher education budget is rather pessimistic. Seemingly, the budget for higher education in Kentucky will not increase significantly the next time around.

Congress on Senate and Faculty Leaders (COSFL)--Paul Campbell, Chair

Three meetings of this organization have taken place since the last Senate meeting. A brief summary of these meetings follow.

Some major revisions in the Constitution have transpired. Rather than having members pay dues, all faculty are encouraged to pay $10 or more to assist the organization with moving forward.

The organization will have as its main priority the achievement of full formula funding. Another major item is to discuss retirement plans at the various state universities to ensure that they are actuarially sound. And the organization will address the issue of the quality of trustees and regents appointed by the Governor for the state universities. Some type of screening process and a six-year term for regents will be recommended. COSFL is also concerned about the budget outlook but has not decided to make this a primary issue as far as the legislature is concerned.

The TIAA-CREF retirement plan (which relates to Western, Murray, Eastern, Morehead, and Kentucky State) will not be at the top of COSFL's agenda; however, the organization may become involved with the insurance program.
Jim Byram, KEA, addressed the August meeting of COSFL. He reported that KEA has six full-time and six part-time lobbyists working in the interests of higher education. A concern voiced by Dr. Campbell is the high cost of the lobbyists efforts. Campbell reported that Senator Ed O'Daniel met with the COSFL group during this time. The Senator discussed the budget outlook and reported that there will be something like $300 million dollars in new money and that $524 million dollars has already been requested. The budget does include a 5 percent increase in salaries for educators.

Joan Lang, Deputy Executive Director for Planning Higher Education, met with the group. The thrust of her remarks were to push for full formula funding.

Campbell announced that a special program on KEA will air on TV October 18 at 9 p.m. Some of the issues concerning higher education will be discussed.

NEW BUSINESS

Institutional Goals and Planning—Joan Krenzin, Chair

Krenzin discussed six recommendations for improving purchasing on campus. Some wording was changed in the second recommendation. The Senate voted to suspend the bylaws so that the recommendations could be adopted on first reading. Motion carried.

Bart White, Chair, acknowledged Dana Boden's contributions to the Senate and the newsletter and thanked her for her services. Dana has accepted a position at The University of Nebraska.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.
INTERESTED IN ADVANCING THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION?
JOIN AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS (AAUP)

AAUP continues to contribute to the prevailing pattern of academic freedom, tenure, and governance. Here are examples of the ways in which AAUP assists the interests of the profession:

. Annual salary survey (recognized as the authoritative source for data on salary and compensation changes)

. Government relations office (works to promote federal legislation advancing higher education objectives and assists state and chapter leaders to lobby effectively in their state legislatures)

. AAUP's Amicus briefs before the Supreme Court and appellate courts have advanced the court's understanding of academic principles and have involved precedent-setting decisions beneficial to the profession.

. . . . and AAUP provides leadership in many other areas of concern to the profession: retirement and pension planning; recruitment and retention of minority faculty; academic freedom and artistic expression; faculty involvement in academic athletics programs; and the increase in part-time and non-tenure track faculty appointments.

AAUP's 75 years of experience in developing and interpreting procedures relating to academic freedom and institutional governance enable the organization to speak effectively on issues of faculty concern. AAUP's ability to respond is directly dependent upon the support received from individual faculty members. YOUR MEMBERSHIP WILL ASSIST AAUP TO REMAIN THE PREEMINENT VOICE FOR THE STANDARDS AND IDEALS OF THE PROFESSION.

Contact:
American Association of University Professors
1012 Fourteenth Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005
(202)737-5900
The Role of the Faculty Regent

With the impending election of the Faculty Regent at Western, an examination of the role of the position becomes both interesting and timely. There is often a divergence of opinion concerning the function of the Faculty Regent when issues which excite faculty interest are before the Board of Regents. Among the responsibilities which are suggested as being appropriate are representing faculty interests, acting as an ombudsman or ombudswoman, being a provocateur, or serving in the same manner as the appointed regents. To examine the issue, two sources may provide special insight, the Kentucky Statutes that authorize and empower Boards of Regents and the opinions of the previous and current Faculty Regents, the Chairman of current Board, and the President of the Institution.

Examination of the Kentucky Statutes to ascertain the particular responsibilities of the Faculty Regent does not provide resolution of the issue. Other than establishing the eligibility of the individual and of the electorate, the statutes do not mention any peculiar or independent role for the Faculty Regent. Indeed, the establishment of voting privileges for the position suggests that the Faculty Regent is neither limited nor empowered separately from other members of the Board except in the matter of faculty compensation. The composition of the Board required by KRS 164.320 suggests that narrowly defined constituencies are not intended and that the electoral process for the Faculty Regent may be intended to provide a vehicle for identifying the individual to serve rather than to establish a limited interest. The function of the Board as a "body corporate" (KRS 164.350) with the participation of the Faculty Regent establishes that the position shares the common interests and powers of the governing body rather than some particular position such as ombudsman or ombudswoman or representative of faculty interests. Such a relationship does not require unanimity of position on issues before the body but does suggest an equal and shared "right of interest".

The experiences and opinions of the five individuals who have served as Faculty Regent at Western provide a basis for understanding the responsibilities of the position.

The first Faculty Regent, Dr. Herb Shadowen, 1968-1971, held the post during a period when the opportunity to vote on matters before the Board was not available. Dr. Shadowen described his participation as advisory concerning faculty perspectives and interests. He was able to participate in discussions of the Board but could present no motions and could only introduce initiatives through cooperation of another Board member.
The Role of the Faculty Regent

An example of this cooperation was the establishment of the faculty sabbatical program. Dr. Shadowen’s experience indicates that the role of the Faculty Regent was initially advisory with respect to faculty interests.

Dr. Lowell H. Harrison held the position of Faculty Regent from 1971 to 1974. Initially, he too lacked the opportunity to vote or introduce motions, but the statutory authorization for such participation was established by KRS 164.289 in 1972. Dr. Harrison believes the Faculty Regent shares the common responsibility of other Board members and is not assigned separate responsibilities such as ombudsman. He has provided this description:

"Because of his/her intimate association with the campus, the Faculty Regent should be able to bring particular knowledge of this institution, and of higher education generally, to the deliberations of the Board, many members of which have little understanding of the complexities of higher education. In the presentation of such information, the Faculty Regent should represent the entire campus community, not just a segment of it".

The third faculty member to be elected as Regent, Dr. William Buckman, served from 1974 to 1983, the longest period of any Faculty Regent at Western. Dr. Buckman has provided an apparently more limited view of the role of Faculty Regent. He stated that the "Faculty Regent represents faculty interests ---- provides faculty perspective to policy issues".

Ms. Mary Ellen Miller, 1983 to 1987, has provided an opinion of the responsibilities of the position different from any of the others surveyed. In her view, the Faculty Regent acts as an "ombudsperson to provide individual faculty interests and concerns to the President of the university" and "representing faculty interests" on matters before the Board or Board committees.

Dr. Eugene Evans, the current Faculty Regent since 1987, has provided the following description of responsibilities:

"To consider the university as a whole, balancing the interests of its constituent parts;

To bring a faculty perspective to board deliberations;
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To keep the other Regents and the President apprised of faculty concerns;

To be a staunch advocate of academic values;

To report to the faculty concerning Board actions and attitudes."

Additional insight concerning the role of the Faculty Regent may be gained from the views expressed by the Chairman of the Board of Regents, Mr. Joe Iracane, and the President of Western, Dr. Thomas C. Meredith.

Chairman Iracane believes the Faculty Regent "serves the interests of the institution in the same manner as any other member of the board. He indicates that the individual has "special insight to share as a member of the Board because of his or her familiarity with campus concerns" but that as a voting member the interests of the institution are paramount. Chairman Iracane also indicates a special responsibility of the Faculty Regent is to communicate the position and actions of the Board to the faculty so that understanding and support might be gained.

President Thomas C. Meredith described his view of the responsibilities of the Faculty Regent in the September 14th meeting of the Faculty Senate. Dr. Meredith states that;

"Faculty Regent, following election, assumes the role as Regent to act in the best interests of the institution. The Faculty Regent should insure that the board is informed of faculty concerns but his or her vote on issues should reflect the best interests of the institution."

President Meredith indicates that it would not be proper for any member of the Board, including the Faculty Regent to protect or bring forth the special interests of some narrowly defined constituency.

It is clear that, although there exists a degree of divergence, the majority of opinion from those surveyed is that the role of the Faculty Regent is to serve as a member of the "body corporate" without special portfolio or responsibility. The individual provides to the governing group special knowledge
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or insight concerning campus concerns, but has the responsibility to consider all matters before the board and not just those for which a direct faculty interest exists or has been expressed. The Faculty Regent also serves as a conduit for information concerning Board positions and actions to the faculty.

As an expansion of the above summary, I would like to suggest the responsibilities briefly described in the following manner:

The Faculty Regent is a representative of the institution. If the institutional interest are assumed to be broader than faculty concerns then to limit the interests of the position to those for which the faculty have expressed concern diminishes the credibility of the Faculty Regent as a fully participating member of the Board.

The Faculty Regent is a representative for the "University". As the only member of the Board whose profession is practiced at an institution of higher education, he or she is best able to identify and explain the principles and ideals of the institution. He or she is best able to provide understanding of the issues being confronted by public higher education throughout the nation, and is best able to identify the manner in which the principles and ideals of the "University" should guide the resolution of particular issues confronting the Board.

The Faculty Regent is representative of the faculty. The faculty as the "life blood" of the institution possesses as a body certain characteristics which greatly determine the character of the university. The Faculty Regent, through example, provides a basis for understanding of those characteristics and qualities which must be important to the deliberations of the Board.

By identifying the responsibilities of the Faculty Regent in the manner above, and by providing only a brief discussion of each, I seek not to resolve the issue but to stimulate a greater and more careful exploration. If we as a faculty understand with a high degree of unanimity the role of the Faculty Regent, then we are more likely to identify the individual best able to serve. If the interests of the "faculty", the "University", and the institution are to be best served, it is necessary that we identify an individual who can with courage, conviction, and understanding represent those interests.
WHILE YOU WERE OUT, these things of concern to us happened in the Commonwealth’s realm of education:

The board of regents of Murray State University gave notice that the contract of President Kala Stroub, expiring next year, would not be renewed.

An Associated Press news item of May 5th read: "Morehead State University board of regents has adopted a new policy that will allow a larger portion of the school’s athletics budget to be subsidized. The policy raises the allowable subsidy to two-thirds of the overall athletics budget by fiscal year 1992." (AP-NP-05-06-89 0852EDT <+>)

And the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Kentucky upheld on June 8th the ruling of the Franklin Circuit Court that had declared the entire elementary and secondary school system of Kentucky, as it is based on the existing statutory law, unconstitutional.

The reports and commentaries in the press on the Murray affair (cf. Courier-Journal, September 3rd, part "Forum", for instance) indicate a long development of growing alienation both, between President Stroub and the regents, and also between her and the faculty. It appeared from the reports that the growing tension with the board was affected by the latter’s preoccupation with local interests and by the overtly political nature of their appointments. The decision not to renew Ms. Stroub’s contract, as reported in the media was related to her position that a new building, whose funds have been appropriated, should be constructed for academic purposes and uses. The regents insisted that it be built as another facility for athletic purposes. The alienation and the lack of consensus between president and faculty at Murray is a very deplorable and actually damaging development. It prevented the chance -by now quite conceivable and feasible- to convince through common action a board of regents that setting the priorities of the university’s work is no legitimate business of regents and, therefore, constitutes an unacceptable intervention. Pity!

The Morehead affair, like a mystery story, contains intriguing puzzles: The "allowable subsidy" shall be raised "by fiscal year 1992" to "two thirds of the overall athletic budget". Yet in the fiscal year 1987-1988 Morehead’s intercollegiate athletics showed total revenues of $458,900, total expenditures of $1,749,300 - a deficit of $1,290,400, paid out of Morehead’s general funds. (Figures from Table 5 of the "Vos-Report", p 48). Morehead’s bail-out of its intercollegiate athletics costed already in 1988 some $118,369 more than two thirds of the program’s expenditures!
Or is their "overall athletics budget" so much bigger than the budget for intercollegiate athletics only?

How many books do they keep? And what are the economics behind the MSU budget? Rumor has it that the faculty there got this year a salary increase of 7% and better. Do they teach classes with 300? Or was this increase intended as a one-time anesthetic for the faculty, to keep them for ever from meddling in the arcana of their university's finances?

Be that as it may, - from here we observe two events at our sister-institutions which prove the unabating dominance of alien factors and external forces over the affairs and governance of the University. It succeeded in the one case due to the unnecessary and unaffordable lack of consensus between faculty and president, despite her progressive academic thinking. The deafening silence of the Morehead faculty over the outrage there remains incomprehensible.

Obviously we are reminded by these events that all our old problems are still with us. And, though they are statewide, here they continue to require lasting concern and commitment of Western's faculty.

* * *

Suppose the faculty of Western comes to assess the policies we have tried so far as failed, for they have proven futile, ineffective, useless. Such a conclusion, then, seems to leave three options for our future attitudes and endeavours:

(1) Continuation of voicing our grievances in resolutions, or recommendations, or "mass-demonstrations" at the Capitol in Frankfort, hoping against hope - in any case against all experience and evidence- that in some small measure our remonstrations might have some persuasive effect.
(2) Or resignation, accepting as a fact of life that in the order and arrangements of things, improvement and change here are just beyond our reach. Since only few humans could live in permanent resignation, this attitude will appear as complacency which will protect itself with cynicism against those disturbing rabble-rousers who ever so often come about. And in the end one lives in cowed complacency, forever.
(3) Or we can realize and acknowledge the simple basic condition of all politics, that is: In any social relationship in which several groups or institutions interact with some degree of conflict and competition, persuasion succeeds only when acceptance of dialogue and persuasion is the involved parties' better choice. In other words: Mutually acceptable accommodation of conflicting interests takes
place only when facts, circumstances and institutional structure make that accommodation the clearly preferable option.

If Western’s faculty and the faculty senate prefer the third of these options, they must gain for themselves a position different from what we have now, namely, we must establish a firm position of dialogue in the decision-making processes of the University. Which of course we will not get unless it is the other parties’s, especially the administration’s best choice. To assess the faculty senate’s chances in this context requires first an analysis of the entire relationship of faculty, administration, and board of regents at Western Kentucky University.

Twelve years ago the faculty senate was created. Since then it has tried to represent the faculty and to articulate their ideas, concerns, and interests. The faculty senate here, as at all state-operated universities in Kentucky, except for UoL, has no statutory basis. It exists, in other words at the pleasure of the university*). This is, obviously, a position of complete dependency on the administration, utterly insufficient for gaining that institutional position that would guarantee our permanent inclusion and participation in Western’s decision-making process.

It seems, therefore, that the faculty senate is in a situation where it has to consider, on behalf of the faculty, the steps to be taken in order to render its own existence independent and, by the same token, establish legal standing. This would be the precondition for any effective action of the senate. Without this it remains possible that at any instance the senate can be dismissed or dissolved, - which did never happen because just by neglecting, disregarding its actions, resolutions, requests, or recommendations, the same effect was achieved, unfailingly, with much less ado. Thus, the leverage the faculty - and on their behalf the faculty senate - have in case of disagreement with the administration, is nil.

The Board of Regents of each of the six "State Colleges and Universities" is legally established and defined in the Kentucky Revised Statutes (henceforth: KRS) Nr.164.320. Ours, as the others, shall "... consist of eight members

*) The University’s of Louisville "faculty government" and also "staff senate" have at least an indirect statutory basis as both their "chief executives" are specified as members of UoL’s board of trustees - [KRS 164.820 (1)].
appointed by the governor, one member of the teaching faculty, and one member of the student body...". The terms of service is four (originally six) years for the appointed regents, three for the faculty regent, and one for the student regent. There are limitations spelled out in the statute, like no more than two appointees from one county, no more than four of them belonging to the same political party. No other requirements are specified.

In contrast, the statutes dealing with UK and UoL require that the governor shall appoint "competent citizens of Kentucky"; the statute on UK (KRS 164.130) goes further to stipulate that of the sixteen appointed trustees "ten (10) shall be other distinguished citizens of the state representative of the learned professions". This requirement has the obvious advantage that new regents from the very beginning of their service have—most likely—an experienced understanding of the university’s academic nature and life. (It seems sensible to expect, and to prepare for, an inclusion of a similar provision in the event of a revision of the statutes pertaining to us, the state universities.)

In this board of regents "the government of the university is vested". According to KRS 164.350 ("General powers of boards of regents"), the board may (1) receive and expend granted money "for the use and benefit of the university", (2) make rules and regulations, (3) request reports, etc., (4) determine the administrative structure of the university and (5) "grant diplomas and confer degrees upon the recommendation of the president and faculty."

And KRS 164.360 ("Appointment and removal of president, faculty and employees") reads:
"(1) Each board of regents may appoint a president, and on recommendation of the president may, in its discretion, appoint all faculty members and employees and fix their compensation and tenure of service, ...

"(3) Each board may remove the president of the university ..., and upon the recommendation of the president may remove any faculty member or employee, but no president or faculty member shall be removed except for incompetency, neglect of or refusal to perform his duty, or for immoral conduct. A president or faculty member shall not be removed until after ten days' notice in writing, stating the nature of the charges preferred, and after an opportunity has been given him to make defense before the board by counsel or otherwise and to introduce testimony which shall be heard and determined by the board. ........."
These look like rather broad, sweeping and penetrating powers. Yet, although of the "General powers." (s. above) only Nr. (5) explicitly subjects one of these powers under the president's and the faculty's recommendation, it is almost impossible to imagine that the board would do anything under numbers 1, 2, and 4 without preceding consultation with, and recommendations from, the president and, perhaps on occasion, from the faculty, except for a thoroughly deteriorated situation as it apparently exists in Murray. Normally, reason and prudence will advise the regents to handle the delicate complexity of a university with great restraint. Besides, nothing in the laws grants the regents the power to make, or overrule, those decisions which are the most genuine and internal prerogatives of the university, that is to determine her own goals, setting her very own priorities, within the broad ranges of the law, i.e., KRS 164.300 ("Purpose of state universities and colleges").

Thus, the board is by law in its nature, its structure, and its mission a supervising, disposing, consenting organ which responds on behalf of the sponsoring Commonwealth to the initiatives, projects, plans of the university. The lead in this relationship can come only from the university herself. The question then is, how is the leadership articulated? How are the purposes determined, the goals set?

For all practical purposes, the functions of leadership in the university are exercised by the administration. This gives it an absolutely enviable position of power which is hard to challenge, to question, to oppose, let alone to correct. Let's not be hypocritical, would not everybody we know just enjoy to be in such position where one's visions, creativity, and innovative imagination could be exercised unincumbered by all those mediocrities which surround us in daily life? Of course, idiosyncrasies which certainly do not deserve free passage would go unincumbered, too.

Managerial absolutism is a curious matter. Undeniably, it is a powerful component of the American (pop-)cultural, kind of an adult fairy-tale, heroically being forced into real life. But in the depth and fullness of American Culture, managerial absolutism is as alien as any absolutism. One good reason for this - among many - is that it is impractical because of the minimal chance for correcting faults, foibles or idiosyncrasies.

(From a historical view, managerial absolutism applied to the university is particularly curious as the Occident's universities from their very inception were self-governing republics of scholars, electing their "managers" for
specified terms from their own ranks. This model lasted through all upheavals of the seven and a half centuries since the founding of the Sorbonne, even through the age of political absolutism. And still today it is in full vigor and effect. Only the totalitarians, Robespierre, Stalin, Hitler succeeded in suppressing the University and her freedom, temporarily.)

And frankly, who needs really "managerial absolutism" in running this university? There is no "manager" within a radius of 60 miles, all around, who has such a "workforce" of highly trained and skilled individual thinkers as the faculty and the staffs of the library and some institutional services of Western Kentucky University. Here, leadership means not cajoling and prodding, supervising and controlling; rather encouraging, facilitating and co-ordinating is all that it takes to lead this institution to greatness!

In fact, of course, and legally, the administration has to answer to the board of regents. In this relationship, however, the university as a whole gives account to the Commonwealth, and that must be grounded, without exception, on her academic nature and express the consequent essential priorities. This implies the obligation of the administration to exert leadership, and to enlighten, too, the regents on the complex academic realities. It is precisely this aspect of the administration’s duties which could not be accomplished on the basis of "managerial absolutism". The strength of a truly academically minded administration toward the regents, the state, and the public is to be grounded on a firmly established and constantly cultivated consensus with the faculty. Hardly anything can be more convincing, and involving the regents into the academic realities than such a lively, creative consensus between administration and faculty.

A board of regents that on this ground is an autonomous yet integral part of the university will have little inclination to force external priorities upon the university. Should such alien attitude reappear, nevertheless, an administration and faculty on a firmly united position would be able to overcome any adverse stance of the regents. (President Constantine Curris of Murray took his regents to court for unacceptable interference in the university’s internal affairs - and won.)

Of course, it is possible that for several reasons this whole complex is not seen this way in Wetherby Hall. It is always tempting for the faint-hearted to play it safe, aligning oneself with the powers that be. Or one sticks with the traditional ways, or pampers one’s own pet-ideosyncra-
sies. However, an administration that would rather shy away from the inconveniences and uncomfortable hassles of consensus-politics and steer the course of least resistance would soon notice staggering moral costs, forfeiture of leadership, and stagnation of the university. And in the end, facing unexpected forceful and resourceful resistance, it might founder in a lost fight.

*   *   *

This completes the circle; we are back at the faculty. No matter how convincing we might consider our arguments, what decides an issue in the course of human events has been rarely the goodness of an argument. Most often it was and is the political condition that the acceptance of the argument, of the request or demand is the opponent's best, or only good, choice. To achieve this in our situation would appear as the faculty's and the faculty senate’s only rational and necessary policy goal. It requires the fair and realistic self-assertion of the faculty, the prudent utilization of our assets, the circumspect articulation of our goals, and a determined and consistent pursuit of them.

There is no way around this simple truth: It is the faculty and the staffs of the library and of some institutional services who do the work of the university. All other activity is auxiliary.** In light of this basic reality, it is surprising that this salient group of eminently able people have still no role in the governance of this institution, despite the indignities and the damage we suffered personally from the single-minded profligacy of past administrations' policies. And, much more importantly, despite the fact that the faculty are the element of permanence, compared to which presidencies are transient, some even ephemeral, the faculty remain still excluded from any participation in the decision-making processes of this university. My dear Colleagues, we live in a time when even Leninist dictators are coming to acknowledge that they have to yield participation and power to the people!

** A seldom relished boon of the Freedom of Speech is what it says about the speaker. Jimmy Feix called the "Vos Report": "opinionated .. expected .. because it's coming from a special interest." (Lexington Herald-Leader, August 20th, 1989, p. A14, 3rd column, 6th paragraph) Fascinating to see how incognizance engenders audacity! You may never have heard of it, Jimmy: "The Faculty IS the University!" Now you may guess who the "special interest" lobby is in this place!
About two thirds of today’s faculty will still be serving in the year 2004. This proves that the faculty have a direct stake and interest in the quality and conditions of Western then. Those are decided by the priorities which are being set now. The future adequacy of the library holdings in books, journals, newspaper archives, other media will be essential, this is determined by the acquisition policies of today. It will also be essential when we would finally begin to develop a comprehensive program of adequate quality education for the 600 students with ACT scores of 27 and more who have enrolled here already, - and put our funds into such programs. The instrumental equipment that is accessible for our students to use, matters. The size of classes matters.

No one has a greater interest in these things than the faculty. It is anachronistic that the faculty remain excluded from governance. But again, why should anyone who has a monopoly in decision-making be expected to give up so comfortable and convenient a circumstance when and if he can still believe to have better choices than doing that.

Yet, it has become possible now, and for this reason the time has come, to clear up the illusion that no changes in policy, and no changes in the policy-making processes and procedures are needed, and that the dumb faculty can be kept excluded forever. An illusion this is, for the budgetary policies, and the related processes, priorities and appropriations of the past two administrations, - they are all bankrupt.

The university has no way out of this self-made predicament than to rethink the concept and the politics of the intercollegiate athletic program. In the five years covered by the budgets 1983/84 to 1987/88 its deficits run up to $6,393,300 which Western paid out of the government appropriations. The approved budget for 1988/89 and the budget recommended for 1989/90 contained a deficit total of $2,414,666, again to be paid out of the state funds which the legislature has allocated for the work of the university (cf. "Vos Report", Table 3, p.46; and "1989-90 Operating Budget Summary for Fiscal Year", i.e., WKU’s official budget document, pp 14 and 22).

It is simply not conceivable that this practice can go on endlessly, not even the Director of Athletics can believe that. In any case, though, the faculty and, we assume, the academic administrators can not accept any more continuation of such policy, out of their acute responsibility for the future quality and health of Western. This opens the prospect that the administration itself might use this
crisis to seek an active participation of the elected faculty senate in salvaging athletics with minimal possible damage to the program.

Such cooperation should be considered by the senate as desirable and feasible, - after the administration has recognized officially and publicly the faculty senate as the elected representation of the faculty, and after the administration agrees officially and publicly to create with the senate an institutional system for the faculty's participation - henceforth permanent - in the university's policy-planning, -deliberation, and decision-making; this has to include explicitly the deliberation and setting of priorities and the entire budget process.

If the administration, despite the magnitude of the crisis, rejects the idea of faculty participation both, in the salvage effort and in prevention of future disasters, the faculty senate would have to determine the alternatives. In that deliberation the continuation of the status-quo will, presumably, be considered as unacceptable, for moral reasons, as clarified above. But it would be unacceptable also for political reasons:

If the administration - despite the crisis - would remain opposed to seek and establish permanent cooperation with the faculty, it would be fair to assume that it plans to continue, endlessly, the practice of funnelling large and steadily increasing amounts of state money, allocated to the work of the university, to non-statutory purposes.

Therefore, the faculty has quite clearly in this contest better choices than resignation. If no agreement on permanent cooperative participation of the faculty in the university's decision-making would be forthcoming, there are two areas in which the faculty senate can operate with very good chance of success: the judicial, and the legislative-political area. In such contest the case of the faculty, which is the case of the future and health of this university, most likely will succeed, while the programs - which presently might still be salvageable with some thorough adjustments and corrections - would have deteriorated beyond repair.

Add to this the considerable costs ensuing from distraction from regular pursuits, from negative publicity, damaged reputation, losses in national ratings. Consider, if you please, the effects of that kind of budgetary policies, and of the controversy over those, on the periodical accreditation procedures! And let it suffice that there are still
other variations, - thinkable and un-speakable ones. May they so remain, forever!

Calculating the implications of its options, the administration might very well reach the conclusion that accommodation with the faculty, and their senate, at mutually acceptable terms is indeed its best choice.

* * *

Just let us keep in mind that calculations like these are not intended to wage a conflict; rather they demonstrate the superior utility of accommodation for settling disputes.

Besides, rational policy pursues only limited goals.