Contents of This Issue

Editor's Note .................................................. 1
An Excerpt on Ecological Education ...................... Aldo Leopold 1
Reflections on Grants in Aid ................................. Fiscal Affairs Committee 2
An Amendment to KRS 164.300 Regarding Selection and Functions of Regents ............. Georg Bluhm 5
Faculty Senate XV Minutes: October 10, 1991 .............. 8
Faculty Senate XV Minutes: November 14, 1991 (Unapproved) ........................................ 11
Editor's Note

With this number of the Newsletter, we are publishing the most recent Senate minutes without waiting for their approval at the next Senate meeting. We hope that this practice will keep you more up to date about your Senate. Please keep in mind that these minutes are subject to correction.

Articles in this issue include a report by the Fiscal Affairs Committee on another aspect of athletics' role in the life of the university and a contribution by Georg Bluhm on important legislation coming before the state legislature in 1992.

--Jan Garrett

On Ecological Education

"Perhaps the most serious obstacle impeding the evolution of an earth ethic is the fact that our educational and economic system is headed away from, rather than towards, an intense consciousness of [the] earth. Your true modern is separated by the earth by many middlemen, and by innumerable physical gadgets. He has no vital relation to it; to him it is the space between cities on which crops grow. . . . If crops could be raised by hydroponics instead of farming, it would suit him very well. Synthetic substitutes for wood, leather, wool and other natural land products suit him better than the originals. In short, the earth is something he has 'outgrown'. . . ."

"One of the requisites for an ecological comprehension of the earth is an understanding of ecology, and this is by no means co-extensive with 'education'; in fact, much higher education seems deliberately to avoid ecological concepts. An understanding of ecology does not necessarily originate in courses bearing ecological labels; it is quite as likely to be labeled geography, botany, agronomy, history, or economics. This is as it should be, but whatever the label, ecological training is scarce.

"The case for an earth ethic would appear hopeless but for the minority which is in obvious revolt against these 'modern' trends.

"The 'key-log' which must be moved to release the evolutionary process for an ethic is simply this: quit thinking about decent use [of the earth] as solely an economic problem. Examine each question in terms of what is esthetically and ethically right, as well as what is economically expedient. A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise."

--Aldo Leopold, A Sand County Almanac, 1949

(Textual purists will note that I have substituted "earth" for "land" in all but one of its occurrences in this excerpt.--JG)
We're calling this a report on grants in aid because it involves athletic awards and Norm Hunter adamantly insists that these cannot be called scholarships. "They certainly have nothing to do with scholarship," he says.

The article is also indebted to Arvin Vos's "Reflections on Travel Budgets" for more than its title. Arvin showed that more than four times as much money has been allocated at Western to athletic travel than is budgeted for faculty travel. His essay goes on to argue that this fact shows the university's real priorities favor athletics over academics. Our point is the same, but demonstrated a different way.

These are the questions we asked. How much does Western spend on competitive academic scholarships to bring in good students and how much on grants in aid to bring in athletes whose academic skills are largely irrelevant? What are the total amounts in each area? How many students are affected? What is the size of a typical award? And what do these figures say about our priorities as an institution?

Anyone accusing us of measuring apples against oranges should realize that Western's budgeteers invited the comparison by choosing recently to list athletic and academic grants in the same budget category, a decision that removed a large part of the cost of fielding teams from the athletic budget. Before 1990 athletic grants were considered expenses of the sports programs. Since then, however, they have moved out of athletics and are now chalked up against Institutional Scholarships.

Some other odd birds appear in the budget under Institutional Scholarships, things like War Orphan Scholarships and incentive grants offered students from selected Tennessee and Indiana counties. We omitted such programs from this account because they are not competitive and not primarily academic. True, incentive grant students must present somewhat higher academic credentials than Kentuckians, but the standards are modest and anyone who meets them gets a grant--as if you guaranteed a football scholarship to anyone who could do fifteen pushups. It seems clear incentive grants are meant to extend our service area, attracting more students, not the best possible students.

Factoring out athletic grants, the incentive program, and a few other non-academic items, it appears Western's 1991/92 budget actually devotes $1,386,500 to academic awards. The money is spread out over about 1200 students in this way:
### 1991/92 ACADEMIC AWARD BUDGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWARD</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>NUMBER AWARDED</th>
<th>AVERAGE VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGENTS SCHOLARSHIPS</td>
<td>$392,500</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>$1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS SCHOLARSHIPS</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.H. CHERRY SCHOLARSHIPS</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC SCHOLARSHIPS</td>
<td>59,110</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALLMARK AWARDS</td>
<td>73,840</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALUMNI LEADERSHIP &amp; COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHTS SCHOLARSHIPS</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARDS OF EXCELLENCE</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE HEIGHTS MERITORIOUS</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>c. 250</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLARSHIPS</td>
<td>184,050</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONORS SCHOLARSHIPS</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMONWEALTH SCHOLARSHIPS</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$1,386,500</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td><strong>$1160</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here are the figures for athletics:

### 1991/92 ATHLETIC AWARD BUDGETS FOR PLAYERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPORT</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>NUMBER AWARDED</th>
<th>AVERAGE VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASEBALL</td>
<td>$74,555</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$5735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN'S BASKETBALL</td>
<td>88,825</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOTBALL</td>
<td>408,450</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN'S GOLF</td>
<td>18,340</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>5841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCCER</td>
<td>36,260</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWIMMING</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN'S TENNIS</td>
<td>21,335</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>5829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN'S TRACK</td>
<td>51,880</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>7236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN'S BASKETBALL</td>
<td>88,825</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN'S GOLF</td>
<td>18,340</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>5841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN'S TENNIS</td>
<td>19,850</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>5838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN'S TRACK</td>
<td>44,280</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>5834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLLEYBALL</td>
<td>30,780</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$937,920</td>
<td>158.78</td>
<td>5907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are for players only. It is the mix of in-state and out-of-state tuition that causes the differences between average awards for various sports. In addition, men's and women's basketball have book and room scholarships for four student managers each, eight awards totaling $9560—averaging $1195. Football funds eight student managers with in-state tuition awards, totaling $11,520, or $1440 per award. Adding these managerial grants into the account gives a total athletic scholarship pool of $959,000.
Another complication is that in several sports, such as golf and swimming, grants can be split. According to Pam Herriford the total number of sports players attending Western with some sort of athletic grant is 236, which would bring the average grant in aid value down to about $4000, still well above the average grant of all but the most prestigious programs on the academic side.

What does the $959,000 we budgeted for athletic scholarships get us? The awards bring perhaps 250 students on campus. Some are good students, some aren't, but this hardly matters: their real reason for being here is sports.

Arvin's report showed that the university sets aside four times as much for athletic as for faculty travel. In view of the administration's widely-touted claim that our institutional spending is rational—that our budget is driven by institutional priorities—Arvin's numbers seem to show that Western's real priorities favor athletic competition (we cannot say success) over faculty development.

Competitive academic awards can be considered student body development. In 1991/92 Western plans to spend about 1.4 million in this area to attract nearly 1200 highly qualified students. At the same time, we plan to spend two thirds as much to bring in about 250 highly qualified athletes.

There are various ways the difference can be formulated: We will commit a third more than we devote to athletic grants to attract five times as many outstanding students. We consider a good athlete worth four times the support we offer a good student. At current levels of funding, the money we give to athletic grants would supply over 700 academic scholarships. And so on.

But the underlying conclusion is clear. If money talks, the policy that guides Western's handling of grants in aid is not "Light, more light," but "Go, Big Red!"
AN AMENDMENT TO KRS 164.300.

regarding the

BOARDS OF REGENTS, THEIR SELECTION AND FUNCTIONS

In mid-January 1992, just nine weeks from this writing, the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky's Legislature will convene in its regular biennial session. On both houses' agenda are three items of paramount interest to the faculties of the six State Universities, i.e., Western, Eastern, Northern, Morehead, Murray, and Ky. State, as well as to the faculties of the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville. These items are: "An Act relating to Higher Education", an Amendment to the Open Records Law, and an Amendment to the Open Meetings Law. Of these three items, the first one is the topic of this article.

Representative Ernesto Scorsonese, Democrat from Lexington, plans to introduce again the bill amending the current statutes on higher education which in the General Assembly of 1990 had the code HB 136. Its central and most consequential part is an entirely new instrumentary and procedure for the selection and appointment of regents and trustees at the State Universities. It failed then to pass, partly for absence of external support, which is but a euphemism for the incognizance and apathy among the faculties.

Currently, the Board of Regents of each of the "six State 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 appointed by the governor, one member of the teaching faculty, and one member of the student body...". The terms of service is 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 may be residents of the same 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".

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, ..."

"(2) Curbs any variety of nepotism by the board.

"(3) Each board may remove the president of the university ..., and upon the recommendation of the president may remove any faculty member or employee, ..., however only for cause, and with due process.

This, then, is the reality at the State Universities nowadays, in simple words:

Under the currently valid laws, the governor is free to appoint, at his discretion, to a board of regents any person he wishes, for whatever reason. The governor is not obligated to consider the qualifications or aptitude of his chosen one. [Indeed, there is widespread consensus that memberships at boards of regents are awarded as political patronage or as personal acts of a governor's gratitude for services rendered.]

And "in this board", so flimsily and wontonly selected and appointed, in glaring absence of any legal obligation to academic standards and qualities "the government of the University is vested"! Just to take, for an example, an uncomfortably close issue: That board of regents is endowed with the awesome power of "determination of the existence of financial exigency requiring economy measures. (This) is a prerogative reserved for the Board and will not be delegated." (Faculty Handbook, 13th Edition, p. 24)

The Scorsone Bill ("AN ACT relating to higher education") contains several amendments to improve the current statutes over the whole range from CHE, over UK, UoL, to the 'six State Universities'. The most consequential change from the current statutes is contained in this entirely new addition:

"SECTION 6. A NEW SECTION OF KRS CHAPTER 164 IS CREATED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

(1) There is hereby established the Governor's Higher Education Selection Committee ..." (The following is here paraphrased:) It has seven members, serving -after the initial period- six years. The members are "appointed by the Governor with the consent of the House of Representatives and the Senate."

(2) In the selection process "the Governor shall solicit recommendations from each of the following: (a) Advisory Conference of Presidents; (b) CHE-Student Advisory Council; (c) Associations representing faculty; (d) Associations representing university and community college alumni;"
(e) Higher Education advocacy groups; (f) The State Board of Education; and (g) Associations representing business and civil interests.

(5) "... the committee shall be responsible for submitting three nominations from which the Governor shall select each gubernatorial appointment to a university governing board ..." ... ... "Nominations shall be made thirty days prior to the expiration of a term" or a.s.a.p. "The Governor shall make the appointment within thirty days following receipt of the nominations."

(6) "In making its nominations, the committee shall consider the needs of the respective institution, locate potential appointees, review candidates' qualifications and references, conduct interviews, and carry out other search and screening activities as it deems necessary."

Gee Whizz!! Regents' candidacies based on reviewed qualifications and references! Interviews! Just compare this outlook with our past and current absurdities! And no more Jocks! Western Kentucky University progressing in a congenial environment that is grounded in the consensus of faculty, an academic-minded Board of Regents and possibly, likely (?) a co-operative administration!

I had a conversation with Mr Scorsone in Lexington. He welcomes our interest, and even more, any resolve in the faculties to supportive action. He is also open-minded for ideas and proposals from the faculties: it will be certainly possible to discuss with him further amendments. I brought up the point, as the appointees to the boards of trustees of UK and UoL must meet standards and qualifications, so also the appointees to our board of regents should have qualified themselves by having earned an academic degree. Really, the Bachelor degree is no longer a badge of 'elitism'. But we may trust that many B.A.s have some understanding of the nature and the mission of a University.

Mr Scorsone is willing to listen and think and absorb our ideas, like the one I just mentioned. We, in turn, ought to agree that the strategic, tactical, and operative procedures of legislation must remain at his exclusive discretion. In other words, he would not pursue ideas and goals which might scuttle the whole project.

For sure, there is still a long way to go, and many pitfalls must be overcome. But this Scorsone Bill—even without any further amendments—holds a great potential to make this university a much more genuinely academic place, for the benefit of all, students, teachers, and city. It is our best chance to work for a great, joyful future of our University, by giving the Scorsone Bill our full support, even
sacrificing work and time, before and during the General Assembly.

Please let the action committee know your thoughts and let us discuss forthright what actions we could take in furthering the passage of the Scorsone Bill of Amendments.

Georg Bluhm

FACULTY SENATE XV MINUTES
October 10, 1991

The October meeting of Senate XV was called to order by Joan Krenzin, substituting for Arvin Vos. The Chair and Vice Chair being absent, Joan Krenzin served as the Chair and Fred Murphy served as Parlementarian. The minutes of the September 12, 1991 meeting were approved as submitted, except that the last sentence in the opening paragraph was deleted. Senators absent without representation were James Bingham, John Bruni, Larry Caillouet, Ann Cline, Phil Duff, John Faine, Stephen Jacobs, Gary McKercher, Robert A. Otto, Norma Schira, Stephen Spencer, and Stephen White. Senators absent but represented by their respective substitutes were: Louella Fong by M. Jenkins; Susan James by Nan Restine; Sally Kuhenschmidt by Jacqueline Pope; Arvin Vos by Edward Schoen; and Ed Dorman for Richard Hackney. Vice President Robert Haynes was also absent.

Executive Committee Report: Senator Krenzin relayed a request by Arvin Vos to Committee Chairs that if they could not be present at the meeting of the Council of Committee Chairs he would appreciate the presence of another committee member in the council. The Executive Committee considered the possibility of a Spring university convocation at the President’s request and advised the President that it was less than enthusiastic regarding it because of the concern about having an extra meeting.

Academic Affairs Committee Report: Academic Affairs had nothing to report.

By-Laws, Amendments, and Elections Committee Report: New senators were asked to stand and introduce themselves. There was some confusion on this point. In particular, Senator Lou Turley was not sure whether he would be considered a new Senator inasmuch as he had attended the September 12th Faculty Senate meeting. Following clarification that this round of introductions was intended for all Senators who were new to the Senate this term, Lou Turley graciously rose and introduced himself to the Senate with other new Senators then following suit.

Communications Committee: Jan Garrett announced that the first issue of the Faculty Senate Newsletter was out, but that the Communications Committee did not yet have any articles for the next issue. Senator Garrett announced that the Committee would need four or more pages of material to comprise a Faculty Senate Newsletter. Senators who did not receive the appropriate number of copies should notify Senator Garrett or the Senate office.

Fiscal Affairs Committee: The Fiscal Affairs Committee had no report.
Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee Report: Georg Bluhm substituting for the Committee Chair reported that the Committee is beginning work on documentation of the progressive increases in travel costs, and associated travel allowance disbursements. The Committee expects to produce a report in March 1992 in which it may be found that travel reimbursements are adequate or inadequate. In either event the Committee will report to the Senate at large.

Report of COSFL Meeting: Sylvia Pulliam reported on the Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership for Higher Education (COSFL) meeting held Saturday, September 28th in Louisville, Kentucky. Notable reports were received on women's issues, from the University of Kentucky delegation; athletics, from Western Kentucky University; and on part-time faculty from the University of Louisville. COSFL also discussed the Western Kentucky University Credit Union issue, recommended an exchange of ideas and information, and decided not to make funds available for lobbying because of limited funds.

Faculty Regent Report: Regent Evans announced the two issues he was prepared to discuss, the WKU Credit Union and the Student Health Service. Regarding the Credit Union, Regent Evans reported that he introduced and the Regents passed unanimously a resolution to attempt to see that the same services provided by the WKU Credit Union remain available to faculty, students and staff on campus. The Board of Regents' legislative intent regarding the Credit Union is that WKU should end up with services very much like those provided by the present Credit Union. The Board resolved that space was to be let to the highest and most qualified bidder for space.

Regent Evans announced that he asked the Chairman of the Board to seek an Attorney General's opinion about the legality of the WKU Credit Union, but got back a letter which was not an "opinion". The letter advises that Section 177 of the Kentucky Constitution prohibits WKU as a State agency to assist organizations it has no control over. Before being leased, the Credit Union space would have to be declared for these purposes as surplus, then sealed bids or public auction would be a required mechanism to let space for a credit union. At present the Credit Union rent is believed to be $402.50 per month including utilities. It was announced that 1,178 signatures had been collected protesting the closing of the WKU Credit Union.

President Meredith spoke on the general issue of the Credit Union and announced that the University is getting a list of all services provided by the WKU Credit Union in order to construct a bid specification. In addition, it was announced that the Credit Union would use a reduced space in a new arrangement, that the bidding procedure is intended to go forward in an open and fair process and that Valerie Kind is pleased with the process to date.

Regarding the future of Student Health Service, Regent Evans announced that he has not detected any particular opinion of Board members. He reminded the Senate that the initiative regarding changes in the Student Health Service came from faculty and staff via the Western 21 document. The goal is the best level of quality for a reasonable price.

New Business: Fred Murphy moved to adopt a resolution regarding possible budget cuts to assure that decisions about them are made according to the spirit and priorities of Western 21. The motion was seconded by Georg Bluhm. President Meredith spoke in
support of the resolution. The President indicated that a meeting was held at the Frankfurt State Budget Office in which there was some "doom and gloom" and that some budget cuts seemed likely. "Therefore: Be it resolved that whenever and if ever budget cuts become necessary the Faculty Senate urges that they should be made according to the priorities established by Western XXI, with its emphasis upon the importance of the classroom and teaching, and in consultation with representative faculty." The motion carried on voice vote.

Georg Bluhm rose to propose a second resolution as follows in support of the proposed revision of the Kentucky Revised Statutes to assure that Regents are drawn from a pool of qualified people. Currently no particular qualifications are necessary for WKU Regents. Current statute requires only that there be no more than two from one county, and no more than four from each political party. The motion was read as follows: "Therefore: Be it resolved the Executive Committee or an Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate shall forthright establish contact with the Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University, Kentucky State University, Morehead State University, Murray State University, and Northern Kentucky University. The purpose is to create a unified position of the six State universities for preparing and promoting legislative revision by the General Assembly in its forthcoming session of the Kentucky Revised Statutes currently in effect which determines the governance of the six State universities." The motion was seconded by Mike Klien and was adopted by voice vote. The Chair may appoint an ad hoc committee to implement this resolution.

President Meredith rose to announce the status of the health insurance program at WKU. He noted that four years of coverage had been proposed via sequential annual options. The Plan T-2000 will go up in price significantly but other plans have had much more modest increases. In asking for a sense of the Senate regarding extra money being expended for organ transplants, a show of hands indicated that the Senate would be in favor of having this option for a small additional cost.

There being no further business, the Senate meeting was adjourned at 4:22 p.m.

RESOLUTION OF FACULTY SENATE XV
October 10, 1991

RESOLVED, The Executive Committee or an Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate shall forthrightly establish contact with the Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University, Kentucky State University, Morehead State University, Murray State University, and Northern Kentucky University. The purpose is to create a unified position of the six State universities for preparing and promoting legislative revision by the General Assembly in its forthcoming session of the Kentucky Revised Statutes currently in effect which determines the governance of the six State universities.

RESOLVED, That whenever and if ever budget cuts become necessary the Faculty Senate urges that they should be made according to the priorities established by Western XXI, with its emphasis upon the importance of the classroom and teaching, and in consultation with representative faculty.
The meeting was called to order by the Chair Arvin Vos at approximately 3:30 p.m. Absent without representation were Senators Ann Cline, Ed Dorman, Norman Hunter, Cheryl Keyes, and Robert A. Otto. The following Senators were represented by substitutes: Larry Caillouet by Jim Wesolowski, Louella Fong by M.O. Jenkins, Susan Gore by Becky Leavy, Jackson Kesler by James L. Brown, Sally Kuhlenschmidt by Ray Mendel, and Michael Klein by Michelle Coakes. The Senate meeting began with an open forum on the budget. Initial comments were made by President Thomas Meredith, Senator Robert Hansen, and Senator Fred Murphy.

President Meredith began by introducing the Budget Committee consisting of Dr. Robert Hansen, Dean Charles Kupchella, Dr. Stephen Schnacke, Dr. James Heck, Dean Jerry Wilder, Vice President Robert Haynes, Dr. Paul Cook, Dr. Cecile Garmon, and Dr. Tom Harmon. The Committee has met and will continue to meet until budget cuts are approved. The Committee is reported to have read all of the departmental scenarios regarding 3% and 6% budget cuts. The President announced that the Council of Higher Education asked for funding in the next biennium at the 90% and 100% levels, but that the Council also forwarded to the Legislature other scenarios with lower funding levels, against the counsel of the university presidents. The President had met with the Revenue Cabinet on October 9th and the announcement of the need for a cut was made October 15th. President Meredith explained that budget cuts are mandated whenever the revenues are forecast to fall 5% or more short of budget requirements. A second budget cut is forecast, possibly in the January - March time frame. It was announced that higher education absorbed 16% of the Kentucky state budget, but received a disproportionate 37% of the budget cuts. Grades K - 12 on the other hand received 64% - 65% of the State budget, but received no cuts. The President remarked that in the last session Western Kentucky University's allocation rose to 88% of full formula funding which was the highest ever, but with the budget cuts WKU is now at its lowest level of funding ever, at 79%. It was reported that the Budget Committee, in looking at possible areas for cuts, is committed to the instructional budget.

Senator Robert Hansen rose at this point to announce that the emergency fund balance should be satisfactory through the rest of the year if the next budget cut is not large. However, he also noted that future allocations to WKU will be based on a base which is $2.4 million less than the current base of $54 million allocated by the State. One of the challenges of the Committee is the question of how to gear the cuts to Western XXI and meet the budget at the same time. The need to have a contingency fund in the face of budget cuts was also addressed. The policy of the Committee will be to cut first from those areas which are felt to be least useful relative to Western XXI. It is anticipated that 3% and 6% cuts in departments and support areas are to be the last means to achieve a balance. Furthermore, it was announced that no one's pay would be cut, nor would anything else of that sort be done in seeking the $2.4 million cut. Senator Hansen noted, however, that some positions will remain vacant, while additional faculty is being accepted in other areas depending on circumstances. Again, the Committee is doing its best to keep the academic area unaffected. Senator Murphy then rose to briefly state that the Committee is being driven very importantly by Western XXI.

At this point the forum was opened for questions and comments. Senator Bruni asked to be informed as to what other areas were being looked at for cuts, how they fit into Western XXI, and how these other areas would relate to the policy of "not impacting
Senator Hansen replied that the University consciously underestimated revenues and devised a conservative budget which implied that there might be no cuts this year, at least in the instructional area. While there is a surplus, the surplus dollars are expected to fluctuate and it is too early to be specific as to what areas might be cut. Senator Murphy suggested that research and service may have to take a secondary role under these circumstances and the President informed the Senate that the review of the budget includes further University review, a Board of Regents review, and expected approval of the plan on December 2nd.

Jim Wesolowski rose to inquire as to additional sources of revenues the President had alluded to, or other items not included in the conservative budget. Senator Hansen replied that tuition from summer school and higher than expected student enrollment would be included. Those, plus the surplus from last year, and reserve funds for contingencies made up the additional amount available. President Meredith noted specifically that about $200,000 extra is available from summer school enrollment, $200,000 is available from extra fall enrollment, and that the surplus emergency contingency fund has approximately $2.3 million in it. However, it was noted that there is a danger in dipping into the emergency contingency fund, which must not be depleted completely. Dr. Wesolowski observed that the emergency fund of at least $2 million and $400,000 available in extra summer and fall tuition seemed to measure up well versus a total budget cut at this time of $2.4 million. Senator Hansen replied that it might be possible to cut expenditures before going into the funds, but it in any event it was not anticipated that measures such as removing telephones, or cutting back on assistants, secretaries, or student services would occur. The President noted that of the slightly more than $2 million available in the fund $100,000 – $150,000 had gone immediately to pay for extra faculty, etc., associated with increased student enrollment.

Ray Mendel noted an inconsistency in that it had been suggested that there would be no cuts in the academic areas, and instructional integrity would be maintained, but courses with low enrollment might be dropped. Dr. Mendel also noted the contrast in the operating budget in the Athletic Department which he estimated at perhaps $2,000 per football player, versus an operating budget of perhaps $5 per student in various academic areas.

Senator Carl Kell rose to ask what was learned as a result of department analyses of the impact of 3% and 6% budget cuts. Senator Murphy characterized what was learned as a disaster if a 3% cut were made and that the consequences of a 6% budget cut in departments was unimaginable, that it would mean wiping out the operating budget in many departments. Senator Hansen noted that in academic departments faculty and secretarial wages account for 80% - 90% of the operating budget, so that the amount available for 3% and 6% cuts is minimal. Implementation problems exist also in that some departments could not make cuts in operating budgets since the funds had already been spent. It was also noted that the Athletics Department is said to have responded that their 3% cut could be managed by the football team taking a bus rather than flying to its final game. The President noted that contractual relationship tend to hamstring what the institution can do. Senator Pulliam wondered whether there would be cuts in research support and expectations of faculty and the implications of same on tenure and promotion because of the budget cuts. Vice President Haynes replied that not many resources are put into research in the first place, therefore there is not much to be taken out, and that the administration will try to keep faculty workloads what they are at present. The Vice President did not expect the University to lower faculty expectations in line with the budget cuts. Regarding the size of classes, the minimum size is six for graduate classes, ten for advanced undergraduate classes, and fifteen for lower level classes.
Professor Dunham (Biology) then stepped forward with a plea that the administration remember its policy of flexibility when push comes to shove. For example in his department faculty had already undertaken to fund their own travel so that their travel funds could be diverted to instructional purposes. Therefore, an across the board dictum that travel funding would be suspended would negatively impact their instructional programs. Senator Bruni suggested that the Western XXI priorities may not be the best in a contracting economy, that it might be prudent to reorder priorities since Western XXI was made in another, better, economic climate. To this, Senator Murphy's rejoinder was that Western XXI was made with the expectation that conditions would shift and that Western XXI was not focused simply on the good times ahead, but also attempted to encompass the possibility of lean times as well. The open forum closed at 4:37 p.m.

At this point the Faculty Senate moved into its regular business, beginning with consideration of the October meeting Minutes. There were no corrections, and therefore the Minutes were approved as submitted.

Executive Committee Report: Chair Arvin Vos reported that the Executive Committee had met with the President; that Robert Otto, the Vice Chair, is an Athletic Committee member and so the Faculty and Senate are represented on the Athletic Committee at this time, that the sexual harrassment policy is on a side burner at this time because, the President quickly averred, of the budget issues.

Academic Affairs Committee Report: Senator Murphy reported on student evaluations of Faculty. The Committee has their report in progress, and calls upon the Faculty Senate and others for examples of evaluation instruments other than the one currently used by Western Kentucky University.

Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee: Senator James reported that the study is under way on travel costs and budgets, and that the deadline for survey responses is November 15th.

Faculty Status and Welfare Committee: Senator Kuehn reported that Faculty Status and Welfare Committee is active in several areas. First the annual salary survey is underway with the hope that it will be out by the next Senate; regarding the Employee Dependents Program he reported that 110 students take advantage of the 50% tuition waiver, and that as might be expected several unusual situations that have come up. As an example, Senator Kuehn noted the question of whether children of retired employees would be eligible for tuition waivers, and the answer in that case is negative. Second, Senator Kuehn addressed the relationship of the University non-smoking policy and the Drug-Free Workplace Act. WKU may not be fully in compliance with the mandated non-smoking policy. As required, a brochure has been distributed regarding a drug-free workplace.

Communications Committee Report: Senator Garrett reported that the forthcoming Faculty Senate Newsletter will include the Minutes of the October meeting as well as the unapproved Minutes of the November meeting.

Political Actions Committee: Senator Bluhm announced that a Political Action Committee had been formed pursuant to the October resolution of the Faculty Senate to lobby the Legislature. The Committee members are Carl Cheif, John Bruni, Charles Bussey, Sylvia Pulliam, and Georg Bluhm. The Committee has had contact with faculty from other State universities for concerted action, and has been in touch with
Representative Scorsoni of the Kentucky Legislature as well. The forthcoming Faculty Senate Newsletter will have a related article by Senator Bluhm. It was noted that a proposed open records law would open personnel files to University employees for their inspection.

Faculty Regents Report: Regent Gene Evans rose to report on several matters. First, he noted objections raised at the Council of Higher Education against granting Western Kentucky University the right to offer a doctorate in education. One objection was that if Western were granted the authority to have a doctorate similar universities would have to have it as well. Additionally, Western should not have the doctorate because Western's output would not supply all of the demand in Western's forecast. Another objection was that doctorates may not be necessary for public school administrators; that is, it may not be necessary to have a doctorate to be a principal of a public school.

On the subject of the Credit Union, Regent Evans reported that a subcommittee of the Board of Regents had formulated a proposal for the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents which will be passed on to the Finance and Administration Cabinet at the appropriate time. Finally, Regent Evans noted that he had been misquoted in a letter in the recent College Heights Herald with respect to the Credit Union. According to Regent Evans, the sense of his statement regarding banking on campus was that faculty would want to do all of their banking on campus. In contrast, the sense of the story was that faculty would do all of their banking on campus if the credit union were replaced by a bank. Regent Evans noted that he had taken no position on the credit union itself. Considering a gender bias resolution, Regent Evans noted that while a law on the subject may exist, a law on the subject is not enough. The purpose of a resolution is to help to make sure that a law is enforced. Regent Evans noted a plethora of sex harassment cases and the like reported in the press, which amply demonstrate that simply having a law on the books does not guarantee enforcement.

Finally, Regent Evans discussed the issue of the President's entertainment allowance. Regent Evans read a clause from the President's contract announcing first that he would have no comment whatsoever on the clause that he would be reading, but hoped that once he had read it there would be no further discussion on the topic. The clause Regent Evans read, which he felt the Faculty Senate is entitled to know of, is as follows: "An annual allowance will be provided in each annual operating budget for expenses incidental to official University functions held at the residence, including those accompanied by social amenities and activities subject to cost approval and periodic review by the Finance and Investment Committee of the Board of Regents."

New Business: The first new business was the election of COSFL representatives. COSFL is composed of the Faculty Regent, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and two Senators. Nominations were opened for the two Senators to be elected. Senator Sylvia Pulliam was nominated by Senator Krenzin, seconded by Senator Bruni. Senator Charles Bussey was nominated by Senator Bluhm, seconded by Senator Bruni. As there were no further nominations, nominations were closed. The Senators were elected by acclamation. There being no further business and no announcements, the Senate adjourned.
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