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The winter season is surely upon us, as folks are staying in their offices and not venturing forth with the "buzz and commentary" that usually fills this section. It is, however, far from a dull semester for those who keep abreast of the local mass media.

* The next big news story: when the search committee at the University of Mississippi officially advertises the vacancy in the president's mansion in Oxford.

* The next big decision by the Board of Regents: Friday, February 24 to consider the entire "New Level" document.

* The next (and current) big move by the Student Government Association: Faculty evaluations: should they be made public and should they be recommended each semester?

* The next big WKU sports story: How far the men's and women's basketball teams get in their respective NCAA tournament.

* The next "really big" question: "When will the budget committee meet?"

* And, the final question asked each and every Spring: "How much is in the faculty salary raise pool?"

* (Fill in your own "really big" question here)

*------- Bart White
Dear Editor:

I noted in the October 13 Senate minutes that there was a discussion of faculty evaluation forms. Apparently there was a comment that "tough" professors are likely to receive lower evaluations. I thought faculty might be interested in some data I came across. According to a 1988 (Cashin) review of research on student ratings of teaching, workload difficulty is correlated positively with student ratings. One study, (Marsh, 1984) found that "students give higher ratings in difficult courses...." Cashin & Slawson (1977) found a correlation of .22 between "difficulty of subject matter" and the remaining items of the student survey instrument.

An interesting additional bit of information provided by Cashin is that when student ratings are obtained in the first half of the term and the person seeks consultation regarding those ratings the end of term ratings increase dramatically. Cashin strongly advises using multiple sources of data for interpreting teaching effectiveness.

Summarizing Cashin's summary, student ratings positively correlate with administrator, colleague, and alumni ratings. Student ratings are NOT related to sex of the instructor (there may be a sex of instructor by sex of student interaction), instructor age and teaching experience, instructor research productivity ($r=.12$), student age, sex, level, GPA, or personality. Time of day and time during term are also not related to ratings. Expressiveness of instructor does seem to be related to ratings as is student prior motivation or taking a class as an elective. Lower ratings were obtained when the course was a requirement. Higher level courses tended to receive higher ratings but the correlation was small ($r=.07$). There were effects due to differences in academic fields but reasons for this are unclear. Finally, ratings are higher when students have to sign them, when the instructor is present and if the directions say the ratings will be used for personnel decisions.

If anyone has additional research data, I would be interested in it.

Yours,

Sally Kuhlenschmidt
Psychology
November 28, 1994

Memo to: Marv Leavy, Faculty Senate Chair

From: David J. Keeling
Chair, Fiscal Affairs Committee
Faculty Senate

Subject: WKU Foundation

The Fiscal Affairs committee has reviewed the responses (both written and verbal) of the WKU Foundation to the list of questions prepared about the activities of the Foundation. At this point in time, the committee believes that the Foundation has attempted to address all questions and inquiries honestly and openly. Some questions remain unanswered and will probably remain so until the first year's financial audits have been conducted. At that time, the committee strongly recommends a further analysis of the Foundation's activities to address the unanswered questions and to pursue further questions that the Faculty Senate might deem appropriate.

The committee members who attended the Catron/Rutledge Senate presentation are of the opinion that Mr. Catron tried to respond honestly and directly to the questions posed. The debate (in the Herald and elsewhere) about the "softness" of the Senate's questions appears to miss the underlying rationale for the initial inquiry. The Fiscal Affairs Committee was not charged with the task of "investigating" the character of the Foundation's officers nor was it charged with the task of "rooting out" any existing or potential fraudulent activities. Such actions are best carried out by professional auditors and others. The Fiscal Affairs Committee's task simply was to analyze the organizational and administrative framework of the Foundation and to pose such general questions as the Senate felt were important for all faculty and staff members to understand.

The committee strongly recommends that the Senate continues a direct and open dialogue with the Foundation and its officers. The committee further recommends that periodic reviews of the Foundation's activities are undertaken by the Fiscal Affairs Committee (or any other body that the Senate feels is appropriate).
SUMMARY OF THE SUMMATION COMMITTEE'S REPORT
ON THE "MOVING TO A NEW LEVEL" PROPOSAL

Prepared by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate
December 6, 1994

1. Increase ACT to 20. Need slower phased-in implementation, 1996-2000, to coordinate with KERA and Western XXI. Avoid significant impact on enrollment. Concern with minority recruitment difficulties.

2. Community College / University College. Strengthen Community College for two-year and technical programs. Create University College for students not meeting WKU admission standards.

3-4. Classroom expectations and computer technology. Increase training and development for students and faculty. Incorporate new technology in instruction.

5. New faculty quality. Must provide competitive salaries and more academic support, such as release time.

6. Reduce class sizes. Opposed to increased teaching loads or reduced research involvement. Optimum class size determinations are best made by each discipline.

7. Everyone an excellent teacher, no exceptions. "Quite unrealistic." Must balance teaching, research, and service.

8. Applied research emphasis. No, applied and basic research should be valued.


10. Evaluations taken more seriously. Advancement should be directly related to performance evaluations. (not referring to student evaluations here)

11. Evaluations should be used to correct weaknesses. Improve the evaluation process.

12. Commitment to advising. Departments should be evaluated on this. Reward good faculty advising.

13. Reward unit excellence. Yes, but "unit excellence" needs clarification.

14. [Reduce] release time. Decisions most effective at unit level. The "Higher Level" proposal may necessitate increased release time.

15. Identify acceptable service. Yes, but keep departmental flexibility.
18. **Comprehensive student assessment.** Significant problems of administration, legality, recruitment, etc.
   - **Rising junior exam:** Little support.
   - **Comprehensive assessment for majors:** Questions about faculty workload in administering these tests and in tutoring students who need help.
   - **Quality assurance:** That's what a diploma means. The improvements resulting from "Moving" will increase quality.

19. **Foreign travel for students.** Financially unrealistic for most WKU students. Develop on-campus means of international educational experience for WKU students.

20. **Volunteer public service.** Unanimous disagreement. A universal requirement would be difficult and burdensome to administrate.

21. **Culture of the academic week.** Faculty and official university policies must support attendance at classes.

22. **Students on campus seven days a week.** Considerable skepticism.

23. **Continuing education.** Should be expanded and possibly transferred to the Community College.

24. **Advisory councils.** Beneficial if roles and functions clearly defined.

25. **Institutional Advancement ($).** Of course.


27. **Administrators develop operational mentality toward facilitating our educational mission.** Must adopt a "can-do" philosophy.

28. **Continued staff development.** Individualized improvement, not a generalized seminar.

29. **Retention, graduation rates, and recruitment.** Phased-in, flexible implementation needed.
The following is a slightly revised text of comments made before the Council on Higher Education on the evening of 11 October 1994. The Faculty Senate was invited to address the open meeting held in the Regents Room of Weatherby Administration Building regarding proposals for performance funding of and long-term strategic planning by the state universities of Kentucky.

First of all, let me thank you for providing this public forum as an opportunity for faculty input into discussions on the state and direction of higher education in Kentucky. My comments on the issues of strategic-planning and performance funding are brief and general. Rather than proposing policy initiatives, I wish to ask the Council and the university administration to consider the purpose of higher education in the Commonwealth.

My concern is not for the particulars of policy implementation, but with the assumptions behind such decision-making. There are at least three operant ideas regarding the function of the university. First, in the historic sense, the university is a community of scholars and students committed to promoting the free exchange of ideas and the pursuit of knowledge. Secondly, the university is an institution of socialization, intended to bring minorities and marginalized citizens into the mainstream of society. Finally, the university provides students with specialized skills and organizational tools useful in the marketplace. The question facing Western Kentucky University is how to balance these three educational roles. How are we to fulfill our mission? No doubt we will need to do each of these things. Maybe we need to do something else. But, priorities and operating assumptions need to be made explicit before establishing policy.

In recent years, there has been an effort to sell the need for continued and increased funding of higher education to a public often skeptical of the worth of the academic life. Legislators and administrators have begun to contend for university funding based upon its "cash-value" to the state. Higher education, it is argued, attracts corporations and industry with top-paying jobs and an increased tax base. For every dollar invested, the Commonwealth receives $1.35 in return, or something like that. This seems to me to be a potentially dangerous tactic, especially if we begin to believe our own public relations propaganda. With good reason, college faculty here and across the nation have expressed reservations about this "commercialization" of higher education.

There is no question that an educated work force is a more productive one, and that it is in our economic best interest to educate our populace. However (forgive my idealism here), education has intrinsic value in and of itself. The pursuit of knowledge and the cultivation of learning for the sake of learning is good for the soul. It should help to make persons more well-rounded, more creative, more tolerant, more whole. Such individuals help to create better communities, and thus contribute to the quality of life that we all seek. To promote higher education simply because it is profitable, caters to the kind of mentality that prompts young freshmen to ask why they must take the Western Civilization course or Biology 101 if they are studying to become a stockbroker. "It's not relevant," they complain. True, those courses may not help them directly in their chosen profession, but it will certainly help them become better educated and, hopefully, better persons. We can also hope, then, that this will make them the kind of individual that employers will covet.
The "commercialization" rationale for education only validates the often misguided attacks upon higher education from without. In order to pacify our myriad critics and protect our "consumer base," legislators in Frankfurt, and even university administrators at times, have glorified the role of undergraduate instruction at the expense of research. We do this at our peril, because good teaching demands good research. Rather than catering to populist misconceptions about what universities do (or don't do) in these areas, our leaders ought to be advocating the traditional role of education in training people to be thoughtful, informed, and socially aware citizens. We ought not to be market driven, as if we are producing Corvettes off an assembly line. As departments in Potter College have recently affirmed in their review of President Meredith's *New Level* initiative, "education is not a commodity whose worth is determined by the market."

To this point, Wendell Berry--Kentucky's own gentleman farmer and resident pundit--recently argued that an educational preoccupation with career placement is both short-sighted and self-defeating. According to Berry, we diminish the role of education if we treat it merely as a "career track" toward job placement. The goal of education, he says, is not the training of workers or even of good citizens. Rather, it is to "preserve and pass on the essential human means--the thoughts and words and works and ways and standards and hopes without which we are not human." In other words, by continuing to emphasize its primary role in seeking and expanding human knowledge, the university can also contribute to the socialization and training of its constituency. In making better and more responsible humans, we thus teach our students to participate more fully in the community, including the marketplace. We give them the tools for life.

In conclusion, let me mention two specific concerns about what performance funding will mean on a practical basis--in the way we teach our courses and do our research.

How precisely are we, for example, to increase retention and graduation rates without lowering expectations? Some argue that we already graduate too many students who are not really educated. Better advisement and more extensive nurture can only do so much if a student does not measure up academically. Attracting better quality students up front will certainly help in this regard. But, we must have something to attract them to us--more and better scholarships, or an Honors College, for example. And we must have something to keep them--smaller classes and greater offerings staffed by more, not fewer, faculty. These solutions to problems of retention and graduation rates require institutional investment and commitment, not marketing smoke and mirrors.

Faculty also worry that performance funding will be overly concerned with a random and uncritical body count. Will sheer numbers of graduates and majors be the primary (or only?) gauges of a program's effectiveness? Relatively small programs with a long and venerable history in the academy--anthropology, philosophy, and religious studies, to name a only few in the liberal arts--often do not attract large numbers of majors, but teach great numbers of students in general education. Such programs are essential in fostering critical thinking and self-reflection, skills that are the hallmarks of an educated person. Outcomes assessments are completely misguided if they assume that the worth of a program can be determined solely by the number of graduating majors who land jobs, for example.
To sum up, I am pleased that the Council on Higher Education is studying the performance of our public universities. My concern is that performance be defined broadly and comprehensively enough so that the "cultivation of learning" remains our highest calling. As a colleague put it to me recently, the "product" of the university should be aware and articulate persons, not just competent managers and workers. They should be persons with broad and deep sympathies who are worthy heirs of the human cultural tradition that we pass on in our classrooms and in our research. In this way then, we do indeed contribute to the common wealth of Kentucky.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry Snyder, Vice-Chair
(Department of Philosophy and Religion)

1. Similar concerns are raised about "the market-driven debasement of higher education" by Linda Ray Pratt in "A New Face for the Profession," Academe (September-October 1994): 38-41.

Call to Order
The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by chair Marvin Leavy at 3:30 pm. Karen Sansom substituted for Bill Howard and Susan James for William Traugott. Linda Clark, Mary Cobb, Matthew Dettman, Charles Hays, Daniel Jackson, Robert Smith, David Stiles, Wieb Van Der Meer, and Ed Yager were absent without alternates.

Disposition of the Minutes
Minutes from the Nov. 8, 1994, meeting were approved as distributed.

Reports of Faculty Senate Committees
A. Executive Committee (Marvin Leavy)
The Executive Committee met three times during the previous week. The Committee heard a report from Larry Caillouet reviewing the summary of department responses to the President’s Moving to a New Level document (see report from Academic Affairs below). Chair Leavy and Senator Nancy Baird had reviewed a draft of a new edition of the faculty handbook, which was intended to have only changes in style or that were reflections of what has actually been the practice for some time. They reported that there were no substantive changes in the draft.
The Executive Committee has concerns dealing with responsibility and standards of the faculty, apart from mandates from Administration. The Committee feels that the Senate should take initiative in these matters and not just react to outside forces. In this regard:
1) Professional Responsibility and Concerns Committee chair Roy Cabaniss was given a broad mandate to review the entire scope of the faculty evaluation process, in addition to its original charge to look at the effectiveness of student evaluations. The committee will look at such sources as AAUP statements. Although we do not know what will be the elements of the final version of the New Level document, this charge appears to address elements of the document.
2) Vice Chair Larry Snyder will chair an ad hoc committee yet to be named that will address issues of collegiality and professional ethics and responsibility. The committee may adopt a statement or adapt an existing statement concerning both faculty-student and faculty-faculty relationships.
3) Fiscal Affairs Committee chair David Keeling was asked to look at compensation levels for part-time faculty. The committee will consider the effect on the University budget of raising course compensation for at least two grades of part-time faculty. This addresses two top funding priorities as outlined by the Board of Regents: (1) increase spending on instruction, and (2) increase faculty salaries.

B. By-Laws, Amendments, and Election Committee (Joyce Wilder):
The committee is working to develop an up-to-date faculty list to be ready for Senate elections in February.

C. Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee (Marvin Leavy reporting for Roy Cabaniss):
The committee’s mandate for examining evaluation procedures of faculty has been expanded.
D. Faculty Status and Welfare Committee (Eileen Williams):
The dollar figures for faculty salaries should be ready in January.

E. Academic Affairs Committee (Larry Caillouet):
Caillouet reported on the committee’s review of the report from the Hughes Summation Committee, which had the responsibility of summarizing responses to the original Moving to a New Level document. The review committee agreed that the summation of reports that was submitted to Vice President Haynes was substantially in agreement with reports from a lower level. However, the Summation Committee’s report didn’t match well with reports submitted to them with respect to the Community College vs. University College issue; there was not support for a University College at the individual college level until it was supported by Hughes’ committee.

Some of the items mentioned by the Summation Committee’s report were: a slower implementation to increase the ACT score for admissions to 20 might be needed to match the KERA and Western XXI schedule; strengthen the Community College for 2-year and technical programs and create a University College for those who don’t meet admission requirements; technology and training should be increased, especially for faculty; provide competitive salaries and more academic support; it’s a good idea to reduce class size when appropriate, but each discipline should decide how best to do that; it is not realistic to expect everyone to be an "excellent" teacher, but it might be more possible for a unit to achieve overall excellence even though some individuals might not excel in every area; both applied and basic research should be encouraged; evaluations should be taken more seriously and go beyond the Purdue system currently in use; the University should reward advising of students; proposals in the Moving to a Higher Level document may require more release time for faculty; new programs should be implemented only when needed, with continued graduate programs; there are problems with the mechanisms for instituting a comprehensive student assessment, and the diploma itself should be a certificate of quality assurance.

Caillouet mentioned that some people have expressed concern about whether this proposal will reduce enrollment. He reminded the Senate that the process is still open without much specification of mechanism, and the Regents are expected to vote on this in January.

F. Fiscal Affairs Committee (David Keeling):
A summary of responses to questions concerning the WKU Foundation has been distributed. The committee will remain vigilant and continue the dialogue and oversight as more data becomes available, trying to satisfy concerns immediately as they arise.

G. Senate Communications Committee (Bart White):
Everyone should have received two issues of the newsletter.

Report of Faculty Regent (Ray Mendel):
There has been no meeting of the Board of Regents since the last Senate meeting. Regent Mendel addressed some issues about the WKU Foundation. Although the purpose of the Foundation is noble and necessary, he had two concerns related to the Foundation:

1. Although most money raised by the Foundation is restricted, fees will be set by the Foundation and are not restricted. Since the Foundation will govern the use of this money, it should make full disclosures about how this money is spent.

2. Mendel prefers that the Foundation not have any employees; people working for the Foundation should be employees of the University, so
there should be little overhead for the Foundation.
The Budget Committee has met only once this year, when it approved a set of priorities. The real work of the committee has not yet been addressed.

President Meredith has said that a revolution has occurred and that decision-making has been pushed down to the department level. It would be a good idea to submit a list of topics that we think should be up to the department to administer.

Report of COSFL Representative (Charles Bussey):

COSFL members were concerned with administrative bloat. Senator Bussey was surprised how hostile COSFL was to Gary Cox and the Council on Higher Education. They felt that Cox was talking with university presidents to learn what the universities needed but was not in touch with faculty. They will probably discuss the legislative session at their next meeting.

Old Business There was no old business.

New Business
A. The first order of new business dealt with the Faculty Senate's deliberations concerning the Moving to a New Level document. No final document was available for the Senate to examine, but comments were invited.

Larry Caillouet moved that the Senate go into informal discussion; seconded and passed.

Caillouet said that many have questioned what raising admission standards will do to enrollment. A University College which would admit those students who don't meet the standard would address that issue. Another point of view is that raising the standards could actually prevent a decrease in enrollment, because there wouldn't be as many poor students to drag down the majority.

The Senate then returned to formal session.

Dorsey Grice made a motion concerning the WKU foundation (stated below). The motion was seconded and accepted as a first reading.

B. There was no other new business.

Announcements and adjournment

In reference to a comment in the Herald, Leavy said that he had no problem with evaluations being made public if and when he taught classes, but this is his opinion personally and he can accept that others have different opinions.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Sylvia Clark Pulliam
Call to Order
The faculty Senate meeting was called to order by chair Marvin Leavy at 3:31 pm. Jeanette Askins substituted for Mary Cobb, John Petersen for Robert Haynes, and Patricia Minter for Fred Murphy. Absent without alternates were Jim Brown, Catherine Carey, Matthew Dettman, Ed Dorman, Dorsey Grice, Charles Hays, Bill Howard, Barbara Kacer, Jeff Kent, Ray Mendel, Wieb Van Der Meer, and Eileen Williams.

Consideration of the Minutes
The minutes from the October 13 were approved as distributed.

Announcements
Chair Leavy announced that faculty would have an opportunity later this month to review the draft of the final plan that the university-wide committee will make regarding the Moving to a New Level document. The Academic Affairs Committee and the Professional Responsibilities committees will be reviewing the Vice-presidents' response and investigate the consistency between the reports from the deans, the vice-president, and the final draft.

Old Business
There was no old business.

New Business
A. Introductory comments:
Parliamentarian Joan Krenzin moved that the Senate go into informal session for the purpose of hearing about and discussing the WKU Foundation. Motion seconded and passed. Senate entered informal session.
Leavy stated that the formation of the WKU Foundation has stirred the interest of the university. Because of the structure and importance of this foundation and its fund-raising role, the Senate has invited Steve Catron, Chair of the Board of Directors for the WKU Foundation, and Robert Rutledge, Vice President for Institutional Advancement and Executive Director of the WKU Foundation, to address the Senate.

B. Remarks from President Meredith:
President Thomas Meredith has asked for an opportunity to address the Senate concerning this Foundation. Meredith commented on the University's ability to raise money for the Preston Center, in spite of expressed concern by the Herald and others that the University couldn't raise large sums of money. He also mentioned that up to now, several groups have approached potential donors without a unified plan. A third motivation for
establishing the Foundation was a recognition that the state will be providing less money for higher education in Kentucky. He encouraged Senators to attend forums that will be conducted by Vice President Rutledge over the next several days.

C. Introduction of Mr. Steve Catron, Chair of the Board of Directors of the WKU Foundation:

Leavy explained the format of the meeting. Mr. Catron will speak for 20-25 minutes to address the questions originally given to him by the Fiscal Affairs Committee. Then Senator David Keeling, Chair of the Fiscal Affairs Committee will accept additional questions for Mr. Catron.

Steve Catron, a Bowling Green lawyer for more than 20 years, is a former Regent of Western Kentucky University.

D. Presentation addressing faculty concerns regarding the WKU Foundation, Inc.

Mr. Catron apologized for changing the date of this meeting and thanked the Senate for this opportunity to address the Senate.

Catron emphasized the role of the Foundation is to raise large amounts of money for the University. It is a long-range program unlike any seen before at WKU for major fund-raising efforts. Spending money is not the purpose of this Foundation; that is the responsibility of the University. Because of this role, public confidence is essential, as well as public audits and fiscal responsibility, and an investment policy, which will be carried out by PNC Bank of Louisville in the role of investment manager. Time has proven that the best type is a private, non-stock, non-affiliated foundation similar to the structure of the College Heights Foundation, although there are many other choices which could have been chosen; but this is the structure that will be used for fund-raising purposes.

Catron mentioned that the University has been largely dormant, with some exceptions, in the area of fund-raising. He expressed frustration concerning the controversy surrounding the organization of the Foundation and his concern that well-qualified candidates for the Board will be discouraged from participation. He commended the members of the Foundation's Board, pointing out that they do not benefit personally from their role, and emphasized the need to continue to recruit the very best possible members for the Board of Trustees.

Catron addressed several of the questions that were submitted to him. His responses did not deviate substantially from the written responses that he provided for the Senate and which are attached. The complete text of his prepared remarks as well as his responses to questions from the floor have been taped and are available through the Faculty Senate office.

He closed by stating that he is passionate in his feelings that the Foundation is a great cause that will carry WKU into the next century as an important leader, and that the University will not prosper in the same manner without this Foundation. 
E. Questions submitted in Senate meeting:

Senator Keeling, Chair of the Fiscal Affairs Committee, served as moderator for this portion of the meeting. Questions were submitted by those in attendance at the Senate meeting. Steve Catron responded to each of them. A typed record of the dialogue and an audiotape of the entire meeting are available in the Senate Office as a supplement to these minutes.

F. Comments by Vice President Robert Rutledge:

A series of forums will be held, beginning tomorrow, to explain succinctly the concept of major gift solicitation and major gift campaigns. He will explain from a mechanical standpoint how an individual who is supposed to benefit from a donation will be informed about that donation and about that account.

Rutledge indicated a willingness to come before the Senate on a routine basis or otherwise be available for communication.

G. Adjournment.

William Traugott moved for adjournment. Meeting was adjourned at 4:41 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Sylvia Clark Pulliam