FROM THE CHAIR...

A WORD ABOUT WESTERN XXI

The primary topic of informal faculty conversation the past few weeks has focused on the now public document from the Western XXI Steering Committee, the "Vision Statement" and the "Academic Program and Support Service Recommendations." Many faculty are more than pleased, especially those in the upper-left hand corner of the "Academic Program Recommendations" page. Those relegated to the bottom-right section of this same page are obviously disgruntled and have rightly asked for additional clarification as well as more time in which to put their thoughts in writing for the Committee and the President to consider before the Regents accept the draft for consideration on October 25.

Without defending or justifying either the Committee or the academic program/support service in question, the Steering Committee has done what it was chartered to do by the President last Spring. It has created a vision of the future that the Board can use to establish priorities at a time when the university has not and will likely not be blessed with full formula funding that would make tough decisions easier to make.

Arguably, the theory of group dynamics suggests that the Steering Committee, if composed of a different matrix of personnel, would have come up with a different report. So be it. We have what we have and now need to go forward. The real question here is not "Why did the Committee do whatever," (reports are available in the Office of Budget and Planning for those who wish to trace the paper trail from genesis to final report) but "How and when will the university implement the findings of the Western XXI Steering Committee?" Or, "How can we improve our relative position within the context of the Western XXI strategic vision?" Or how about "How will the faculty be involved in the implementation process?"

This report is not final but merely a Draft. Changes will continually be made based on input from Department Heads, Deans, students and faculty. It is up to all of us, Faculty Senate included, to hold the administration accountable for the logical, fair and timely implementation of changes resulting from this report. If anyone is unfairly injured in this process, I will be the first to cry foul.

Bart White
Chair, Faculty Senate
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 24, 1990

The meeting was called to order by the chair at 3:35 p.m. The minutes of the April 12 meeting were approved as submitted. This will be the first meeting of the new Senate XIV.

Election of Officers

Nominations for the offices of Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Parliamentarian. The following senators were accepted by acclamation: Chair- Bart White, Communications & Broadcasting Vice Chair- Joe Glaser, English Secretary- Robert Otto, Teacher Education Parliamentarian- Jim Wesolowski, Communications & Broadcasting

Acknowledgements were given to outgoing officers for their service to the Senate: Vice Chair- Joan Krenzin Parliamentarian- Rich Weigel Past Chair- Fred Murphy

Executive Committee Report: Chair White commended the president for the salary recommendation of 5% satisfactory performance and 2% merit for the upcoming year. Last year salary increments ranged from 0 to 38%. To correct statements that last year 80% of the faculty received merit, a Senate study of salaries showed that 47% of faculty received merit raises of 3% and 96% of the faculty received increases above the 2% level set for satisfactory performance. Budgets will continue to be monitored to reflect our concern for the instructional budget needs.

By-Laws, Amendments, Elections Committee: Senator Yungbluth reported that the elections for Senate XIV have been completed. Any changes in membership will be the task of the new committee. New senators were introduced by the committee chair.

University Budget Committee: Senator Hansen and Dr. Thomas Baldwin, Academic Council faculty representative, reported. Senator Hansen reported that the state of affairs of the university budget reflects a lack of fiscal responsibility for years by the university. The committee has had its last meeting before presenting the budget to the Board of Regents. A study of fiscal responsibility of departments will occur beginning this summer. The only way to provide raises for the 1991-92 budget year is to reallocate internal funds which the president has said he will do. This committee will be able to oversee this reallocation. 75% of the budget is allocated to salaries and fringe benefits. Employees receiving below $20,000 will receive at least 7% and up to 10% in salary increments. The salary increase above the 5% level of funding will have to come mainly from reallocation of funds/cuts within the academic department budgets. Dr. Baldwin reported that Senator Hansen has done an exceptional job representing the Senate on this committee, being able to ask insightful questions. He expressed gratitude to the
president for making faculty a part of the budget process. The Western 21 committee priorities should be reflected in the next budget year process. The athletic budget should receive no additional new monies and be held to their allocated budget as other departments are held. The Senate was to be commended for their constant pressure over the years regarding fiscal responsibility in athletics.

Old Business

The second reading of the resolution to support the recommendations of the Fiscal Affairs Committee's analysis of the budget and expenditures of Western was made and the motion was accepted. An amendment to the resolution was proposed by Senator Wesolowski and passed as follows:

to change the last sentence to read: "The Senate further urges the administration to follow the stated recommendations throughout the 1990-91 and 1991-92 budget years.

A motion was made by Senator Bluhm to: Postpone definitely the amended resolution to the Fiscal Affairs Committee for editorial revisions suggested by Senator Bluhm and to present the revised resolution at the next Senate meeting. Motion passed.

Announcements

The Western 21 Committee will report to the faculty following the President's address to the faculty on Friday, April 27.

Following this meeting, committees are to meet or select a date for electing their committee chairs.

The Senate adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
September 6, 1990

The meeting was called to order by Chair White at 3:30 p.m. The minutes of the April 24 meeting were approved with one correction. The chair announced that the Senate Office has been moved to 155 FAC, and the hours are Tuesday through Friday from 1-4 p.m. The phone number will remain the same at 5325. Senators absent without representation were: Whitney Combs, Wade Ferguson, John Jones, Michael Lasater, Thomas Roberts, Jo Ann Verner.

The University President's Report

The president was asked to address the Senate at the first meeting of the fall. The president reported that the WKU Institute for Economic Development through funding from the Tennessee Valley Authority will develop a pilot project for leadership development training of rural area leaders. The Western XXI Committee report will be shared in open hearings beginning in early October with announcements made to faculty for feedback. The Board of Regents will then finalize the report which will become the governing document for the direction of the university. Each budget unit on campus will then need to address the report with action plans by December. A budget review process of each unit will occur this fall. The 1991-92 budget will be based upon the priorities of the Western XXI report which involved wide-based input. A question was asked about health insurance and a solution for the increasing costs does not exist. A report from the Solid Waste Task Force has not yet been made but will be forthcoming. The Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 is the most encompassing reform of any state. We will provide support as necessary. A doctoral program for school administrators is being proposed for assistance in the school reform movement. The number one priority will continue to be faculty salaries by the president. He has worked hard this past legislative session and continues to emphasize the future shortage of faculty and below benchmark salaries to legislators. Five percent new monies is projected for the next budget year.

Executive Committee Report: Chair White stated that the Senate is an open forum for diverse views of its members and welcomes varied discussions on the issues during the year. The revised Senate Constitution is available for members who have not received one by calling the Senate Office. A charge was made by the chair to communicate Senate proceedings to departmental faculty and receive their feedback on issues. As a byline, the chair mentioned that the Floyd County teachers have settled their strike. If you have a master's degree and ten years experience, you can earn $33,000 which is almost the average salary of WKU faculty during 1989-90.

By-Laws, Amendments, and Elections Committee: This committee will need to meet following Senate adjournment today to elect a chair and complete the necessary remaining elections.
Faculty Status and Welfare Committee: Senator Rasdall listed the concerns thus far on the committee's agenda and welcomed ideas from senators and faculty. Topics of study for this year are: a fringe benefits survey of faculty, TIAA retirement option would have to be done by legislative act only, streamline faculty registration, passive smoking areas, recycling policy, the effect of the extra payroll payments on our taxes, and the committee needs to meet and elect a chair.

Faculty Regent Report: Regent Evans reported that at a recent Regents' retreat the doctorate in school administration was discussed. Athletic scholarships will not appear in the current budget as athletic expenditures but as institutional scholarships. That sum is $941,310 which is now found in the general part of the budget and is not broken down by sports. This is in response to questions asked by faculty. The present budget document is probably as thick as the Chicago residential portion of the phone directory. Regent Evans advocates a policy that in the budget the library should receive the least cuts if reductions have to be made in the budget. In fact, $48,000 was increased in the library budget through his efforts when $2,000 only appeared originally. Environmental support does exist by the board for waste management efforts. He is encouraged by the initial reports of the Western XXI Committee as a sound document.

Old Business

Amended Resolution to the Senate Fiscal Affairs Committee Report on "The Budget and Expenditures of Western Kentucky University".

A motion was made by Senator Bruni to make the resolutions of the report stronger and to refer it back to the committee for revisions a second time. Seconded. Motion was defeated.

A motion by Senator Glaser to amend resolution #2 to delete the words "much more closely" and to read: The expenditures for the academic, administrative, athletic, and other units of Western Kentucky University shall comply with the adopted budgets. Seconded. Motion passed.

A motion by Senator Glaser to amend resolution #4 to delete the words, "reducing, and finally " and to read: Emphasis shall be placed also on eliminating overspending in the executive management budgets. Seconded. Motion passed.

Motion to accept the amended resolution was made and seconded. Motion passed.

The Senate adjourned at 5:05 p.m.
ROBERT HANSEN:

THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE*

The University Budget Committee is composed of 10 persons. It includes two faculty, one department head, one dean, five administrative directors and President Meredith.

The committee was appointed by President Meredith in the Spring of 1990, after recommendations of appointees were requested from the Faculty Senate, Academic Council and Deans' Council by the President.

Prior years' budgets were determined only by administrative personnel, and inputs from other university constituents was considered only indirectly through their respective vice presidents who negotiated in the budget process. The president has thus expanded the decision recommendation base for more appropriate budget development.

In planning for the academic year 1990-91, the first year of the state legislative biennium higher education appropriation process, there was not time, prior to state allocation decision to enable the committee to review the entire WKU budget. Therefore, the prior year budget (1989-90) was extended to the new year with modifications for personnel changes, utility rate changes waste disposal, computer operating systems hangs, etc. (often referred to as "add on" budgeting).

Priority lists of "new items" spending requests were presented to the budget committee from various administrators. These requests, previously collected from deans, vice presidents and directors were evaluated by the budget committee in relation to the expected incremental revenues for 1990-91. Substantial time was devoted to salary increment recommendations with respect to limited revenues from the state legislation, student tuition and other sources. After consideration of percentage increases of from 3% to +10% (plus fringe benefits accompanying personnel salary increases), the president and vice-president of administrative affairs were able to determine a fair schedule of salary increments within the budget constraints.

The balance of expected revenues was then prioritized by the Budget Committee to cover the "new items" spending requests. Results of this procedure caused elimination of many new items and still produced an excess of proposed expenditures over expected revenues.

The revenue short-fall, amounting to over one hundred thousands of dollars was shared by the five major units of University operation in proportion to each unit's budget proportion of the total budget. Vice presidents were to use their discretion in applying the short-fall within their operating units.

Since budgeting is intended as a financial plan based on university objectives, the 1991-92 budget process is intended to be directed toward fulfilling the objectives for the university developed within the Western XXI Committee.

The timetable announced for presentation of these objectives to the president and Board of Regents will permit the Budget Committee to begin early hearings on the 1991-92 budget and assist in directing expenditures toward the Western XXI objectives.

The persons who have concerns about particular expenditure and/or revenue matters of the university, should present them to the Budget Committee for consideration.
MEMBERS OF THE BUDGET COMMITTEE

Dr. Thomas Meredith, President
Dr. Paul Cook, Executive Vice President
Dr. Robert Haynes, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Dr. Jerry Wilder, Vice President, Student Affairs
Dr. Cecile Garmon, Vice President, Budget
    Tom Harmon, Director of Accounting
Dr. Charles Kupchella, Dean
Dr. Stephen Schnacke, Head, Educational Leadership
Dr. Tom Baldwin, Faculty (Language)
Dr. Robert Hansen, Faculty (Accounting)

* Professor Hansen is the Faculty Senate's member of the University Budget Committee.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Paul Cook
FROM: Pat Ingram
DATE: July 12, 1990
SUBJECT: Faculty Salary Increases

The following data are provided in response to your request yesterday for information on faculty salary increases in recent years. These figures were taken from the survey compiled by the Virginia Council of Higher Education. As you know, the data for this survey are collected in late spring/early summer prior to the fall semester indicated. I located only a statewide figure for Fall '85, presumably increases by institution were not collected for that year. Please let me know if you have questions or need additional information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Fall '85</th>
<th>Fall '86</th>
<th>Fall '87</th>
<th>Fall '88</th>
<th>Fall '89</th>
<th>Fall '90</th>
<th>1990 Salary*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>$28,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State University</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>26,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead State University</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>27,326</td>
<td>27,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State University</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>26,992</td>
<td>26,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Kentucky University</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>27,361</td>
<td>26,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Community College System</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky University</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Retyped for Readability)

*Present salary as calculated from the above percentages.
Beginning with a base of $20,000.
WKU Ranking: 9/9

NOTE: The $20,000 base salary figure and the 1990 salary figures are calculations of the Senate Executive Committee and are not part of the original memo sent to Paul Cook. We used $20,000 as a base to show that, even though our raises have not been the lowest in the state each year, as an average percentage over the past six years (since 1985), Western faculty have experienced the lowest raises in the state.
### Minimum Statewide Salary Schedule for 1990-91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Experience</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Salary Schedule for 1990-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 Years</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>18,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>26,510</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Years</td>
<td>29,770</td>
<td>27,240</td>
<td>24,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 Years</td>
<td>30,720</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>25,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 + Years</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>28,680</td>
<td>26,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minimum Statewide Salary Schedule for 1991-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Experience</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Salary Schedule for 1991-92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 Years</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>22,580</td>
<td>19,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>27,840</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>22,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Years</td>
<td>31,260</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>25,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 Years</td>
<td>32,260</td>
<td>29,610</td>
<td>26,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 + Years</td>
<td>32,760</td>
<td>30,110</td>
<td>27,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The above figures are state minimums, which schools districts can pay above.

WKU average faculty salary: $33,867 1989-90

WKU average assistant professor: $28,446

Source: Faculty Senate Salary Survey, AY 89-90
Despite the Mythology, Most Colleges Lose Money on Big-Time Sports

By Murray Sperber

Intercollegiate athletics have evolved from their origins as benign student recreation into College Sports Inc., a huge commercial entertainment conglomerate, with operating methods and objectives totally separate from, and mainly opposed to, the educational aims of the institutions that house its franchises.

One of the most tenacious myths about today's big-time college sports is that they earn huge sums of money for American higher education. In fact, if profit and loss are defined according to ordinary business practices, almost all colleges lose money on their intercollegiate athletics programs.

Richard D. Schultz, executive director of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, recently admitted, "You can probably count on your two hands the number of athletic departments that actually have a surplus annually."

Another myth about college sports is that big-time athletics programs generate money for the academic units of their universities. In reality, studies indicate that athletics programs raise dollars only for themselves and that their main donors refuse to contribute to any unit of the institution other than the athletics department. Moreover, when an institution becomes involved in a sports scandal, regular donors to the university—alumni, foundations, and corporations—often withhold contributions.

As for the argument that college sports create school spirit, I discovered the opposite while doing research throughout the country: At institutions with big-time programs, administrators, faculty members, and students constantly told private horror stories about local coaches' and athletes' receiving money and/or academic privileges forbidden to anyone else. The frequency of these negative anecdotes suggests that the athletics programs create a high degree of distrust and opprobrium on campuses.

The men and women who run athletics departments consider themselves part of corporate America, managing large enterprises and amassing and guarding all revenue from their commercial entertainment business. They also like to reward themselves with the high salaries and perks of the corporate world. However, these executives do not want the financial responsibilities of every other business person in America, such as paying their own light and water bills. Instead they prefer the "no bottom line" mentality of some government bureaucrats, and they allow their expenses to far exceed their revenues. Then, at the end of the fiscal year, they claim that their sports franchise is really an educational unit of their institution, like the physics department, or an auxiliary student activity, like the student union, and they appeal to the central administration for supplementary funds to balance their books.

University authorities, whether through collusion, fear of bad publicity, or confusion about the real issues, have long cooperated with athletics administrators and covered their losses. College officials almost never point out the fallacies in the appeals of their athletics directors for extra funds: A big-time athletics program is not an academic unit or a genuine student activity. If the physics department has a budgetary shortfall one year because of low enrollment, the university absorbs the financial loss because the mission of an academic unit is education, not monetary profit, and the value of teaching and research cannot be calculated in dollars and cents. But the purpose of a major athletics program is commercial entertainment, and if its expenses exceed its revenues, then, like every other business in America, it should pay its bills.

A similar fallacy exists in the student-activity rationale. If athletics programs are student centered and for recreational purposes, colleges can justify underwriting them as genuine student activities. But big-time athletics programs, with ultra-expensive facilities for the exclusive use of elite athletes, cannot remotely be called student activities. Nor can their participants, who devote the majority of their time and energies to sports, be termed regular students.

Ascertaining the exact amount of red ink in college sports is difficult. Because athletics departments are often autonomous or semi-autonomous units with little real supervision by university officials, they refuse to open their books to faculty athletics committees and thus can erect "iron curtains" around their operations. Even at public universities, where no legal justification exists for their secrecy because they directly and indirectly benefit from state or federal funds, they will not reveal their true financial situation.

In addition, because they frequently use "creative accounting" methods to remove as many expenses as possible from their books, they are adept at concealing millions of dollars of losses. For example, one of many tricks at public institutions is for athletics departments to pay tuition for out-of-state athletes at in-state rates, reducing this expense by $100,000 or more. Their real annual deficits are much more extensive than the N.C.A.A. and individual athletics directors admit.

Even the lucrative contracts to televising college basketball and football will not cover all losses. Last year, the University of Michigan's athletics department—with a consistently sold-out stadium that seats more than 101,000 fans, as well as victors in the Rose Bowl and the N.C.A.A. men's
**Basketball tournament (events which earned it over $3.5 million)—acknowledged a $2.5 million year-end deficit. It projects annual losses increasing to $3.3 million by 1993.**

**The most visible symbols of big-time college sports are their huge stadiums and arenas; ironically, the most hidden cost in intercollegiate athletics is the financing and maintenance of these facilities. Few colleges build a stadium or an arena with cash up front; once the money is borrowed from banks or raised by bond issues, someone has to pay the interest charges and try to retire the debt. That someone is usually the students, in the form of mandatory activity fees whose exact use is not specified.**

Once the stadiums and other facilities are built, maintaining them is enormously expensive. Football stadiums need special care because of the stress on concrete in regions with cold winters and hot summers. Indoor arenas, weight rooms, and other such facilities also are costly to maintain. Whenever possible, athletics departments move these maintenance costs off their books and into the “Buildings and Grounds” line in the university-wide budget, thus avoiding million-dollar-plus bills. Some athletic departments, without informing the public of these financial maneuvers, then claim that they balance their books.

The single greatest expense for most big-time athletics programs is personnel. Last year, the Indiana University athletics department budgeted $4.6 million for this item. Institutions often absorb a large part of this expense by placing athletics-program personnel, including coaches, on regular faculty or staff lines in their budgets, even though many of these people rarely set foot inside a classroom or do any work for the university outside of their athletics duties.

Another multimillion-dollar expense frequently removed from athletics-department books is athletics scholarships, often called grants-in-aid. The N.C.A.A. admits that many programs that “award grant-in-aid to participating athletes do not report these costs as operating expenses,” because they are able to get the institution to finance them out of regular student-scholarship money or other sources. This financial maneuver becomes particularly pernicious when institutions allow coaches to take federal student aid and other money earmarked for needy minority students and award it instead to athletes with minimal S.A.T. scores and little aptitude for college work.

**Does it make sense to throw money down the athletics department’s deficit hole?**

Murray Sperber is associate professor of English and American studies at Indiana University at Bloomington and the author of College Sports Inc.: The Athletic Department Versus the University, published by Atheneum.

**The N.C.A.A.: this book’s detailed revenues and expenses of intercollegiate athletics programs,** also reports that a majority of athletics departments receive “direct state or other government support.” For many public institutions with big-time programs, it says, such support comes to over $1 million a year.

In 1984, when he was athletics director at the University of Virginia, Mr. Schultz told the Richmond Times-Dispatch: “A five- to six-million-dollar program ought to be able to generate its own revenue without resorting to public funds. Taking state tax money places you in a position of people being able to say you’re taking money that could be used for general education.” Mr. Schultz added, “I know public money is tempting, but I like to be able to look professors in the eye.” Now that he has become executive director of the N.C.A.A., Mr. Schultz has yet to convince the organization, especially the athletics directors who occupy most of the key posts on its Executive Council, of his position.

Although the N.C.A.A. acknowledges that “direct” government subsidies help support intercollegiate athletics, in fact, athletics departments at both public and private colleges receive millions more in indirect subsidies. In ruling on Temple University’s challenge to Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972—which bars sex bias in federally assisted educational programs—the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit noted that Temple’s athletics program “benefits from governmental aid to other branches of the university. Federal money to those other branches allows the university to divert other funds to the sports program.” Divert seems too mild a word for what can occur in the various schemes used by some athletics programs and compliant university officials.

In similar ways, central administrators cover a huge number of miscellaneous athletics-department expenses: The pharmacy department or the university health service assumes the increasingly expensive drug tests mandated by the N.C.A.A.; some of the medical personnel who take care of the athletes are paid out of health-service funds; the athletics department’s legal problems are taken care of by the university attorney’s office. Every other possible expense that an athletics director can persuade a central administrator to carry vanishes from the A.D.’s book.

The N.C.A.A. claims that its members’ “self-studies,” including financial audits, are proof of the association’s commitment to reform and cost control. However, each institution is allowed to report what it wants to. Although the N.C.A.A. provides guidelines, it lacks the power to prevent an athletics department from cooking its books. An outside accountant certifies the figures, but he or she has no way of knowing whether, for example, all or part of the telephone bills for recruiting (often a $50,000-plus item) were moved to the university-wide telephone bill—or does such financial sleight-of-hand violate N.C.A.A. rules.

If the association is serious about reform in this area, it should pass a “sunshine law” requiring members to make a full annual public disclosure of the athletics department’s financial records, including listing all moneys from the university’s general operating fund and other resources that go to cover athletics-department expenses.

The many tricks and devices that athletics programs use to underwrite their annual deficits, especially the diversion of taxpayers’ dollars and other university funds, prompt questions about the reasons for having intercollegiate sports programs. In an era when the academic units of most colleges and universities go begging for money, when tuition and other student costs are rising exponentially, when graduate teaching assistants are not paid a living wage, when faculty members are not paid commensurately with their professional skills, does it make sense to throw money down the athletics department’s deficit hole? Moreover, in the 1990’s, because of what the sociologist Harry Edwards terms the increasingly expensive “athletics arms race”—and in spite of the infusion of television dollars into college sports—these deficits will increase.

**American colleges and universities can either gain control of this problem, placing their academic priorities foremost, or they can continue to give in to vocal athletics directors, coaches, boosters, and the N.C.A.A., and waste more good money on their money-losing athletics programs. As many government programs have proven, throwing enormous amounts of money at systemic problems frequently solves nothing. And the finances of big-time college sports are surely a systemic problem.**
HIGHLIGHTS

Campus Trends, 1990 is the seventh in an annual series of surveys designed to provide timely information on changes taking place in the academic and administrative practices of American colleges and universities. The surveys are conducted by the American Council on Education.

For this year's report, special attention was given to college and university faculty, in light of significant shortages predicted for the next decade. Special attention was also given to general education requirements.

All results are reported by type and control of institution. For many questions, comparisons are made between responses given in this year's survey and those given when the same questions were asked in previous Campus Trends surveys.

Highlights from the survey are as follows:

**College Faculty**
- More than 6 in 10 colleges and universities reported a net gain in the number of their full-time faculty. In 1986, only 37 percent of institutions had posted a net gain in full-time faculty.
- Four in 10 institutions reported a net gain in the number of their faculty from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups. About 2 in 10 institutions also reported gains in moving minority faculty into tenured positions.
- Most colleges and universities (61 percent) increased the number of women among their faculty. A majority of institutions (53 percent) also reported progress in moving women into tenured positions.
- New full-time faculty appointments since July 1988 accounted for an average of 7.9 percent of today's current faculty.
- Only a small proportion of faculty left to take other faculty positions during 1988-89. Such departures accounted for 2.6 percent of full-time faculty.
- On average, 1.8 percent of full-time faculty retired in the past year.
- Sixty-three percent of institutions are having greater difficulty in getting top applicants to accept positions, particularly in certain disciplines. Sixty-five percent reported that it is taking longer to find qualified persons to fill faculty positions.
- Thirty-seven percent of administrators reported that the quality of applicants for faculty positions has declined.
- Dual-career couples are getting new attention. Close to half of the institutions reported having recruiting situations which involved dual-career couples, and about 4 in 10 institutions have assisted the spouse's job search.
- Three in 10 institutions have tried to widen their pool of applicants to persons with nonacademic experience.
- Twenty-five percent of institutions have hired new, junior faculty in a few fields at a salary that is above that of other senior faculty in the same department.
- Administrators at almost all institutions (89 percent) expressed concern about the effects of upcoming faculty shortages on at least a few departments or disciplines.
- Administrators at 56 percent of institutions expressed concern about the effect of faculty shortages on their institutions generally.
- Half of all colleges and universities expected an increased pace of faculty hiring for full-time positions during the next five years.

**The Undergraduate Curriculum**
- Almost all colleges and universities (96 percent) require students to complete a certain amount of general education coursework.
- Most four-year institutions—86 percent—have general education requirements that apply to all of their students.
- General education courses typically make up one-third or more of total coursework.
- Most institutions (83 percent) structure their general education courses in the form of distribution requirements, usually involving a “mix” of core and distribution requirements.
- Interest in freshman seminars is strong. Four in 10 institutions now offer freshman seminars, including half of baccalaureate colleges.
- Senior “capstone” courses are now offered by about one-third of four-year institutions.
- Close to half of all colleges and universities (45 percent) require students to take courses focused on Western civilization. Similarly, 44 percent require students to take courses that deal with world civilization.
- Only 22 percent of institutions require students to take a course dealing with racial or ethnic studies.
- Over half of administrators at four-year institutions indicated that they would favor a stronger general education component than currently exists at their institutions.
Assessment

- Eighty-two percent of colleges and universities have some form of assessment activity currently under way.
- Currently, 66 percent of colleges and universities are developing their own instruments for student assessment, an increase from 45 percent in 1988.
- Portfolio assessment—a method of assessing several pieces of a student's work completed as part of regular courses—is currently in place at 3 in 10 institutions.
- Thirty-five percent are collaborating with other institutions on their assessment activities, an increase from 27 percent in 1988.
- To date, two out of three institutions have obtained some results from their assessment activities. Of these institutions, 85 percent have used the results to serve internal needs, especially program and curriculum planning.
- Just over half of institutions said that assessment is part of a self-study for a regional accrediting agency.
- Just over half of the public institutions are working under a state mandate to develop a student assessment program.
- Three out of four administrators agreed that, as part of the accreditation process, colleges and universities should be required to show evidence of institutional effectiveness.
- Sector differences about assessment's prospects are striking: while administrators at 6 in 10 two-year colleges agreed that assessment will improve undergraduate education, only 4 in 10 administrators at baccalaureate and comprehensive universities and only 3 in 10 administrators at doctoral universities supported this view.

Other Changes

- Fifty-five percent of institutions increased their enrollment of first-time freshmen in 1989–90, down from 62 percent in 1988–89.
- Among baccalaureate colleges, only 40 percent increased their enrollment of first-time freshmen; 33 percent reported a decrease in first-time freshmen.
- Forty percent of doctoral universities reported a drop in the number of their first-time freshmen.
- Forty-three percent of all four-year institutions reported an increased number of graduate students in the last year. Half of the comprehensive universities reported increased graduate enrollment.
- Three in 10 institutions increased the number of international students on their campuses in 1989–90.
- About 3 in 10 institutions reported an increase in enrollment of African American, Hispanic and Asian American students.
- Just over half of American colleges and universities have procedures in place to track minority student attrition each term and to review data on completion rates for minority students.
- One-third of institutions have published a plan for increasing minority participation on their campuses, including one-half of comprehensive and doctoral universities.
- Demands for increased spending affected about 80 percent of institutions in three areas: computer equipment and software; faculty compensation; and health insurance costs.
- Close to half of administrators judged the financial condition of their institutions to be "excellent" or "very good." Twenty-two percent rated their financial condition as "fair" or "poor."

Important Challenges Ahead

- Issues of adequate financial support outweighed all other problems, being cited by 65 percent of administrators as one of the three most serious challenges they face.
- Concern over faculty staffing has risen dramatically: 59 percent of administrators cited this area as one of three major challenges in 1990, compared to 24 percent of administrators in 1988.
- Issues related to the quality of the academic program also rank high among administrator concerns. In the 1990 survey, 47 percent of administrators cited such issues as one of the three major challenges they are facing.
- Enrollment issues have dropped since 1988 as an area of wide concern. However, differences between public and independent institutions have become sharper.
- Concerns about facilities—including renovation and renewal needs, as well as needs for new buildings—were cited by 36 percent of administrators as among their most pressing challenges.
- Concerns about improving the cultural and ethnic diversity of American colleges and universities were cited by 24 percent of administrators as among their greatest challenges.

* From CAMPUS TRENDS, 1990, Higher Education Panel Reports, Number 80, July 1990
American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. 20036
RESOLUTION

The Faculty Senate at Western Kentucky University endorses the five (5) recommendations made by the Fiscal Affairs Committee in their Report entitled "The Budget and Expenditures of Western Kentucky University: An Analysis."

The Senate further urges the administration to follow the stated recommendations throughout the 1990-91 and 1991-92 budget years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The administration of Western Kentucky University, in cooperation with the faculty, shall set spending priorities consistent with the University's primary educational mission. Accordingly, the University shall allocate the funds from future budget increases with first priority to the Colleges, the libraries, and the academic services, and to instruction and instructional program improvements.

2. The expenditures for the academic, administrative, athletic, and other units of Western Kentucky University shall much more closely comply with the adopted budgets.

3. Strong emphasis shall be placed on eliminating entirely the overspending in the athletic budgets. If these efforts continue to fail, Western must seriously consider changing to a class of intercollegiate athletics where costs are not prohibitive.

4. Emphasis shall be placed also on reducing, and finally eliminating, overspending in the executive management budgets.

5. Copies of this report shall be forwarded to the Western XXI Task Force, to the President of Western Kentucky University, to the Dean of the Faculties, and to the Associated Student Government. Copies shall be made available also to the Faculty of Western Kentucky University.
The Fiscal Affairs Committee has selected several possible subjects to investigate in the following year. Please take a moment to number them showing which items you would most like to see reported on. Use number 1 to indicate the greatest interest, etc. If there are other fiscal affairs areas you would like to see investigated, please indicate that also. The Fiscal Affairs Committee reserves the right to select suggested topics that can be completed during Senate XIV.

_____ A. WKU budgets and expenditures for 1989-1990. This report will be an update of the Committee's budget analysis completed in April 1990.

_____ B. The Committee will investigate and report on the expected and budgeted operating expenses for the student health and activities building, the proposed dormitories and the Economic Development Institute. The emphasis will be on examining the forecasted operating expenses, the expected sources of funding of the operating expenses and revenue projections for these capital projects.

_____ C. Analysis of the allocation of the increased state funding for 1990-91 academic year. The Committee will investigate how the increase in funding was allocated to faculty salaries, colleges' budgets, executive management budget and intercollegiate budgets.

_____ D. Report on the workings of formula funding. The Committee will discuss how formula funding is determined for WKU and how the funding mechanism operates.

_____ E. Please describe any other topics you would like the Committee to examine.