The meeting was called to order by Chair White at 3:35 p.m. The minutes of the April 24 meeting were corrected with an additional change, making two corrections total. The minutes of the September 6 meeting were approved as submitted. Senators absent without representation were: Georg Bluhm, Whitney Combs, William Howard, Norman Hunter, Michael Lasater, Robert Otto, Jo Ann Verner.

Executive Committee Report: Chair White reported that the Executive Committee did recommend to the president that an extension be granted for additional comments regarding the Western XXI report. The Faculty Senate Newsletter was sent out today. During the past five years, Western's salary increases were lowest in three of the five years with the five year average placing us the lowest. A handout was distributed.

By-Laws, Amendments, and Elections: Three new senators have been elected to fill vacancies and they are Carolyn Stringer from the Journalism Department, Gabe Buntzman from the Management and Marketing Department, and Gary McKersher from the Music Department.

Faculty Status & Welfare Committee: Senator Kuehn, committee chair, reported that the annual faculty salary study is underway. Streamlining faculty course registration is proceeding. A handout comparing faculty insurance benefits at other institutions was distributed. A study of a smoking policy is underway.

Fiscal Affairs Committee: Senator Redman, committee chair, reported that a list of committee projects will be circulated to faculty through the newsletter for feedback on priorities for committee study.

Faculty Regent's Report: Regent Evans reported on a meeting with the Council on Higher Education. Mr. Joe Bill Campbell of the council commented that doctorates in education involving regional schools should be on a joint doctorate program. Expenditures for athletics is too high. Emphasis for faculty evaluation should be more on teaching and less on research. These comments reflect council members' concerns. The Board of Regents will consider the Western XXI report on October 26 and some realignment of top administrative positions.

Western XXI Steering Committee Report: Senator Flynn who has been the faculty chair of this committee reported that the committee study had wide representation of about 150 members. Strategic planning will continue to be an on-going process so it does not end with the report and will receive adjustments.
Changes have and will be made in the document. A process developed by the outside consultant was implemented and followed. Teaching remains the main focus of faculty activity. Professional involvement supports the teaching role. The model used did establish priority programs for budget considerations. The Senate Chair expressed hope that this document will receive fair treatment in implementation and that faculty will have a major part and voice in implementation decisions.

University Insurance Committee Report: Vice Chair Glaser reported that a comparison chart of state universities in Kentucky regarding insurance benefits was compiled and distributed for senators. Western's coverage places us in the middle regarding benefits and coverage. An upcoming meeting will focus on health insurance only. The options, cafeteria plan, will again be available for faculty in which to pick from various coverages. Western ranks high in disability insurance coverage. The life insurance category is recommended to go out for bids since it is felt that a better package and rate might be available.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolution on Faculty Salaries

WHEREAS:

The cost of living is projected to be above the 5% level, more likely in the 7 - 8% range

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Faculty Senate recommends to the President for the 1991-92 academic year that salary increases be at least at the level equivalent to cost-of-living increases for satisfactory faculty performance. Merit pay would be considered if an amount above the cost-of-living increase becomes available.

The motion was adopted and seconded for first reading. Comments regarding merit recognition other than salary, fringe benefit increases (health insurance) versus salary increases, and a unified effort by state faculties to influence legislators were made.

B. Resolution on Anti-Bigotry

A motion to suspend the rules and consider the motion on one reading was made and seconded. Motion passed.

The resolution was introduced, adopted, and seconded. An amendment to the motion was made and seconded:

"And moreover, that the Faculty Senate at Western Kentucky University deplores any and all bigotry directed toward any group."
The motion to amend passed. The amended motion was called for and passed as follows:

The Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University deplores any and all anti-Arab bigotry no matter how it might be expressed, welcomes foreign students from Arab countries as our guests in the genuine meaning of that term, and encourages their pursuit of learning at Western Kentucky University.

And moreover, that the Faculty Senate at Western Kentucky University deplores any and all bigotry directed toward any group.

Announcements:

The next Senate meeting will be November 8. The December Senate meeting will be changed to December 6 because of finals week. Adjournment occurred at 5:00 p.m.
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
November 8, 1990

The meeting was called to order by Chair White at 3:35 p.m. The
minutes of the October 11 meeting were approved with one change.
Senators absent without representation were: Georg Bluhm, Gabe
Buntzman, John Faine, James Flynn, Rita Hessley, Norman Hunter,
Gordon Jones, Michael Lasater, Eric Pennington, Sylvia Pulliam,
Arnold Redman, Barbara Strande, Carolyn Stringer, William
Traugott, Jo Ann Verner.

Executive Committee Report: The last article in the Herald was
in error as reported regarding faculty salaries. The Herald
money bag graph reported figures as WKU average faculty salaries
and it should have been lowest five year average raises, not
salaries. Senator Kuehn published a correction letter in the
Herald, Letters to the Editor section. The committee's meeting
with the President seemed positive. All budget unit heads are
having to justify their budgets this year to the University
Budget Committee which the President attends and which the Senate
also has member representation in Robert Hansen, Department of
Accounting. The idea of a business manager to oversee the
athletic budget was discussed as a possibility. Sixty(60)
different budgets come under athletics and it is felt that a
business manager would more than justify the salary expense in
savings. The Executive Committee endorsed the idea. The Herald
also wrote an article favoring this idea. The Chair was pleased
with the President's attempt at getting the athletic budget
spending under control. At the most recent Board of Regents
meeting, the Western XXI report was delayed until November 30 for
input from the Administrative Council. Budgets are to be related
to the Western XXI report. The issue of part-time faculty was
discussed as to low pay, large class sizes, and enrollment caps.
The President seems sensitive to the issues. A budget surplus of
2 million dollars was put into the reserve fund, which was
deprecated, to establish university fiscal responsibility. A
reserve fund for the size of Western should be around 3 to 4
million dollars. A method for periodic evaluation of deans is
being formulated and faculty will be involved in the process.

Faculty Status and Welfare Committee: Senator Kuehn reported
that the annual faculty study is almost complete. A study
of faculty benefits at other state universities is underway. A
response from 150 faculty was received regarding a study of a
smoking policy.

Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee: Senator
Hackbarth reported that the university is going to take action on
a past Senate resolution for periodic evaluation of deans. A
full scale evaluation of deans will occur. A study of the total
percent of credit hours taught by part-time faculty will be
studied. The committee has requested the Chair to appoint an ad
hoc committee to study the efficiency of the Audio-Visual Service
Center.
Faculty Regent's Report: Regent Evans reported that we are not the lowest paid, state university faculty. In fact, after UK and UL, Western including combined ranks is $805 on the average below Eastern with all other state schools falling below us for the 1989-90 year. The board is very concerned about faculty salaries and Regent Evans will monitor Western's position when the 1990-91 state university figures are available.

Old Business

A. Resolution on Faculty Salaries- Second Reading

WHEREAS:

The cost of living is projected to be above the 5% level, more likely in the 7 - 8% range,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Faculty Senate recommends to the President for the 1991-92 academic year that salary increases be at the level equivalent to cost-of-living increases for satisfactory faculty performance. Merit pay would be considered if an amount above the cost of living increase becomes available.

The motion passed.

New Business

Senator Bussey asked an information question for his department concerning whether the Senate evaluates the President. The Board of Regents has the designated responsibility to evaluate the President. The Senate climate survey last year did have one item regarding the performance of the President. If a desire is expressed, the Senate or a committee may study the issue.

Announcements: The next Senate meeting will be moved up to December 6 because of finals week. The meeting room location has not been arranged yet so watch for a possible location change in the agenda. Adjournment occurred at 4:05 p.m.
Why Not a Strategic Plan
That's Really for the Twenty-first Century?

by Jan Garrett, Philosophy and Religion

Tzu-lu said, "The ruler of Wei is waiting for you to serve in his administration. What will be your first measure?" Confucius said, "It will certainly concern the rectification of names. . . . If names are not rectified, then language will not be in accord with truth. If language is not in accord with truth, then things cannot be accomplished. . . . With regard to his speech, the superior man does not take it lightly."

-- The Analects 13.3

When the work on Western XXI began about a year ago, the quantity of energies which were to be invested in it, its description as a strategic plan, and the title itself created expectations in the less cynical among us. We took the title, for example, as more than a public relations gimmick. We assumed that the university was trying to orient itself wisely towards its tasks well into the next century.

Now, the mountain has labored and brought forth . . . well, a disappointment.

Much of the blame for this disappointment lies with the "methodology" chosen to generate the Western XXI report. It failed to focus sufficiently upon the common mission of the university, with the result that attention naturally shifted to judgments suggesting resource commitments to various academic programs.

The "methodology" proposed by Dr. Robert Shirley bore the marks of collective egoism, a form of decision-making intermediate between egoism and utilitarianism. The utilitarian aims at maximizing the greatest happiness for everyone affected and the egoist aims at maximizing his or her own self-interest. The collective egoist aims at maximizing the collective self-interest of his or her group.

The collective egoist character of the Shirley methodology was most visible in the "environmental" category of factors originally considered by the XXI committee. This category seems to refer less to a class of problems faced by society, which it will be the university's mission to address, than to the university's surrounding environment, seen as a set of opportunities to be exploited or hostile factors to be guarded against.
As a methodology, collective egoism is something of an abstraction; it must be further specified by deciding how the collective interest is to be ascertained. One way to do this is to poll individuals for their values or preferences. It is also a relatively cheap way of "involving people" while at the same time avoiding a free political dialogue which could go in directions not foreseen by those who initiated the process.

Now, from an ethical perspective, collective egoism is suspect for the same reasons as personal egoism. It fails to consider all parties affected. In theory, that omission can lead to conflict later on. But, as I see it, the danger of the collective egoist method is not primarily that the egoism of the university is destined to clash with that of other powerful collective egos. For the mutual adaptation of self-interested collective egos may here and there produce a harmony of interest. Yet in the long-range it is less likely to produce optimally rational conduct than a strategic plan based upon clearly stated goals justifiable in terms of society's common good.

The values polling technique is inadequate for ascertaining those goals. Most of us have fairly vague ideas about what we as individuals or departments should do in the long term. And even if we did have clear ideas at the individual or departmental level, they would not in themselves "add up to" a clear idea of what the larger institution to which we belong should be doing. The insufficiency of the instrument for determining goals made it inevitable that collective egoist considerations of units within the university and the actual composition of the Western XXI Steering Committee would have a significant impact on the final product.

Czech playwright, former dissident and now President Vaclav Havel told the U.S. Congress not long ago, "Consciousness precedes [social] being, and not the other way around, as the Marxists claim." "Social being," of course, refers to preexisting habits of behavior, typically reflecting the established distribution of wealth and power in a society. Havel's idealistic formula is relevant to us, because, ironically, it and not its Marxist converse captures the essence of rational planning.

On the other hand, our strategic planners seem to have followed the Marxist formula. (One does so most effectively when one is unaware of doing so!) As a result, they have produced a plan which willy-nilly aims to turn out another generation that will live and act more or less like the present one. Is that the university's mission? Is it our job merely to reflect what already exists and train our students to do more of the same?
How can we put consciousness ahead of social being? By seriously thinking about the problems likely to be faced in the coming century by the commonwealth of Kentucky and the larger societies in which it is embedded.

"Commonwealth" is a good word. It refers to the people as a group, with a common welfare, or common good which makes them more than just a collection of individuals thrown together accidentally. It is significant that references to the commonwealth and the people of Kentucky have disappeared from language of the authors of the XXI report.

Have we lost the conviction that the university has a mission to foster the common good? Our leaders' language suggests that the idea no longer makes much sense. The "people," for whose benefit the existence of a state university would have been justified a few decades ago, has been replaced by the statistical category "students" and the collective institutional nouns "business," "industry," "government" and "education." Business and industry have the task of producing the means of material life, i.e., the instruments of living. Government has the task of providing the legal framework in which other functions can proceed smoothly and fairly, another largely instrumental function. And "education," in this context, is lower education. In short, the university is an instrument for the instruments of life. This conclusion should give us pause.

My point is not that the university can or should limit itself to the contemplation of eternal verities, as if that calling alone could justify the rest of the social order that makes it possible. It is rather that the university's service to society should be based on a clearer notion of life than one is likely to find in those populations unaffected by universities. An analogy with medicine is appropriate. The doctor is the servant of the patient, because she acts for the sake of the patient's health, not for the patient's idea of the good life, which may be quite faulty. Of course, the doctor must listen carefully to her patients if she is not to misdiagnose the particular case, and if the patient has life-threatening habits, she must try to convince him to change. But if a doctor does not know what is good for the patient as a human being, she has no business practicing medicine.

We need to see the university's mission as serving students, businesses, etc. as they might be, not merely as they exist now. For if we do the latter, we will "give them what they want," primarily in terms of marginal utility of short-term economic performance. Many students still unrealistically expect that they can continue the wasteful lifestyles of their parents' generation. Most businesses still resist the changes required for sustainable industry, transportation, communication, and agriculture. Most
levels of government are responding in a woefully inadequate way to waste problems and the threats to climate and biodiversity. Is more of the same what is meant by "life, more life"?

If we were really developing a strategic plan for the twenty-first century, we would try to anticipate the problems which the world will face in the coming decades. (I suggest that these are nearly identical to the problems we have been creating over the last several.) We would develop a strategy to prepare our students for their lifelong struggle to restructure lifestyles and systems of production so that something like human civilization will still exist by the year 2050.

Of course, the university will always be involved in transmission of traditional liberal arts wisdom and recently acquired knowledge and skills. The danger is that, while communication skills and technological adeptness make our graduates efficient cogs in the existing economic machine, the liberal arts wisdom they acquire will be no more than a veneer of culture making them aesthetically acceptable (hence even more efficient) in the same context. Incidentally, this economic machine might be described as already the most efficient device ever invented for transforming back into carbon dioxide the atmospheric oxygen without which animal evolution would not have been possible.

For the past century or so, universities have been involved in "economic development," but it shows no great wisdom to include this concern in the university's mission. Wisdom would have recognized that the term is fatally ambiguous. As the excellent PBS series "Race to Save the Planet" and an increasingly large number of other studies show, the issue is not whether economic development will occur but whether the development is environmentally sustainable. The kind that dominates today is not.

If the "Western XXI" report is seriously flawed, what can be done? One possibility was indirectly suggested by Jim Flynn in his comments on the document to the Faculty Senate. He made the point that it is not cast in bronze, but presumably can be revised periodically, say, every five years. That remark implies that the current version may become obsolete five years before the twenty-first century begins.

We would do well to follow the advice of Confucius and rename the report "Western 1995." That decision would free up the phrase "Western XXI" to label a real strategic plan which could orient our collective efforts more wisely and ultimately more effectively.

November 16, 1990

This book moves the on-going debate concerning intercollegiate athletics a big step forward. Murray Sperber has written a hard-hitting, comprehensive analysis of the impact of college athletics on the university. It should be read by everyone who cares about our colleges and universities. The academic mission of the university, Sperber argues, is being compromised by intercollegiate athletics—College Sports Inc. Those who have been following the discussions concerning athletics here at Western will find that our problems mirror those faced by universities all across the nation.

Sperber thoroughly demolishes the myth that athletic programs generally make money for their universities. In fact, few programs are self-supporting. From ten to twenty of the 802 members of the NCAA make a profit—always a small one. In 1987-88 even Notre Dame did not make money; Michigan, with a $20 million budget and a stadium seating 101,000, expected a profit of only "a few hundred thousand." By contrast, the others are losing millions annually. Typical was the news from Arkansas. Its state schools had lost well over $6 million—all funds that had to be covered by state subsidies. Indeed, the Arkansas state subsidy was smaller than the $6.4 million in public funds diverted to cover intercollegiate sports programs at Kentucky's six regional universities during the same year. From Sperber's data it can be seen that Western's loss of more than $1.2 million that year is typical.

Why do university administrators tolerate such losses? According to Sperber, "University authorities, whether through collusion, fear of bad publicity, or confusion about the real issues, have long cooperated with athletic administrators and covered their losses." That the athletic program is not an academic unit, but serves primarily to provide commercial entertainment, is ignored completely. Sperber calls the present situation a "scam." He believes that if the public becomes aware how the financial losses hurt the university, then "major reforms might come to college sports."

During the past two decades enormous changes have occurred in college sports and are still occurring because of the lure of television money. Athletic directors have increasingly operated their programs as businesses. Indeed, the building of new and larger stadiums, enlarging of arenas, the incredible spending on recruiting, and huge coaches' salaries are said to be needed to make money. Time and again, athletic directors justify their spending by saying, "You have to spend money to make money." When
deficits occur, however, the athletic program is not held responsible. The coaches and the athletic director do not take a cut in salary, but the university picks up the tab. College Sports Inc. is "an amazing hybrid of corporate and public agency America." On the one hand, its officers consider themselves managers of a large business, amassing and guarding all revenue, and so reward themselves with commensurate salaries. On the other hand, at the end of the fiscal year, they claim that their program is really an educational unit of their school, like the math department, and they appeal to the central administration for extra funds to balance their books.

For most athletic departments, salaries are the greatest expense. As Sperber documents, athletic department salaries typically far exceed the pay for comparable academic faculty. Moreover, salary is often only a part of their total "compensation package." Athletic personnel "do not like to compare their salaries to those of faculty members; they prefer to see themselves in the same league as corporate America and they reward themselves accordingly." The result is that they have it both ways—"a corporate pay scale, and a public service institution absorbing the red ink." (Although Sperber does not note the fact, there is a remarkable parallel between athletic departments and the S&L operators, who also harvest all the profits for themselves but whose losses are covered by the government.)

Sperber gives a detailed analysis of the revenue picture for college athletics. It is a sobering picture. The outlook is bleak. No additional revenues seem likely from ticket sales. The television ratings of bowl games are slipping, and so revenue from them declining. Many athletic programs have resorted to a surcharge on tickets in order to increase revenues. Even Western, whose attendance has been relatively low the past few seasons, has resorted to this tactic.

A favorite source of revenue for many schools is the student "activity fee." Sperber notes that a recent survey showed that at Division I football schools the money raised from student fees averaged $1,196,000, and comprised up to 60% of the total revenue of the program. At Virginia Commonwealth, for example, students contributed $1.9 of the $2.2 million in program revenue. In this regard, Western students are fortunate for they contribute only slightly more than $500,000 per year through mandatory fees, which, however, is more than Western's teams generate in income from tickets and guarantees.

Unlike income, expenses such as salaries, grants-in-aid, travel, insurance and medical costs are rising rapidly. Clearly a major financial crisis looms for most programs. Sperber thinks the Michigans and Georgias will remain solvent, but "many more schools
...will sweat, hem and haw, and eventually drop out."

Since this book went to press, a number of schools have changed conferences in the hope of increasing television revenues, but for most such maneuvering is futile. What is clear, according to Sperber, is that "the finances of College Sports Inc. are a systemic problem." Sports spending needs to be curbed. Unfortunately, too often the opposite has occurred. To compete, schools have built new, larger facilities and students are paying for them. For example, at Kent State where a new football stadium was built in 1971, students have been paying off the construction bonds "with millions of dollars of their 'activity' fees, and will continue to do so well into the twenty-first century." At George Mason, students are paying a mandatory $100 per year to finance the new athletic center. Clearly, the danger is that "schools will waste more and more money--funds increasingly needed by other parts of the university--on their franchises in College Sports Inc."

With regard to the athletes, Sperber notes that for most of them the forty to sixty hours a week that they are required to spend for their sport precludes their being students in any meaningful sense of the term. Student grants are, he argues, thinly disguised work contracts. Such students are professionals, whether it is admitted or not. Readers will enjoy the account of the creative strategies which athletic departments have devised to get their protégés admitted and to keep them eligible. Most blatant is the practice of having another student take the test for the athlete. Then there are the special admission procedures--the kind that U of L seems to have used to admit athletes who scored in the single digits on the ACT. Once admitted, the athletes are guided into "hideaway curricula," such as "Rocks for Jocks" as one easy geology course was nicknamed. For those who cannot manage even such a class, there is the junior college route, extension courses, remedial classes, and the techniques for remaining eligible until the end of the season, even when failing all one's courses.

Most disheartening, perhaps, for those who value the academic mission of the university is the practice of giving large athletic grants to academically marginal students. Sperber puts the question well: "why ...give enormous financial benefits to athletically talented but often academically hopeless individuals, and deny money and access to many potential teachers, doctors, lawyers, and other future leaders of American society?" The practice is especially pernicious at some schools who pay for their "gladiators" by "diverting money from funds earmarked for academically motivated minority students." The result is that academically more capable, but financially needy, minority students are ignored by the university while the it uses large sums to recruit academically marginal athletes who will have neither the
interest nor the time to pursue an academic career.

With regard to the NCAA, Sperber argues that the possibility for meaningful reform from within has disappeared. It is, he says, time to stop pretending. Intercollegiate sports are not connected to the educational mission of the university; their purpose is commercial entertainment. They are not self-supporting and their deficits siphon large sums of money from academic programs, faculty, staff, and regular students. The specious argument that grants-in-aid are not "hard" funds is ignored by Sperber; rather he speaks of the way athletic programs are able to tap into the general operating funds of the universities as a form of money laundering. In a decision against Temple University the U.S. Court of Appeals noted how the athletic program benefits indirectly from federal dollars, because "federal money to...other branches allows the university to divert other funds to the sports program." The simple fact is that resources diverted to support athletic programs are resources lost to the academic mission of the university.

Sperber suggests two solutions: schools should cut athletic programs loose from the university to operate as independent businesses, or turn their athletic programs back into genuine student activities. Either solution will free the university from the current academic fraud being foisted on the students and the taxpaying public.

The damage being inflicted on the universities is not limited to the direct financial losses, for athletic publicity can harm a school, but there is no evidence that it generates any support for academic programs. Not surprisingly, bad sports publicity harms a school. The year after SMU was penalized by the NCAA, alumni gifts declined by more than $1 million. However, athletic success does not generate alumni contributions. Interestingly, during the years that its basketball team was winning national championships, UCLA had a much lower average rate of donations from its alumni than did the other schools in its conference. Even at Notre Dame, undoubtedly the school with the largest booster following in the nation, a high university official has said: "We at Notre Dame have had extensive experience trying to turn athletic interests of 'subway alumni' to [academic] development purposes--and we have had no success. There is no evidence that the typical nonalumnus fan of Notre Dame has much interest in its educational mission."

These facts call into question one of the myths about college sports, namely that "the alumni demand it." According to Sperber, "the majority of people who support and donate money to athletic programs are not alumni: and rarely do more than "1 to 2 percent" of alumni contribute to their alma mater's athletic program. Some studies have shown that alumni giving is, if anything, inversely related to athletic success. There is a strong correlation between
football success and booster club donations. As Sperber observes, boosters tend to be fair-weather friends. However, since their contributions are only to the athletic program, an increase in them is insignificant for the university.

Indeed, the inverse relationship between giving and athletics has been documented—that eliminating an athletic program is followed by a major increase in alumni giving. In 1986 when Tulane dropped basketball, donations rose by $5 million; when Wichita State dropped football—in spite of warnings that enrollment would drop and fund-raising fall off—enrollment climbed instead and giving jumped from $13.5 to $25.5 million. Seattle University, which once had a highly successful basketball program, reported six years later that "alumni have actually been donating more dollars to the school, in significant increments, every year since the decision was made." Sperber sums up the relationship of alumni to the university well:

Regular alumni,…once mobilized, are loyal to and have a deep affection for their alma maters. Moreover, they see their connection to a school as a lifetime commitment, a tie that transcends this year’s football and basketball won-lost records. Alumni are not oblivious of their schools’ athletic teams, but they place them below the horizon as a criterion for giving or withholding money—except if athletic success or scandal becomes so visible that it jeopardizes the academic seriousness of a school and the value of its alumni’s degrees. Then they give less.

While alumni gifts, unlike booster contributions, support the academic mission of the university, the adverse affects of being known for athletic success extends to an even more important source of funds. The largest donations to colleges and universities come from foundations and corporations, and the foundation people who control these big bucks are often graduates of Ivy League or small liberal arts schools. "Whether it’s justified or not, they [foundation officers] tend to believe that schools with highly successful sports teams are not really serious about having first-rate academic departments." Like it or not, a grant proposal is likely to be taken less seriously if it originates from a "jock factory."

One of the big problems in college athletics as it is currently structured is that there is no effective control on coaches’ salaries. Whereas faculty salaries are affected by the realities of the academic labor market, coaches’ salaries seem to defy the laws of supply and demand. Moreover, their salaries are supplemented by ticket deals, income from summer camps, shoe contracts, media shows, endorsements, car deals, and more. "Only a combination of show business hype and lottery fever," writes
Sperber, "keeps these annual-income balloons in the air."

Murray Sperber discusses most of the areas which have been studied by various Faculty Senate committees here at Western and others as well. Our situation is rather typical. Indeed, sometimes it is uncanny to see how much our situation has its parallels. Some will recall the 1983-84 academic year when because of a short-fall in state funds, the instructional budget was cut by 9% but athletic expenditures at the same time went from $1.5 to $2 million, almost $400,000 over the approved budget. In 1988 at Utah State University, also because of a short-fall in state funds, the school administration slashed the academic budget and faculty and staff accepted a $500,000 reduction in medical insurance benefits, while at the same time the athletic department was allowed to run up a $800,000 deficit. To cover this loss the university took money from academic funding. Utah State's athletic director justified his spending with the same sentiment that was used to justify increased spending on football at Western: "Sometimes you have to spend money to make money."

By contrast, Seattle University, after dropping its big-time athletic program, was able to move an extra $135,000 into undergraduate academic scholarships, and four years later had an increased enrollment and more money for scholarships for minority students, so that many more black students were attending the school than when it was a Division I basketball power.

Murray Sperber has documented what many of us already sensed: the entertainment goals of the prepfinancial athletic programs that have come to dominate the college scene are at odds with the mission of the university. Sports are valuable, but the present system is irrational. Located as they are on the fringe of the university, college athletic programs present themselves sometimes as a business, sometimes as an educational program, with the result that they are neither educationally nor fiscally responsible. What Sperber’s book shows is that until fundamental changes are made, most American colleges and universities will be saddled with an ever increasing burden that is a threat to their educational mission.
HIGHLIGHTS

Excerpts from; Campus Trends, 1990

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.

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.
FOR THE RECORD—
From: Educational Record, Summer/Fall 1989

Are Athletic Tails Wagging Presidential Dogs?

The spring 1989 Educational Record provides a timely examination of important ethical issues confronting American higher education; a number of fine pieces speak cogently of the need for university leadership both to articulate the ethical norms and values that should guide the institution and to see to an actual performance that gives life to those norms and integrity to the institution. Clearly, in helping to guarantee that these goals are addressed and achieved, the top leaders must develop and then rely on subordinate leadership that shares their institutional values.

Richard E. Lapchick’s excellent article on “The Future of the Black Student-Athlete” identifies exactly the kind of techniques that can be employed to guarantee ethical behavior in one area of academic life: intercollegiate athletics. Unfortunately, even as it does this, it also takes for granted a direct presidential role in athletic supervision too often and too easily affirmed in our day. Indeed, in recent years many college and university presidents not only have immersed themselves in athletics at their home campuses, but also have allied to bring a united presidential presence to the governance of intercollegiate athletics and to the NCAA. Rather than providing a solution to the central problem of college sports, such action reflects the problem itself—it is far more the malady than the cure.

The great preponderance of collegiate athletics proceeds legitimately, even fruitfully, as a quite natural and subordinate part of the academic whole. The corrupting problem arises if and when the sense of institutional proportion is lost, when an academic institution, whatever it may say, begins to act as if athletic endeavors were of great, even central importance in the life of the institution. The corruption reaches its zenith, as it has in several recently celebrated cases, when the disproportionate prominence given to sports creates a win-at-any-price mentality in pivotal institutional posts.

At this point, the cheating and rule-breaking begin and the athletic tail can be seen most clearly and most vigorously wagging the institutional dog.

What is not part of the central problem are the fans, the alumni, the press. Their excesses, if any, are their responsibility, presuming the college or university does not incite excessive behavior. The simple fact is that these aspects of collegiate athletics reside effectively outside the purview and the authority of the schools.

By contrast, when we talk of institutional actions that designedly or inadvertently elevate sports beyond its true status in an academic structure, then we talk of matters essentially and, indeed, rather easily controllable by institutional authority. Wrong action in athletics should be treated with the same scorn and retribution we bring to bear on plagiarism, grade falsification, and financial skullduggery. All such things attack directly the vital premises and trust on which the whole academic enterprise rests. In every case, the more important—the accepted and well-understood norms of ethical behavior that constitute the framework of decent human existence—has been sacrificed to the less important—one’s concern for one’s own success.

Against this background, the presidential alliance to intervene in national athletics is part of the problem precisely because it is a prominent example of the disproportionate attention to athletics that, I have suggested, is the very root of the scandals now too much with us. These presidents are, in the normal operation of their schools, entirely accustomed to delegation of responsibility as the key to their own and their institutions’ success. They reserve for themselves various core synthesizing and initiating leadership roles, as they must, but the discrete tasks of governance are placed in the hands of faculty and key administrators. In turn, those hands are held accountable for the successful and ethical conduct of affairs in their area. The president does not run the library, the computing center, or the academic department where the institution actually delivers, or fails to deliver, on its central promises. Nor do the presidents collectively conspire to form national alliances to run such departments. Instead, they expect others to manage those affairs; they evaluate the outcomes and they change leadership if the outcomes are inadequate.

When presidents treat athletics differently from other areas of campus life, either on their individual campuses or in their collectivity, they are accomplishing a host of counter-productive and unintended results. First, they inevitably elevate sports by singling it out for their personal attention. Second, they lessen the incentive and the capacity of on-site managers—student affairs vice presidents, athletic directors, coaches—to manage their affairs in harmony with institutional values or to pay the customary price for failure to do so. Third, because they can be only fleetingly, even dilettan­ tishly involved in direction of athletic activities, they have an unusually good chance of making mistakes; sport deserves better.

Rather than intervene directly in athletic governance, presidents collectively and singly will do much better if they recognize that principles and organizational tools are already in place for the successful and ethical management of sports. Indeed, as compared to many more complex segments of the university, administrative authority in athletics is essentially complete. It only requires the will to insist that institutional integrity be protected at all stages and the ability to delegate on-site management to the leadership already in place. They need to insist that excess be avoided and symmetry be attained. And finally, they need to recognize that the ultimate root of overt cheating and rule-breaking has its origin in less obvious but still truly disproportionate behavior, including presidential preoccupation with the peripheral.

—Quentin Quade

Quentin Quade is executive vice president of Marquette University.
IT'S A WONDERFUL LIFE . . .

Remember those times when you were in dire need for some instant cash? Perhaps a loan for a sudden repair of the house, or an appliance, or a second car; or just a 90-days note; or discussing, and getting good advice on financial planning - on our regular scale, which not necessarily involves portfolio management. Was it not great to do the formalities, those applications, disclosures etc. with people like ourselves, who knew us as we know them, — with colleagues?

This is precisely the essential difference: Credit Unions started as self-help cooperative associations of people who back in the XIXth century were hardly "credit worthy". They formed "affinity" or "common bonds" groups as members. That is what we still are at the credit union: not customers, but members. And that makes doing business there so different, so pleasant.

The credit union has the legal status not of a corporation, but of a non-profit cooperative association for mutual benefit. Which has, admittedly, some nice side-effects, for instance, credit unions are not subject to the federal corporate taxation. But then they are also very healthy: 15,700 credit unions nationwide with 65 million members have $203 billion in assets, in member deposits alone $185 billion - in comparison the deposits in US banks total at $2.5 trillion. The credit unions' own federal deposit insurance system, the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund (NCUSIF) has a deposit rate of 1.25% of the insured (i.e. up to $100,000) deposits. U.S. banks, in contrast, operate in insurance matters at their own insurance fund (FDIC) with a deposit rate of only 0.79%. (Sources: Membership: Credit Unions National Association (CUNA); all other Data are quoted from The Economist (London), March 31, 1990, p 78).

The turmoil about the Savings and Loan industry, and the ensuing public climate of insecurity, as well as the necessity to overhaul, and update the regulations and the public regulatory system have been used by the banking industry for a massive offensive against the only competitor left, the credit unions - though modest and humble we may be. The bankers' associations are lobbying the federal government, especially Congress, to achieve the following goals through legislation:

* Abolition of the credit unions' federal income tax exemption;
* Separation of the regulatory and insurance functions of the National Credit Unions' Administration (NCUA);
* Termination of the credit unions' independent regulator and subjecting the credit unions under the regulatory jurisdiction of the agency that also regulates and controls the banks;
* Absorption of our insurance system (NCUSIF) into the banks' insurance fund (FDIC).

Any of these changes would terminate the independence of our credit unions, as we know them.
The Economist suggests (loco cit.) that "rather than seeking to have credit unions brought under the FDIC, banks should look upon the credit unions' deposit insurance system as a possible model for themselves. ... there is no call on the taxpayer until credit unions have used up all their capital, a discipline which makes credit unions wary of risk. Contrast this with the 'moral hazard' posed by deposit insurance FDIC-style."

So, our very own interest is in jeopardy, and we are challenged to defend them. This, then, is the proverbial time for every good man and woman etc. ... (to stand up and be counted). CUNA, the national organization of the credit union movement is organizing "OPERATION GRASSROOTS", which asks for every member's participation, especially by way of writing to our representatives in the United States' Congress:

Representative William H. Natcher  
2333 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Senator Wendell H. Ford  
173 A Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Senator Mitch McConnell  
120 Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

To quote, and repeat, Valery's appeal:  
"Just write in your own words to let them know you want credit unions left alone ..... Be personal and specific. ... This matter is deadly serious ..... Think about it; and act on it today."

The Networks give us this season 1001 (or so) occasions to watch what George Bailey has to say to that character, what's his name?„„, Potter.

Remember,

IT'S A WONDERFUL LIFE ... (at our CREDIT UNION, too)!  

(georg bluhm)