CONCERNS PRESENTED
BY
FACULTY SENATE

1. The Faculty Participation Committee worked many hours on the subject of increased faculty participation at the department level, but to my knowledge this portion of our work was never presented to the Board of Regents by the president.

I am sending you a copy of our work for your perusal. You may desire to pass this on to the committee that receives the assignment to consider department head selections. I think the recommendations have merit and could be enlarged upon to include the various college deans. I would be happy to meet with the committee for the purpose of discussing the deliberations of the Faculty Participation Committee on this subject.

2. Should be efforts to establish some consistency in matters of promotion, tenure, etc.

3. Should be efforts to establish rotating chairmanships of departments at earliest possible dates--Do need to shield incumbents from falling back into ranks.

4. The constant growth in Administration---A study should be made to ascertain the need for an ever increasing administration.

5. WKU should adopt a policy of rotating Vice-Presidents, Deans, and Department Heads.

6. There should be closer faculty involvement in the allocation of University funds. We pay cash for buildings, yet there is not enough money for competitive salaries (with UK, Louisville) and the nation as a whole.

7. The teaching load. We seem to agree that 12/12 should be the load for people without terminal degrees as well as those with. This was a point mentioned by the accrediting body of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business when they turned down our application for accreditation.
8. Allied to #1 is class size. This was also mentioned by the above accrediting body. In our department, they have lost several faculty members, and we have increased enrollment so the administration keeps increasing our class size. We think that the teacher should have some input into deciding how many students can be effectively taught in a given class. Certain advanced level classes cannot be increased in size without hindering the teacher's effectiveness.

9. Selection of Department Head. We believe that the faculty members should have some input into selection of a new faculty head. We, in this department, did not know anything about the removal of our old department head, and the selection of a new one until it was announced to us in the summer that it had been done. We also think that there should be some type of periodic evaluation by the departmental faculty of the department head.

10. Hiring. We believe that faculty within a department should have some veto power over hiring new faculty. We have had the administration hire people, with degrees in other areas than accounting, to teach accounting. We should have a secret poll of present faculty so that there won't be pressure on, or recrimination against those who object to new faculty.

11. I would like to suggest that the Senate consider a recommendation to the University President that when our raises are less than the annual cost of living increase, the ratio between cost of living increment and merit be minimized; further, that this ratio of cost of living to merit raises be reduced as our percentage for raises falls further and further below the national cost of living increase—that is a sliding ratio adjusted to the discrepancy between our percentage allotment for raises to the national cost of living increase. Should our salary increases ever be 50% the national cost of living increase, I would suggest that we divide the money up equally among all faculty persons and disregard any percentage increase. When we are receiving a half, or less than half, of the national cost of living raise, I feel we need to emphasize and assist each of us in meeting our day-to-day living costs. This should be a concern of first priority and pre-empt merit raises.
12. Parking problem
13. Tendency toward the "police" state where security is concerned.
15. Stimulation of most widespread participation in professional development through increased funding for research, travel and sabbatical leaves.
16. Desirability of an annual "State of the University" report by President Downing aimed specifically at members of the faculty and dealing with concrete issues of interest to us.
17. A study of grade inflation at the national level and, in particular, across the Western campus. The contributing factors should be identified and corrective measures sought.
18. The parking problem. (Personally, I do not feel this is a matter for the senate to consider, but I list it because it was mentioned by several of my colleagues.)
19. Student evaluation of the faculty...the nature of the instrument itself and the disposition of the results. (If such an evaluation is contemplated, the senate should have input.)
20. The question of fringe benefits is of concern to many.
21. Review of department 'headships' and the role of the faculty in the choice of such individuals.....a clear procedure.
22. Concern has been voiced toward the amount of assigned committee responsibilities in addition to regular teaching loads.
23. It has been proposed that secretaries should be given first aid training because students usually seek help first at the department offices.
24. No smoking provisions have been requested for required meetings.

25. Explore the possibility that fringe benefits should be considered as a part of salary for purposes of the Ky. Teacher Retirement calculations.

26. There needs to be a review of our Blue Cross-Blue Shield programs and a comparison of our plan with other available plans.

27. We propose that the senate conduct an in depth study of the administrative structure of WKU, at both the College and University level, to include but not be limited to:
   a. For each position secure a specific description of the job
   b. For each position make an assessment as to whether the title and salary of the job is appropriate to the responsibility.
   c. For each position an assessment of the extent to which the individual occupying the position is getting the job done.
   d. An assessment of the extent to which there is effective faculty involvement in the employment of administrators.
   e. An assessment of the ratios of administrators to teaching/research faculty to student population over the last several years.

28. We propose that a study be made of the terminal examinations for Masters Degrees (Masters Orals and Masters Comprehensive Examinations) to ascertain if they serve a legitimate function. If they are found to have such a function, make recommendations that will clearly establish their purpose and recommendations that will fix uniform and reasonable practices for their administration. If they are found to have no legitimate function, seek to have them abolished.

29. We propose that the senate study the effects of the inflationary spiral on the salaries of faculty members over the last several years. Further we propose that a study be made of the Faculty salary levels in comparison to the economic needs of the faculty.

30. We propose that a study be made of the present status of faculty evaluation practices to ascertain:
1. The real purpose or purposes of this practice.
2. The real relationship between this practice and faculty promotion, salary, continuation and tenure.
3. Whether in its present form the practice produces benefits that make it worth the tremendous amount of time and effort expended.
4. If it is really necessary and reasonable to evaluate every faculty member every year.

31. Course ownership attitudes by faculty who have greater length of service at the University.

32. The opportunity to teach summer school when there are faculty who consider such an assignment protocol to their seniority as faculty. The above topics and others formalized in college meetings have caused me to believe that tenure should be reviewed in the situation of those who have received it five or more years ago.

Tenure, in my opinion, should not imply that there is no further review of professional accomplishment and performance as a teacher.

I wish to suggest that the Faculty Senate consider all of the faculties welfare and the welfare of the University by considering the topics which I have mentioned briefly. To avoid oppressive attitudes within the faculty body, it seems that tenure should not be sinecure and that it is imperative to review such tenure to insure democratic principles.

33. That the well-being of faculty could be promoted by making available recreational facilities. This is particularly related to indoor facilities; i.e., swimming pool, etc.

34. That fringe benefits be given consideration in salary considerations. That is, fringe benefits may be more important than actual cash dollars in considering raises.

Faculty Status and Welfare
35. Need for liability insurance for faculty working with labs or field trips.

36. Disproportionate ratio of administrators to faculty.

37. Lack of communication between parents and lab school.

38. Reporting of faculty salaries without including administrators’ salaries in the averages.

39. Promotion policies for instructors of many years of service.

40. Distributing fall catalog before students register for fall classes.

41. Travel money to encourage participation in professional meetings.

42. Consideration of what part of degree program is binding on student (Currently the student is forced to accept the program in existence at the time he files his undergraduate program, as opposed to the program in operation when he entered Western.)

43. Need for supervised recreation program for faculty children at lab school from 2:00 to 4:30.

44. Banking services for faculty and students somewhere on campus (depositing and check cashing provided by a different local bank each year).

45. Investigation of profit made by College Heights Foundation, at bookstore, which forces some students to pay higher prices for merchandise to support scholarships for other students.

46. Use of outmoded teaching methods in the College of Education (CBTE and cross-grade grouping in the lab school).

47. Abolishment of smoking in elevators, washrooms, classrooms, halls, and any other place where a person does not have the option of avoiding the smoke.

48. Rotating department chairmanship.

49. Unequal distribution of committee assignments and other time-consuming tasks.

50. Reduction of teaching loads for faculty without PhD.

51. Temporary replacement of faculty on sabbatical leave and partial replacement of faculty with load reductions.

52. A striving for clarity and understanding in the role, function, and mission of the Jones-Jaggers Laboratory school relative to parents, faculty and students in the College of Education, and the University.

53. Salary, promotion, and tenure for laboratory school teachers (who hold University rank). As all full-time Laboratory School teachers hold academic rank with the University, there
is concern over:

A. Salary in general and in the possibility of establishing a procedure for awarding merit on a competitive basis by departments within the College of Education.

B. The rate of time necessary for Laboratory School teachers are promoted and earn and receive tenure.

54. Liability insurance that would cover Laboratory School teachers who work with elementary schoolage children who are not regularly enrolled students of the University. (Our student clientele is a different population than the rest of the University.)

55. Is it necessary, or even required, that evaluation procedures be the same for Laboratory School teachers who are performing a different function within the University system?

56. The teaching load at the laboratory school is vastly different then in other departments within the University. How do you equate 30 contact hours per week with young children, plus supervision of the College students who work in our classrooms, plus demonstration lessons, plus committees, parents, etc. with a "traditional" teaching load?

57. "Does registration for a class constitute a legal contract between the university and the student?"

58. Selection of the University President

We are all aware of the politics involved in the selection of a university president in Kentucky. Irregardless of this fact, the Faculty Senate should make some effort to have a voice in the selection - or at least the screening process - by having a representative on the executive committee that is assigned this screening task. Thus, I would like to see the proper Faculty Senate committee study this matter.

59. Funds should be made available for instructional development projects, i.e. models, teaching aids, transparencies, slides, tapes, T.V. tapes, etc. Funds are available for research, but many faculty find it necessary to work out-of-pocket for development of teaching aids.

60. Promotion in rank should result in increased salary or responsibility. The responsibility could be compensated for by reduced load, but if rank is granted and the faculty member does nothing to warrant the load reduction, the load should not be reduced.

61. One hour overloads are not presently compensated--could they be cumulative to permit either a load reduction or overload compensation?

62. The position of Department Head as a quasi-administrative position needs to be examined. Suggest: (A) rotating head (2 yrs.), (B) secret ballot for continuance, (C) majority (of department faculty) vote for head.
63. Examine WKU's relation with social security—Can the faculty vote it out? It is understood that it was voted in.

64. Make a nine month pay option available.

65. Make participation in summer and off-campus programs optional and/or contractual to allow plans for employment elsewhere.

66. A faculty member should not be shifted from one summer course offering to another unless he desires the shift.

67. Review the Faculty Handbook. Spell out requirements for: promotion in rank, tenure, salary increases. If policy is not followed require a written explanation from the agent or agency responsible for denial.

68. Faculty evaluation by students should be used solely for the improvement of instruction and not for controlling pay increases or for denial of tenure. Especially when students are critical of administration and not the affected faculty member.

69. Academic promotions should suggest added responsibility—Instructor load 21 hours, Assistant Professor 24 hours, Associate Professor 24 hours, Full Professor 27 hours. Exceptions for graduate teaching to conform to standards imposed by accrediting agencies.

70. Some emphasis seems to be needed regarding the Department Head and his duties regarding the improvement of instruction in his department. Need to explore the degree of autonomy that faculty enjoy in teaching their subject. One faculty member indicated that he was told to change content, submit quizzes and tests for approval and to change requirements at the direction of the Department Head.

71. Work load (Too Heavy)

72. Ranking (in my case PhD candidate with all but dissertation, I am ranked to low) I believe that comparative studies would reveal that W.K.U. is not in line with ranking state universities in these areas.

73. And of course salaries (Too Low) But that goes without saying.

74. Many members of the Psychology Department have expressed concerns as to the evaluation system(s) presently being utilized to determine faculty "effectiveness". Assuming such procedures continue to be used, it is felt that the Senate should involve itself to help achieve a system that would have the following characteristics:

1. Be broad (across the organizational structure)

2. Be consistent (across time and across the organizational structure)

3. Be flexible (allow for individual variance in teaching, research, and service roles across individuals)
75. The faculty senate should be more than a voice for issues of faculty self-interest. The senate should concentrate the majority of its energy on issues which are important for the fulfillment of the university's purposes. While the senate must serve as the faculty voice on such matters as evaluation, pay, and research support, these issues should not be allowed to dominate. The senate should also concern itself with the issues of the total university budget, the quality of faculty-student relations, standards of academic excellence, and long-range university direction.

76. The faculty senate should adopt a style which is more cooperative than confrontive with the university administration. It should strive to maintain mutual trust with the administration, and must begin by assuming administration good faith. Otherwise its activities will not contribute to either the total university welfare or to long-range faculty welfare. The faculty senate should be aware of a common tendency for faculty senates to increase administration-faculty polarization and should strive to counteract this force.

77. Our college would like to have reviewed the overall teaching loads at W.K.U. relative to teaching loads at other Kentucky universities. Also, we would like to see redressed the inequities involved in having non-Ph.D.'s course load reduced, especially in light of the fact that a 15 hour course load in a given semester may well decrease the effectiveness of a teacher. This position is also taken by the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business.

78. Our college would like to investigate the feasibility of a rotating department head, or preferably a policy in which a more or less permanent department head would be forced to suffer a vote of confidence every three years.

79. Our college would like to have initiated a study which will result in a definition and consistent application of the word "faculty".

80. My concern is the fact that new faculty are not allowed to apply for Summer one-half stipends to pursue research and/or creative endeavors until they've been here for two years. How's that for reinforcing research persons, especially in light of our Dean's request for an increase of 30% research endeavors?

81. There is widespread agreement that a period of rapid growth in higher education has ended. As a consequence of stabilization, opportunities for mobility among university faculties have been reduced, while the percentage of tenured faculty has experienced a corresponding increase. Unless preventive measures are actively pursued, stabilization of personnel in an academic area may ultimately result in stagnation. (If new blood cannot be regularly injected into a departmental body, it is critical that steps be taken to assure that the existing blood maintain adequate circulation.) Opportunities that may be effectively utilized by the faculty to continue professional development and remain current in their
respective areas of specialization must be provided. It should further be recognized that provision of such opportunities will, in itself, be inadequate to assure the maintenance of desired faculty competence. Efforts must be made to encourage a high percentage of participation on a regular basis.

82. The following broad headings are thus suggested for consideration by appropriate committees of the Faculty Senate.

A. Time-Release and Funding for Research or Creative Activities
B. Funding for Travel to Professional Meetings
C. Sabbatical Leaves

Specific questions that should be resolved include:

1. Is the currently utilized definition of research and creative activity broad enough to permit the qualification of an adequate number of faculty members for funding and release time?

2. Are the opportunities presently afforded for release time and funding adequate to allow participation by a desirable percentage of the faculty membership? (Are the current budget and time release allotments adequate?)

3. Are departments able to effectively utilize the currently allotted release time (without penalizing non-participants with additional workload)?

4. Is the recognition given research at Western adequate to promote a desirable level of creative activities?

5. Is the present travel budget adequate to encourage ample participation in professional meetings at the state, regional, national, and international levels?

6. Is the Sabbatical Leave program (and its budget) adequate to meet the needs of an increasing number of eligible candidates without penalizing colleagues with increased workload?

83. A second non-related concern stems from the Faculty Senate Constitution as it pertains to the role of the Faculty Regent.

1. Should the Faculty Regent be automatically included as an ex-officio member of the Senate but required to win the voting privileges afforded an elected senator via a local departmental or college election?

2. Should the Faculty Regent serve as a member of the Executive Committee of the Senate? (ex-officio—non-voting or voting; only if elected by a college caucus; not allowed to serve; etc.)

3. Should restrictions be placed on the role played by the Faculty Regent in the Senate? (not allowed to serve as chairpersons, etc.)
84. This attached document is the U. of Kentucky's University Senate product dealing with various aspects of international programs.

I would hope our Senate at WKU might consider this important matter and hopefully come up with recommendations for academic policies appropriate to Western.

Unless there is a University approach to international programs, our present series of piece-meal activities will continue to be unorganized, uncorrelated, and non-productive for the total welfare, it seems to me.

85. A university policy on the approach to international programs should be established. Such a policy was adopted by the Faculty Senate at UK in 1971. I am enclosing a memorandum from Dr. Paul Hatcher on this subject. I have a copy of the 20-page UK document in my office and will forward it to the appropriate committee upon request.

86. An investigation should be made into the possibility of setting aside an entire class period (e.g. 3:10 T TH F) for university, college, and departmental committee meetings. This would eliminate conflict with classes, and the additional days would prevent so many meetings from being scheduled on Thursdays.

87. A request should be made that the library reassess its policy on check-out period for faculty members. Most universities allow books to be checked out for full semesters at least (some books are necessary for class preparation throughout a semester). The money saved on sending notices to faculty members could be better used for buying books and subscribing to journals.

88. More faculty input into the selection of deans and administrators at levels higher than that of department heads

89. Need for more housing for married students.

90. Need for more funds for attending professional meetings. Advances for travel expenses to professional conferences.

91. I would like to suggest as a possible Faculty Senate discussion topic the idea of making the grading system more indicative of a student's actual accomplishment in a course. As it is now, no distinction is made in grading between plus and minus within a given grade. For example I think we all have experienced the frustration of knowing that a student who has barely managed to make a B will get the same amount of quality points as the student who is agonizingly close to an A. Why not go to a decimal system where a student would get a 3.3 or a 3.9 instead of a whole number? Or perhaps a plus and minus system where the computer would translate the plus or minus into a decimal? I don't know enough about our computer system to suggest a specific system, but I feel that there is a more accurate method than the present system of letter grades being turned into whole numbers.
92. Teacher retirement, withdrawals— I have heard that Western withdraws a larger percentage than does UK or UL. If this is true, why should there be a difference? Shouldn't there be equality throughout the state universities? (from faculty salaries)

93. What about the part-time faculty member? The university saves much money through the policies they have regarding salaries & other benefits in regard to these individuals. Are there large number of part-time employees? If so, what are their concerns?

94. One thing that interests me is partial payment of hospitalization for part-time faculty. It might be

95. Teaching loads

96. Committee work

97. I would like to see an in-depth study of comparative teaching level at other universities, specifically art department, but generally over all teaching loads throughout the University.

98. Immediately obvious is the art faculty teaching load (12-15 cr. hrs. per sem.) which exceeds that of many university fine arts programs. While the department of art conducts a full compliment of committee assignments and other extra curricular obligations, our faculty positions are relatively small in number. This imposes a heavy non-teaching load. Beyond this the professional expectation of our department administration requires individual creative out-put. A teaching load reduction would permit us to rechannel energy into additional creativity in both teaching effectiveness and individual research.

99. I know not whether this properly comes under the province of the faculty senate. I submit it as a possible agenda item; those with greater wisdom than I will be able to determine if it is reasonable and proper and/or has redeeming social value.

Whereas, teachers frequently need books in order to properly carry out research, and
Whereas, the WKU library does not have a number of books that a member of faculty could possible require, and
Whereas, the administration of the library has been singularly defensive in the face of suggestions or criticism, and
Whereas, interlibrary load will not seek volumes in print and even if the WKU library is willing to purchase such volumes they are not available for many, many moons,
Therefore, I raise the question about the possibility of the faculty senate attempting to obtain relief for faculty members for whom present library holdings and procedures are inadequate.
100. Faculty salary information appear in "median" rather than "average" figure.

101. Strongly believe that all administrators for (for us including Dept. Head, Director of Fr. English, and Graduate Director) should be evaluated every two years and results go to deans plus a faculty watch-dog committee.

102. I'd like for the senate to consider the question of promotions. Who? How? When?

103. One of my concerns is the shoddy manner in which the University--our Department specifically--exploits part-time teachers. While I am not unaware of or surprised that corporations throughout the country are guilty of "sharp" practices with part-time employees, I am disturbed that the University would stoop so low. I believe the University and education in general should lead rather than follow in matters of employee welfare. Shouldn't the University be especially concerned with the question of proper and equitable use of human resources?

I am, of course, aware of the manifold problems of part-time people because ______ has taught at Western part-time for the last seven or eight years. Obviously I have a special interest in the solution to this problem; nevertheless the existence of the grievances listed below can be verified quickly and easily. Any part-time teacher could testify; unfortunately most full-time people also know of this problem, though many are unconcerned or apathetic.

1. Part-time teachers almost invariably teach Freshman English, the course which, if taught conscientiously, is probably the most time consuming for the teacher. Teaching three or four sections of Freshman English should be considered the equivalent of a full load.

2. In some cases part-time teachers carry a teaching load equal to or practically equal to that carried by a full-time teacher; yet the part-time teacher's salary is barely a fraction of the full-time teacher's salary.
3. Part-time teachers are ineligible for most of the fringe benefits accorded full-time personnel.

4. Part-time teachers apparently cannot expect advancement of any type. In other words part-time teaching is a dead-end occupation. Any number of people, including I'm sure, would be willing to give testimony before the Faculty Senate.

I think the Faculty Senate has every reason to be concerned about the problems of part-time teachers. These people are our colleagues. They teach the same courses we teach. How can we as humane, thinking individuals acquiesce to and be satisfied with a university policy which systematically demeans and exploits our own colleagues?

104. An evaluation of superiors (Deans, Department heads, etc.) every other year.

105. The establishment of a policy of written memoes to substantiate the "oval tradition" which currently is in use when one's superior negotiates with him.

106. Written examinations, which go on file for public purusal for all graduate degrees. Abolish the oral!

107. These and related questions are of concern to me, and I feel that the concern would be wide-spread if more were known about our proficiency testing programs. If the senate can be brought to interest itself in the question, I don't think it would be long before it would take some action to rectify testing abuses, and I think action coming from the senate would likely be effective. A lot of the ground work has already been done. Frank or Jim Heldman should have the report to the English department done several years ago by a committee that reviewed the English tests and commented on their quality. Mrs. Cheryl Chambless, an admissions counselor, did the 2½ year report I referred to earlier, A Three Year Review of Credit by Examination at Western Kentucky University, for Ronnie Sutton. This report was released to deans and department heads in the spring of 1976 and ought to be available to senate committee. I myself did a commentary on the
Chambless report and submitted it to Jim Heldman in the spring of 1976. He should still have it. With all this material around I think a senate committee could do its work quickly and well, and the work needs doing. Not only are our testing policies academically very suspect, but taking up such an issue this early in its existence would help the senate set for itself a tone of responsibility and academic seriousness several pitches above the sort of wrangling over parking lots and perks that have paralyzed other faculty senates in the past.

108. I hope the Faculty Senate will investigate the expanding role the CLEP examinations have come to play in the academic life of the university, especially with regard to their impact on our already-minimal general education requirements. Questions a committee on CLEP, and other testing boondoggles, might consider:

Are the tests really a valid substitute for course work? If so, under what conditions?

Are our standards realistic? (U of L's are only 5% higher on the general CLEP tests, but that 5% would eliminate roughly half of the people who have gained credit under our system.)

Is there anything significant in the fact that CLEP credit is rising, apparently by about 50% a year, in a period of falling ACT scores?

How much impact will CLEP and similar programs ultimately have on FTE's? In May, 1975, a study of the previous 2½ years showed that testing programs had resulted in the rewarding of 9513 hours credit to 958 students, and the CLEP component of these awards had risen steadily in the 2½ year period with no plateau in sight.

How much credit ought an individual student be allowed to accumulate by testing? At present a student can gain up to 42 hours or roughly one third of his college credits through CLEP alone, and that 42 hours includes almost all of the substantive work he would have had to do under general education.
Might some sort of regulation that a student must take subsequent course work in an area in which he has received testing credit be instituted? At present only about a third of them do.

Should not the academic departments concerned with the various areas the tests cover have some say in determining the standards for success? The English department, for one, has spent two years in fruitless negotiations, trying to modify English testing policy.

109. Teaching loads

110. 2 part summer school; no May term

111. Study of Faculty loads with respect to:
    a. differential of earned doctorate vs. masters holder
    b. comparison to other state Universities (Eastern, UK, etc.)
    c. load credit for laboratory courses

112. Consideration of changing the present Dept. Head to a Dept. Chairman or faculty review.

113. Practice no replacement for faculty on leave or on sabbaticals.

114. Propose giving faculty members option between present Kentucky retirement and TIAA-CREF.

115. Propose an increase in the faculty travel allocation to $300.00 minimum per faculty member.

116. Propose an improvement in faculty fringe benefits; such as membership fees to professional associations.

117. Propose a reduction in faculty teaching load to nine hours per semester.

118. Western Kentucky University has no published salary scale or announced policy for awarding salary increases. Only vague perimeters of high and low salary in the various ranks are made public.
This procedure (or lack of a clearly defined one) leads to the apprehension that salary increments are awarded for political and personality reasons to reward the faithful and to punish critics. (This grievance writer found that he had a 6.2% pay increase and that a few others willing to discuss the issue had similar raises close to 6% while the generally assumed institutional average increase was higher.)

I recommend a published pay scale based principally on rank, degrees, and experience completely equalizing pay among colleges and between men and women teachers. We are told that the administration is working on such equalization; but in the absence of published scales, progress must be taken on faith. This is not good enough.

Admittedly, a pay scale may be sterile but the political abuses without one are greater than the injustices with one. The absence of published scales and the presence of unknown factors leading to pay increases smack of merit pay without the criteria announced. NEA and AFT have taken positions categorically opposed to the merit pay concept.

119. The forced monthly reporting of professional activities in meetings, committees, consultation, etc. is burdensome busy work and smack of "invasion of privacy". An example of this irritating exercise is the College of Education monthly report which demands completion by a stated date and announces that it is "imperative" to comply. The consequences of failure to report are not spelled out and neither are the purposes for the report, except in vague terms.

This reporting probably leads to generous fabrication of activities performed for fear that a poor record will cause disfavor by an ever present "big-brother" college administration.

120. This concern addresses itself to the policy and practice at Western Kentucky University of requiring full-time faculty members who do not have the doctor's degree to carry a teaching load of 3 semester hours per year more than those full-time faculty members who
do have the doctor's degree. For example, the teaching load of a full-time faculty member without the doctorate is 27 undergraduate semester hours per year, whereas the teaching load for a full-time faculty member with the doctorate is only 24 undergraduate semester hours. Faculty members upon attainment of the doctorate are automatically rewarded with an increase in salary. The implication that faculty members with more formal education should teach less is not justifiably defensible.

Please give this matter your careful consideration. Unwarranted discrimination in this instance may, and should be, corrected by equalizing the teaching load. I ask you to counsel the administration to alleviate this inequity which is a concern of a large number of the teaching faculty at Western Kentucky University.