Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Kuhlenschmidt at 3:34. Rita Hessley substituted for Charles Henrickson, Carol Wilson for Sylvia Pulliam, and Sheryl Venable for Karen Sansom. Absent without representation were James Bingham, Linda Brown, Dwight Cline, Lou-Ann Crouther, Ed Dorman, Sam Evans, Christopher Hamilton, Susan James, Jeffrey Jensen, Terry Leeper, Zubair Mohamed, Rudy Prins, Rick Shannon, and James Worthington.

Minutes of December 1 and December 10 Meetings

The minutes for the December 1, 1992 meeting were approved as written. In regard to the minutes of the meeting of December 10, 1992 Senator Fang, Chair of the Fiscal Affairs Committee asked that one statement from her report be changed to show that about 75% of the departments did receive some budgetary increase to help offset the increased costs from the surcharges assessed to purchases from Central Stores and in duplicating costs. In no case was the additional money enough to cover the additional costs from Central Stores and duplicating. Senator Neal and Senator Casto asked that the spelling of their names be corrected.

Old Business

Chair Kuhlenschmidt requested that barring objections, we would deal with old business before the committee reports in order that Former Regent Gene Evans could leave. The resolution regarding Dr. Evans was presented for a second reading.

The Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University hereby thanks Gene Evans for his service as Faculty Regent. The Faculty Senate recognizes and appreciates his concerns for Western Kentucky University.

The motion to accept the resolution was passed unanimously. Senator R. A. Otto presented a plaque to Dr. Evans in appreciation for his service.

Report from the Executive Committee

Chair Kuhlenschmidt reported on the meetings of the Executive Committee and the Council of Committee Chairs. She explained a request that each of the Senate's committees formulate a reason for existence and a set of goals relating to the values the committee considers important. These global goals will be used to communicate among ourselves, and possibly to the President and the Board, the direction we would like to take in the next three or four years. The consideration of values and goals can help to guide future committees to operate in a proactive rather than a reactive manner.

The committee to evaluate the President is formed and is working on an instrument, with the end of March deadline in mind. The President and the Board are being kept informed.

The Honors students have been invited to attend the March Senate meeting. The intent is to honor them and to introduce them to the notion of the profession of university teaching.

The agenda for Board meetings, received the day of each meeting, are being kept on file in the Senate office. Earl Fischer and Fred Mudge have again displayed concern for faculty in their comments.

The Executive Committee met with the President yesterday.

1. He said, "There is no imminent reorganization of colleges."
2. In relation to the liability resolution from last year, we agreed to forward our questions on liability to him. We will get responses and answers to those questions.
3. The President indicated that football had stayed within budget.
4. The program for faculty computers is moving ahead, with money taken from the reserve. Those computers are supposed to be on our desks by April.
5. State budget receipts were good in December and January. Nevertheless, Mike Malone, Head of Senate Appropriations, favors another budget cut.
Report from Academic Affairs

Chair Brunson distributed a summary of the recommendations of the University Task Force on Minority Recruitment and Retention chaired by Vice President Wilder. The summary was prepared by Bob Hansen. Money figure requests were $237,000 for Athletic Grants-In-Aid and $182,170 for the rest of the program. After discussion, the Senate committee drafted a resolution endorsing this final report and recommended that the University undertake a similar program to enhance the recruitment and retention of minority faculty. Subsequent to that meeting, Vice President Wilder created an implementation committee, chaired by Dr. John O'Connor. That committee is now trying to rank order the twenty-five recommendations of the initial task force. Some of these recommendations are directed toward minority faculty as well as students.

Report from By-Laws, Amendments, and Election Committee

Senator Scott reminded the Senate that departmental elections would be taking place during the next two weeks. The election of at-large senators will take place during the first week of March.

Report from Faculty Status and Welfare Committee

Chair Neal asked that the salary report, which has already been mailed to all senators, be posted by departmental senators so that all faculty will have a chance to see it. Many of the errors about which he has already received complaints, relate to the information that Institutional Research provided via their computer printout. Last year's promotions, for example, had not been put into the computer.

Report from the Faculty Regent

Regent Ray Mendel started by commenting on some observations he has formulated during his first days in office. First a set of facts:

1. The Faculty Regent has one vote out of ten on the Board of Regents.
2. Neither the Faculty Regent nor Student Regent chairs any subcommittee of the Board.
3. Both the Faculty Regent and Student Regent are assigned to fewer committees than are any other members of the Board.
4. Neither the Faculty Regent nor Student Regent serves on the Executive Committee.
5. The Board members are largely dependent on the President for information.

To increase faculty influence on the Board we need to be sure our Faculty Regent is better informed and has more data than any other Board member. He must be a resource to the Board. Second the Faculty Regent must be perceived by the Board as faithfully representing the faculty posture on key issues. The Senate needs to be the key forum for defining and developing the issues which are of concern to the faculty. The Senate needs, also, to define and develop consensus, with all faculty rallying behind whatever decision is made. People elected from the departments need to be willing to spend time developing that consensus within their departments. Finally, faculty need to show up at Board meetings. Currently administrative personnel dominate the spectator group.

There have been two Board meetings since the Senate last met. The first issue involved reorganization of the administrative structure and resulted in the creation of a new Vice President for Institutional Advancement. At the second meeting President Meredith provided answers to the questions asked about this position at the first meeting. The information seemed to make a case for this position. A handout from Regent Mendel summarizing these data supported the argument that the position will generate more money than it costs. Information on money generated in years past and the cost of generating that money will provide a baseline for evaluating the effectiveness of the new position. Information from other institutions that had implemented a similar structure suggested that an increase in funds generated had been
accomplished by such a structure. The creation of this position has with it a sunset clause: if the revenues generated by the new position do not exceed the increase in cost, then the position will disappear, and we will revert to the old structure. The President considers three years to be an adequate period of time to test this structure. Regent Mendel felt comfortable with the evidence presented, and he made the motion that the position be accepted.

The new Vice President for Institutional Advancement will supervise the Office of Development, Institute for Economic Foundation, WKU Foundation, Alumni Affairs, and University Relations. The other organizational change involved moving the supervision of auxiliary services (food services, housing, and the bookstore) from the office of the Vice President for Student Affairs to the office of the Vice President for Finance and Administration.

The second meeting of the Board was also used to address the issue of a salary plan. Two aspects of the salary issue are encouraging. First, past budgets have given to salaries the money that was left after other needs had been met. The new plan assigns to salaries an amount that the salary committee has determined will eventually raise the salaries to benchmark levels. Second, this is a multi-year plan. This time the President appointed a committee, chaired by Vice President Ramsey, whose charge was to look at where we are and where we need to be. That information was then passed to the Budget Committee to determine how we can get there. This new approach then looks at what other aspects of the University have to be downsized or streamlined in order to meet the salary needs.

The salary plan adopted was not, in every respect, the salary plan that Regent Mendel wanted to see. The Salary Committee had found the following discrepancies between Western salaries (by rank) and the mean salaries of Kentucky regional universities and the mean salaries of benchmark universities (determined by the Council of Higher Education).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Based on 1991-1992 Salary Data)</th>
<th>Mean of Regionals</th>
<th>CHE Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Disparity (226)</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Disparity (125)</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Disparity (150)</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Disparity (53)</td>
<td>+10.2</td>
<td>+7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of that data base, the Salary Committee recommended that mean increases vary by rank. (Specific increases for an individual within a rank would be based substantially on merit.) The Budget Committee accepted the Salary Committee's recommendations for the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. They rejected the 0% increase for instructors because we had just come off a year of no increases so they felt that at least a cost of living increase was in order. The Salary Committee, on the other hand, was trying to do away with the existing salary compression and restore equity. The Salary Committee's plan cost $147,000 less than that of the Budget Committee. The $147,000 would have been more than enough to provide increases to library personnel who had been left out of the faculty increases. The Board accepted the recommendations of the Budget Committee.

In relation to the additional action of the Budget Committee in providing 3% increases to administrators earning over $50,000 a year, a group for whom the Salary Committee had recommended no increases, Senator Dietle had two questions. He wanted to know how many people were on the Budget Committee and how many of those were administrators earning over $50,000. Regent Mendel replied that eight of the twelve Budget Committee members were administrators earning over $50,000. However, there are two faculty members on the Budget Committee, and those two ultimately agreed with the Budget Committee's modifications.

In response to a question from Senator Scott, Regent Mendel said that the library personnel were included in a pool that receives raises but not in the faculty pool. The distinction there is one made by the Federal government in terms of EEO categories. They define, as does the AAUP, teaching faculty as people who teach six hours or more.
Assuming that we have the funds, the salary increases will be provided. Regent Mendel believes that since the Budget Committee has embraced these goals, they are committed to find the money. Senator Glaser expressed concern that the money not come from instruction or deferred maintenance. Regent Mendel said that he felt we were talking downsizing, but he hoped the bulk of the cuts would come from non-academic areas. In regard to the merit issue, Regent Mendel stated that if we are to remain competitive, merit has to weigh heavily in salary increases. Senator Bruni expressed concern that we not cut instructional supplies and increase class size to the extent that we cannot do our job.

Report from COSFL

In the absence of Senator Pulliam, Chair Kuhlenschmidt presented the COSFL report. A COSFL meeting was held last Saturday, at which it was learned:

1. The University of Louisville, on February 24, will have a speaker on post-tenure review. Their Board has declared that tenure review would be done without reference to prior reviews. They will ignore the reviews of the previous six years and base tenure decisions on one years activities. The faculty does not think this will hold up in court, but it is an interesting example of what Boards can do.

2. The faculty at the University of Kentucky are asking the attorney general to declare that personnel files be open as part of the Open Records Act. This stems from the belief of an individual who feels he/she is being treated unfairly and wants an opportunity for comparison with others.

3. Eastern's Senate is trying to purge itself of the voting administrative members.

New Business

Senator Leavy, representing the library faculty, expressed the concerns of the library faculty at being considered separately from other faculty, being considered instead in Category C: Administrative and Professional. One factor which resulted in this exclusion was a separate statistical reporting method that was applied to that part of the faculty. In as much as library personnel have faculty standards applied to them for hiring, promotion, and tenure, standards recently upheld by the administration, they are deeply concerned that they are being treated unjustly. By virtue of this compensation plan all library faculty, regardless of rank, are in a category which will receive, on average, only a 3% pay increment. Senator Leavy added: We appreciate this opportunity to express to the Senate our concern and underscore what we perceive to be unequal treatment. We also wish it to be known at the same time, however, that we do appreciate the efforts of the Faculty Regent in our behalf and to express our appreciation also for his receptiveness in hearing our concerns.

Senator Brunson moved and Senator Glaser seconded:

The Faculty Senate endorses the Final Report of the Task Force on Minority Recruitment and Retention (October 24, 1992), and recommends that the University undertake a similar effort to enhance the recruitment and retention of minority faculty.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55.

Respectfully submitted by Joan Krenzin
February 11, 1993

Statement on Effect of Compensation Plan on University Library Faculty

I come before this body today representing University Library faculty to inform you, our colleagues, of the impact of the recent compensation plan on University faculty.

University Library faculty have been excluded from Category A: Faculty in this plan.

A separate statistical reporting method was applied to part of the faculty, resulting in this exclusion.

Inasmuch as we have faculty standards for promotion in rank and tenure, upheld by the University administration, we are deeply concerned that we are being treated unfairly.

By virtue of this plan, all of us—regardless of our rank—are to receive only a possible 3% pay increment.

We appreciate this opportunity to inform the Senate of our concern and to emphasize the inequity of this compensation plan as it relates to the faculty.