Faculty Senate Minutes
February 17, 1994

Call to Order
The sixth meeting of the Senate XVII was called to order by Chair Dietle at 3:32. Claus Ernst substituted for Barry Brunson, Michael Ann Williams for Karin Egloff, M. B. Lucas for Joan Krenzin, and Rose Davis for Nelda Sims. Absent without alternates were Roy Cabaniss, Mary Cobb, Matthew Deadman, Louella Fong, Corban Goble, Chris Hamilton, Charles Hay, Charles Henrickson, Barbara Kacer, Terry Leeper, Patricia Lockett, Glenn Lohr, Bill Meadors, Richard Patterson, Rudy Prins, Karen Sansom, David Stiles, Samanta Thapa, William Traugott and James Worthington.

Considerations of the Minutes
The minutes for the December 9th meeting were approved without any corrections.

Committee Reports
Report from the Executive Committee
The chair pointed out the inconsistencies of the state's governor who wants to allocate money for a new engineering school in Paducah after trying to reduce spending by eliminating duplicate programs at the state universities. He suggested that letters from individual senators to state legislators might be helpful, especially when urging them to make sure that the governor cannot cut academic budgets after the legislators will have left for the year.

The Council of Academic Deans adopted the proposal for a Library Advisory Committee which was suggested by the Faculty Senate last fall. The purpose of the committee is to "review library policies and make recommendations to the Dean of Libraries and to the Vice president for Academic Affairs." The committee will not scrutinize the work of individual librarians.

The budget committee met for the first time this Monday (2-14-1994). From a faculty representative on the budget committee, Chair Dietle heard that President Meredith wants to back off the salary plan by proposing a smaller percentage increase than the plan calls for. This seems to be a bit early considering that the committee just started meeting. According to the faculty representative on the budget committee, the basic budget is never presented to the budget committee to consider fundamental changes; the important decisions are never made in the committee; and a number of areas are off-limits to the budget committee itself.

The annual evaluation of President Meredith is coming up in the last week of March. Some faculty members suggested to wait with the evaluation until a budget is in place. That is probably not possible, but the evaluation can reflect the status of the next budget as it exists by the end of March.

The student government has not formally requested the Faculty Senate to discuss whether faculty evaluations should be made public.

The idea of "confidentiality" seems to be misused on campus. Much to the information provided to him and other members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is prefaced by some statement indicating that it is confidential - even if many people on campus already know it. Labelling non-confidential information as confidential can be used to manipulate faculty members into believing that they are "in" on something. The Faculty Senate might want to come up with a resolution/statement of policy about how it wants to deal with the issue of confidentiality.

Report from the Committee on By-Laws, Amendments and Elections (Larry Snider)
The Faculty Senate constitution calls for the election of new senators to begin in February with departmental elections and to continue with college at-large elections in March. Currently there are 13 departmental seats coming up for elections: 1 from College of Business Administration, 8 from Ogden College, and 4 from Potter College. The departmental representatives are being contacted to post lists of eligible departmental members. Faculty not interested can indicate that before the election. The number of college at
large seats varies with the number of faculty in that college. Currently there are 3 at-large seats up for election in Ogden. College elections must be monitored by someone in that college.

Report from the Committee on Faculty Status and Welfare (Marvin Leavy)
The salary report from the committee is made up of three parts: 1) a listing of all professional and administrative personnel; 2) a listing of faculty by rank; 3) a listing of faculty by department and rank. In each of these three parts, the information is ordered according to 9-month salary equivalents.

The target percentages of the salary plan seem to have been met in all four categories. It is somewhat difficult to determine whether the target for assistant professors was met, since the comparison is to the starting salary of the prior year. However, that salary often changes during the year, due to finishing a degree. The committee wants to create a set of guidelines for next year’s committee.

Report by the Faculty Regent (Ray Mendel)
There has been no board meeting since October 1993. Mendel attended the meeting of the budget committee on Monday. Targets were set for the salary plan which are lower than called for by the salary plan. The starting point of the discussion should be to implement the salary plan. The administration should be challenged to develop a budget along those lines and not give in before they even started. The final budget is supposed to be completed by March 25, 1994. Nothing has happened since the budget for last year was completed. Even without the state budget being in place, the university should have started working on problems which must be attacked to implement the salary plan.

The president has been contacted by faculty who do not want salary increases if other people in the university will lose their jobs. There are no massive lay-offs necessary to implement the salary plan, since a lot of retirements within the next few years will provide the flexibility for downsizing. Mendel believes that the salary plan is realistic and that the faculty must let the administration and the board know if they think the salary plan is important.

Compared with other regional universities, Western pays the second lowest contribution to health insurance (-$1300.-/year). Kentucky State pays the lowest (-$1200.-/year) and Murray the highest (-$4200.-/year). Mendel will try to bring this issue to the board’s attention.

There is a board meeting scheduled for February 25. The two main issues scheduled are some personnel action with respect to extending the contract of a coach (no name was given) and the adoption of a uniform salary policy which specifies that faculty on soft-money should always get exactly the same salary increase as other faculty at WKU.

Old Business
The motion below was brought to the floor for a second reading.

The Faculty Senate adopts the report of the committee to review Western XXI.

Senator Grice amended the original motion by substituting "accept the report of ... XXI for review" for "adopt the report of ... XXI." The amendment carried. The amended motion passed.

New Business
Senator Leavy put the following motion on the floor for a first reading.

WHEREAS information on the Highest Degree is missing for many faculty in the printout supplied to the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee for use in preparing its annual salary survey for the Faculty Senate;

WHEREAS the Nine Month Equivalent salary of faculty for the prior year in the printout is not systematically updated to reflect all changes in that year (thereby creating some incorrect $ and % change figures);
The Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University requests that the Office of Institutional Research supplies the Computer and Informational Services Office with updated information on the highest degree and revised prior year nine month salaries of faculty to be posted in the printout run-off each fall for the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee of the Senate.

The motion will be up for the second reading at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.

John Bruni raised the question of the role of athletics at WKU. In particular, he was interested in the amount of money spent on scholarships and other supports for athletes in comparison to scholarships for scholarly students and viewing that data in relation to the number of students who benefit from the money. (The amounts are ~1.14 million for about 200 student athletes and ~1.6 million for the 14000 other students.) Maybe the Faculty Senate should pursue this issue in connection with the priorities which are followed at WKU.

Announcements
The next meeting is on March 10, 1994. Nominations for next year’s officers are needed soon.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:33.

Respectfully submitted by Uta Ziegler