Call to Order
The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by chair Marvin Leavy at 3:30 pm. Karen Sansom substituted for Bill Howard and Susan James for William Traugott. Linda Clark, Mary Cobb, Matthew Dettman, Charles Hays, Daniel Jackson, Robert Smith, David Stiles, Wieb Van Der Meer, and Ed Yager were absent without alternates.

Disposition of the Minutes
Minutes from the Nov. 8, 1994, meeting were approved as distributed.

Reports of Faculty Senate Committees

A. Executive Committee (Marvin Leavy)
The Executive Committee met three times during the previous week. The Committee heard a report from Larry Caillouet reviewing the summary of department responses to the President’s Moving to a New Level document (see report from Academic Affairs below). Chair Leavy and Senator Nancy Baird had reviewed a draft of a new edition of the faculty handbook, which was intended to have only changes in style or that were reflections of what has actually been the practice for some time. They reported that there were no substantive changes in the draft.

The Executive Committee has concerns dealing with responsibility and standards of the faculty, apart from mandates from Administration. The Committee feels that the Senate should take initiative in these matters and not just react to outside forces. In this regard:

1) Professional Responsibility and Concerns Committee chair Roy Cabaniss was given a broad mandate to review the entire scope of the faculty evaluation process, in addition to its original charge to look at the effectiveness of student evaluations. The committee will look at such sources as AAUP statements. Although we do not know what will be the elements of the final version of the New Level document, this charge appears to address elements of the document.

2) Vice Chair Larry Snyder will chair an ad hoc committee yet to be named that will address issues of collegiality and professional ethics and responsibility. The committee may adopt a statement or adapt an existing statement concerning both faculty-student and faculty-faculty relationships.

3) Fiscal Affairs Committee chair David Keeling was asked to look at compensation levels for part-time faculty. The committee will consider the effect on the University budget of raising course compensation for at least two grades of part-time faculty. This addresses two top funding priorities as outlined by the Board of Regents: (1) increase spending on instruction, and (2) increase faculty salaries.

B. By-Laws, Amendments, and Election Committee (Joyce Wilder):
The committee is working to develop an up-to-date faculty list to be ready for Senate elections in February.

C. Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee (Marvin Leavy reporting for Roy Cabaniss):
The committee’s mandate for examining evaluation procedures of faculty has been expanded.
D. Faculty Status and Welfare Committee (Eileen Williams):
The dollar figures for faculty salaries should be ready in January.

E. Academic Affairs Committee (Larry Caillouet):
Caillouet reported on the committee’s review of the report from the Hughes Summation Committee, which had the responsibility of summarizing responses to the original Moving to a New Level document. The review committee agreed that the summation of reports that was submitted to Vice President Haynes was substantially in agreement with reports from a lower level. However, the Summation Committee’s report didn’t match well with reports submitted to them with respect to the Community College vs. University College issue; there was not support for a University College at the individual college level until it was supported by Hughes’ committee.

Some of the items mentioned by the Summation Committee’s report were:
- a slower implementation to increase the ACT score for admissions to 20 might be needed to match the KERA and Western XXI schedule; strengthen the Community College for 2-year and technical programs and create a University College for those who don’t meet admission requirements; technology and training should be increased, especially for faculty; provide competitive salaries and more academic support; it’s a good idea to reduce class size when appropriate, but each discipline should decide how best to do that; it is not realistic to expect everyone to be an “excellent” teacher, but it might be more possible for a unit to achieve overall excellence even though some individuals might not excel in every area; both applied and basic research should be encouraged; evaluations should be taken more seriously and go beyond the Purdue system currently in use; the University should reward advising of students; proposals in the Moving to a Higher Level document may require more release time for faculty; new programs should be implemented only when needed, with continued graduate programs; there are problems with the mechanisms for instituting a comprehensive student assessment, and the diploma itself should be a certificate of quality assurance.

Caillouet mentioned that some people have expressed concern about whether this proposal will reduce enrollment. He reminded the Senate that the process is still open without much specification of mechanism, and the Regents are expected to vote on this in January.

F. Fiscal Affairs Committee (David Keeling):
A summary of responses to questions concerning the WKU Foundation has been distributed. The committee will remain vigilant and continue the dialogue and oversight as more data becomes available, trying to satisfy concerns immediately as they arise.

G. Senate Communications Committee (Bart White):
Everyone should have received two issues of the newsletter.

Report of Faculty Regent (Ray Mendel):
There has been no meeting of the Board of Regents since the last Senate meeting. Regent Mendel addressed some issues about the WKU Foundation. Although the purpose of the Foundation is noble and necessary, he had two concerns related to the Foundation:
(1) Although most money raised by the Foundation is restricted, fees will be set by the Foundation and are not restricted. Since the Foundation will govern the use of this money, it should make full disclosures about how this money is spent.
(2) Mendel prefers that the Foundation not have any employees; people working for the Foundation should be employees of the University, so
there should be little overhead for the Foundation.
The Budget Committee has met only once this year, when it approved a set of priorities. The real work of the committee has not yet been addressed.

President Meredith has said that a revolution has occurred and that decision-making has been pushed down to the department level. It would be a good idea to submit a list of topics that we think should be up to the department to administer.

Report of COSFL Representative (Charles Bussey):

COSFL members were concerned with administrative bloat. Senator Bussey was surprised how hostile COSFL was to Gary Cox and the Council on Higher Education. They felt that Cox was talking with university presidents to learn what the universities needed but was not in touch with faculty. They will probably discuss the legislative session at their next meeting.

Old Business There was no old business.

New Business

A. The first order of new business dealt with the Faculty Senate's deliberations concerning the Moving to a New Level document. No final document was available for the Senate to examine, but comments were invited.

Larry Caillouet moved that the Senate go into informal discussion; seconded and passed.

Caillouet said that many have questioned what raising admission standards will do to enrollment. A University College which would admit those students who don't meet the standard would address that issue. Another point of view is that raising the standards could actually prevent a decrease in enrollment, because there wouldn't be as many poor students to drag down the majority.

The Senate then returned to formal session.

Dorsey Grice made a motion concerning the WKU foundation (stated below). The motion was seconded and accepted as a first reading.

B. There was no other new business.

Announcements and adjournment

In reference to a comment in the Herald, Leavy said that he had no problem with evaluations being made public if and when he taught classes, but this is his opinion personally and he can accept that others have different opinions.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Resolution submitted (first reading):

We wish to express our appreciation to the Board of Regents and others who have established a foundation to raise funds for the University.

We are concerned that the independence of the WKU Foundation does not offer sufficient control over the expenditures of discretionary funds.

We urge the Foundation to adopt a policy of full disclosure of all expenditure and we ask the Board to further encourage such a policy.

Respectfully submitted by Sylvia Clark Pulliam