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It was decided by the committee conducting the self study that only the following standards were applicable to the Senate:

Standard 1, Purpose
Standard 2, Organization and Administration
Standard 4, Financial Resources
Standard 8, Physical Facilities

As it should, the Southern Association Self Study process is designed to result in the identification of weaknesses that obstruct the total achievement of an organization's stated purpose. Thus the results of this self study tend to concentrate on perceived weaknesses rather than strengths. Aware of this fact, the self study committee wishes to make specific note of positive features of the Senate:

1. Since its inception, the Senate has functioned well and provided a forum for the expression of faculty concerns that did not exist before.

2. In the main, the deliberations of the Senate have been conducted in a reasonable and responsible manner resulting in a responsible image for the organization.

3. Many members of the Senate have been conscientious in meeting their responsibilities and have devoted hours to the work of this organization.

4. Most studies conducted by the Senate have been both thorough and accurate, resulting in a reputation of credibility.
Standard One: PURPOSE

The statement of purpose of the Faculty Senate was developed in 1976 by a University-wide committee and is contained in the Senate constitution as adopted by the University Board of Regents:

FACULTY SENATE CONSTITUTION
WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Preamble

The Faculty Senate at Western Kentucky University is an elected body of representatives from the faculty whose functions are to provide a forum for the concerns and interests of the University-wide faculty community, to furnish advice and recommendations with reference to policies that pertain to the faculty and to make available to the University the expertise of the faculty on appropriate matters.

1. Functions of the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate functions as an official representative voice of the faculty on any University policies which the President may refer to it for consideration and opinion, or which it determines should be brought to the attention of the President, or to the Board of Regents through the President.

It makes recommendations to the Academic Council on academic policies and programs.

It may, upon request, or upon its own initiative, furnish advice and recommendations on policies and procedures, such as those relating to:

b. Salary, workload, working conditions, summer teaching employment, patent policy, copyright policy, awarding of University research grants, and recognition and publication of scholarly or creative work.

c. Retirement programs, insurance plans, sick leave, and other business issues which concern the faculty.

d. Planning and maintenance of physical facilities when these may affect the attainment of the educational objectives of the University.

e. Faculty responsibilities, privileges, grievances, sabbatical leaves, leaves of absence, travel expenses for professional conventions and programs, off-campus instruction and service, consulting, and academic freedom.

f. Long range planning of institutional goals and priorities as related to the function of the Senate.

The Faculty Senate may advise the Board of Regents, in the event of a vacancy or an announced impending vacancy of the Office of President, on qualifications for the Office of President and the policies concerning faculty involvement in the filling of the office.

II. Coordination of the Academic Council and the Faculty Senate

Each body is dominant in its stated functions and it is the duty of each to report its recommendations to the President and to the Board of Regents through the President.

Two general observations about this statement of purpose are:

1. The function of the Senate is strictly advisory and, beyond the conduct of its own affairs, it is without authority.

2. The stated purpose is very broad and permits the Senate to concern itself with every University activity and to give advice and make recommendations to anyone it deems appropriate.

It appears that the purpose of the Senate is clearly defined and readily available.

In an effort to ascertain some faculty attitudes and perceptions regarding the Senate, the evaluation committee distributed a questionnaire. (See Appendix A.) From the persons holding rank, the committee received two hundred six (206) responses. This is a return percent of thirty-four (34%). In the questionnaire, faculty members were asked if they felt the statement
of purpose in the constitution expressed the appropriate purpose of a faculty senate.

Twenty-nine percent (29%) strongly agreed with the statement of purpose and sixty-two percent (62%) agreed. Thus ninety-one percent (91%) of those who responded were in agreement with the stated purpose of the Senate, five percent (5%) were in disagreement.

It would thus seem, at least among the questionnaire respondents, that the general statement of purpose is consonant with the views of the faculty.

To further ascertain faculty attitude regarding the purpose of the senate, questions were asked to indicate the degree of agreement they felt regarding the appropriateness of each of the following functions of the Senate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION DEALING WITH:</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>UNDECIDED</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducting elections</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty status and welfare</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional responsibilities and concerns</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional goals and planning</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal affairs</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic affairs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending committee appointments</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of respondents thought that each of the specific activities constituted an appropriate function of the Senate and in most instances the agreement was overwhelming.

There was little disagreement with any of the functions, with "dealing with fiscal affairs" of the University being the only activity about which there appeared any doubts of consequence.

Of those who responded to the questionnaire, seventy-two percent said they were familiar with the purpose of the Senate. Thus, from the foregoing it appears safe to conclude that they are aware of the stated function of the Senate and are in accord with it.

There is no specific structured process through which the Senate periodically examines its purpose.

The committee used two approaches to try to ascertain the extent to which the purpose is presently being realized. First, the committee asked the current Executive Committee of
the Senate to review the activities of the Senate in its six years of existence and provide the following information:

1. A listing of the studies that have been made and the reports that have been adopted during this period.

2. A listing of specific changes that have occurred as a direct result of these studies and reports.

3. A listing of other specific and concrete accomplishments that can be directly attributed to Senate activity.

(See Appendix B.)

Review of the information furnished by the Senate Executive Committee led to the following conclusions:

1. There have been a number of changes in the University that are the direct result of Senate action.

2. There have been a number of changes in the University that may in part be due to Senate action.

3. There have been a substantial number of Senate studies and reports that have resulted in no observable action.

The second approach the committee employed to determine the extent to which the Senate is felt to be fulfilling its purpose was the questionnaire. Three questions dealt with general perceptions regarding Senate effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>% RESPONSE</th>
<th>UNDECIDED</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I perceive the Faculty Senate is accomplishing its stated purpose effectively</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall the Faculty Senate performs a significant function at WKU</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the Senate is representing me effectively</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition the questionnaire asked respondents to list the degree of agreement they felt regarding how well the Senate was accomplishing each of the following specific functions:
FUNCTION DEALING WITH | AGREE | % OF RESPONSE | UNDECIDED | DISAGREE
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Conducting elections | 88 | 10 | 4
Faculty statute and welfare | 56 | 29 | 15
Professional responsibilities and concerns | 52 | 31 | 17
Institutional goals and planning | 43 | 37 | 20
Fiscal affairs | 31 | 43 | 20
Academic affairs | 47 | 38 | 15
Committee appointments | 66 | 27 | 7

From the foregoing it seems evident that the Senate has a problem. A substantial percentage of the respondents have questions regarding the extent to which the Senate is fulfilling its purpose. Regarding some functions, not even a majority of the respondents perceived the Senate as being effective. Since seventy-six percent (76%) of the respondents felt they were adequately informed about Senate activities and eighty-four percent (84%) viewed the Newsletter as a valuable source of information, a lack of information will not serve as an adequate explanation for these attitudes among the respondents.

It is pointless to speculate as to the reasons why so few faculty members sent in their questionnaires. And, of course, there is no legitimacy in speculating as to what the responses might have been on unreceived questionnaires. Even so, when you couple the questionnaire results with the very poor percentage of questionnaire return—a response that bodes ill for the Senate, regardless of the reason—you have an organization confronted with serious problems.

It can be concluded that the Senate has two easily discernible observations regarding the fulfillment of its purpose:

1. The Senate has not been as action oriented as the questionnaire respondents feel it should have been. Among some of those who are knowledgeable about Senate activity there appears to be a question regarding the quality of performance.

2. The faculty apparently is not fully aware of the quantity of Senate activity that has occurred.
PROJECTIONS

This study has revealed that although it is seen to have a worthwhile purpose, the Senate is not perceived to be a very effective organization. Despite the fact that in large measure those who returned the questionnaire said they were informed about Senate activities, substantial portions of the faculty appear to be unaware of those things the Senate Executive Committee feels have been accomplished.

Review of the written comments of the questionnaire reveals a frequent theme centering around the idea that the Senate is an unimportant debating society.

In the light of this study the Senate resolves to:

1. Study in depth the results of the questionnaire with particular reference to the written comments.
2. Through follow-up activity, seek to ascertain the reasons why there was such a poor return on the questionnaire.
3. Establish a practice of requiring that studies and reports contain specific recommendations for action to be taken.
4. Establish a system through which recommended Senate action is monitored.
5. Establish a practice of periodically reporting accomplishments of the Senate to the faculty.
6. Examine the structure and procedure of the Senate to determine what things have created the impression among some that it is unduly influenced by the University administration.
7. Establish a practice of asking the faculty to evaluate the Senate every three years.
8. Examine the present attitude of faculty to ascertain if it is feasible for the Senate to become a more assertive body.
9. Take steps to eliminate the apparent confusion about the differing roles of the Senate and the Academic Council.
The question of merit pay

1. Do administrators and quasi administrators benefit more from
   this than faculty members.

2. More emphasis on faculty welfare, salary benefits and watching
   university budget-spending.

3. Survey faculty more on affairs.

The entity to act as a direct representative of the faculty to the Board of Regents.

Administrative officials should address the Senate Ex-Officio.
For the sake of the appearance of independence, the Senate should
ask the President and Vice President to refrain from attending
Senate meetings. The Senate should be an INDEPENDENT BODY; should
address the Board of Regents as an INDEPENDENT BODY.

With the President or Vice President of Academic Affairs present
at Senate meetings I don't believe individuals without tenure
would have the freedom to say statements contrary to current of-
official policy. I believe the openness of the Senate is jeopardized
and the Senate appears to have become a timid body, one which does
a lot of paperwork (like this self-study) which simply gets filed.
(Do you know anyone who has had their salary readjusted due to the
Senate report on salaries which had inequities obvious to any
reader???) - ignorance was bliss

1. To make all intercollegiate athletics self-supporting.
2. To cut back the administrative faculty by at least 50%-75%.
3. To obtain permission to become more than an advisory group.
   To become a legislative group like the Academic Council,
   but to function in administrative matters as well as academic
   matters-and to acquire the power to override presidential veto.

Teaching load is still out of step (too high) with universities of
high calibre.

The problem with the Senate is that it is just a debating society
with little real power.

If the committees are doing the work assigned to them--What more
can we ask?
Drop-Add: ideas and procedure
Preregistration problems
Department heads (administrative voice) and elected chairpersons.

Who gets merit pay? What criteria are used for merit pay?

The matter of the abundance of administrators at WKU needs to be addressed. It would seem most appropriate to do this in these days of economic uncertainty... and potential drop in enrollments. It would seem that we could function more effectively with at least 1/3 less administrators and this money could be used advantageously for salary increases for the all-important classroom teachers (instructors, assistant professors, especially)

Currently insurance concerns--high rate for BC-BS for WKU employees

1. I believe that the Senate should address the dismissal of competent contingency faculty and really determine the why of such dismissals.
2. The selection/appointment of upper level academic administrators
3. The inordinate power resting in the Deans of Colleges.

Fringe benefits that do not cost us.

It would be interesting to have the Senate identify, rate, and comment on their accomplishments over the years of their inception as they relate to the objectives stated on the preceding page. About all I get is a series of committee reports presented in the newsletter along with a lot of 'busy' work reports. What is being accomplished?

Over the last few years, there have been several opportunities that allowed the Faculty Senate to make Western a better University... but the Senate failed! Why was there not a better response to the refusal of a department to allow "The World...Garp" to be performed? The FS did not support academic freedom. The FS failed miserably with the Rank and Promotion document... the faculty looked like a bunch of "wimps". Why does the FS not openly and strongly support research and productive activity for the 'professional' core of the Faculty? It has become a body that speaks for the weaker and less professional portion of the Faculty... and more like a Faculty House social group. I am disappointed!!!

Ways to improve the quality of instruction and both the quality and quantity of faculty research.

I lost all respect for the Senate's "effectiveness" last year when without even a whimper the entire Senate sat passively while members
of the faculty were summarily dismissed. Even a vote of sympathy was withheld - much less support, concern, or inquiry. I wonder how effectively these dismissed faculty members feel the Senate represented them and their concerns.

Senate is extremely ineffectual and by in large has alienated the faculty ego - faculty passiveness!

I am not a Maslow fan, but how about a focus on the PHYSICAL needs of the faculty, before we work on prestige, money, etc? How can we work in offices that are too cold, too hot? I cannot believe that there is not the technology available to have a comfortable temperature in classrooms and offices. If it can be done in the administration building and some classroom buildings, it could also be done in Cherry Hall, Thompson Complex, and Grise Hall! If the Senate is really interested in the committee structure of the university and making recommendations for persons to serve on committees, then why are the same people serving over and over on different committees? It seems to me that we penalize good committee workers by putting them on additional committees, while the great majority of faculty are not doing their "fair share" of committee work.

One additional service that the senate could perform is at the beginning of each academic year, to publish a list of all committees in the university (university-wide level through college level --not departmental committees necessarily) and their membership. If some of the committees are "secret" then the name of the committee should be published with the statement "membership is secret." It would surely be nice to know who serves on what committees.

While it is good that the Faculty Senate serves as sort of "watch dog" over the Administration the Senate could do more in helping the Administration hold faculty accountable for truly outstanding teaching, research and student advisement. The Faculty Senate should be the Faculty's own worst critic. In times of crisis in terms of funding the Faculty Senate should take the leadership in not only being critical of unneeded administrative overhead but also being supportive of seeing that a quality faculty is retained.

Whether to do away with Faculty Senate

Now that we don't spend as much time apologizing for Tom Jones, we ought to be able to address more significant problems.
1. Grading System (don't like A, B, C, D, F system; prefer to add +/- to the letter grade).
2. PRC needs to do something to expose faculty members who give WKU a bad name; don't want a witch hunt, but I do want real quality and in some cases retraining.

Re-change of the Grade Policy - Let's see what happens this semester. If there is a significant reduction in the number of grade changes,
then the "new policy" was needed.

Grade inflation. If it can't deal with this, it will have trouble dealing with any academic matter of substance.

Push the Salary inequities - issue further
More faculty input into policy making up and down the line (from selective admissions to insurance)

Faculty salaries

Campus parking problems.

The Faculty Senate too often functions as a rubber stamp or adversary after the administration has decided upon a course of action.

Salaries, Faculty parking, Job sharing, Flex time

Faculty parking; higher salaries for instructors and assistant professors (those at the lower end of pay scale); sabbatical for librarian; job sharing; flex time; day care center ON CAMPUS.

Inequities in the salary structure (there should be less reliance on the "marketplace"; the concept of equitable compensation for similar duties has not been given enough consideration)

Grievance Procedure - the newly adopted one is much too weak; in matters of promotion is nonexistent. There should exist some way for faculty members to find redress for unfair, arbitrary or biased treatment.

Guidelines for granting of tenure

Athletic program and budget, course numbering, budget crisis planning

I know very little about it.

Quality of instruction, Duplication of effort (courses, administrative), Student advisement (the lack of...)

Faculty benefits--health insurance--how it is changed and the faculty use of its health insurance--other types of fringe benefits that can be offered.

Graduation placed on Sundays,
Faculty Senate does not make policy. They need to concern themselves with classroom activities and environments. Scheduling reports through-
out the University would be helpful. Most reports are requested with limited time to make decisions and accumulate information. Would be helpful to know the dates certain reports are due and when each dept. should have this information ready for pyramiding to the top administration. School calendars should be improved.

Administrator evaluations, Re-evaluation of processes of selection of senators and senate membership.

1. Greater direct faculty participation in academic institutional
   make up.
2. Limitation of final administrator's authority over academic
decisions.
3. Providing checks and balances upon administrators' arbitrariness.
4. Providing effective machinery for appeals as to administrative
decisions or evaluations, salary, promotions, tenure, etc.
5. Providing for implementation of stated procedures as to adminis-
   trative review of department heads' decisions (by deans, v.p.,
etc.)

Whether grown persons should refer to one another as "Senator."
Whether it is willing to give independent advice, even though it
many anticipate it will be displeasing to the administration.

1. Delineation of responsibilities between senate vs U. officers,
   U. committees, Academic Council, etc. Unclear.
2. Senate can be and is out-manuvered and sometimes senate president
   is intimidated . .
3. Must watch "Sweetheart" relations between senate officers (esp.
   Pres.) and Administration . .
4. Some Senators get off their ego trips in meetings . . .This has
   improved.

1. Only faculty member should have any control over grades.
2. Enhanced mission and role for WKU in Kentucky's future.

Public Relations between faculty and general public
Relations between faculty and student body

Too much Senate time devoted to topics we have hired administrators
to handle.
Techniques of removing some non-teaching tasks from teaching faculty.
Methods of improving communication from top administration to
teaching faculty.
I think Faculty Senate has become involved with too many projects and/or studies - especially in past years. This detracted from very important issues to which a lot of attention should have been devoted. Examples are the reduction in library budgets, recommendations for admissions, and the faculty tenure policy which did not receive the support and effort they should have received from the entire Faculty Senate.

I'm glad to see concern about the following:
A. Change of grade policy without consultation
B. Changes in BC/BS without faculty input
Note: In both there was little or no faculty input. Especially B should get even more serious consideration!

I don't believe the Senate should become involved with approving courses and programs, but it should be concerned with academic policies. Senate should press for more open institutional planning where more people are involved in setting priorities and direction for the University.

The manner and extent to which the University Administration engages in money-raising activities both on and off the University premises -- also how the money raised is being used.

1. The question of criteria for promotion and tenure - effective date vs retroactive policy!
2. Require vote of confidence for department head periodically. At least conduct a survey on this important matter with entire faculty!
3. Nonexistent faculty grievance input where all grievances are addressed rather than ignored by the administration as is presently the case! These are but a few of my concerns! ! !

1. More direct involvement on the part of the senate in areas of academic excellence - including expenditure of funds earmarked for these activities.
2. More vocal representation of faculty concerns regarding working environment - including fringe benefits, etc. Specifically in the areas of Insurance, Tuition, Rebates, etc.

Insurance (Life) too high

Chairperson of department terms of 3 or 4 years with individual continuing a maximum of three consecutive terms.

Continue to pursue salaries - to be more equitable with other universities.
1. Faculty work load equitability - does this come under faculty status and welfare?
2. Faculty evaluation - especially the format being used by Ogden College.

Low morale; A feeling of having to compete with researchers, authors etc. and not being recognized as effective teachers.

A four-year limit on term of service of faculty regent

1. See to the abolishment of the change-of-grade policy.
2. See to it that mid-term deficiency reports are called for at mid-term instead of 1 1/2 weeks early as they were in this semester.
3. Work toward the establishment of a university-wide attendance policy. The current non-policy is discriminatory toward students in that each student must conform to five or six different teachers' attendance policies. And certainly we must have such policies.
4. See to the re-institution of the evaluation of administrators by the faculty.

The chief problem with the Faculty Senate is that it is too bureaucratic. It has hamstrung itself with its ineffective network of committees. The Senate seems also to sit around waiting for the President or some other administrative person to ask its advice; meanwhile, the faculty is being hindered by decisions such as those listed in items 1 and 2 above.

I am convinced that unless the Senate begins to initiate actions which will protect the faculty both from needlessly restrictive policies from the Administration and from policies which placate students, we would do just as well without the Senate.

Anything at all touching those most important folk at a university, the faculty.

My only complaint with the Senate is the lack of area publicity for Senate doings: if you ask news media to come to meetings of the largest deliberative body in Western Kentucky, they will come.

Possibility of continuing our life insurance policies after retirement.

I wish the Senate would be much much more aggressive in attempting to meet faculty needs and concerns. Rather than act, the Senate tends to react or do nothing at all.

I strongly support the concept of a faculty senate, and believe that the majority of individuals who have served on the senate are sincere, committed and hard-working. The problem is not with the
organization or make-up of the senate, but rather with inability to bring any clout to its decisions. Questions relating to salary inequities, grievance procedures, etc., may be pursued by the senate, but their recommendations do not appear to yield a great deal of influence. This problem is perhaps exacerbated by the existence of other university committees and councils dealing with the same questions.

I wish that we could keep some financial matters from slipping through the cracks such as the medical insurance change. The changes made were obviously intended to keep the family membership charges paid by the faculty member low at the expense of individual coverage for all -- The single person was cheated (as he usually is). I shouldn't have to pay to keep family costs low.

Benefits, Parking

The categories are so broad as to be universal. However, somewhere in them I would like to see annual physical exams in our insurance; more accessible facilities in the faculty house; and a steam room.

Summer stipend
Extended campus stipend
Travel expense: extended campus and professional meetings

Abolishing tenure
In order to prepare the Faculty Senate's report for the Southern Association, we need some information from faculty members. Will you please complete this questionnaire and return it to your representative within two days after receipt.

According to the constitution, the purpose of the Faculty Senate is:

Faculty Senate at Western Kentucky University is an elected body of representatives from the faculty whose functions are to provide a forum for the concerns and interests of the university-wide faculty community, to furnish advice and recommendations with reference to policies that pertain to faculty and to make available to the University the expertise of the faculty on appropriate matters. The Faculty Senate functions as an official representative voice of the faculty on any university-policies which the President may refer to it for consideration and opinion, or which it determines should be brought to the attention of the President, or to the Board of Regents through the Senate.

**INDICATE THE RESPONSE THAT MOST NEARLY REPRESENTS YOUR OPINION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Response - 206</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>undecided</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think the above statement expresses the appropriate purpose of a faculty senate.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I perceive the Faculty Senate is accomplishing its stated purpose effectively.</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall the Faculty Senate performs a significant function at WKU.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the Senate is representing me effectively.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am adequately informed about Senate activities by my representative(s).</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Newsletter is a valuable source of information for me.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed below are some areas of concern of the Faculty Senate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducting elections</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing with matters of faculty status and welfare</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing with professional responsibilities and concerns</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing with institutional goals and planning</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing with fiscal affairs</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing with academic affairs</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommending committee appointments</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommending committee appointments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommending committee appointments</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommending committee appointments</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommending committee appointments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B -- LISTING BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Faculty Senate--From the beginning to 8-77

Studies, Reports, Changes Resulting:

February 10, 1977

J. David Cole, Chair, Board of Regents, spoke. This response to the Senate established relations with the Board. Regents do often recognize that faculty have ideas, suggestions, proposals which contribute to the growth of the University.

April 14, 1977

Jody Richards met with the Executive Committee to discuss teacher retirement systems and the prospect of making our contributions more equitable with U. K, even though U. K. is under a difficult system. A heavy lobbying effort in 1978 through COSFL helped initiate increase in the state's contribution to our retirement, thus increasing our take-home pay.

Senator Shadowen moved that the Faculty Senate inform the President of its desire to participate in an advisory capacity in administrator selections. This motion was in anticipation of the faculty involvement on search committees formed to select candidates for Vice-presidential vacancies, deans of Ogden, Potter, Business Colleges, University President and Director of Development.

May 12, 1977

The Executive Committee reported that President Downing did not approve a three-hour load reduction for a Faculty Regent. So far, no faculty regents in the state have this reduction, and there does exist an attorney general's opinion on the matter.

Studies and Reports

October, 1977

Proposed grievance procedure distributed and discussed. No action taken until later date: different version implemented.
November 1977

Proposal on "fair dismissal" referred to FSW.

Adopted proposal for evaluation of administrators.

Report from Bill Biven on faculty liability.

Proposed change in KRS to allow "Instructors" to vote in Regents election.

December 1977

Report from FSW subcommittee on promotion and tenure (Krenzin)

Report on educational income and expenditures for WKU for 1975-76 and budgeted 1977-78.

Two constitutional amendments (elections).

March 1978

Administrative Structure ad hoc committee studied growth of administrative structure.

April 1978

Administrator evaluation conducted.

PRC (Petersen) to study consulting and outside activity.

FA met with Harry Largen to discuss CPHE and legislative effects on WKU budget.

FA began major study of budget and how budget priorities are set.

May 1978

Report on administrative structure (size, duplication, etc.).

Included, in part, in financial exigency procedure document currently with President Zacharias.

Evaluation of administrators, see April 1978.

No official action taken; several faculty members now carry liability insurance on their own.

Possible topic to pursue again in the upcoming legislative year.


Informational.

Continued growth and reflective of changing needs.

Informational.

Informational.

Informational.
Executive Committee had question and answer session with Jody Richards on retirement equity.

Worked with ASG on student evaluation of faculty.

August 1978

Representatives from state-assisted universities (except U. of Louisville) met during summer.

Work with ASG in organizing forum for gubernatorial candidates.

Proposed study of summer stipends at WKU in relation to other state-assisted universities.

September 1978 - May 1979

Presidential Selection Committee Studied (Sept. 1978).

First Faculty Senate NEWSLETTER (October 1978).


Summer School Stipends (Oct. 1978).

Faculty Senate agreed to work with ASG to develop instrument for student evaluation of faculty (Nov. 1978).

Cost of Administration and Instruction at the College and Department Levels (FAC 001.1 12/14/78-43po45)

Salary Information for WKU faculty in comparison with the Consumer Price Index (FSW 002.1-report).

Committee's progress in dealing with rank and promotion policies (FSW 001.1-preliminary report).

Continued close relationship with Legislators.

Senate prepared groundwork; administration followed through with current evaluation procedure.

Beginning of COSFL; became a unified "power" organization, especially for dealing with the CHE.

Forum took place and was well attended.

Increase came about.

Faculty involved in planning and search for president-- included input on committee composition, qualifications of candidate, and nature of the search.

Currently used to keep faculty informed of activities.

Unified effort of Senates at Kentucky's universities, presently active.

Purdue instrument was later adopted and is currently being used.

Distributed to faculty.

Distributed to faculty.

Action taken in 1982
Net faculty income vis-a-vis the cost of living increase from 1970-present (FSW 002.1-007.1-study)

Recruitment and retention: A survey of suggestions (IGP 002.1 2/8/79-study)

Sept. 10, 1979
Presented report on recruitment and retention - a survey of suggestions.

Oct. 11, 1979
Met with Earl Wassom, Director of the Library so that he could explain his action of cancellation of more than $30,000 worth of library journals without consulting the academic departments affected.

Created an ad hoc committee on faculty relations.

Nov. 8, 1979
Created the committee of university committees.

Changed the Communications Committee from an ad hoc to a standing committee.

Passed a motion creating a university ombudsman.

Jan. 17, 1980
Appointed an ad hoc committee to evaluate the Senate.

Feb. 4, 1980
Voted to circulate a petition among all faculty urging the Governor, Secretary of Finance, and members of the General Assembly to adopt the salary increases recommended by CHE.

Senators filled out evaluation forms on Senate.

Feb. 14, 1980
The Fiscal Affairs Committee brought in competing insurance companies to explain their offerings.

Distributed to faculty

Informational

Academic departments have had a strong voice in library decisions since that date.

Faculty-student discussions and departmental socials grew out of its recommendations.

After a slow start, it became a very active committee.

The President chose not to carry out this request.

This appears to have been used by the Executive Committee only.

The faculty received across-the-board salary increases of 9%.

Blue Cross-Blue Shield cancelled its planned rate hike.
March 13, 1980

Salary study was presented

Report from the Academic Affairs Committee who had provided a forum for Dr. James Pearse and Dr. Regis O'Connor to present their views on whether or not the academic freedom of Dr. Pearse had been denied.

April 10, 1980

Report on University Revenues and expenditures.

Addendum to recent salary study.

Distributed questionnaire on experience credit and academic credit.

May 8, 1980

Passed a policy on rank and promotion.

Passed a resolution to drop upper level hours required for graduation from 54 to 42.

Report on cost of instruction per college.

Conducted an administrator evaluation.

Sept. 11, 1980

Conducted election of Faculty Regent

Oct. 9, 1980

Committee appointed by Senate Chair to serve as an Advisory Committee on the awarding of Honorary Degrees - committee recommended extremely conservative behavior in awarding honorary degrees.

Nov. 13, 1980

Investigation of Dental Insurance

Informational

(Academic Affairs Committee determined that Dr. Pearse's academic freedom had not been denied.)

Informational

Informational

Information gained was used for a later proposal.

Informational

Council on Academic Deans made a different proposal and neither was accepted by the President.

Subsequently passed by Academic Council.

Informational

Some changes in personnel followed.

A valid and fair election

2 honorary degrees have been awarded.

No recommendation because of the cost.
Dec. 11, 1980

Request for a change in the catalog which would insure that students could be guaranteed graduation if they meet requirements on the undergraduate degree program, even though program changes are made by the University subsequent to the date of filing.

Feb. 1, 1981

Developed an 8-point plan for the faculty to involve themselves in seeking adequate funding for higher education.

March 5, 1981

Report on trends on faculty salary. Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee was directed to provide a forum for any faculty member with a written grievance who has exhausted the normal channels for resolving grievances.

April 2, 1981

Ad hoc Faculty/Student Relations Committee requested faculty members to serve as sponsors for incoming freshmen.

Requested the President to make greater use of Committee on University Committees to nominate faculty to serve on university-wide committees.

Requested that Communications Committee monitor area media for errors in reporting of items concerning WKU.

New catalog has not been printed. The change will appear in the new catalog.

Kept hinges squeaking.

A better informed faculty.

No grievances have been heard.

2 faculty members volunteered.

President requested all vice presidents to make use of this committee, and requests for nominations increased.

This has not been done.
Sept. 10, 1981

Moved to support the concept of minimum academic standards for admission to the University.

Oct. 8, 1981

Presented report on unfilled faculty and staff positions resulting from budget cuts.

Motion passed to ask the President to postpone taking the internal and external University consulting policy to the Board or else to express the Senate's disapproval.

Same action on the Rank and Promotion Requirements document.

Oct. 30, 1981

Met with ASG to consider a petition to CHE requesting that everything possible be done to restore higher education budgets to workable level.

Nov. 12, 1981

Established an Ad Hoc Political Action Committee.

Moved to work with A.S.G. and prepare and distribute an informational packet about the financial status of the University.

Dec. 10, 1981

Passed University Consulting Policies and Rank and Promotion Requirements.

Moved to cooperate with A.S.G. in having an A.S.G./Senate reception.

Moved to ask President to form a committee to determine procedures to be used in terminating faculty in case of financial exigency.

Jan. 14, 1982

Faculty Grievance Procedure passed.

April 8, 1982

Presented a report on Individual Salaries by Rank at WKU.

Gave a report on employment classification at WKU.

Will go into effect Fall, 1983.

President did this (postponed).

President did this (postponed).

Petition was delivered to Harry Schneider.

Distributed 8,000.

Both have been put into action.

Occurred on April 7.

Committee was formed and has produced a document which is being reviewed by the President.

This has been approved by the Board of Regents and is now part of the Faculty Handbook.

President asked Dr. Davis to study the report. At the Board meeting, several salaries were increased as a result.

Informational.
April 29, 1982
Received a report -- Analyses of Salaries at WKU.

Sept. 9, 1982
Faculty urged to participate in the Phonothon.

Moved to participate in National Higher Education Week by opening classes to visitors.

Received a report on Trends in Faculty Salaries.

Oct. 14, 1982
Announced an extension in the deadlines for the self-study.

Moved to have the Academic Affairs Committee of the Senate study the change-of-grade policy.

Moved to request that faculty be notified and that there be open hearings when changes are being made in the insurance coverage.
III. Organization

A. Composition

1. The term faculty for the purposes herein is defined as persons in the full-time employ of the university who hold faculty rank and who satisfy at least three-fourths of their contractual obligation in teaching, research, public service, and/or other non-administrative assignments.

The term college as used herein is defined as the undergraduate colleges and the area of Academic Services.

2. The Faculty Senate shall be composed of members elected by and from the faculty, with the President of the University and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs or designated alternates serving as ex-officio, non-voting members. The Faculty Regent, unless already an elected member of the Senate, shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Senate.

3. Each department is entitled to one senator who shall be elected by secret ballot by the faculty of that department; each college may also be entitled to at-large senators. The total number of senators (departmental senators plus at-large senators) to which each college is entitled is that number which will make up a delegation equal to 10 percent (rounded to the nearest whole number) of the college's total faculty as previously defined. The at-large representation of each college therefore may vary, and the number shall be determined and adjusted in accordance with the number of qualified faculty members listed on the official Senate roster prepared during the fall of the academic year during which the elections occur. No department shall have more than one at-large senator until all departments in the college have at least one senator serving in an at-large capacity.

4. Term of office: Each elected member shall serve for a term of two years and shall be eligible for reelection for a second consecutive term but ineligible for further reelection until one year has elapsed. Elections to fill vacancies shall be for the unexpired term.

B. Officers

1. The Faculty Senate shall have a chairperson, vice-chairperson, secretary-treasurer, and parliamentarian.

2. The officers of the Faculty Senate shall serve in their respective positions for a period of one year, or until a successor is elected. They shall be eligible for reelection.

3. The terms of the chairperson, vice-chairperson, secretary-treasurer, and parliamentarians shall begin with their election at the regular May meeting of the Faculty Senate.
C. Elections

1. Elections for the first Faculty Senate shall be conducted by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Council at such dates as may be appropriate for the first election. All subsequent elections of new members of the Faculty Senate shall be conducted under the supervision of the By-Laws, Amendments and Elections Committee.

2. Members of the Faculty Senate are to be elected during the third and fourth weeks in February and shall be chosen as follows:

   a. Departmental elections: During the third week in February the faculty in each department shall elect by secret ballot one representative to the Faculty Senate.

   b. At-Large elections: During the first week in February the By-Laws, Amendments and Elections Committee will inform each college in writing of the number of at-large senators to which the college is entitled. Each of the aforementioned colleges shall elect at-large senators during the fourth week of February by secret ballot.

3. Elections of Officers, the Executive Committee, and the Standing Committees

   a. Elections of Committees: During the week following the election of the at-large senators (exclusive of vacations), the out-going member of the By-Laws, Amendments and Elections Committee from each college shall call a caucus of the senators from that college who will be serving during the forthcoming year, together with the out-going senators from that college.

   The purpose of this caucus is three-fold:

   i) The current members of the Senate shall provide the newly-elected members with a brief orientation to the Faculty Senate.

   ii) The current members of the Senate shall provide a description of the duties and responsibilities of each of the standing committees.

   iii) The senators who will be serving during the forthcoming year shall elect from their number one senator to serve on each of the standing committees, commencing with the May meeting of the Faculty Senate.

   b. Election of the Officers of the Faculty Senate: At the May meeting of the Faculty Senate, the senators who will be serving during the forthcoming year shall elect by secret ballot one from their number to serve as chairperson of the Faculty Senate, one to serve as vice-chairperson, one to serve as secretary-treasurer, and one to serve as parliamentarian. Election to office shall be by a majority of those present and voting.

   c. Elections of Committee Chairpersons: At the same May meeting of the Faculty Senate, each of the standing committees which will be serving during the forthcoming year shall caucus and elect a chairperson from its membership.
4. Vacancies in the Senate: Departmental vacancies in the Faculty Senate occurring during the academic year shall be filled by new elections within three weeks of the vacancy. Departmental vacancies occurring during the summer term will be filled by new elections within three weeks of the beginning of the next fall semester. Vacancies in at-large delegations shall be filled by the individual receiving the next highest vote in the at-large election of the college in which the vacancy occurred. In the event no individual on the ballot is eligible under these provisions, a special election shall be held in that college.

D. Meetings and Rules of Procedure

1. The Faculty Senate shall meet once each month during the school year unless the frequency of meetings is changed by a vote of the Senate. The date, time, and place of the meetings are to be determined by the Executive Committee.

2. No regular meeting of the Faculty Senate shall be held unless an agenda prepared by the Executive Committee is distributed to all members of the Senate at least four school days prior to the meeting.

3. Special meetings may be called by the chairperson with the concurrence of the majority of the voting members of the Executive Committee. Such meetings must also be called by the chairperson upon written request of at least ten members of the Faculty Senate.

4. The Executive Committee shall appoint a temporary chairperson should neither the chairperson nor vice-chairperson be able to attend any Faculty Senate meeting.

5. A quorum for the Faculty Senate shall be a majority of the Senate membership.

6. The right to vote shall be vested in the members of the Senate.

7. The Faculty Senate shall adopt rules for the conduct of its business. In the absence of any special rules of order which the Senate may adopt, Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure shall govern the conduct of the meetings.

E. Committees

1. Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall be composed of the chairperson of the Faculty Senate and one senator from each college. The vice-chairperson, the secretary, and the parliamentarian shall sit ex-officio and non-voting. The chairperson of the Senate shall preside and have voting privileges.

The term of the elected members of the Executive Committee shall commence with their election and shall be for one year or until successors are elected. A quorum for the Executive Committee shall be four of the six voting members of the committee.

It shall be the responsibility of the Executive Committee to perform functions assigned to it by the Faculty Senate. It shall function as liaison between the Senate and the administration and between the Senate and the Rules Committee of the Academic Council. Its recommendations shall be recorded in its minutes and reported to the Senate at the next regular meeting. It may create special
and ad hoc committees and determine the composition of all committees subject to the approval of the Senate. It shall refer to the appropriate Senate committee for study such matters as are designated by the Faculty Senate. The written reports of the committees to the Senate shall be submitted to the chairperson of the Faculty Senate. It shall insure that elections of the Senate are carried out as specified by the Constitution.

2. By-Laws, Amendments, and Elections Committee

It shall be the responsibility of this committee to supervise nominations and elections. It shall study and, when appropriate, make recommendations concerning Senate rules and by-laws, proposed amendments, and procedural changes.

3. Faculty Status and Welfare Committee

It shall be the responsibility of this committee to study and, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on policies, criteria, and procedures for faculty appointments, recruitment of faculty, reappointments, promotions, and granting of tenure.

It shall study and, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on policies and procedures concerning salary, faculty workload, working conditions, and summer teaching employment. It shall also furnish advice on policies and procedures relating to retirement programs, insurance plans, sick leave, and other subject areas that are relevant to faculty welfare.

It shall also study and, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on policies and procedures concerning sabbatical leaves, leaves of absence, professional travel expenses, off-campus teaching and service, consultant activities, and academic freedom and academic due process.

4. Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee

It shall be the responsibility of this committee to study and, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on the policies and procedures for the consideration of faculty grievances.

It shall study and, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on policies, criteria, and procedures for faculty evaluation, and the recognition of outstanding performance in teaching and University service.

It shall study and, when appropriate, make recommendations on policies and procedures relating to patents and copyrights, University research grants, and recognition of scholarly and creative activity.

It shall also study and, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate concerning the responsibilities and obligations of the faculty person in his/her role as scholar and teacher.

5. Institutional Goals and Planning Committee

It shall be the responsibility of this committee to study and, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate relating to the long-range planning process, including institutional goals and objectives, program-related physical facilities, and policies related to instructional support areas.
6. Fiscal Affairs Committee

It shall be the responsibility of this committee to study and, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on institutional policies, procedures, and guidelines related to resources allocation, the financial impact of proposed program additions or changes, and institutional response to financial exigencies.

7. Academic Affairs Committee

It shall be the prerogative of this committee to study and, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on academic policies and programs under consideration by the Academic Council. Upon recommendation of the committee, the Faculty Senate may initiate action on academic policies which it thinks should be considered by the Academic Council. This committee shall coordinate its efforts and activities with the Fiscal Affairs Committee where academic policies and decisions have financial and budgetary consequences.

8. Committee on University Committees

It shall be the responsibility of this committee to nominate members of the university community to university-wide committees when instructed to do so by the chairperson of the Faculty Senate at the request of the President of the University.

9. Committee on Senate Communications

It shall be the responsibility of this committee to produce and distribute the Faculty Senate Newsletter to the university community and to prepare other communiques of an informative nature at the request of the chairperson of the Faculty Senate.

IV. Senate Action

The Faculty Senate acts directly or through its committees. Formal communications containing advice and recommendations of the Senate on institutional policies are addressed from the chairperson of the Senate to the President or office or body designated by the President, or through the President to the Board of Regents.

The Faculty Senate may also address communications to a member of the faculty or the faculty in general, making suggestions or recommendations, giving advice, furnishing information, or communicating otherwise for whatever purposes the Senate deems appropriate.

V. By-Laws

General by-laws governing the operation of the Faculty Senate shall be adopted by a majority vote of the actual membership of the Senate.

VI. Amendments

An amendment may be proposed by the Faculty Senate by a two-thirds majority of those voting, provided it was included in the agenda and was available to the members of the Faculty Senate at least two weeks before the vote is taken. An amendment becomes operative upon being approved by the Board of Regents.

By-laws will be adopted to determine how amendments will be submitted.
VII. Ratification

The Faculty Senate shall be established and this constitution shall be adopted upon approval of the Board of Regents.

BY-LAWS

BY-LAW I. Proposed by-laws shall be submitted in writing to the By-Laws, Amendments, and Elections Committee at least two weeks prior to a regularly scheduled Senate meeting.

BY-LAW II. Amendments. A proposed amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution must be submitted in writing to the By-Laws, Amendments, and Elections Committee. The By-Laws, Amendments, and Elections Committee shall forward the proposal, together with committee recommendations, to the Executive Committee for placement on the agenda of the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.

If disapproved by a majority of the voting members of the By-Laws, Amendments, and Elections Committee, the proposed amendment shall, upon written request of at least ten (10) members of the Faculty Senate, be submitted to the membership in the manner specified by Constitution, Article VI.

BY-LAW III. Alternates. A senator requesting a replacement may petition the By-Laws, Amendments, and Elections Committee for a temporary alternate to serve for a period of no fewer than four (4) regularly scheduled consecutive Senate meetings nor more than nine (9) such meetings. If the petition is approved, the temporary vacancy will be filled in the same manner as a permanent one, in accordance with Article III C 4 of the Constitution. The elected alternate shall assume all senatorial duties of the senator being replaced.

BY-LAW IV. Elections will be held to reflect changes in organizational structure of the University only at prescribed annual Faculty Senate elections.

BY-LAW V. Procedural matters brought before the Senate require only one reading. Substantive matters brought before the Senate require two readings. Determination of matters of substance will be made by the chair.

Inasmuch as the organizational structure and administrative duties are spelled out in great detail, there is every reason to believe that they are clearly understood by those involved in the Senate. The Senate is structured along lines traditionally associated with representative deliberative bodies. Through its structure and rules, it provides ample opportunity for faculty involvement, democratic processes, and joint decision making. The committee structure is designed to conform with the constitutionally mandated functions.
Through the study of (1) information supplied by the Senate Executive Committee, (2) written comments on the questionnaire, and (3) the experience of former Senate leaders, the following conclusions evolved.

The organizational structure and administrative procedures are, in the main, sound and require only minor adjustments. These minor adjustments center around the following perceived problem areas:

1. Some administrators—in particular department heads—do not facilitate the work of Senate members.
2. Some faculty members perceive that the Senate doesn’t enjoy sufficient independence from administrative domination.
3. Some members obviously lack commitment to their Senate activities and responsibilities.

PROJECTIONS

To try to alleviate the problems identified, the Senate will consider the following possibilities:

1. Possibly service on the Senate could be enhanced if recognition of this service took the form of reduced teaching loads to enable members to devote more time to this activity.
2. Possibly teaching schedules can be arranged so that all members can be free of teaching duties and travel when Senate meetings occur.
3. Perhaps the Senate should evaluate the ex-officio positions to see if the merits of this constitutional provision outweigh the disadvantages.
4. Perhaps an effort should be made to encourage persons to actively seek and campaign for positions and to conduct Senate elections so as to enhance this.
5. The constitutional provision connecting at-large positions to departments should be re-evaluated. This provision creates many problems and may well have been directed at a non-problem.
6. In addition to the college caucus, there may be a need for an orientation session for new Senate members that is conducted by the Senate officers. In particular emphasis should be given to the necessity of members being conscientious in fulfilling their responsibilities.

7. Re-evaluate By-law V, which requires first and second readings of matters of substance. While this practice may deter some precipitous acts, it certainly increases the likelihood of the Senate being viewed as a bland debating society.

8. Consideration should be given to the problem of momentum loss that occurs during the summer and means found to reduce this loss.
The University allots funds to the Faculty Senate to conduct its operations. Preparing the budget and overseeing the disbursements is primarily the duty of the Faculty Senate chair; some chairs have appointed other senators to assist them in this task. These funds are used to facilitate the conduct of Senate business, primarily for preparing, printing, and dispensing the Senate's communications and for paying secretarial salaries.

Since the Senate was founded only six years ago, the first few budgets represented some guesswork. (See budgets in Appendix.) By this time, the chair is able to anticipate needs in a reasonable fashion and prepare a suitable budget. Cutbacks in the University's budgets have constrained some of the Senate operations.

Considering the times, the budget is minimally adequate. However, more money is needed in each of the line items. More secretarial time is needed to relieve faculty of clerical duties so that they may spend their time on professional endeavors. At present, faculty spend time collating, stapling, and typing when there is more work than the secretary can do in the fifteen hours per week.

The printing budget needs to be slightly higher because the costs of duplicating are constantly rising. At present, the Senate is staying within the budget by typing some material on spirit duplicator masters so that copies can be run off on scratch paper provided by faculty members. If the money were available for more office supplies, secretarial time could be used more efficiently.

Because the meetings of the Congress of Senate Faculty Leaders are held at various campuses throughout the state, travel money is needed for the two representatives to attend these meetings. The amount budgeted lasts about half a year, and the representatives must then pay travel expenses from their own pockets.

In summary, the current budget of the Faculty Senate is minimal considering the general financial situation of the University.

PROJECTIONS:

1. Efficiency of operation would necessitate a larger budget.

2. For the future, the Senate should investigate the possibility of some independent supplement funding.
### FACULTY SENATE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>SALARIES</th>
<th>PRINTING</th>
<th>SUPPLIES</th>
<th>FOOD</th>
<th>TRAVEL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1977 (1/1-6/30)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>480 00</td>
<td>200 00</td>
<td>200 00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1157.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>397 88</td>
<td>424 08</td>
<td>67 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1166.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>82 12</td>
<td>-224 08</td>
<td>132 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1977-1978</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1210 00</td>
<td>600 00</td>
<td>600 00</td>
<td>125 00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2523.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>1026 78</td>
<td>475 30</td>
<td>254 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1869.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>183 22</td>
<td>124 00</td>
<td>345 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>653.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1978-1979</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1390 00</td>
<td>600 00</td>
<td>600 00</td>
<td>125 00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>1770 75</td>
<td>896 33</td>
<td>161 26</td>
<td>168 75</td>
<td></td>
<td>4547.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-380 75</td>
<td>-296 33</td>
<td>438 74</td>
<td>-43 75</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1957.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1979-1980</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1390 00</td>
<td>800 00</td>
<td>400 00</td>
<td>130 00</td>
<td>200 00</td>
<td>2720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>2094 56</td>
<td>1164 28</td>
<td>304 96</td>
<td>223 00</td>
<td>204 68</td>
<td>4235.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-704 56</td>
<td>-364 28</td>
<td>95 04</td>
<td>-93 00</td>
<td>-4 68</td>
<td>-1515.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1980-1981</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1486 00</td>
<td>650 00</td>
<td>150 00</td>
<td>130 00</td>
<td>118 00</td>
<td>3270.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>2190 46</td>
<td>504 00</td>
<td>38 62</td>
<td>143 52</td>
<td>167 77</td>
<td>3444.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-704 46</td>
<td>-146 00</td>
<td>111 38</td>
<td>-13 52</td>
<td>-50 77</td>
<td>-174.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1981-1982</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>2200 00</td>
<td>650 00</td>
<td>135 00</td>
<td></td>
<td>240 00</td>
<td>3137.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>1673 33</td>
<td>582 60</td>
<td>57 05</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>229 17</td>
<td>2836.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>526 67</td>
<td>67 40</td>
<td>77 95</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 83</td>
<td>300.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1982-1983</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>2123 00</td>
<td>650 00</td>
<td>135 00</td>
<td></td>
<td>300 00</td>
<td>3208.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDARD 8: PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Physical facilities provided by the University include a room for Senate meetings and an office for the chair and a secretary.

The Faculty Senate meetings are held in the Garrett Conference Center Ballroom, the Regents Room, or the combination classroom on the second floor of the Garrett Conference Center. All of these sites have one or more of the following drawbacks: poor acoustics, poor seating arrangements, minimum seating capacity.

The Senate office has been located near the professional office of the chair if possible, or wherever the office space is available. If the chair were selected from a department that has expanded to its maximum capacity, the Senate office location might present a problem.

PROJECTIONS:

The University needs a large meeting room with good acoustics so a large, deliberative body could meet, even when other University events which require large rooms are taking place. The large room could be used not only by the Faculty Senate but also by other large deliberative bodies.