



WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY 42101

Faculty Senate

TO: FACULTY SENATE DEPARTMENTAL SENATORS
FROM: MARY ELLEN MILLER, CHAIR, INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND PLANNING
COMMITTEE
DATE: MARCH 22, 1979
SUBJECT: THE LUCAS RESOLUTION

Attached is a copy of the Lucas Resolution, presented at the last Faculty Senate meeting.

The Institutional Goals and Planning Committee has been asked to conduct a public hearing in regard to the resolution. We are, therefore, asking you to see that members of your department are made aware of the resolution. We invite you and any interested member of your department to attend a discussion period on April 4, 1979, at 2:00 P.M. in the Faculty House.

The sponsor of the resolution will be there to answer questions.

Thank you for your help.

MEM/jb



WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY

Department of History

MEMO TO: Tom Jones, Chairperson
Faculty Senate

FROM: M. B. Lucas

DATE: February 20, 1979

I propose that the Faculty Senate, through an existing or an ad hoc committee, proceed immediately with a recommendation for "Chairperson" concept of leadership for all departments at Western Kentucky University. The procedure I propose is that Western adopt a system whereby each academic department Chairperson is elected by the department, that if the person chooses to continue for a second term there be an evaluation and vote of confidence by the department at the end of three years, and that that vote of confidence determine whether or not that Chairperson will continue for another three year term. Further, I propose that salaries for Chairpersons be given in two categories. First, the Chairperson should receive a salary appropriate to his or her rank and duties within the department as a regular faculty member. Yearly increases in pay for teaching faculty duties should be noted in this category. Second, an additional stipend should be paid specifically for duties as Chairperson; this should include yearly increases for duties as department Chairperson. When a departmental Chairperson ceases to hold that position, whether by personal choice or an adverse vote of his or her departmental colleagues, his or her salary would continue at his or her appropriate level as a teaching faculty member. That is, once a person ceased to be Chairperson, he or she would forfeit the additional salary received for duties as Chairperson. The newly elected Chairperson would receive the appropriate additional pay as Chairperson. Chairpersons would be eligible upon a constitutional change, for membership in the Faculty Senate.

MBL:jw

RESPONSES TO THE LUCAS RESOLUTION

- I. From the public hearing: attended by about 35 people; approximately 90% of those who spoke favored the resolution.

II. Written Responses

A. Strongest opposition:

1. Nursing--16 signatures in opposition because the accrediting association stipulates that

The administrator of the school is a nurse educator who holds an earned doctorate or shows progression toward and has preparation and experience in teaching administration in baccalaureate and/or degree programs in nursing.

No faculty member in the department here holds an earned doctorate.

2. Engineering and Technology--sample remarks:

"In every case, the Engineering Technology faculty feel that even though the Lucas resolution doesn't specifically call for rotation of departmental leadership, that it will inevitably lead to it."

"...a continuity of leadership is required in order to produce quality academic programs since change requires more than several years to implement and evaluate."

"I believe the faculty evaluation of administration, run by the Faculty Senate, was a giant first step and should be continued. This is the appropriate way to locate and change ineffective leadership, not through a method such as the Lucas resolution. I hope the new president will focus in on evaluation of top administrative positions and that some needed changes can be made."

"The political infighting within the department (at another school that has the chair system) was very obvious, faculty morale very low, and the academic program out of date."

"Department heads, under the proposed system, would be inhibited in making decisions which might offend any faculty member and would be reduced to administering by a 'committee of-the-whole.'"

"Rotating dept. head idea is a 'crock.'"

"The proposed 'election' of chairpersons presupposes that any person in a department may be qualified to serve as chairperson

any person able to secure popular support within his department would be a 'good' chairperson

or, in other words, no special knowledge or experience is needed to fulfill the duties of chairperson."

3. Physical Education--opposed but favor more faculty voice in selection and retention of heads.
4. English--65% opposed
5. Business Administration--"less efficiency, less compatibility between chair and dean, and politics diverting attention from teaching and perhaps other costs."

III. Alternative suggestions

1. Should have a system that will let each department make its own decision regarding chair or head.
2. Favor the concept but prefer four years instead of three.
3. "I would suggest to your committee the following:
 - a. a three-year term for a department head with a maximum of three terms (9 years); by then he has run out of ideas.
 - b. a department vote of confidence at the end of each three-year term. If the said department head does not receive a simple majority vote of support, then the dean should remove the said department head or meet with the department and verbally give his reasons for or retention. Whatever, the department vote and the reasons for the dean's response should be submitted in writing to the vice-president of academic affairs."

IV. Strongest support--Government, Psychology, Sociology-Anthropology History, Accounting. Sample responses:

1. "Department heads should be responsive to faculty needs; if not, this is a good way to replace them."
2. "Would provide opportunity for unpopular chairs to make a graceful exit."
3. "Of course I support the principle and the proposal and hope that the Senate can succeed in persuading the President/Board to do it. Let me know if there is any way I can help."
4. "I think a person should be allowed to serve as many terms as he/she could be elected by the faculty of the department."

5. "It's the usual thing--not radical. The largest dept. in my college is overwhelmingly in favor of the principle. We can iron out specifics later."
6. "Most universities have it now."

V. Other questions or comments.

- A. Two statements of opposition to "chairperson:"
 1. "Yes, usage changes over time, thus language 'grows'; if 'chairman' is not desired, let us then invent or adopt an entirely different word-foundation (such as 'mentor', 'coordinator', 'tribune', or so on) and NOT do violence to the semantic roots of this or any other language element."
 2. "'Chairperson' is a wretched term. If we get rid of all 'man' terms we'll have to throw out 'woman.'"
- B. "Would this system be limited to department heads? What about deans?"
- C. "This would make more work for department members."
- D. "This would discourage going outside for new people."
- E. "I oppose a simple majority vote of the department members being the only factor in retention or non-retention."
- F. "I am unalterably opposed to the 'Chairperson' being a member of the Faculty Senate. I am afraid that the office will always be considered an administrative office at Western. As such I feel that it should not be represented on the Faculty Senate regardless of the manner of the choice of the person." (One other strong statement along the same lines.)