

FEBRUARY MEETING TWO WEEKS LONG

The amount of business at the February Faculty Senate meeting forced a recess and a later meeting; the Senate met on February 8 and 15, and, after hearing comments by President John Minton, discussed several committee reports.

President Minton commented on his status and his philosophy of being president under the present circumstances. He plans to assume and face his responsibilities as though he were the permanent president. He pointed out that even though he had no interest in being a candidate for the office, he did not feel that the university could afford to stand still while the search for a new president proceeds. Minton described his long relationship with Western, which began in 1958, as one that has allowed him to experience a vast cross section of university functions.

Since assuming his duties, President Minton has met with the legislature's appropriations committee to discuss the possibility of budget cuts. He also conferred with local legislatures about recently-introduced measures which he felt would hurt the university. One of these had to do with a suggested one-percent budget cut for all agencies of higher education. The other had to do with capital construction purchases. Minton felt that this measure was too restrictive. In addition, he commented on enrollment, which he felt would show a slight increase when all figures were finally tabulated.

Dr. Minton's final comments related to the resolution introduced at the January meeting which called for a faculty salary raise in line with projected inflation figures. He said that while he supported the resolution in spirit, a five-percent salary increase was all the faculty could count on for next year.

The Executive Committee reported that a successful meeting had been held with Harry Snyder concerning the basic importance of faculty senates in the state's institutions of higher education. He was quoted as saying that he was not in favor of faculty positions being cut because of enrollment decreases. He also accepted the idea of having a faculty member on the Council.

The Faculty Status and Welfare Committee continued to provide important but depressing statistics concerning the faculty salary situation. Members are urged to discuss this well-publicized data with their respective senate representatives.

The Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee reported on the process involved in looking at one's own evaluation in Vice-President Davis's office. It was noted that no special forms need to be filled out. The only stipulation in the vice-president's office is that either Davis or Dean Stroube must be present when a

(The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.)

continued-
FEBRUARY MEETING, TWO WEEKS LONG

file request is made. The committee met with no problem in following through with this process at the college and department levels either. Vice-President Davis commented on the report himself by adding that faculty can be assured that all annual evaluations are available to faculty members.

The Institutional Goals and Planning Committee presented its report on enrollment trends at Western. After much discussion and many statements, the Faculty Senate voted to disseminate the report in order to get university-wide feedback. It is a very important report and faculty members are urged to read it carefully and to respond to the request for comments which will accompany their copies.

Dr. Albert Petersen introduced a resolution on behalf of Dr. Ronald Seeger asking the Board of Regents not to vote on an increase in scholarship allotments while faculty salaries remain in such dire straits. The Faculty Senate voted to refer this resolution to the Fiscal Affairs Committee.

Finally, Senator Bill Buckman asked that the Fiscal Affairs Committee be directed to meet with the administration and determine the possibility of any budget adjustments that might provide the needed raise in faculty salaries.

ON FACULTY EVALUATIONS

by Steve O. Thornton, President, ASG

L'Estrange was quoted as saying, "'Tis better that a man's own works should praise him than the words of others." I, for one, feel that many of our faculty have little need for a faculty evaluation. As pressure mounts, however, both within and outside of the profession, for a high level of teacher accountability and rapid professional growth, teacher effectiveness and/or teacher performance is an issue of particular concern in education today.

Teacher effectiveness and teacher performance are actually two separate ratings. Evaluating the performance of a faculty member is accomplished by measuring his or her behaviors. Measuring the knowledge gained by the student as a result of the teaching performance of a faculty member would be the evaluation of a teacher's effectiveness.

Writing to the "community of scholars" I feel compelled to ask questions rather than answer them. Below I have listed some questions which I feel are questions that need to be answered:

1. Should such an evaluation be mandatory or voluntary for each faculty member?
2. Who should administer such an evaluation?
 - A. the ASG
 - B. the FS
 - C. ASG and FS together
 - D. the administration (department heads, for example)
 - E. someone else

continued-
ON FACULTY EVALUATIONS

by Steve O. Thornton, President, ASG

3. What should the evaluation form be like?
 - A. only multiple choice
 - B. written comments only
 - C. both M.C. and written comments
 - D. same form for everyone
 - E. part of the form the same for everyone, and part put together by the individual or department members
 - F. other
4. What should happen to the results?
 - A. given to faculty member only
 - B. given to faculty member and his/her department head
 - C. given to ASG for distribution to faculty members and/or others
 - D. results should be made available to all students to aid in their choice of instructors
 - E. other

I would openly solicit your comments and suggestions that would aid our progress in developing an effective and fair evaluation for everyone.

I believe there is a great deal of merit in evaluating from below. Aristotle, in Politics, pointed out that we receive a better notion of the merits of the dinner from the guests than from the cook! Early in my tenure on the Board of Regents I requested from President Dero G. Downing the results of the Faculty Senate's evaluation of the administration. I made the request for three reasons. First, I felt that receiving the evaluation could help me in our (ASG) attempt to conduct a quality evaluation of the faculty. Second, I believe this information could help me as a Regent in recognizing any problem areas that may exist within the university. As a student in the Bowling Green College of Business and Public Affairs, I have little contact outside that curriculum. Third, I, like Aristotle, believe that the guest or student will have a better notion of the merits of the meal or class than others. Realizing that my view conflicts with some others, I must state, and make no apologies, that I believe in the merits of an evaluation from below.

In conclusion, I applaud the Faculty Senate for facing up to serious problems that face our university, such as decreasing enrollments. Together, the faculty and students can achieve great things. Obtaining membership on the Board of Regents is an example of this. I also commend your faculty regent, Dr. William Buckman, for his seemingly tireless efforts as a true full-time regent while maintaining the justified respect of the "community of scholars." In my candidacy for the Presidency of the Student Government Association of Kentucky, the student government state-wide organization, I have proposed a formal link between our delegation and the Council of Faculty Senate Leaders. I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with the Faculty Senate at Western, and look forward to the opportunity to work with Tom Jones and others on the state level.

MEETING THE COMMITTEES: FISCAL AFFAIRS

by Don Bailey

The Constitution of the Faculty Senate states that the responsibility of the Fiscal Affairs Committee (a standing committee of the Senate) shall be

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.

Of all the standing committees of the Senate I suppose the role of this committee is the most ambiguously stated, because no one, not even the writers of this document, could predict what if anything could be learned concerning this area of the University's operation.

There was a time in many universities when only a tightly-knit, hush-mouthed few knew anything about the financial operation of the institution--and Western was no exception. As little as a decade ago it was the general consensus among faculty members that administrators had their budget closets and fiscal vaults crammed with all kinds of skeletons. The sensitivity with which policies and practices were guarded created widespread suspicion that policies and practices in handling finances could not have stood exposure to the light of day.

Well, whatever the answers to those questions from the past (if indeed there were any real questions), things are different today. To my knowledge there are no aspects of the financial operation of Western which the Fiscal Affairs Committee has not been invited to examine (with the exception, of course, of data guarded by the regulations protecting individual privacy). When Vice-President for Business Affairs Harry Largen and Director of the Budget Paul Cook were asked for information on revenues and expenditures, 100 percent cooperation was received in locating and interpreting items of interest in the fiscal records. According to Mr. Largen and Dr. Cook there are many problems, especially with categorizing expenditures; however, there seems to be a real effort underway from the state level down to the institutional level to more clearly relate costs to the department or fiscal unit of the university which benefits from the expenditure.

The Fiscal Affairs Committee has not been one of the busier committees of the Senate. In the two years since the inception of the Senate there have been no referrals from the Senate to this committee, and only two suggestions have been presented by individuals (neither was within the purview of this committee). This does not mean that the committee has done nothing. On the contrary, it was agreed that an attempt should be made to determine the personnel cost of instruction and compare that with the personnel cost to administer the instruction.

For this study expenditure data were taken from the official records for the 1976-77 fiscal year. Departments and colleges were called on to help interpret their use of certain personnel funds, and data believed to be reasonably accurate were obtained for this proposed Administration/Instruction study. The cost of personnel services for Instruction was determined to be \$9,849,416 while the cost of personnel

continued-
 MEETING THE COMMITTEES: FISCAL AFFAIRS

by Don Bailey

services to administer that instruction (within the colleges) was \$2,648,677. This represents a cost for direct administration of instruction at the 21 percent level.

This 21 percent figure, of course, does not include: (1)any of the General Administration Offices (president, academic affairs, administrative affairs, business affairs, accounts and budgetary, personnel services, purchasing, institutional research, university attorney, academic computing and research, and international projects); (2)any of the Student Services Offices (registrar, student affairs, admissions, counseling service, health services, student financial aid, undergraduate advisement, scholastic development, and university recreation); (3)any of the General Institutional Expenses (public affairs and community relations office, alumni affairs and placement office, print shop, postal services, central stores, university-school relations office, university publications office, duplicating services, etc.); (4)any of the Physical Plant Operation; (5)any of the "Organized Activities Relating to Education Departments" (athletic programs, university farm, etc.); or (6)any of the Miscellaneous Areas so grouped in the financial records. (Some administrative areas, such as academic affairs, registrar, scholastic development, etc., probably could be associated with the Instructional Programs.) The Fiscal Affairs Committee concluded that the task of assigning the work of some of these offices to Instruction or the Administration of the Instruction was an impossibility. Keep in mind that vast segments of the university operation are not related to Instruction at all, and the Administration of those areas could not be assigned to the instructional programs either.

The committee decided to leave it to the reader of its report to decide how he wished to evaluate the administrative cost of instructional programs above the level of the colleges. Considerable information was provided in the report concerning sources of revenue as well as a rather extensive listing of university fiscal units and their expenditures (both for total operation and for personnel). In addition, it was pointed out that several fiscal units, although rather costly, generate sizeable revenues for the university. (Would you believe that revenue from motor vehicle registrations was \$36,577.91 and parking fines brought in another \$40,437.20? Or how about "Sales and Services of Educational Departments," at almost \$105,000 and "Organized Activities Relating to Educational Departments" netting another \$517,000?)

In the future the Fiscal Affairs Committee probably will repeat this study on a yearly basis (as the records become available), if it should appear that there is value in the data. In the meantime, the Committee invites members of the faculty (and others) to submit questions, etc., which would be appropriate to the interest of this committee and which they would like to have answers for.

NEW SENATORS

Congratulations to the following faculty members who have been elected to represent their departments in the Faculty Senate:

John Jones	Physical Education
William Traugott	Educational Leadership
Joanne Powell	Educational Services
Mary Crisp	Teacher Education
Marizu Richardson	Home Economics and Family Living
Greg Lowe*	Military Science
Brian Sullivan	Business Administration
Marvin Albin	Business Education and Office Administration
Mohaninder Gill	Informational Systems and Distributive Education
Fred Clark*	Accounting
Ron Veenker*	Philosophy and Religion
Robert Blann*	Journalism
William Walls*	Foreign Languages
Neil Peterie	Art
Dale Wicklander	Communication and Theatre
Jim Parks*	Physics and Astronomy

Under a new system of representation, the library has been divided into four units, each of which receives one Senator:

Pat Bowen	Reference
Virginia Neel	Circulation
Agnes Adams	Automation and Technical Services
Elaine Harrison	Special Collections

(The * indicates re-elected to a second term.)

As this issue of the Faculty Senate Newsletter goes to press, elections have not yet been held in the departments of Agriculture, Health and Safety, and Allied Health. The results of those elections as well as the names of Senators chosen at-large in the various colleges will appear in the March issue.

THE CONGRESS OF FACULTY SENATE LEADERS

by Tom Jones, Chair
Faculty Senate

As has been reported to you, the Congress of Faculty Senate Leaders met on January 26, 1979, on the University of Louisville campus. Our invited guest was the Executive Director of the Council on Higher Education, Harry Snyder. The group was enthusiastic about Mr. Snyder's positive responses to our questions and concerns. He suggested that the COFSL come up with a plan whereby the members of it or some other faculty group could meet regularly with him, with him and the Council staff, or with him and the Council.

I appointed a subcommittee consisting of myself, Ron Veenker, Tom Wagner (Senate Leader at Murray State), and Steve West (Vice-Chair at Murray) to study how best to proceed. This sub-committee will meet tomorrow (Friday, February 23) at Hopkinsville. The next COFSL meeting is set for Lexington on March third. After that meeting we hope to proceed with orderly plans for meeting with the Council.

FS

FACULTY SENATE
communications committee
NEWSLETTER

CROWE J CRANFORD
UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
103 HL

D2818