

BOARD ADOPTS EVALUATION POLICY.

In its October meeting, the Board of Regents adopted a *Policy Regarding Evaluation of University Personnel*. This policy was briefly described in the November 1, 1983 issue of the *College Heights Herald*, and appears to be substantially that quoted from in the May 4, 1983 *Newsletter*. In it the Board retains sole and exclusive responsibility for the personnel evaluation of the President, and the President has the responsibility for the evaluation of other University personnel. The Board has not delegated and does not authorize the *formal* evaluation of University personnel, except as set forth in this policy.

NO CHANGES IN MEDICAL INSURANCE COVERAGE

James B. Tomes

Many questions have been directed to the Department of Personnel Services regarding alleged changes in Western's medical insurance coverage. Western's coverage *has not changed*; we have *the same coverage* we had last year. The confusion seems to result from recent changes made in the State's (Commonwealth of Kentucky) medical insurance for state employees. Please be advised that we have a separate contract with Blue Cross and Blue Shield, and changes made in the Commonwealth of Kentucky medical insurance *do not* affect us.

SENATE MEETING

Patricia Trutty-Coohill
Mike Ramsey

University Committees and Their Membership

The 1983-84 list of university committees and their membership has now been distributed to members of the Faculty Senate. Joan Krenzin asks that any corrections to this report be brought to her attention. As the report will be distributed to deans and department heads, it is important that it be as accurate as possible. Senator Krenzin has provided the *Newsletter* with the following committee signifi-
cance:

Number of university committees: 92;

Fewer than one-half of the faculty serve on university committees;

No faculty member serves on more than seven university committees;

Faculty committee champions (serving on seven committees): Joan Krenzin, Jerry Rust, Richard Weigel;

In general, administrators serve on more committees:

Administration committee champions: Ronnie Sutton (12 committees), Faye Robinson (10), James Davis and Steve House (9), John Minton and John Peterson (8), James Tomes (7);

In the faculty survey conducted last year, faculty members registered their impression that committee work was given a low weighting in the determination of faculty evaluations and raises.

Faculty Salaries

Jerry Rust, Chair of the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee, has distributed the

Report on Trends in Faculty Salaries (Academic Years 1974-75 through 1983-84) and has requested that the report be given the widest possible dissemination among the faculty. Your senator should have a copy that you can inspect.

Institutional Goals and Planning Committee

The Chair of this Committee, Sam McFarland, reported that, due to overwhelming personal commitments he was unable to remain as Chair. As a result, a new Chair, Jim Babcock, has been elected. This Committee has been discussing President Zacharias' strategic planning program.

COSFL Report: KEA FEELS NO OBLIGATION TO SUPPORT HIGHER EDUCATION.

Harry Robe reports that the line between the KEA and higher education is clearly drawn. At the October 15 meeting of COSFL, Mike Jones, of the KEA staff, was very clear about his organization not feeling any obligation to support or work with COSFL, or with higher education in general, as higher education is not affiliated with, or a contributor to, KEA. Primary and secondary school teachers are highly sensitized politically: KEA contributed one million dollars to the campaign of the new Superintendent of Public Instruction (Alice McDonald), and feels that it has acquired a position of influence. Jones feels that there will be competition between elementary/secondary education and higher education for funds, and that KEA would support reallocation of funds from higher education to elementary/secondary education.

Conditions at the seven campuses were reviewed at the meeting. Faculty at Morehead and Louisville are unhappy because of recent recommendations that they reduce their sizes or their program levels. Faculty at Murray and Northern are still enjoying their "honeymoon" periods with their new presidents, who are calling for increased faculty participation, stronger faculty senates, and independent evaluations of administrators. Faculty at Lexington are apparently content, perhaps because of the existence there of a university, rather than a faculty, senate. Their university senate, comprised of faculty and administrators, is a policy-recommending body. Its decisions go directly to their Board of Regents for action.

Senator Ed Ford and Mr. Lovelace, representing Lieutenant Governor Martha Layne Collins, were also present. An understanding was reached that immediate contact should be made with Governor Collins' transition team to discuss higher education goals for her administration, and that, although the 1984-85 Legislature should be left relatively unapproached, the 1986 campaigns should be targeted heavily for candidates sympathetic to COSFL issues (with the specific purpose of pushing for the convening of a special legislative session on higher education in Kentucky). Senator Ed Ford was the major proponent of this approach.

Faculty Regent's Report

Faculty Regent Mary Ellen Miller reported on discussions with Governor Brown and with President Zacharias. When she asked Governor Brown why there is no faculty member on the CHE, he replied that nobody had asked for one. He indicated that he would be receptive to such a proposal. Regent Miller called for direct appeals to the Governor on this matter.

President Zacharias expressed concern about the increasing competition for students, and especially about Murray's aggressive recruiting policies. He is hopeful that the prestigious Governor's Scholarship Program will be held here next semester.

Effects of High School Preparation on Collegiate Performance

The staff of the CHE has released a study entitled *High School Preparation and Collegiate Performance in Kentucky*. As the findings of this study are likely to affect university

entrance requirements, some of the results of the study are presented below:

The kind of high school preparation does make a difference in several important dimensions of academic performance in college. Among all college students of similar ability levels, those who had completed the requirements of the Pre-College Curriculum performed better in college.

The 1981 Kentucky high school graduates had generally high levels of compliance with the five minimum requirements of the 1987 Pre-College Curriculum. . . . Small high schools and their graduates fare very well in current compliance with the minimum requirements.

The levels of math and science preparation were quite low and may be insufficient for effective participation in transfer and technical programs without some remedial work.

For students attending universities, high school preparation in mathematics and science were the strongest preparation factors in terms of subsequent collegiate performance. Moreover, stronger preparation in these areas, including algebra II and an additional science lab course, resulted in even higher levels of collegiate performance. Two or more years of foreign language was the next strongest preparatory factor.

The recommended preparation in arts yielded hardly any performance differences and the results, in fact, indicated that students who completed the arts preparation frequently had slightly lower collegiate performance than those who had taken no arts courses. This finding may be related to the very broad definition of arts that includes selected courses in industrial arts and industrial education.

QUOTATIONS FROM CHAIRMAN WEIGEL

Richard Weigel

There exists a significant amount of misunderstanding across campus regarding Faculty Senate evaluation of administrators. Confusion has resulted from poor *Herald* coverage of the opening Senate session, from a lack of communication between senators and the departments they represent, and from the failure of interested faculty members to express their views to their representatives on the Senate.

First of all, I want to make it very clear that *the Senate has not given up its right to conduct its evaluation of administrators*. The administration document to be distributed this spring will give all faculty members an opportunity to evaluate their department heads, deans, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Senate will analyze the results of this procedure and decide how it will structure its own administrative evaluation process in the future. Two major considerations here are avoiding duplication of effort and limiting the expense of evaluations.

Secondly, *the Senate has not retreated at all in its determination to conduct its poll evaluating the President*. The administration's evaluation document does not include the President and the Board of Regents has declared that it has the sole right to conduct the formal evaluation of the President. The Senate conducted its own evaluation of the President last January and will continue to do so at regular intervals or whenever it decides that a poll of faculty opinion would be appropriate.

I believe that I can speak for most senators when I say that the Senate welcomes opinions and suggestions from any faculty member. We sincerely want to increase communications between the faculty and its representative body. Please feel free to attend Senate meetings or to make your views and concerns known to your senators. One thing the Senate has achieved recently is the participation of a broader group of faculty members on university committees. The information you gave us on the committees questionnaire has been of great use in the committee selection process. Increased contact with your senators on any issues will benefit all of us.



FACULTY SENATE
communications committee
NEWSLETTER