

APRIL 6, 1987

NEWSLETTER

MULTIPLE-CHOICE: CHOOSE THE SINGLE, CORRECT HEADLINE (IF ANY):

SENATE PASSES

- (a) REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE,
 - (b) SUBSTITUTE MOTION TO ENDORSE CONCEPT OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRSHIP,
 - (c) MOTION NOT TO ANTICIPATE FACULTY REFERENDUM ON CHAIR CONCEPT,
 - (d) THE BUCK.
-

Chair/Head: A New Beginning

As Senator Allan was unable to attend, Senator Flynn presented for its second reading the Allan/Campbell motion that the Senate endorse the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Departmental Governance. Senator Flynn immediately proposed a substitute motion that, rather than endorse the Report itself, the Senate endorse the *concept* of Chairship, as defined as follows on page three of the Report:

A chair is an agent for the departmental faculty and serves at the pleasure of the faculty, while a head is an agent for the administration and serves at the pleasure of administrators. This definition may be further elaborated to define "chair" as a group leader selected by the faculty of a department, whose leadership implies collegiality and consensus, and whose primary responsibility is to convey and to execute policies determined by the faculty.

Senator Seidler objected to the Senate's voting on the Chair/Head matter at all, saying that, as the faculty is to vote on it, for the Senate, as a body representative of the faculty at large, to vote on it as well, would allow senators to vote twice: once as senators and once as individual faculty members. "Since we represent the faculty," he said, "I don't think that we can pre-guess them at this point." Senator Caillouet agreed. Senator Otto remarked that we had had plenty of time in which to find out how our constituencies felt about the Chair concept and that he had done so with his (they are for it). Senator Hobbs, of the Department of Music, said that she had been asked by those she represents in the Music Department to write a position paper on the Chair/Head subject. Due to the fact that she is married to the Head of this department, she asked former senator Dwight Pounds to read that paper. The paper condemned the Chair system root and branch, saying:

- (i) "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."
- (ii) We presently evaluate our Department Heads with a yearly administrative review, the Faculty Senate short form, a five-year evaluation, and a yearly evaluation by the Dean. Several Heads have been removed [!!!] as a consequence of these reviews. The music faculty fails to see any advantage in a change to Chairs.
- (iii) There is no support by the music faculty for this change.
- (iv) Interviews with the Academic Vice President and the Dean of Potter College reveal no compelling reason for the change.
- (v) Chairships have generally not been successful in other institutions [*presumably, the reference is to music departments, conservatories, etc. - ed.*] "to a great extent because of the complexity of music units."
- (vi) "Almost all of the music faculty expresses the strongest possible opposition to the concept of mandatory rotating and elected Department Heads."
- (vii) Under the Chair system, the general atmosphere becomes political rather than professional.

- (viii) Under the Chair system, no one is responsible for the joint failures or accomplishments of the department.
- (ix) Individual specialties are emphasized depending on who is the Chair. Other specialties may suffer until they can gain enough political strength to overpower the reigning emphasis.
- (x) The elected Chair is generally inexperienced and has no power — not being a member of the administration, but only a member of the faculty who is dealt with as such by the upper administrative levels.
- (xi) By the time that a Chair has learned how to function, he is replaced. Long-range goals are difficult to set or achieve.
- (xii) Chairships do not work in highly-specialized, diversified departments.
- (xiii) The Tom Jones Symposium brought to campus only persons who were in favor of the Chair system.
- (xiv) The Chairship form of departmental governance is only a stone's throw away from an ominous [or, perhaps, "obvious;" *the tape is indistinct at this point — ed.*] disaster for many of our departments.
- (xv) A unified music faculty would prefer the Senate to send a strong message to the President stating a preference for the present system of departmental governance, which has allowed viable faculty input and continual strong representation to the upper administration.

Senator Weigel pointed out that the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee did not recommend a rotating Chairship, and that there was nothing to prevent a department from keeping the same Chair in office indefinitely. Senator Hobbs replied that establishing the Chair system "makes it very easy for anybody up above to say, OK, let's make it rotating."

After some further discussion, primarily of procedural matters, the motion to substitute the Flynn motion (that the Senate endorse the *concept* of the Chair system) for the Allan motion (that the Senate endorse the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee) passed by a voice vote. [Note that this means that the substitute motion — the Flynn motion — became the motion on the floor. It does not mean that the Senate had passed the Flynn motion to endorse the concept of the Chair system.]

Senator Seidler then moved that the Senate present the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to the general faculty for a referendum. Senator Seitz seconded this motion. After some discussion of the Seidler motion, the Senate realized that this motion was out of order, as there was already a motion on the floor — the Flynn motion. The Seidler motion was therefore ruled out of order; the Senate returned to the FM.

Senator Caillouet then moved that the motion on the floor (the Flynn motion) be postponed indefinitely. The motion to postpone passed by a 16-10 vote. Senator Seidler then moved again that the Senate present, without recommendation or prejudice, to the faculty for a vote the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Departmental Governance. Senator Campbell moved to amend the Seidler motion so as to read that the vote shall be on the *concept* of Chairship as defined on page three of the Ad Hoc Committee's Report. The amendment was passed by voice vote.

The amended motion, reading

The Senate will present, without recommendation or prejudice, to the faculty for a vote the concept of Chair as defined on page three of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Departmental Governance,

was passed by a voice vote.

Senator Fulwood moved that the Senate recommend that each College be requested to convene prior to the referendum and discuss the report. The motion passed by a voice vote.

Sick-Leave Policy

Senator Richards presented for a first reading the resolution,

That all personnel employed by Western Kentucky University, and who participate in the Kentucky Teachers' Retirement System, also participate in the formal Holiday, Vacation, and Sick-Leave Program as provided for in Policy no. 25, dated November 1, 1985.

That the Board of Regents of Western Kentucky University pass a resolution and provide funding so that KTRS participants can, at service retirement, receive service credit for accrued sick-leave as provided for in the statutes, regulations, and rules of the Kentucky Teachers' Retirement System.

Lifestyles of the Rich and Famous

Senator Hunter presented his formidable and meticulous report on (over)spending on Intercollegiate Athletics. The report is far too lengthy and detailed to summarize here; if you have not seen a copy, you can obtain one from your departmental senator. The bottom line is that, in 1985-86, Intercollegiate Athletics overspent its budget by 22.4%. The maximum overspending by a college of this University was 5%. The combined overspending by all four colleges was 2.5%.

The report draws the conclusions that (i) the athletic budget continues to be in a state of crisis, (ii) expenditures continue to exceed budget and revenues even when athletic budgets are increased disproportionately to academic budgets, (iii) revenues have increased but unrestrained spending still results in high deficits, (iv) football has played a major role in creating an unhealthy and worsening situation, and (v) perhaps the most appalling issue in the report is the lack of resolve by the appropriate University officials to put a stop to the overspending of athletic budgets. The major purposes of a budget are to plan and control. The second function has been, and continues to be, ignored.

Senator Sullivan presented for a first reading the resolution,

Be it resolved that, in light of the Fiscal Affairs Committee Report on Intercollegiate Athletic Expenditures, the President be urged to (i) request that the Board of Regents examine the current direction of the football program and determine an appropriate level of future competition, (ii) continue to review the control of athletic expenditures, and (iii) report to Faculty Senate XI on the future of our intercollegiate athletic program.

Salary Survey

Senator Wright announced that the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee had decided to hold off the salary survey until the fall preceding the legislative assembly, so that the resulting agitation would not have time to decay before the meeting of the legislature.

COSFL Report

Senator Weigel reported on the meetings with gubernatorial candidates Julian Carroll and Dr. Grady Stumbo.

Carroll pointed out that, when he became governor, there were three separate school systems — primary, secondary, vocational, and higher education [!!!] — and that he had attempted to bring those together. He emphasized that his particular expertise was in the area of budgets, and that there is a financial crisis in the state (as many as 30 counties are on the edge of bankruptcy). He feels that the problem of high-school dropouts is a major one, both in education and in society. Future dropouts, he said, can be identified in the second grade; we need to use counsellors and social workers in grades 1-8 to work with these potential dropouts. He also emphasized the importance of education as compared to sports, and said that Kentucky should have a policy requiring

high-school athletes to maintain a specified grade average in order to participate in scholastic sports.

Carroll said that the governor needs a higher-education liaison person, chosen from the ranks of the teaching faculty, working in his office. He is opposed to teacher-testing, as being unfair to teachers, and says that we must, instead, concentrate on improving the quality of the education that we provide for our teachers.

He believes that the presence of faculty members on Boards of Regents is essential, and that the CHE should contain one faculty representative from each university in the State. He is opposed to collective bargaining, because he believes that it creates a confrontational atmosphere that destroys professionalism. He said that we must treat our teachers as professionals, and pay them accordingly.

He said that there would be no tax increase.

Dr. Stumbo emphasized the need for having qualified persons as members of Boards of Regents and of the CHE. The governor must be prepared to initiate special programs related to research, centers of excellence, or endowed chairs. His first priority would be full formula funding. He said that the governor must defend the CHE budget in the legislative process.

Dr. Stumbo believes that there should be one or two faculty members on the CHE, and that faculty members should have a way to voice their legitimate concerns; he is not opposed to collective bargaining, but he would not allow strikes.

He said that higher education would not have been included in the recent cut-back in funding had he been governor, and that it cannot be cut any further.

He would instruct the CHE to emphasize academic programs and faculty/staff salaries; he would be willing to use line-iteming for specific, essential areas of the budget where he thought that the funds were not getting down to the university level.

He said that there should be no increase in the number of four-year institutions in the State.

He said that there should be no tax increase (although he does support an unmined minerals tax).

E. S. Dorman