TO: Thomas Jones, Faculty Senate Chairman and Members, Academic Affairs Committee

FROM: Donald C. Butler, Associate Professor
       Adult and Community Education

DATE: February 22, 1979

RE: Attached Preliminary Report

The attached Preliminary Report has been developed to bring you up to date on the activities involving my role as Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee. My off-campus teaching schedule three days a week has made it virtually impossible to schedule meetings of the committee with any degree of regularity or consideration of other members' availability.

At the December meeting of our committee, I was asked to follow up on the issue of percentage salary increase between faculty and administrators, item 1 of this report. The second item deals with Mr. Jones' request to investigate abuse by students of the BEOG financial aid program. Item 3 concerns the status of the student evaluation of faculty.

As it stands now, I am attempting to clear my off-campus schedule in order that I may report on these items if it is necessary at the March Senate meeting. If you have any questions about the enclosed, please advise.

cmb
Enclosure
1. Comparison of percentage increase of salary for faculty and administrators 1977-78 to 1978-79.

Upon receiving a request from members of the faculty to investigate the salary question, I made an official request for information to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A meeting was held with Dr. James L. Davis and Dr. William H. Stroube. The following information was provided:

- Average salary increase 1977-78 to 1978-79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Faculty</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrators
Average salary increase, 6.2%
Administrative category includes vice presidents, deans, department heads, directors

- One dean received an increase of 8% which included both an increment increase and also a salary adjustment to compensate for inequities. According to information provided to me, no other administrator received more than a 6.4% increase. The maximum salary increase for anyone at WKU was 8%.

I was further advised that three factors must be considered when examining salary increases: 1) the regular increment increase, 2) increase as a result of promotion, and 3) adjustments to compensate for salary inequities.

The obvious question that comes to mind relates to the fact that the percentage of salary increase is only one part of the picture. The base salary for each category, faculty and administrator, is the critical figure when one begins to examine the actual in-pocket dollars. If there are widespread disparities between faculty salaries and administrative salaries, should we not consider a salary adjustment process between the two categories? Perhaps "across the board" salary increases for WKU personnel are inappropriate, given the wide range of base salaries.

2. Student abuse of BEOG program.

The Chairman of the Faculty Senate received a request from an official in the Office of Student Affairs related to possible student abuse of the BEOG financial aid program. The specific complaint indicated there was a possibility that students were receiving financial aid through the BEOG program and were not making satisfactory progress in their studies. Meetings and
The committee is scheduled to meet on Friday, February 23, at which time a decision is to be made regarding the selection of the evaluation instruments.

Two points need to be restated regarding the evaluation:

- **It is an ASG activity.**

- Faculty members serving on the ASG committee serve at the request of the ASG and represent themselves individually rather than the Faculty Senate, and provide assistance or advice only upon request from the student leadership.

It is my understanding that a survey is going to be distributed to faculty members regarding the student evaluation project. I would encourage all those who receive the survey form to seriously consider the questions and to respond as openly and as objectively as is possible. In my opinion, the student members of this ASG committee are approaching the evaluation process very openly, objectively and with a considerable amount of attention to all the complex issues involved. If the evaluation is ultimately conducted, such an evaluation ought to be conducted as responsibly as is possible and with considerable attention to the various consequences of the total process.

I am prepared to provide additional information should any faculty member so desire, and furthermore I will refer any and all comments from any faculty member to the ASG committee on faculty evaluation.
conversations were scheduled and conducted with officials in the Student Affairs office and also the Financial Aid office. The information given to me by both of these administrative units indicates each unit has separate functions when determining student eligibility for financial aid. Student Affairs deals with the aspect of satisfactory student progress and other factors; Financial Aid office deals with financial need and eligibility.

I have attached a letter from Ms. Mona Logsdon that outlines the situation at Western. In addition, I am attaching a copy of an article from the Courier-Journal dated January 16 that deals with this issue. I can find no evidence of widespread abuse of the program.

3. Student evaluation of faculty.

The ASG committee working on the student evaluation of faculty project is meeting on Friday afternoons at 4:30. Certain faculty members have been asked by the ASG to continue meeting with the committee to provide assistance when requested. I am meeting with the committee as official liaison between the Faculty Senate and the ASG committee. Mr. Victor Jackson is serving as chairperson of the committee.

A timeline for implementing the evaluation process has been developed and is outlined below:

a. Proposal from ASG to Vice President for Academic Affairs - Spring 1979.
b. Begin instrument development (if this is the approach) - Fall 1979
c. Field test of instrument prior to the end of Fall semester, 1979.
d. Distribute to faculty for review prior to the start of Spring semester, 1980.
e. Evaluation conducted during Spring term, 1980.

Some issues that continue to surface in the ASG committee discussions and also in comments from faculty members to me are:

- Type of instrument to be used, i.e., should we develop one at Western (the retranslation process) or should we use an instrument already in existence, e.g., the Purdue forms?

- The format of the evaluation itself - one part or a two-part form to allow for any special requirements of various departments?

- How to distribute the results and who sees them. Published form for everyone? Given to faculty members and all superiors only? Faculty member and department head? Development of a central clearinghouse where interested parties could go to obtain the results?

- The real purpose of evaluation. Potentially to be used for promotions, salary increase? Assist students in selection of faculty members for classes? Improve instruction and thus the academic programs at Western?

- We already conduct an evaluation - why another one?