A little information as to the facts can at least do no harm — C. V. Boys

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION REPORT PRESENTED TO SENATE

Nancy Solley, Thomas Coohill, Ed Dorman

Committee Reports

Executive Committee:

Senator Uveges announced that partial distribution of grant funds to colleges and departments had been made in the amounts of $28,000 (1981-2) and $30,000 (1982-3). The distribution was based on a formula combining measures of effort and success. The President hopes to provide the full amount in 1983-4.

The Executive Committee recommended that copies of the minutes of other Kentucky Faculty Senates be reviewed by the Vice-Chair of the Senate and distributed to the appropriate committee chairs. Others who wish to read these materials should see Senator Uveges.

All faculty members are encouraged to contribute ideas regarding improved student retention to Dr. Faye Robinson's Retention Task Force.

Faculty members interested in exchange possibilities with institutions which are members of the Faculty Exchange Center should contact either Senator Uveges or Dr. John Peterson, who have the proper application forms.

Committee on University Committees:

Senator Weigel informed the Senate that President Zacharias has chosen Linda Allan, of Library Automation and Technical Services, from the three faculty members nominated by this committee for a place on the University Traffic and Parking Committee. The committee has also sent forward nominations for positions on the Insurance Committee.

Any departmental Senators who still have University Committee questionnaires are requested to send them to Senator Weigel, in care of the Department of History.

Faculty Status and Welfare Committee:

Senator Murphy reported that President Zacharias has forwarded to the University Insurance Committee, with his endorsement, the resolution passed by the Senate on October 14, requesting open hearings when the committee considers changes in rates and coverage.

The Faculty Status and Welfare Committee had a useful discussion with the President regarding the salary study and analyses from last year, and, as a result, is confident that future studies of this sort can be made more useful and more effective.

Professional Responsibilities and Concerns Committee:

Senator Mason assured the Senate that this committee had detected no breach of official policy with regard to the confidentiality of the results of the Purdue Faculty Evaluations used by the University. Two copies of both the numerical
results and the comments are made: one copy of each is sent to the department head and one to the faculty member. All other copies are destroyed and the computer tapes are erased. It has been official policy from the inception of this procedure that the department head would receive a copy of the results to use as a part of the faculty member's overall evaluation. Any understanding that the department head is not, or was not, supposed to receive a copy is erroneous. The only exception to this policy was the initial "dry run," the results of which were sent only to the faculty member concerned. Many memoranda and other communications have stated explicitly that the department head is to receive a copy of the results of this evaluation.

Faculty Senate Self-Study Committee:

Dr. JoAnn Harrington reported that this committee has decided that four of the suggested standards are applicable to the Senate. These are Standard 1: Purpose; Standard 2: Organization and Administration; Standard 4: Financial Resources; and Standard 8: Physical Resources. Two hundred of the questionnaires sent out to measure faculty awareness of the Senate were returned. The responses are being tabulated and analyzed, and will be available to all interested faculty members. Due to the pressure of time, this committee has set up three meetings at which Senators and other interested persons may inspect the report. These meetings are scheduled for

- Wednesday, December 1: 1:30 pm in the Regents' Room, 3:00 pm, Downing Center, Room 308,
- Friday, December 3: 8:00 am in the Regents' Room.

Unfinished Business

Senator Pauline Jones presented for a second reading an amendment to the Constitution, VI BAE 006.1 10/14/82 (printed in the October Newsletter). The amendment passed.

New Business

In view of the College of Education proposal that 8 additional hours of professional education coursework be added to the curriculum requirement for secondary teacher education, without increasing the number of hours required for graduation above the present value of 128, Senator Elliot put before the Senate a petition to increase the graduation requirement for these students to 136 hours. Such an increase would maintain the current amount of coursework required in discipline-oriented areas. Senator Elliot moved that the Senate endorse the concept contained in the petition. The motion passed. Departmental Senators were requested to circulate copies of the petition in their departments and return them to Senator Elliot, in care of the Department of Biology, by the evening of Wednesday, November 17 (one day before you probably will read this).

The next item of business was an extended discussion of the report, Review and Evaluation of Academic Units and Administrators (hereinafter referred to as REAUA), produced by Dr. Elmer Gray's ad hoc committee formed to devise processes and instruments for such evaluations. Some of the members of this committee were present in order to answer questions about the committee's report.

Senator Elliot asked if the proposed five-year intervals between evaluations were not too long, and suggested that three-year intervals would be better. Dr. Gray explained that these evaluations were intended to be tied to the Reviews of Academic Programs, which take place at five-year intervals. Several Senators expressed the view that five-year intervals were too long, particularly for the evaluation of department heads. Dr. O'Connor pointed out that these evaluations were not intended
to replace the Faculty Senate evaluations, which are given at shorter intervals. Senator Joan Krenzin said that this evaluation must stand on its own merits and not on the assumption that it will be supplemented by a Faculty Senate evaluation; it could happen that the Senate would not have funds to administer an evaluation. Senator Weigl said that the REAUA instrument could do what the Senate wants to be done by its evaluation, but that it should be administered every three years for department heads.

Senator Pearson said that the President had seemed to imply that the REAUA evaluation would, in itself, constitute the evaluation of administrators, and that the Faculty Senate evaluation would not be needed. Senator Dorman said that the ad hoc REAUA committee had been assured at the outset that this evaluation was not intended to replace, or interfere with, the Faculty Senate evaluation. Senator Weigl moved that the Senate have a straw vote on the duration of the interval between successive evaluations of department heads, using the appropriate portion of the REAUA instrument. The results of the straw vote were: 9 for annual reviews, 16 for reviews at three-year intervals, and one for reviews at five-year intervals.

Senator Murphy said that the questionnaire should include a general item of the nature of a vote of confidence in the administrator being evaluated. Senator Weigl and several other Senators agreed. Senator Murphy moved that the Senate have a straw vote on whether a "vote of confidence" question should be included in the evaluation questionnaire. The Senate voted that it should.

Senator Pearson drew the attention of the Senate to the statement in REAUA that an administrator could, upon request, see the original, individual evaluation forms on which he had been evaluated by faculty members. Dr. Gray said that this was a legal right. It was pointed out that faculty members do not have the right to see the individual evaluation forms on which they have been evaluated by students. Senator Krenzin informed the Senate that President Zacharias holds that administrators should have the right to see the individual evaluation forms handed in by faculty members, as a man has the right to know his accuser. He believes the fact that faculty members do not have a corresponding right with respect to student evaluations to be a separate issue, to be considered apart from this one.

Senator Murphy asked if any provision has been made for evaluating the President. Vice-President Davis read the letter from the President that led to the creation of the REAUA instrument: it did not request an evaluation of the President. Senator Seeger moved that the Senate have a straw vote on whether the President should be included in the evaluation of academic units and administrators. The Senate voted that he should be.

Senator Pauline Jones emphasized that the Senate should not drop its evaluation, as REAUA does not include all the administrators that the Senate has been evaluating.

Faculty Regent Buckman affirmed that the REAUA instrument should be returned to the Senate for consideration when it is in a form that the President considers to be suitable for presentation to the Board of Regents, but before it has been presented to that body.

The next two items were accepted for a first reading without discussion, due to the lateness of the hour.

Senator Pearson presented document VI FSW 004.1 11/11/82: a proposal for amending and clarifying the tenure policy. The proposed changes are intended to make the policies for the granting of tenure and for promotion parallel.
Senator Seeger presented a proposal that Western establish the honorary rank and title of *Distinguished Professor of ___________.* The blank would be filled in by the recipient of the honor. The actual academic rank of the title-holder would be Professor. An honorarium should accompany the title (the amount of $5,000 per year was suggested).

**Faculty Regent Report**

Regent Buckman informed the Senate that Western had a large carry-over of more than $1,000,000, and is not in dire financial straits. However, a new Council cut could eliminate much of this.

The legislature has passed the retirement provision, allowing faculty members who have sick leave to count up to six months of it toward retirement. As we do not have a sick leave policy at the present time, this action does not affect us.

Formula funding now includes the principle of common levels of funding for common levels of instruction. Meetings are to be held in all the colleges, at which faculty members will be able to see just what factors make up the formula.

**COSFL Report**

COSFL has passed a resolution urging each Faculty Senate to appoint up to four Senators to attend each meeting of their Board of Regents and report back to the Senate.

**Article**

*WHEN THE SHOE IS ON THE OTHER FOOT, IT'S NOT THE SAME SHOE.*

*Ed Dorman*

The Review and Evaluation of Academic Units/Administrators, Part III B, states that The administrative evaluation information forms (A and B) will become confidential. (Forms A and B are the questionnaires to be used by the faculty in evaluating administrative leadership.) Four sentences later, the report emphasizes the confidentiality of the individual evaluation forms: The individual evaluation forms (A and B) will then be placed in confidential storage. The next sentence reads, The administrator being evaluated may request access to his/her individual evaluation forms.

One supposes that, when administrators request access to their individual evaluation forms, the requests will sometimes be granted. It therefore appears that the evaluation forms that we fill out are to be only "a little bit confidential."

It is as though a Security Guard for chickens were to advertise that all coops under his protection would be thoroughly sealed against intruders, that all predators would be shot, and that only foxes would be allowed inside (but only upon request).

What is surprising is that no plausible explanations of this policy have been offered to divert the mind from what is admittedly its intent: to give the administrator evaluated a chance to identify the authors of whatever responses have aroused his interest. It has been stated quite baldly that administrators should have this right; the reason given being that a person has the right to know his accuser.

Passing up all that might be said about the mental set disclosed by such a justification, I will remark only that, if it be valid, then the evaluation forms should be signed. After all, a person has the right to know his accuser, not to guess at him. If the justification is not valid, then there is no excuse for failing to preserve total
confidentiality. In no conceivable circumstances would the fairest and wisest procedure be the one presently advocated: to let the faculty hand in unsigned evaluations, and let the administrators try to guess who wrote them. What if they guess incorrectly?

It has been argued that faculty members can take steps to make identification difficult or impossible; but, if this is recommended, why allow the inspection at all? Why should faculty and administration become caught up in some absurd game of cops and robbers? And what if, in a particular case, the administrator wins the game and correctly identifies the faculty member who provoked the investigation? What is it expected that he will do with this knowledge? Some administrators are no doubt the mirrors of perfect virtue, but others were once faculty members, even as you and I, and we may suspect that they are not totally without fault or flaw.

I cannot help feeling that the people who will want to see their evaluation forms are the last ones who should be allowed to.

It has been argued (and not once or twice) that some faculty members, if they felt secure in anonymity, would behave in a malevolent and vindictive manner, pouring out the venom of their twisted little souls on the evaluation forms of innocent superiors. I am sure that we are all aware of just how much concern has been shown regarding similar attacks made by students on faculty members in the various university and departmental evaluations of teachers. The fears of administrators that faculty members might behave in an unprofessional manner, if given access to student evaluations of them, are taken seriously; the fears of faculty that administrators might behave in an unprofessional manner, if given access to faculty evaluations of them, are not. Perhaps this is merely an instance of the asymmetric moral relations between higher and lower organisms: if a man kills a virus, it is not evil; if a virus kills a man, it is.

It has been argued, also, that it is unjust that faculty cannot see their individual evaluations (with which position I strongly disagree, but let us accept it, as it is theirs), and this is a wrong; it would also be unjust not to let administrators see their evaluations, and this would be a second wrong. And, as we all know, two wrongs don't make a right . . . . Is it really true that, whenever the two-wrongs argument is used, it seems that there are three differences between the two wrongs? That (i) the first wrong is to the weak, the second to the powerful, (ii) the first wrong is already established, the second has not yet begun, and (iii) nobody really intends to do anything about the first wrong, but the second will be prevented? So here we are, and it is the faculty member stuck with the first wrong again, the wrong that doesn't count. Why can't we have the second wrong sometime—the one that doesn't happen?