Faculty Senate Evaluation of Administrators

Fred Murphy proposed the motion:

The Senate reaffirms its commitment to the principle of conducting its own administrative evaluations, but will refrain from such evaluations during the academic year 1983-84 to give the new procedures established by the administration an opportunity to be tried. It directs the committee on Professional Responsibilities and Concerns to examine the instrument and procedures carefully, after their initial use, and to make recommendations as to the adequacy of both in fulfilling the functions that the Senate considers important in such evaluations.

Senators speaking in favor of the motion were Tom Baldwin, Charles Crume, Margaret Howe, Joan Krenzin, Fred Murphy, and Richard Weigel. The grounds advanced were that the new, administration evaluation will do all the things that the Senate evaluation does, and do them at least as well, that it would be superfluous to give two evaluations in one year, that one should not choose an evaluation that will not be attended to in preference to one that will be attended to, and that evaluations under the control of the faculty might understandably make administrators feel threatened.

Senators speaking in opposition to the motion were Thomas Coohill, Ed Dorman, Larry Elliott, Dorsey Grice, and Patricia Trutty-Coohill. They argued that the suspension of the Senate evaluation would be only a prelude to its permanent elimination, that an important right of the Senate would be abandoned, that the influence of the Senate would be diminished, and that two evaluations in one year could be handled without confusion.

Requested by your reporter (Ed Dorman) to address the Senate on the question of whether he opposes evaluations that are constructed and conducted by the faculty, President Zacharias charged this person with acting irresponsibly as a Senator and as editor of the Newsletter, accusing him of devisiveness, creating a faculty-administration split at Western, having an "us against them" attitude, not acting in the best interests of the University, trying to create a false impression that the President desires a subservient faculty, making "clever use of language" in order to mislead the Senate, and of exhibiting playfulness on serious issues:

Him the almighty power
Hurled headlong flaming from the ethereal sky,
With hideous ruin and combustion, down . . .
Who durst defy the omnipotent to arms.

In addition, Dr. Zacharias accused the remains of your reporter of publishing stories, critical of him, obtained at third or fourth hand.* In response to further questioning, the President said that he "has no objection to Faculty Senate opinion polls on the effectiveness of administrators, or on anything else," but that the Senate evaluation instrument is "only a survey," whereas the administration instrument is "a validated instrument."

The motion was passed by a 33-15 vote.

*This is false. Information—obtained at second hand—has been printed in the Newsletter and is printed in all news publications.
Evaluation of President by Faculty
Several persons have inquired as to when the President is to be evaluated by the faculty. There will be no evaluation of the President by the faculty during the period in which the Faculty Senate evaluations are suspended, as the new evaluation instrument does not include an evaluation of the President.

Change-of-Grade Regulations
Ron Seeger informed the Senate that it is no longer the case that a department head's approval is necessary in order to change a grade.

Appreciations
Fred Murphy proposed a motion of appreciation for the services rendered by Joan Krenzin during her tenure as Chair of the Senate. The motion was enthusiastically endorsed.

The Senate also passed a motion by Joan Krenzin that a letter be sent to Dean Hellstrom expressing the appreciation of the Senate for his action in providing the emeritus faculty with free tickets to the Fine Arts Festival.

Faculty Regent Report
Mary Ellen Miller informed the Senate that she is on the following committees of the Board: the International Education Committee (Chair), the Student Affairs Committee, the Finance Committee, and the Academics Committee. She urges faculty members to bring their concerns to her through their representatives.

Committee Reports
Committee on University Committees:
Thus far, during the 1983-84 year, this Committee has submitted nominations for membership on the University Committee on Admissions (to which Richard Ayres was appointed), the University Press of Kentucky (to which Carlton Jackson and Jim Wayne Miller were appointed), and the Athletic Committee (to which William Kummer was appointed). The Committee is updating the list of membership on University Committees, and hopes to have copies ready for distribution early in November.

Political Action Committee:
Harry Robe announced that he has made the initial contacts with the two gubernatorial candidates and hopes to have them appear on campus.

Letter to the Editor
(This letter has been abridged for publication. The complete letter is available at the office of the editor: TCCW 232, 4357.)
I have had an opportunity to read your editorial in the Faculty Senate Newsletter. The editorial concludes that President Zacharias is responsible for the proposed evaluation policy. This is incorrect.

On July 1, 1978, the Board of Regents adopted a policy with regard to evaluations. The action taken by the Board at that time, followed faculty efforts to undertake independent evaluations. I am enclosing a copy of an excerpt from the Board Minutes.
Prior to the scheduled meeting on April 30, 1983, University Attorney William E. Blivin, at the direction of the Board of Regents, prepared and submitted to the Chairman and members of the By-Laws Committee a Policy Regarding Evaluation of University Personnel. I am enclosing a copy. This was done at the direction of the Board of Regents.

President Zacharias thought it appropriate that he not be directly involved in the evaluation policy. It was his thought that he should not participate in the development of a Board of Regents policy for his own evaluation, nor in the delegation of authority to the President for evaluation of University personnel. The President correctly recognized the independent responsibility of the Board of Regents in the matter of evaluation.
The Board of Regents has developed the evaluation policy and not the President. To suggest otherwise is simply contrary to fact. During my years on the Board, I had the opportunity to observe faculty evaluation efforts. Those efforts reflected the views and concerns of the faculty.

The Board of Regents has the overall responsibility for the management of the University. This includes faculty, students and administrators. The Board of Regents has the sole and exclusive responsibility for the personnel evaluation of the President of Western Kentucky University. The President has the sole and exclusive responsibility for the evaluation of other University personnel. The Board of Regents has in the past, and under the proposed policy, would continue to seek information from all segments of the University community. The proposed policy formalizes input from all segments of the University community, including the Faculty Senate. In my judgment this represents the proper state of affairs.

I recognize the above represents the facts and my personal views on the subject. Whatever one’s views on the matter of evaluation, the policy of evaluation was initiated and developed by the Board of Regents and not the President.

John David Cole

We are at one with the President in his opinion that he should not participate in the development of a policy for his own evaluation, and sincerely applaud his decision not to be directly involved in the formation of the evaluation policy. We regret having published the misinformation that the President submitted the policy to the Board. However, according to your letter, the policy was prepared and submitted (at the request of the Board) by the University Attorney, William E. Bivin. Two independent sources have reported Mr. Bivin's making statements to the effect that he is the President's attorney. On the other hand, Mr. Bivin categorically denies having made such statements. It is difficult to know what to think.

Anticlimax Department (Research Division)

(From an address given to the Graduate Faculty, on March 31, 1983, by President Zacharias:)

"A dynamic faculty must be involved in scholarly activity. . . . The dynamism of the classroom is determined to a great extent by scholarly activity. . . . good teaching requires faculty who are in some way involved in research."

(From a document entitled "Research, Creative Activity, and Professional Activity at Western," by Dean Hellstrom:)

"We find on the national scale what we find at Western: the best teachers are more often than not engaged in research and those engaged in research are more often than not among the best teachers. . . . It is only that the list of great teachers is a list of great scholars and creators. . . . the modern conception of the university does include research, and I want us to be able to compete with other modern universities."

(From the "point system" used by the Ogen College Dean's Office for evaluating faculty members on non-classroom activities:)

Service to Middle/Secondary Schools: 1 point each. Maximum: 2 points.

Publications: Local, state: ½ point. Regional, national: 1 point each. Maximum: 2 points.

Part of the cost of printing this publication was paid for from State Funds KRS 56.375.