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WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
Announcements

***********************************************************************
ATTENTION: Regents Discuss Salary Plan
On Thursday, Feb. 4, from 9:00 am until ??? in the Regents' Room, WAB, the Board will be reviewing the salary and budget committee's recommendations regarding faculty salaries, as well as the possibility of a new vice-president. Your presence for any portion of the meeting could make a big difference in your pocketbook. If you cannot come, send someone for you.
***********************************************************************

The Senate secretary's hours for this semester are: Mon., Wed., Fri. 3:30 to 4:30; Tues., Thurs 8:00 to 12:30.
***********************************************************************

It is not long until new elections for Senate members. Please give serious and careful consideration to whom you wish to represent your opinions to the administration and community.
***********************************************************************

Material published in this newsletter expresses the opinion of the author and not the Faculty Senate
***********************************************************************

From the Desk of the Chair
For recent Senate actions see the summaries of meetings in this newsletter. Given the way the calendar, the newsletter schedule, and special meetings fell there are 4 meetings summarized in this issue. I have received no objections to summarizing, rather than printing the entire minutes. Complete copies are available from the Senate office and/or library archives. I have also prepared a brief description from my point of view of the events concerning the vote of confidence issue. In this newsletter you will also find descriptions of responses to other Senate resolutions from the Governor and others.

Senator Dietle has contributed a review of a book which, according to Regent Evans, was made available to the prior Board by the President and has been a resource used by the President.

Regent-elect Mendel has contributed a critical incident report form. He needs your input in order to effectively present your concerns to the Board and President. Keep copies available and record events that impact on your work-life. If we do not provide our Regent with data, we sabotage his efforts on our behalf.
Comments on the Vote of Confidence Compromise
by Sally Kuhlenschmidt

I wish I knew a pithy quote that would capture the essence of the last two months of debate and discussion on the issue of a vote of confidence. On the other hand, a situation so complex and filled with emotion deserves more than a distillation into an easy few words. I have enjoyed being in the position of chair because I am privileged to hear firsthand the passion and the points to be made by all those involved. How the Senate arrived at having an evaluation with a confidence item is summarized in the Senate minutes. Why is contained in an understanding of how the tension inherent in deliberative and democratic bodies leads to particular decisions.

I have observed an increasing polarization within the Senate and the University regarding the president. I have heard from those who have expressed loyalty to Dr. Meredith, a desire for positive action, and a wish to pursue their particular studies in peace and quiet. I have also heard from those who felt wronged, who wanted justice, who were unable to return to their studies because they did not feel peaceful or quiet. In the Senate debates both of these positions were defended with passion, wit, and ability. Like an elaborate chess game there were moves and countermoves, amendments and rebuttals, with each side seeking advantage.

Unlike a chess game, however, democracy provided for a balance in the outcome. Those feeling satisfied with the President generally favored an evaluation, which was accepted. Those feeling concerned generally favored a vote of confidence, which was provided. Both sides seemed to find the outcome acceptable if not optimal. In a deliberative body, the acceptance of compromise is essential. Each member gives up a little and receives a little and some gain is achieved for everyone rather than having one gain everything at the cost of others gaining nothing.

The Senate has generated a good solution for the faculty, Dr. Meredith, and the Board. Faculty will have the opportunity to express our many-sided opinions. The President and the Board will have the opportunity, which they have not had before, to hear from all of the faculty. The outcome will also provide vital direction to your faculty leaders. We will have the opportunity to know, rather than speculate, on what the faculty need from our leader. Over the past months many people have been willing to say what the faculty want from the President. The Senate will be the first to collect actual data on that question.

The success of this solution depends on full participation. When presented with the evaluation form complete it carefully and punctually. Here is the opportunity for direct input to the President, the Board, and the community I hear asked for in faculty coffee lounges. Use it.
Summary of October 6 Senate Meeting
based on approved minutes

Joe Rains, President of SGA, asked for support for the student rally for higher education in Frankfort. Chair Kuhlenschmidt reported that President Meredith told the Executive Committee that a cap was put on athletic spending and that he was trying to get computers into the offices of all faculty who would use them. She also reported on a recent meeting of the Athletic Committee at which Dr. Marclanl revealed athletic cost-management techniques, such as zero-based budgeting and using an equipment coordinator to prevent losses. Dr. Marclanl said athletic budgets were "levelized" as of July 1992, receiving only a set percent of state appropriations (which does not include salaries). They require a contribution to HAP for certain tickets so the cost will be tax-deductible. For long time fans not wishing to contribute certain sections are reserved. The Elections committee will be running the Regent’s election. Academic Affairs committee is examining recruitment of minority faculty and students and the length of the summer term.

In old business the following resolution passed by a vote of 30 to 10:

The Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University respectfully requests the Board of Regents to enact, with all haste, the recommendations put forth by Arthur Andersen & Co. in the "Agreed-Upon Procedures Report," commonly known as the "audit."

A motion which included endorsing the Andersen recommendations, the President’s recommendations, and putting "the matter behind us" failed following a speech by Senator Henrickson comparing the sets of recommendations and information from Regent Evans concerning who on the Board was aware of changes in the President’s allowance.

The following resolution was passed 20 to 11:

The Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University expresses its concern and utter dismay regarding the manner in which University funds have been administered and disbursed by the current University administration as revealed in the Agreed-Upon Procedures Report prepared by Arthur Anderson & Co.

Much of the debate centered on the words "utter dismay" and the phrasing went through several alterations before the final form was approved.

The following motion passed by a voice vote:

In the Interest of fiscal integrity, the Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University respectfully requests the Board of Regents to require the internal auditor of the University to report directly to the Board in addition to the Administration.
Summary of November 12 Senate Meeting

Chair Kuhlenschmidt reported that Regent Kristen Bale requested the Board minutes concerning the audit action be forwarded to the Senate and that Regent Fred Mudge had attended a faculty meeting to get input on faculty concerns. President Meredith was cautiously optimistic concerning budget cuts and reported at the Senate Executive Committee meeting that the Phonathon brought in $125,000 in pledges for the academic departments. He said the athletic department budgets would be "levelled," although salaries and increases in the costs of grants-in-aid may or may not be included. He indicated the football program was told to reduce spending because ticket sales produced less money than anticipated.

Academic Affairs chair Brunson indicated that Vice President Wilder is studying minority recruitment so they will wait until they can review his report. Regent Evans indicated that the President's contract will be clarified and that one interpretation is that it extends until August of 1996. The Board Chair will approve it unless objections are raised. Mrs. Meredith could be reimbursed for travel relating to University business but it must be approved in advance. Private funds will provide $1000 of the President's entertainment fund.

Senator Pulliam was elected COSFL representative and Senator Cobb will serve as alternate. The following resolutions were passed on one reading:

The Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University herewith commends and congratulates Joe Rains, the Student Government Association, and the students of WKU for their enthusiastic participation in the rally protesting further budget cuts in higher education in Frankfort on October 14. The Faculty Senate recognizes and appreciates the participants' concern for the future of Western Kentucky University.

The Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University implores the Governor and the legislature to forego any additional cuts in funding for higher education in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and, furthermore, we implore the Governor and the legislature to restore, as soon as fiscally possible, those funds previously cut from the higher education budgets.

A third resolution commending Dr. Meredith, his administration and the Budget Committee for attempting to protect the academic budget was presented for first reading. An effort to postpone it indefinitely failed 17 to 24.

Dr. Marciani, at his request, spoke to the Senate on the "Reaching New Heights," campaign and said the real issue is lack of state support, not academics vs athletics. He said the average price for a basketball ticket in the Southeast is $160 and the HAF donation was chosen rather
than a straight increase because it is tax-deductible and provides other perks. Senator Glaser asked for evidence that the assistant ADs would earn back their salaries within one year. Dr. Marciani replied that the AD for Business Affairs has brought the operation in under budget and the Coordinator of Marketing has only been here a little over a year and he is open to evaluation at the end of this year. Senator Glaser pointed out that there are no state appropriations for athletics. Senator Hansen said that the budget for Athletics was $190,000 when Dr. Marciani came and it is now $403,000. Dr. Marciani said the Department was not properly funded. Senator Vos requested a breakdown of the $1.7 million in athletic income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ticket sales</td>
<td>$434,000</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>game guarantees</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAF reimbursements</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concessions</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student fees</td>
<td>645,900</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA distribution</td>
<td>178,500</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other*</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other athletic receipts, radio-sports networks, endowment income medical insurance reimbursements, athletic parking receipts, royalties, and corporate sponsorship for football.

Senator Vos asked about revenue shortfall from football and Dr. Marciani said they anticipate a shortfall of $57,000. Some will come from grants-in-aid that will not be used second semester ($37,000), concessions ($8,000), and corporate sponsorships. Senator Bruno asked if salaries were included in the cap. Dr. Marciani indicated they would not be included. Senator Bruno asked if all other departments have to include salaries. Dr. Marciani indicated yes but said gender equity may force them to add a coach which could not be handled through athletic revenues. Senator Bruno said President Meredith had said that if the athletic business manager could not pay his/her own salary plus cost it would be terminated and asked what the criteria were for making that decision. Dr. Marciani said the Coordinator of Marketing had to be self-sustaining and that he had made more than his own salary the first year.
November 23, 1992

Dear Sally:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding funding for higher education. I certainly appreciate the concern that you and the other members of the Faculty Senate have regarding the possibility of further cuts in funding for higher education.

You can be sure that I will strongly oppose further cuts from higher education and will insist that every agency and department of state government be carefully evaluated before any such proposal could even be considered. I will continue to work for increase funding for higher education as I have in the past as our competitive situation becomes even more precarious.

Thanks for taking time to write. Be sure to contact me at any time about issues that concern you.

With best regards, I am

Sincerely,

Nick Kafoglis
State Senator

NK:sl
December 10, 1992

Dr. Sally L. Kuhlenschmidt
Chair, Faculty Senate
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

Dear Dr. Kuhlenschmidt:

Thank you for your recent letter which included a resolution from the Faculty Senate at Western Kentucky University which asks that higher education be exempted from any reduction in funding due to Kentucky's current budget situation.

Managing very limited resources in a period of economic hard times has been one of the most difficult challenges that we have had to face in our administration. We are doing everything in our power to manage the state budget in a responsible way so that we might avoid any reduction in funding for essential programs.

Education remains the highest priority of our administration, and we are doing everything that we can to avoid any reductions in funding for higher education. I appreciate the work that you and your colleagues at Western Kentucky University are doing to provide a solid education for the citizens of Kentucky. Be assured that your concerns are being given careful consideration.

With best regards, I am

Sincerely,

Brereton Jones

BJ/skj
Comment by Sally Kuhlenschmidt

In light of the recent news concerning state appropriations being held back, the Governor’s letter is enlightening. Apparently "the highest priority" means the first cut...again. I am sure he would benefit from letters concerning the increasing difficulty we face in providing "a solid education for the citizens of Kentucky." His letterhead provides an address and phone number for anyone wishing to explain to him what "priority" actually means. He is your public servant, explain what you need.

***************************
Summary of December 1 Special Senate Meeting
based on unapproved minutes

In response to a request by ten senators a special meeting was called to discuss a vote of confidence. During the course of the discussion Senator Dietle showed a petition presented to him by a non-senator which he said 234 people had signed. The petition stated: In view of the renegotiation of President Thomas C. Meredith’s contract by the Board of Regents, we, the undersigned, request that the Faculty Senate consult the faculty by holding a vote of confidence on President Meredith. This vote should be held before the contract is finalized in January 1993, thus allowing the WKU faculty to voice its opinion.

Following discussion and acceptance of one amendment the following motion was given first reading: That the Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University conduct a vote of confidence among the faculty on the President. The following addition had previously failed: not later than one month prior to a contract renewal or extension of a contract. The chair was asked to seek clarification on the nature of the pending Board action on the President’s contract.

The Senate Chair reported that the Board forwarded a copy to the Senate of its action regarding the Special Procedures Report and a copy is in the library. With regard to the Senate resolution regarding the internal auditor, Board Chair Burns Mercer informed Chair Kuhlenschmidt that the regular audit will be simultaneously sent to him, the Chair of the Board Finance committee and the President.
Executive Committee Report Chair Kuhlenschmidt announced that COSFIL is revising its constitution and is preparing an editorial for state newspapers. She indicated that Board Chair Mercer said they are only "clarifying" President Meredith's contract, not changing any terms. He asked that the faculty give the new board the opportunity to prove themselves, to give them the benefit of the doubt.

She reported that, in the regular President-Senate Executive Committee meeting, the President also said that his contract was to be clarified and that the length of the contract would not be changed. Following discussion President Meredith said he would welcome an annual evaluation under the same parameters as faculty evaluations, with the evaluation going to him and the board. Later that evening the President contacted Chair Kuhlenschmidt and indicated that Board Chair Mercer would also be comfortable with an evaluation if the President were comfortable, adding that U of L conducts a perception survey every 3 years on their president. Chair Kuhlenschmidt called the U of L Senate Chair and Regent who confirmed they conduct a survey and said they had "shot themselves in the foot for not making it public" because decreasing numbers of faculty completed the instrument. Chair Kuhlenschmidt also spoke with Board Chair Mercer and he indicated support for an evaluation if the President supported it. He felt results ought to be confidential as are those on faculty members, adding that the Faculty Regent would have the information. He said the contract would not be an action item at the next Board meeting unless members raised some particular issue.

In other discussion with the President he seemed amenable to the more stringent plagiarism policy. Senator Hackney is on the new computer committee.

Faculty Status and Welfare Committee Chair Neal indicated that benefits across institutions are being studied, including summer pay. The salary report will be available soon.

Fiscal Affairs Committee Chair Fong investigated purchasing procedures and learned that departments are not permitted to purchase from outside vendors any materials which are already supplied by Central Stores or items on a list. She indicated that an automatic 23% surcharge is added to all items by Central Stores in order to be self-supporting, in effect producing a budget cut for all departments as they received no increase. The Legislature has mandated that all paper goods used by universities must be made from recycled paper, a more expensive product.

Faculty Regent Regent Evans said, "The document as presented to the Board at the last meeting did stipulate that the President's contract would not terminate until August of 1996. So that has been changed, and that language
will not be there. There will be no interpretation of what the present contract means. That will not be addressed until July of next year. The only thing being dealt with now is the subject matter in the audit." Dr. Meredith's base salary is still $100,008. He said that no decisions have been made regarding the computers for faculty program and no one is going to be forced to accept a computer.

**Budget Committee** Senator Hansen reported on a line-by-line comparison of the 92-93 versus the 91-92 budget and found an apparent decline in the instructional budget of $212,000. He said most of the decline came from the end of workmen's compensation payments to faculty injured some years ago. Tuition increased, including mandatory student fees (e.g., residence halls), for undergraduates 7.27% and for graduates 6.58%. College budgets increased: Business 3.3%, CEB 1.7%, Potter 2.1%, and Ogden 1.3%. Funds for supplies and travel have diminished in all departments, primarily due to a decrease in telephone bills in academic departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>mean salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professor</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>$45,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associate</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>37,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistant</td>
<td>138.87</td>
<td>36,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructor</td>
<td>44.37</td>
<td>28,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dept. head</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decreases: Dean's budgets decreased by about 27%, partly due to the elimination of the graduate dean. Budgets were reduced for the community college, nontraditional programs, extended campus (except Glasgow), the Center for Local Government, and the Asian Center. Academic support (media, academic computing, and university farm) appropriations decreased by 17.1%.

*Increases:* Fellowships for graduate students increased by $100,000. Budgets were increased for the honors program, interactive TV, and summer school. Public service monies increased by $429,000. (This figure includes child care and gifted studies which had not previously been budgeted.

Student services increased by 88.65%, which will be partly reimbursed. The athletic director's office increased $57,420.

**Business** The following resolution passed by voice vote on second reading:
The Faculty Senate of Western Kentucky University commends Dr. Thomas Meredith, his administration, and the Budget Committee for their actions in attempting to protect the budget for academics in the face of the serious budget reductions we have experienced over the past year. We encourage the full preservation of academic support in future budgetary decisions.

The resolution on the vote of confidence was brought to the floor and an amendment was introduced which would alter it to an evaluation. Numerous amendments were discussed. Those that passed included performing the evaluation
annually and asking a specific question, the results to be made public, on faculty confidence in the President’s leadership. One amendment, which passed, involved deleting the phrase “following a procedure comparable to those used for appraisal of faculty by students and the evaluation of other administrators’ performance by the faculty.” An amendment that failed would have had responses to the confidence question tallied in 5 categories. The final amendment, which passed 25 to 18, reads as follows.

Whereas, the Board of Regents indicates that the President’s contract is not to be renewed or extended until July, 1993, and, there is significant sentiment for a faculty evaluation of the President’s performance prior to contract renewal, Therefore:

The Faculty Senate resolves that a detailed assessment of the President’s performance will be conducted among the faculty. The faculty assessment of the President will be conducted annually by the Faculty Senate, prior to the end of March. The comprehensive faculty questionnaire, with provision for comments, will be developed by the Faculty Senate, with an opportunity for including survey items suggested by the President and the Board. The survey must contain the question: “I have sufficient confidence in the President’s leadership to endorse his continuing as president.” The results of this question will be made public.

A resolution thanking Gene Evans for his service was presented for first reading.
Having a professional interest in how universities are run, I opened James Fisher's book with great anticipation. Here was an expert - so the blurbs on the dustjacket told me - who would discuss the problems of university governance and present challenging solutions. I must admit that the book proved an eye opener, though not in the way that Mr. Fisher intended. Since this book is being touted as a handbook for Boards of Regents, it is important for faculty and students to be aware of its contents. What Fisher presents is not so much a blueprint for reform as it is a recipe for disaster.

The book rests upon the premise that there is something seriously wrong with higher education in the United States. The exact nature of the malaise is left vague. It is simply posited as something that everyone accepts. Mr. Fisher is more precise in identifying the cause of the problem: it is all due to the "egalitarian wave of the '60s and '70s."(p. ix) During those decades university governing boards committed the academic equivalent of original sin. They bowed to the pressure of politicized faculty and radical students and accepted the idea of "collegial leadership," allowing faculty and students access to the members of the board. Even worse, some states and boards arranged for faculty and students to be directly represented. Fisher argues this trend "reflects Plato's writings about the height of degenerate democracy, 'Even the dogs become arrogant.'" Fisher goes on to liken those who believe that "Parity begets leadership" to paranoid personalities who refuse to admit any rational objections to their views.(p. 3) Three pages into the book and Fisher is already labelling his critics as paranoiac, arrogant dogs. Candidates for the U.S. presidency and university consultants appear to have a great deal in common.

The victim of collegiality, according to Fisher, is the university's president. He has been "neutered," rendered powerless by a desire to give faculty and students a voice in university affairs. Fisher warns, "If board policies include formalized contact with members of the faculty and student body, they should be changed, or the board should recognize that this condition dramatically reduces the ability of the president to lead effectively and should take this into account in its evaluation of the president."(p. 5) Fisher thinks that the only way for a president to be an effective leader is by excluding faculty and students, a university's two largest constituents.
Fisher believes that the exclusion of faculty and students from any public or formalized participation in university affairs is the cure for all the academy's woes. The board and president must combine forces to show the faculty their proper place. Fisher denies faculty any right to speak to the board or directly influence university policy. Faculty have their jobs and they should be content with that. "Beyond academic freedom, which should be rooted in a board tenure policy, what other unique conditions does the institution owe a faculty member: in the strictest terms, nothing." (p. 75, italics in the original)

Fisher does not simply bewail the evils of collegiality; he also praises power. Fisher believes the lack of powerful leaders exists not only in the academy. He speaks of "an erosion of the structure of our society and the reduced legitimacy of our leaders who are held responsible but are too often essentially unempowered." (p. 40-41) At one point he approvingly mentions a study that "makes a compelling case for increasing the legitimate authority of the U.S. presidency because of the government's inefficient, and now obsolescent, system of checks and balances." (p. 19) For Fisher there is no difference between an effective college president and effective corporate, political, or military leaders. (p. 11)

Fisher defines leadership as "the ability of A to get B to do something B might otherwise not have done." (p. 4) There are five ways to achieve such a result: reward, coercion, legitimacy, charisma and expertise. On the first two methods, better known as the carrot and the stick, Fisher provides no new insights. It is interesting, however, that he refers to Machiavelli's belief that it is better to be feared than to try to gain support with rewards. (p. 15) The university president is advised to rely upon the other three forms of manipulation.

Legitimacy is identified as "an essential condition of leadership." (p. 4) The Board bestows legitimacy by identifying the president as the sole source of active power. This concentration of authority leads the university community to expect and accept the president's exercise of power. But legitimacy is largely a matter of enhanced image. Fisher argues, "The more legitimate the leader, the more the leader is endowed with superior qualities." (p. 18) In other words, if people think the president is legitimate they will automatically elevate him or her to a higher plane. But this seems reversed. What happened to the idea that an individual's superior qualities are what create the aura of legitimate authority?

Despite several quotations from the great sociologist Max Weber, Fisher's treatment of charisma is unsatisfactory. In Fisher's analysis, charisma is reduced to the ability to attract and hold loyalty. Surprisingly Eisenhower is mentioned as an example of charismatic leadership. (p. 22) Fisher seems to think anyone with power has the potential for charisma. "The leader can dramatically increase his or her influence by recognizing and responding to the fact that people are attracted to those with power." (p. 23) The attractiveness of power provides valuable
protection since followers of charismatic leaders are willing to defend them in their absence. The charismatic aura is created by the appearance of wisdom, sincerity, confidence and strength. To keep up appearances the president must cultivate a certain aloofness - what Fisher calls social distance. "The leader is more easily perceived as charismatic when viewed from a more distant vantage point." (p. 23) "The effective charismatic leader maintains optimal psychological distance from subordinates." (p. 25) In other words, no man is a hero to his valet.

Fisher's discussion of expertise is both horrifying and hilarious. He defines expert power as "knowledge or its facsimile" (p. 20) and argues that there are two ways to wield influence as an expert. First, you can actually become an expert. But this apparently requires too much time and effort. It is equally useful to be perceived as an expert. The simplest way is to have yourself introduced to your audience as an expert. Should you choose this method, however, Fisher suggests you maintain a discreet silence. You do not want to risk making a mistake and blowing your cover. A sphinx-like demeanor will actually help since "appearing to withhold information or expertise is a measurably significant power form." The fake expert is in little danger of exposure. "People frequently accept expert pronouncements because it takes time and effort for an opponent to gather information for an alternative position. Most are not willing to risk the loss of popularity involved in going against the confident leader." (p. 20) There is no suggestion that the leader should feel qualms about pretending to have knowledge he or she does not possess. After all, "the main job of the leader is to inspire, occasionally offering a trace of detail merely to imply greater knowledge." (p. 21) Anyone familiar with the movie "The Wizard of Oz" will have a hard time reading this section without hearing a voice thundering, "Pay no attention to the man behind the curtain!"

Fisher's discussion of expertise leads to reflections on his handling of evidence. This slender, poorly-written volume is littered with statements that are never substantiated. Despite Fisher's promise that "there is no recommendation in this book that cannot be documented by research and that has not been field tested," his evidence is thin. Sometimes he tells anecdotes based upon his own experience as a university president and a consultant. Often he simply prefaces his conclusions by stating that "Countless commissions, task forces, and conferences have concluded...." (p. 1) When he does mention specific sources his citations are practically useless, simply referring the reader to a book or an article without providing page numbers. The skeptical reader will have to spend a great deal of time and effort tracing the sources of Mr. Fisher's own expertise.

Robert L. Dietle
History Department
CRITICAL INCIDENT FORM

Your Name (optional), ___________________________ College ______________ Date __/__/ __
Department (optional) ___________________________ Approximate Date of Incident __/__/ __

In the space below, describe the incident (please be behaviorally specific):

What were the circumstances that led up to this incident?

What was it that made the behavior in this incident so effective or ineffective?

Place an "X" on the scale below to indicate the effectiveness of the behavior in this critical incident:

1 2 3 4 5 6
Extremely Very Ineffective Effective Very Extremely Ineffective Ineffective Effective Effective

(Mail to: Ray Mendel, TPH 267, Campus)