



# University Senate Archives

---

University Senate

Academic year 1982-1983

---

## Volume XIX

### Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of October 25, 1982

---

**Additional information:** Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:  
<http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/15278>

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY SENATE

AGENDA

Meeting Notice: October 25, 1982, 126 Clinton Hall, 3:30 p.m.

Order of Business:

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
- II. Informal Proposals and Statements
- III. Approval of the minutes for the meeting of September 27, 1982 (Vol. XIX, No. 3).
- IV. New Business:

Nomination for Senate vacancy:  
College of Health Related Professions

Report on impact of the 4.3% budget  
reduction--Vice President John Breazeale  
(Attachment A)

Report from ad hoc Committee on Evaluation  
of Administrators--Dr. Jeff Riemer, Chair  
(Attachment B)

Report on most recent NCAA infractions--  
Dr. Martin Perline, Chair, Faculty Committee  
on Athletics

- V. Adjournment

## IMPACT OF THE 4.3% BUDGET REDUCTION ON WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

The announcement of the need to reduce Wichita State University's fiscal year 1983 budget by 4.3%, or \$1,320,745, came shortly after the beginning of the fiscal year. Because the University by that time had many contractual commitments for the year, and because the reductions were to be made and reported in a very short time, the institution had little opportunity to make the desirable careful, comprehensive assessment of where reductions could be made with least damage to instruction and to related service and research functions.

Reductions had to come from the limited remaining flexible funds or from allocated but as-yet uncommitted portions of the budget such as vacant positions and basic operating funds. Not the least of the difficulties associated with the sudden reduction was the differential impact it had on various areas of the University. Since monies were recaptured wherever they were available, the impact on individual units was as much a matter of chance as of planning. Colleges which had completed faculty recruitment for the coming academic year were in relatively better position than colleges who were still trying to fill vacancies for the fall term. A consistent effort was made during the period of intensive budget reconsideration to minimize this differential impact, but the impact was indeed uneven, and hithardest in areas where there is high faculty turnover and heavy student demand.

With the completion of fall registration and the announcement of 20th day enrollment figures for the University, it is now possible to provide a number of quantitative indicators of the impact of the reduction on instruction and related activities for the fall 1982 semester. While

these indicators are a tangible measure of negative impact, it is not possible to quantitatively assess factors such as student and faculty attitudes and general institutional morale. That there has been a negative impact in these areas is beyond doubt. The long term effect on morale will depend greatly on whether the University is asked to make further reductions in the current fiscal year. There is a general feeling that the institution has survived this reduction with its basic programs and services intact (although under greater pressure), but an equally strong feeling that additional cuts will cripple activities in very visible ways.

#### Quantitative Summary

Additional perspectives on the larger programmatic implications of the 4.3% reduction will be offered later in this report, but first, to the quantitative summary. A total of 52 unclassified and classified positions were affected by the reduction. The primary strategy was to freeze vacant positions, and determine where emergency needs could be satisfied by temporary appointments or lecturers. Three of the frozen positions were filled by temporary personnel, and an estimated 7 EFT were filled with lecturers. The remaining 42 positions remain unfilled. In addition, 25 faculty took on formal course overloads, and all the colleges have faculty and staff informally assuming additional responsibilities and heavier work loads because of the reductions. The Library, for instance, reports that 31 of its faculty and classified staff members are carrying significant overloads as a result of the budget reductions. Liberal Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Education, and Business reduced lecturer positions by about 30, which further increased instructional loads on regular faculty. Impact on student employment was significant: about 16 graduate assistantships were cut, and \$40,000 in student assistant funds were eliminated.

In all, some 110 classes or sections were eliminated from the fall 1982 schedule, creating predictable effects on class size and on the advising and scheduling process. All the academic units experienced significant overcrowding in certain courses or dislocation of normal scheduling patterns due to closure of so many classes. The professional colleges, in particular Engineering and Health Related Professions, found schedule-making for their majors extremely difficult due to (1) high contact hour requirements in their own major programs, combined with (2) lessened availability of Liberal Arts and Sciences courses required in the major programs. Specific instances from the colleges indicate the nature and extent of the problems:

1. In Engineering, two computer-based courses, AE 327 and EE 199, normally are kept at an appropriate 25 students per section. Enrollment in each section of these courses is more than double that number this fall.
2. Engineering courses with labs are hampered by the twin problem of overenrollment and equipment shortages, so that many extra lab sections have had to be added, significantly increasing faculty workload. In at least five courses, enrollment in the basic courses is four times higher than can be accommodated with existing sets of lab equipment.
3. In English Composition, which depends heavily on lecturer personnel who were cut substantially, ten sections were increased to 27 students, which translates into an additional 20 papers per instructor to be hand corrected, discussed, critiqued--in short, less personal attention to students in the course, and a higher faculty workload.

4. In Spanish introductory courses five sections were increased by 20 per cent each (the final class size was twice what it should have been), which diminishes substantially the amount of oral drill and recitation. All instruction in Chinese was canceled.
  
5. Quotas on all Computer Science classes were raised, creating a chaotic situation for students seeking access to terminals and micro-computers for the purpose of completing required class assignments.

### Student Impact

There is no small irony in the fact that the University experienced this reduction just before enrolling its largest number of students ever, some 17,187. In addition to the instructional impacts discussed above, the reductions have caused cutbacks in other areas with a consequent reduction in the amount and quality of service to students. Some specific examples:

1. Library hours were cut more than 20%, from 102 hours per week to 80, a situation which for this urban university has, not surprisingly, caused many complaints. (See attached clipping from campus newspaper, The Sunflower.)
2. Liberal Arts and Sciences removed telephones from departmental and faculty offices across the college, and the Dean has received many complaints that departmental lines are busy and long delays are experienced.
3. The Math Laboratory, which provided remedial tutorial instruction to students experiencing difficulties, has been closed, its Coordinator position frozen.
4. Reductions (5) in tutorial staff in English and writing will permit the University to accommodate the needs of only about one-third as many students as were served last year.
5. All student testing activities (ACT, professional and psychological testing, credit by examination) will be substantially curtailed.
6. Evening and Saturday preregistration will be reduced or eliminated.

Many additional examples could be cited. The basic situation is, however, clear: the University in the short run will continue to provide vital services to most of its students--we will manage to get most of them oriented, counseled, advised and registered. Student services, however, will be less smooth, less convenient, and less available generally. Should the reductions be sustained over a long period of time, the University may well be unable to serve and retain the marginal students to whom our open admission policies commit us and for whom many services have been carefully developed and nurtured over a number of years. The College of Business summed up the situation in a typical statement: "We believe we turned away more students this fall...than we have at any time."

#### Faculty Impact

It is difficult to break out specific impacts on different groups within the University since these impacts are interrelated. However, certain features of the reductions will have a particularly negative impact on the activities of faculty. Evidence has already been presented on damage to the quality of instruction, which has an immediate impact on students and faculty alike; certain other impacts are more subtle and more long-range in their effects on faculty research, scholarship, and development of excellence. Among the many specifics cited by the colleges are these:

1. The budget reductions resulted in the University returning \$200,000 of its \$270,000 capital equipment budget for FY83. The loss of these funds, already inadequate to the needs of the University, will severely hamper the instructional and research efforts of many faculty, particularly in the physical science departments in Liberal Arts and Sciences.

2. Cuts in funding for the University Research Committee will mean six fewer average faculty research awards this year. Reduction in research funds for several Engineering projects, including the important Wind Energy Project, will hurt faculty in that college.
3. Freezing of vacant clerical positions will leave several departments entirely without secretaries or any clerical assistance except the minimum service that can be expected from student assistants. As the year progresses, vacated classified positions will not be refilled except in dire emergency, so the total impact on departments could be much greater by the end of the year.
4. The Library's acquisitions budget was cut \$48,000, \$18,000 for books and \$30,000 for scientific journals in physics, biology, geology, mathematics, and chemistry. Coming on the heels of previous cuts and a slowdown in acquisitions over the last five years, this cut is certain to compound an already bad situation limiting both students and faculty in the ability to prepare for courses, undertake new assignments, and keep up with the latest research developments.
5. New curricular ventures important to institutional mission, such as the new Master of Health Science, have had to be partially postponed despite high student demand.
6. There will be reduced ability for faculty in most areas of the University to travel to professional meetings to present papers or otherwise interact with scholars in their fields. Missed opportunities of this kind can have longterm impacts on the quality of teaching and scholarship and on the development of individual faculty careers.

7. There is already evidence that, while the need for external funds in the form of grants and contracts has never been greater, lack of OOE and clerical assistance, plus the higher instructional commitments already discussed, are keeping faculty from developing proposals for external funding.
8. Having fewer resources, higher teaching loads, and less time for research than before, young probationary faculty members are especially concerned about their ability to build under these budgetary conditions the record of accomplishment in teaching and research which will be required to win the award of tenure.

On a positive note, it must be emphasized that Wichita State University has many dedicated, earnest employees in all categories who care greatly about students and about this institution. Therefore, the dominant picture has been one of people facing up to adversity and working together to minimize the losses. As one college reports, "Virtually without exception the faculty, staff, and students...have exhibited excellent spirit in the face of many difficulties brought on by the recent budget cuts. Faculty have given up some travel, taken on extra teaching and advising assignments, deferred individual research and done without equipment and office materials heretofore available. Students have accepted cuts in student assistant budgets, graduate TA positions, group travel support and the like. Classified have also joined in seeing us through a difficult adjustment. Their suggestions for short cuts and other means for conserving funds reflect imaginative and committed people".

There is strong opinion on campus that the institution has, on the whole, responded intelligently and effectively, given the difficult circumstances of the cut. Where it was possible to develop new efficiencies in responding to specific cuts, these have been pursued. Barring a crippling repetition of the cuts, WSU will continue to be able to provide a reduced but acceptable level of instruction and service to the citizens of this region and state.

SUNFLOWER, August 27, 1982

# Petition protests Ablah cutbacks

A petition protesting the 4.3 percent budget cuts in operating expenses is being circulated by the recently-formed Progressive Student Organizer Coalition.

The group was organized by Diane Gjerstad, Donna Hickey and Connie Shaffer, three Student Government Association members who were concerned with lack of student togetherness, said Gjerstad.

Another of their concerns is the budget cuts, especially the cutback in library hours, said Hickey, because she has heard complaints from students about it.

As a result, they are sponsoring the petition which states that the budget cuts have inhibited "the quality and accessibility of higher education." They will be circulating it until Sept. 1.

After they have gathered signatures, said Hickey, they will present the petition to SGA and introduce a resolution that SGA appropriate emergency funding from their reserve fund.

"The reserves we can work with may only amount to enough to keep the library open one or two nights a week," said Hickey. But if the SGA appropriates the money, she said, it will be a challenge to the administration to come up with matching funds.

PSOC, described by Hickey as "an ERA for college students," is also planning several events for the week of Oct. 4. Combining Voter Registration week with WSU Action Day and National Legislator Awareness Day, they will be bringing legislators to

campus and registering students to vote.

PSOC will invite legislators to speak to students and faculty. The purpose, said Hickey, is to get students more involved.

"If legislators have students behind them, they'll work harder to prevent more budget

cuts," she said.

They also plan to take legislators around campus, she said, "to show physically where cuts were made."

Copies of the petition are available in the SGA office for students wishing to sign or circulate them in classes.

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION REPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

*Document 7*

PREFACE

On November 24, 1981, four members of the University Senate, Zoller Greenberg, Wineke, and Farnsworth, sent a letter to University Senate President Gary Thomann requesting that a committee be appointed to inquire into and prepare a report on the evaluation of administrators. They requested the report include:

"... the rationale and uses of currently available evaluation instruments, and provide information about their form, length, size of data bank, statistical reliability, administrative procedures, and cost."

They further requested that the committee report to the University Senate in April, 1982.

President Thomann notified individuals appointed to the Administrator Evaluation Committee of its charge on April 1, 1982. The first meeting of the committee occurred on April 2, 1982. A second meeting was held with President Thomann on April 20, 1982 to clarify the committee's charge. The committee met on May 5, 1982 and adopted a course of action including individual work assignments for the summer. On September 2, 1982, the committee reviewed its progress and agreed to bring together materials for a final draft of a report on September 23. This report resulted from our deliberations on that date.

The major sections of this report indicate our approach to the Senate charge. Specifically, we have conducted (I) a Survey of Literature on Administrator Evaluations, (II) a Survey and Classification of Administrator Evaluations Used at Wichita State and Other Institutions, and (III) have provided a Summary and Conclusions.

Our report does not attempt to describe or cite all of the materials collected and reviewed by the committee. The instruments reviewed and a bibliography of materials utilized has been forwarded to 1982-83 Senate President William Mathis. They are available in the Senate Office for your perusal.

The Committee:

Jeff Riemer, Chair  
Tammy Daley, Student  
Dennis Duell  
Randy Ellsworth  
Susan Gaston  
Dave Meabon  
Diane Whallon

September 23, 1982

## I. Survey of Literature on Administrator Evaluations

An impressive array of professional literature has been published within the last decade on administrator evaluations. Administrator, within the context of the published literature, refers to persons holding such positions as Chairperson, Director, Assistant and Associate Dean, Dean, Vice President, and President/Chancellor. Although the quotations below are from only a few sources, they are representative of a general theme found in the literature concerning the rationale for and principles of administrator evaluation.

### A) Rationale for Evaluation.

Evaluation of any individual or group must be done with a stated purpose. Charles F. Fisher succinctly states what that purpose should be:

"The primary purpose of any evaluation and development program, be it faculty, administrators, students, trustees, or whomever, is to help improve individual performance and the overall operation and effectiveness of the educational enterprise."<sup>1</sup>

There is a consensus in the literature that administrator evaluations are valuable. Fisher, in synthesizing the work of several authors, advances the following arguments for administrator evaluations:

"To identify, through evaluation feedback, needed areas of individual professional development and growth.

To improve administrative performance.

To help define more clearly individual objectives consistent with institutional missions and goals.

To improve internal communications, administrative teamwork, and the overall management of the institution.

To validate the selection, retention, salary, and promotion process.

To inventory personnel resources for reassignment or training.

To help answer the external demands for accountability from government, trustees, alumni, and the general public, and thus improve the credibility of the administrative process.

To help answer the internal demands for accountability from faculty and students (who ask, if I am subject to evaluation, why not administrators?), and thus improve the credibility of the administrative process.

To enlighten all audiences regarding the institution's integrity and worth."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Charles F. Fisher, 'The Evaluation and Development of College and University Administrators', ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents, American Association of Higher Education, March, 1977, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 4.

The position of the American Association of University Professors is consistent with the views expressed by Fisher and others. It states:

"Institutions should develop procedures for periodic review of the performance of presidents and academic administrators. The purpose of such periodic reviews should be the improvement of the performance of the administrator during his or her term of office."<sup>3</sup>

B) Principles of Administrator Evaluations.

Evaluation principles refer to the criteria and procedures used in the evaluation process. Donald P. Hoyt suggests that any sound evaluation program must be based on two general principles; namely, the principles of uniqueness and contextual interpretation.<sup>4</sup> Regarding the principle of uniqueness, Hoyt states:

"Administrators must be evaluated on the basis of mutual understanding of a unique set of job expectations. If one were determined to dismiss a particular administrator, but feared that some law such as those guaranteeing civil rights or equal opportunity might be used to frustrate this desire, there is a sure way out: Don't tell the administrator what is expected, what he or she will be held accountable for. Because there is always more that needs doing than time to do it, there will be no difficulty in discovering matters that have been ignored or neglected. With no prior understanding of expectations, such "oversights" will provide objective and rational justification for even the most vindictive decisions."<sup>5</sup>

"....For what responsibilities will the administrator be held accountable? The list ought to be different for every administrator and every setting, for it should reflect unique histories and the idiosyncratic nature of local circumstances, including the capabilities and quirks of the local cast of characters."<sup>6</sup>

Regarding the principle of contextual interpretation, Hoyt states:

"....administrators should be judged within the context of the resources they had, the personal or situational obstructions they encountered, and other factors that affect outcomes but are beyond the administrator's control."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> AAUP, "Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators", ACADEME, Vol. 67, April, 1981, p. 82.

<sup>4</sup> Donald P. Hoyt, "Evaluating Administrators", New Directions for Higher Education: Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982, p. 90.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 90.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 93.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, p. 90.

Hoyt delineates other principles relating to the credibility, validity, and fairness of an evaluation program.<sup>8</sup> These principles acknowledge the complexity of administrator evaluations when the administrator may serve several constituencies and thus interact with several levels within the institution and with external groups. The evaluation program will only be fair, valid, and credible when care is taken to insure that the process is conducted openly, asks relevant questions within the context of a unique set of expectations, includes all affected parties, and provides for representative inputs. The process should also recognize that "many important outcomes of administrative behavior cannot be immediately observed."<sup>9</sup>

C) Timing of Administrator Evaluations.

How often should an administrator be evaluated in a comprehensive fashion? Hoyt suggests every three to five years. He observes that "even football coaches are usually given enough time to demonstrate the effects of their recruitment, retention, and coaching efforts."<sup>10</sup>

II. Survey and Classification of Administrator Evaluations Used at Wichita State University and Other Institutions.

Most of the Colleges within Wichita State University have some type of formal evaluation procedure for administrators. The evaluation activities of each administrative unit are briefly described in Section A. Evaluation instruments used at Wichita State are attached in the Appendix. Section B classifies administrator evaluation instruments used at Wichita State and other institutions. It also briefly comments on validity and reliability issues.

A) Evaluation of Administrators at Wichita State.

The College of Business Administration uses an instrument to evaluate the Dean which was developed by the Faculty Affairs Committee. The instrument is sent to all faculty in the College. The summary of data is shared with the faculty, discussed with Assistant and Associate Deans and shared with the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The instrument was used for the first and only time in Spring, 1980.

Chairpersons in the College of Business Administration have not been regularly evaluated by faculty except in the case of one department; that department reserves a Spring faculty meeting for evaluation. A summary of the faculty discussion is provided the Chairperson and Dean.

The faculty of the College of Education evaluate the Dean annually using a form developed in the College. A summary of faculty evaluations are pro-

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, pp. 90-95.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 98.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, p. 98.

vided by the Dean to the Vice President for Academic Affairs during his evaluation. Periodically, not necessarily yearly, Associate and Assistant Deans are evaluated by faculty. These data are included in their evaluations by the Dean. Chairpersons are evaluated annually by faculty using an instrument developed in the College. This information is included in their evaluation by the Dean.

In the College of Engineering all faculty evaluate the Dean using an instrument developed by Chairpersons and the Dean. The instrument also includes sections on the College, individual Departments, Assistant Dean, Assistant to the Dean, Dean's Office Coordinator, Cooperative Education Coordinator, College Records Coordinator, and other administrative personnel. Regarding the evaluation of the Dean, data are summarized by the Chairpersons and delivered to the Dean. The summary report is discussed with Chairpersons and shared with the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Faculty last evaluated the Dean in Spring, 1981.

Chairpersons are evaluated annually using an instrument developed by the Dean and Chairpersons. The results of faculty evaluations are shared between the Dean and individual Chairpersons.

The College of Fine Arts conducts annual evaluations of Chairpersons by faculty. The evaluation form also includes a section on the Dean, Associate Dean, and Assistant Dean.

No formal evaluation of Deans by faculty is undertaken by the Graduate School or the College of Health Related Professions. The Dean of the Graduate School seeks informal feedback on the performance of his duties from those with whom he works closely. Chairpersons in the College of Health Related Professions may seek faculty evaluations but this is not required nor is there a standard form.

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences conducts a review of the Dean using a questionnaire. The introductory statement to the questionnaire reads as follows:

A review of the performance of the Dean is called for in Section VI of the Report for Governance (passed by the LAS faculty), May 7, 1974, which provides that "The Review will be conducted anonymously and with questions submitted to the Dean, Academic Council, the faculty, and Department Chairmen, and administered by the Academic Council." Results of the review will be made available to the University Administration, the Dean, and at the latter's discretion, to the faculty.

Faculty evaluated the Dean in Spring, 1982 and approximately four years previously. Faculty evaluations of Chairpersons may also be conducted.

The Division of Student Affairs has an instrument which is used by supervisors to evaluate staff members, staff members to evaluate supervisors as well as self evaluation by staff members or supervisors. University and Continuing Education Services has an instrument which is used by the Dean to evaluate Counselors and for counselor self-evaluation.

The President of Wichita State University has not been evaluated, in a formal sense, by his WSU constituency. The Vice President for Academic Affairs was evaluated once; in 1976, at the time of the Kellogg Project.

In summary, most administrative units within Wichita State University have, at one time or another, been formally evaluated by their constituency. Procedures, instruments, and frequency of evaluation vary greatly within and among administrative units.

B) Classification of Administrator Evaluation Instruments and Other Comments.

Our selection of evaluation instruments was based on convenience sampling. Some committee members had files of sample instruments and others were borrowed from the files of various campus units. Scholarly books and articles also provided some illustrations of instruments. Evaluation instruments were classified on the basis of the evaluatee's position. Other schemes (purpose of evaluation, evaluator, type of instrument, job functions) were rejected because these approaches did not lead to clear distinctions among instruments. Four positions were identified: (1) Chairpersons - eight instruments; (2) Nonacademic Professional Staff - eight instruments; (3) Academic Deans - seven instruments; and (4) General (applicable to any administrative position) - seven instruments. The following tabulations apply to these categories:

1. Chairpersons:

a. Type:

Seven instruments - Five-point Likert-type scales, functional items.<sup>11</sup>

One instrument - Seven-point Likert-type scale, functional items.

(Five of the above eight instruments had open-ended items for appraising strengths, weaknesses, and comments.)

b. Source of Instruments:

Illinois State University, University of Illinois-Champaign-Urbana, Kansas State University, Wichita State University (N=4), and as illustrated in Booth.<sup>12</sup>

2. Nonacademic Professional Staff:

a. Type:

Six instruments - Five point Likert-type scales, functional items, with open-ended strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions.

<sup>11</sup> Likert-type scale refers to items which ask the evaluator to designate responses as "Strongly Agree", "Agree", "Disagree", "Strongly Disagree". Functional refers to the various activities and behaviors of administrators.

<sup>12</sup> David B. Booth, "Department and Chairperson Development", New Directions for Higher Education: Developing and Evaluation Administrative Leadership, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982, pp. 71-82.

- One instrument - Three-point Likert-type scale, functional items with open-ended items within functional categories.
- One instrument - Completely narrative with self-appraisal and supervisor appraisal.

b. Source of Instruments:

Oakland University, University of Massachusetts, Belhaven University, Wichita State University (N=5).

3. Academic Deans:

a. Type:

- Four instruments - Five-point Likert-type scales, functional items, with open-ended responses for strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions.
- Two instruments - Four-point Likert-type scales, functional items, with open-ended responses for strengths and weaknesses.
- One instrument - Seven-point Likert-type scale, functional items, with open-ended items for appraising strengths and weaknesses.

b. Source of Instruments:

Wichita State University and as illustrated in Rasmussen.<sup>13</sup>

4. General:

a. Type:

- Five instruments - Five-point Likert-type scales, functional items, with open-ended responses for strengths, weaknesses, comments and suggestions.
- Two instruments - Four-point Likert-type scales, functional items, without open-ended responses.

b. Source of Instruments:

Pratt Institute, University of Portland, West Shore Community College, Randolph-Macon College, Alvin Community College, Fort Hays State University, and as illustrated in Wilson and Kroesser.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Glen R. Rasmussen, "Evaluating the Academic Dean", New Directions for Higher Education: Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982, pp. 23-40.

<sup>14</sup> Robert A. Wilson and Hazel L. Kroesser, "Administrative Evaluation: A Comprehensive Approach", Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 42-49.

Based on our classification of the instruments and the tabulations above, we concluded that the typical administrator evaluation instrument is a five-point Likert-type scale which includes an open-ended assessment of the evaluatee's strengths, weaknesses, and a place for comments. Most of the items were functional; i.e. relating to the activities and behaviors of an administrator. Typical functional categories include professional development, decision-making, communication, interpersonal relations, creativity, budget, academic leadership, faculty advocacy, and general administrative skills (planning, organizing, controlling).

Instruments were institutionally developed and unique. No single instrument has been used across all administrative units. Information was not available on data banks. Validity and reliability assessments were available for only two instruments.<sup>15</sup>

---

15

See: Richard M. Fenker, "The Evaluation of University Faculty and Administrators: A Case Study", Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 46, No. 6, 1975, pp. 665-686.

Donald P. Hoyt and Ronald K. Spangler, Administrative Effectiveness of the Academic Department Head: I. The Measurement of Effectiveness, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS, (ERIC Document No. ED171214).

### III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of instituting a program of administrator evaluations is to improve individual administrative performance. There is a consensus in the literature that administrator evaluations are valuable for self improvement. Administrator evaluation procedures should recognize some important principles of evaluation such as the unique characteristics of each administrative position and the context within which the individual administrator must function.

Administrator evaluations have been used in recent years at Wichita State University; some on an annual basis and others a few years apart. The administrators evaluated have been primarily Deans, Associate and Assistant Deans, Chairpersons, and other nonacademic professional staff.

Our review of the literature suggests evaluations should be undertaken every three to five years. The suggested periodicity is not consistent with the Policies and Procedures on Chairpersons document adopted by the faculty on September 30, 1974. The chairperson document provides for an annual evaluation. An annual evaluation of chairpersons has not been carried out in some units of the university.

Our survey of evaluation instruments indicated that the vast majority are five-point Likert-type scales which include open-ended questions relating to the individuals strength, weaknesses, and a place for comments. Most of the items were functional; i.e., relating to the activities and behavior of the individual. Although there were similarities among the instruments used at Wichita State and other institutions, a "single" instrument for all administrative categories appears inappropriate given the differences in administrative assignments and the constituencies involved.

Since no single instrument has been used across all units (nor probably should be), information was not available on data banks. Validity and reliability assessments were, in almost all cases, not available.

The cost of administering evaluations is a function of such things as the length of the instrument, number of evaluatee's, number of evaluator's, and frequency of evaluations. No attempt was made to determine a dollar cost.

APPENDIX  
WSU EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

	Page
A. Dean, College of Business Administration .....	10
B. Dean, College of Education .....	13
C. Associate Deans, College of Education .....	16
D. Chairpersons, College of Education .....	21
E. Chairpersons, College of Engineering .....	24
F. General Evaluation Form, College of Engineering:	
1. College .....	32
2. Department .....	33
3. Dean .....	34
4. Assistant Dean .....	35
5. Assistant to the Dean .....	36
6. Cooperative Education Coordinator.....	37
7. Dean's Office Coordinator.....	38
8. College Records Coordinator .....	39
9. Other Administrative Personnel .....	40
G. Chairpersons, College of Fine Arts.....	42
H. Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences .....	44
I. Professional Staff, Division of Student Affairs .....	48
J. University College and Continuing Education Services .....	55

UNIVERSITY SENATE  
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the meeting of October 25, 1982, (Vol. XIX, No. 4).

Members Present: Ahlberg, Alexander, Breazeale, Brewer, Brinkman, Carmody, Chaffee, Childs, Clark, Dreifort, Duell, Egbert, Gosman, Graham, Greenberg, Harmon, Hunt, James, Janeksela, Kruger, Lee, Mathis, May, McCabe, McCollum, McLeod, Meisch, Menhusen, Myers, Olson, Rozzelle, Schoenhofer, Schrag, Sojka, Soles, Tanner, Terrell, Thomann, Throckmorton, Tilford, Wilkerson, Wineke.

Members Absent: Aagaard, Billings, Crown, Davis, Fox, Milbrandt, Millett, Nelson, Rhatigan, Thibault, Wilhelm, Zoller.

Guests: D. Duell, M. Leavy, Virgil Pangburn, Brian K. McLeod, Chris Laney, Sherry Eslick, Anne Valentine, Paula Rhoads, Milt Myers.

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Mathis called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. INFORMAL PROPOSALS AND STATEMENTS

For the benefit of those present, President Mathis reviewed the ground rules governing informal proposals and statements, which had been in force since their approval by the University Senate at its meeting on September 11, 1972: 1) that the period allotted for informal proposals would be no longer than ten minutes; 2) that each speaker would be limited to one minute; 3) that no formal action would be in order during this period; and 4) that each person recognized may, upon request and with the unanimous consent of the Senate, insert a summary of no more than two hundred words into the minutes of the meeting.

Senator Greenberg asked the President to indicate the circumstances under which tape-recording of Senate proceedings is allowed. President Mathis replied that all proceedings except for informal proposals and statements could be tape-recorded and that tape-recording of informal proposals and statements could be permitted by a majority vote of the Senate.

Senator Clark stated that the Welfare Committee had received approximately 400 completed questionnaires on fringe benefits and that the Welfare Committee plans to present a compilation of results at the next Senate meeting. He asked senators for any suggestions they might be able to offer regarding methods of compilation.

Senator McCabe stated that he had sampled student opinion regarding the recent decision of the General Faculty to deny the student member of the University Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Academic Freedom a vote on tenure and promotion cases. He said that students generally regard that decision as a step backward for an institution that has always been a strong advocate of student participation in university governance. He also said that many students, perhaps wrongly, see the vote as an attack on students by faculty. Believing that students deserve to have a vote on tenure and promotion decisions, he urged the faculty members present to vote to restore the student vote when the issue comes up at the next General Faculty meeting.

-2-

Mr. McLeod, a visitor, asked which standing rule of the Senate President Mathis was invoking when he reviewed the limitations on informal proposals and statements. President Mathis replied that those limitations do not appear in the Standing Rules; rather, they appeared in the minutes of the September 11, 1972 meeting of the Senate. On November 27, 1972, he added, the Senate voted to reinstate "Informal Proposals and Statements" as a regular agenda item. The limitations still apply.

President Mathis announced that there has been a change in Regents policy governing sabbatical leaves which would require a minor revision in the document on sabbatical leaves passed by the Senate at its last meeting. The Regents had required that a faculty member must serve two years at a state Regents institution upon return from sabbatical leave; the new policy requires that the faculty member return to the institution granting the leave. President Mathis stated that if there is no objection, he will order the appropriate change in the University's document. There was no objection.

Senator Greenberg asked if there is some reason that President Mathis has not recommended sending the sabbatical leave document to the General Faculty for approval. President Mathis replied that the document had passed in the Senate comfortably by a voice vote and that the Agenda Committee therefore saw little reason to bring the document before the General Faculty.

III.  
APPROVAL OF  
MINUTES

The minutes of the September 27, 1982 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

IV. NEW  
BUSINESS

Election of  
Senator

President Mathis opened the floor for nominations to fill a vacancy (from the College of Health Related Professions) in the Senate.

Senator Schoenhofer nominated Ms. Mary Martha Stevens. Senator Kruger seconded.

VOTE

Ms. Stevens was elected to the Senate.

Election of  
Committee  
Member

President Mathis opened the floor for nominations to fill a vacancy on the University Curriculum and Academic Planning Committee (College of Health Related Professions representative).

Senator Graham nominated Dr. Edward Weiss. Senator Gosman seconded.

VOTE

Dr. Weiss was elected to the Curriculum and Academic Planning Committee.

Report from  
ad hoc Com-  
mittee on  
Evaluation of  
Administrators

Dr. Jeffrey Riemer, chair of the ad hoc Committee on Evaluation of Administrators presented a report, orally reviewing the main points of the written report submitted by that committee (Attachment B to the Senate meeting announcement).

Senator Gosman asked if Dr. Riemer could tell those who were not members of the Senate last year why this study was requested. Dr. Riemer responded by reading a letter, dated November 24, 1981 and signed by Senators Zoller, Wineke, Greenberg, and Farnsworth, in which the request was made. The

main reason for the request was given as a belief that administrators should be subjected to systematic review, as students, faculty, and classified employees are.

Senator Dreifort asked what was to be done, now that we have the report.

MOTION

Senator Gosman observed that the report needs neither to be adopted nor rejected, only accepted as a report. He moved acceptance of it. Senator Duell seconded.

Senator Thomann asked if the committee has prepared recommendation regarding adoption of an evaluation procedure. Dr. Riemer replied that it has not.

Senator Greenberg stated that those who signed the letter requesting the study felt that administrators, like students and other employees of the University, should be evaluated on a systematic basis.

Senator Gosman observed that approval of his motion would not foreclose further action on the matter.

Senator McCabe suggested that the motion could be defeated and the report sent back to the committee with instructions that it include a recommendation.

SUBSTITUTE  
MOTION

Senator Greenberg proposed the following as a substitute motion: that the report be sent back to the committee and that the committee be instructed to prepare a report with recommendations regarding the evaluation of administrators. Senator Dreifort seconded.

Senator Thomann stated that it seems unfair to ask this committee to return with a recommendation when its original charge did not include a request for one.

Senator Schrag observed that no one is likely to know more about this issue than those on the ad hoc committee; it would, therefore, be an appropriate group to initiate a recommendation.

Senator Gosman stated that the committee could be reinstated and given a new charge; meanwhile, the Senate should accept the report.

Senator Graham pointed out that when the original request was made, the Senate really did not know if administrators on this campus were being evaluated. Now the Senate knows. He praised the report and urged its acceptance.

Senator Thomann suggested that the Senate vote down the substitute motion, accept the report, and refer the issue to the Agenda Committee.

Senator McCabe asked if returning the report, with new instructions, would be an excessive burden on the ad hoc committee. Dr. Riemer replied that it would require a good deal of further research.

Senator Terrell suggested that there is already a recommendation implicit in the report and wondered what specific recommendation the Senate would want.

-4-

Senator Dreifort stated that there should be an explicit recommendation and urged returning the report to the committee.

Senator Lee observed that, while there is a standardized system for faculty evaluation, there is no parallel system for evaluating administrators.

VOTE The substitute motion was defeated.

VOTE The motion to accept the report of the ad hoc Committee on Evaluation of Administrators passed.

Report on  
Impact of  
4.3% Budget  
Reduction

Vice President Breazeale expanded briefly on the written report he had sent to the Senate on the impact of the 4.3% budget reduction (Attachment A to the Senate meeting announcement). He stated that, when the reduction was imposed, it was agreed that each of the Regents institutions would prepare a report on the impact of the cuts; these would later be combined into a single report. The work on this report was coordinated by Dr. Jacqueline Snyder, who did the major compilation from information contributed by the Deans of the Colleges. Vice President Breazeale emphasized that in preparing the report this University wished, not only to indicate its desire to cooperate in the budget-cutting process, but also to stress its consequences to the institution.

Senator Gosman asked if there had been any reaction to the report by those to whom it has been distributed. Vice President Breazeale replied that there had not been a great deal, but what reaction there has been has been positive.

Senator Tanner asked if budget reductions in wake of the present high enrollments would cause us funding problems in the future. Vice President Breazeale replied that our present requests are based on enrollments of two years ago. Citing the "corridor effect," he observed, however, that if the University maintained its high level of enrollment through the spring and summer, we could expect a funding adjustment.

Senator Greenberg asked whether the University returned more money to the state than it might have, thereby providing some kind of cushion against further cuts. Vice President Breazeale replied that the 1.3 million cut was just about on target. He added that we have not filled all vacant classified positions and that there is slightly more money left in the unclassified salary budget than anticipated. He added, however, that there is at least a possibility that state agencies will have to cut their budgets again in November.

Senator Thomann asked where the cuts would occur if another budget reduction were imposed. Vice President Breazeale replied that it would depend in part on the size of the cut. He pointed out that not all agencies (for instance, public school systems and community colleges) were forced to reduce budgets this summer. Their participation in the next budget reduction might help to lower the University's obligation. If, however, the University were subjected to another 1.3 million cut, it would be hard to accomplish without affecting salaries.

Senator Gosman asked if the University would have more time to respond than it was given last summer. Vice President Breazeale replied that

administrative units have already been working, quietly, on contingency plans.

Senator Wilkerson expressed the hope that money could be found to keep the Library open longer than it is at present.

Senator Thomann asked about the legal implications of any reduction of faculty salaries. Vice President Breazeale agreed that such a move would probably cause legal problems. He stated that any reduction would probably require a system-wide approach.

President Ahlberg discussed his view of the situation, emphasizing the University's desire not to appear eager to return more money to the state. He said that the Presidents of the Regents institutions agree on this approach, believing that the cuts already imposed have caused great hardship.

Vice President Breazeale referred to a table of budget reductions that had been circulated to the faculty with the President's memorandum in August. He stated the cuts thereon were in large part projections and that an actual accounting is now being made.

Senator Sojka asked if the University could continue to update the impact of the reductions. Vice President Breazeale replied that we could.

Dr. Martin Perline, chair of the Faculty Committee on Athletics, reported on the recent inquiry by the NCAA into alleged violations by the athletic program. He spoke first to the question of the faculty's role in shaping the policies of the athletic program, pointing out that the Faculty Committee on Athletics has no function independent of the Athletic Board, which is advisory to the ICAA. He stated that faculty members on the Committee now receive Board meeting agendas one week in advance of the meetings, that Board members receive summaries of the athletic budget, and that line item budgets are available for their inspection in the Athletic Director's office. He emphasized that the faculty is represented in the athletic program primarily through committees. With respect to the concern expressed by faculty over academic standards in the intercollegiate athletic program, Dr. Perline observed that athletes are subject to the same academic requirements as any other student.

Dr. Perline also discussed steps taken to prevent the occurrence of violations following last year's investigation and penalization of the basketball program. He noted that a student-athlete relations committee has been established to assist student-athletes on academic matters. Also, the Athletic Director has sent memoranda to all members of the coaching staffs, outlining to them the consequences of rules violations. In addition, the athletic program has developed elaborate forms for the reporting of recruiting activities. Dr. Perline then cited, however, an item in the October 4, 1982 edition of NCAA News, which concluded that success in avoiding violations depends on the integrity of the people involved. Dr. Perline stated that he would also stress the importance of knowing the rules.

With respect to the current investigation, Dr. Perline stated that we have received an official letter of inquiry from the NCAA and that a

Report on  
recent  
NCAA infrac-  
tions

-6-

committee, chaired by Dr. James Rhatigan, is investigating the charges. The President has asked the Student Athlete Relations Committee to evaluate the findings of the investigating committee. Dr. Perline added that the investigation should not be a lengthy one.

In the discussion that followed Dr. Perline's report, a number of questions were raised, most of them directed toward the problem of preserving honesty and integrity among recruiters and boosters of the athletic program. Dr. Perline was asked if it's possible to know all of the NCAA's rules; he replied that it is extremely difficult, but that ignorance of the rules is no excuse for violating them. Senator Schrag observed, in this connection, that most other institutions manage to live within the rules; so WSU must. In response to another question, Dr. Perline stated that penalties imposed on coaches found guilty of rules violations have included dismissal as well as less severe penalties. The discussion concluded with an expression of the faculty's frustration over the continuing misadventures of the athletic program. Senator Dreifort observed that the University may be judged less by its academic standing than by its athletic prowess; the bad publicity given the athletic program can only be damaging. He also expressed frustration over the limited amount of influence that faculty have on athletic-program policy.

President Ahlberg indicated sympathy with the concerns expressed by faculty members, acknowledging that he shares their sense of frustration. He assured the Senate that an investigation into the latest charges is being conducted and that the University is committed to giving due process to all parties involved. While acknowledging that the University has a long history of NCAA rules violations and penalties, he pointed out that three of the seven investigations that the University has experienced since the 1950s have been self-reporting and that only two of the seven have involved major violations. President Ahlberg expressed particular frustration over the fact that the major violations which led to probation and sanctions against the basketball program last year were committed, not by the present coaching staff, but by the one preceding it. He questioned the justice of a system that punished programs and student athletes but not the coaches who may have been responsible for the violations. He closed by stating that the present investigation is different in kind and scope from the last, that the University has admitted to some violations and is studying other allegations.

Announcement

President Mathis announced, as an item of information, that Messrs. Carlin and Hardage have been asked for statements of their positions on higher education. If and when those statements reach us, they will be made available in the Senate office.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Donald Wineke, Senate Secretary  
Lucille Brodie, Recording Secretary