AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Meeting Notice: April 25, 1988, 126 Clinton Hall, 3:30 PM.

Order of Business:

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Proposals and Statements

III. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of March 28, 1988 (Vol. XXIV, No. 12) and for the special meeting of April 11 (Vol. XXIV, No. 13).

IV. New Business:

1. Information on the Athletic Program—Tom Shupe, Athletic Director

2. COCAO Statement on Assessment (Attachment A) and Preliminary Report - Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment—Gerald Graham, Chair (Attachment B)

3. Proposal for Budget Committee—Rules Committee, Peter Zoller, Chair (Attachment C)

V. Adjournment

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Box</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Rogers, Senate President</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpha Duell, Senate Vice President</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Nelson, Senate Secretary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Zoller, Senate President-elect</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Greenberg, Elected by Senate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Childs, Elected by Senate</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Hoyer, Appointed by Senate President</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS AT INSTITUTIONS OPERATED BY THE KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

Council of Chief Academic Officers
March 28, 1988

INTRODUCTION

Assessment of various types is pervasive at nearly every college and university in the nation; it plays a central role in planning and decision making. For the Kansas Regents' system, a substantial portion of each institution's effort and resources is currently being devoted to student assessment, personnel assessment, and program assessment. The Program Review process initiated five years ago by the Regents is but one example of systematic assessment efforts which characterize the Regents' institutions.

Although assessment has, for a long time, been a prominent aspect of planning and management activities, there has been increasing interest, both in Kansas and nationally, in assessing educational programs to address accountability considerations and requirements. Many of these concerns reflect interest in such matters as declining scores on college entrance examinations and anecdotal reports about deficiencies in the basic academic skills of college graduates.

A constructive response to this need will be in the best interests of public higher education in Kansas. Therefore, the chief academic officers of the Regents' institutions have, in consultation with their staff and advisors, given careful consideration to preparing the response contained in this report.

ANALYSIS

Such a project is complicated by four considerations. First, "typical" evaluation models are not always applicable. Second, distinction between evaluation for "accountability" purposes and evaluation for "management" purposes is not always made. Third, there are severe technical limitations inherent in many assessment mechanisms. Finally, some methods of assessment in current use are either inexpedient or extremely costly or both, resulting in highly dubious cost/benefit ratios.

1). Considerations relative to the "typical" evaluation models. According to most "textbook" descriptions, evaluation proceeds from "needs assessment" to "goal determination" to "program component analysis" to "assessment of goal achievement". The major difficulty with applying this formulation to complex institutions of higher education is that such institutions provide a wide variety of programs each with relatively distinctive goals and degrees of complexity.

Although nearly all curricula are characterized by (a) basic skills requirements, (b) liberal education requirements, and (c) major field requirements, there is no consensus as to what must be included under each. Thus:
for some curricula, basic skills means written composition and oral communication; for others, a quantitative expectation is added; still others add computer skills; some may go so far as to add high level intellectual skills (reasoning, problem solving, critical thinking).

for some, liberal education means a systematic exposure to the major methods, theories, and knowledge in natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and fine arts; to others, it means exposure to a sampling of introductory courses in two or more of these broad areas; to still others, it encompasses more specific expectations (creating awareness of international interdependence; an understanding of alternative models of government; historical perspective on recurring societal problems; etc.)

for some, major field requirements mean an exposure to a "core" of background courses and a concentration in one facet of this core; for others, it means satisfying standards or criteria established by accrediting bodies or by certification or licensure boards; for still others, it means gaining the foundation necessary to specialization in graduate or professional school; etc.

In some colleges and universities, a core curriculum has been instituted to insure a degree of commonality in at least some portion of each undergraduate degree offered by the institution. However, it is possible to provide meaningful undergraduate education without requiring consensus on the parameters to be included under any of these rubrics. Appropriate basic skills may differ from one curriculum to the next. All may have a "written communication", a "quantitative skill", and a "computer literacy" component, but the particular goals and content within these components may be very different for a teacher, a manager, and an accountant. Similarly, although most educators will agree that a "liberal education" is a viable concept, its specific goals and content may be very different for an agronomist, a philosopher, an engineer, and a social worker. Finally, each of the numerous "majors" or "specializations" offered at complex universities has a unique set of objectives related to the major field.

For these reasons, it is not possible to provide a single description of educational goals at a given institution. Each of the many undergraduate degree programs may appropriately have different goals related to basic skills, liberal education, and specialization.

2). Considerations relative to evaluation purposes. Most authorities recognize two major purposes for evaluation (assessment) activities:

(a) Evaluation can contribute in essential ways to the decision-making process. For example, it helps sponsors to discover if the programs and projects they are sponsoring are achieving the goals by which they were justified. It also helps administrators determine the relative effectiveness
of different programs or of different people, thus providing a basis for 
administrative judgments and recommendations (program enhancement, 
continuation, reduction, or elimination; salary increases, personnel 
reappointments, promotion, tenure). When evaluation is intended to aid 
conclusions about the viability of programs or personnel, it is called 
summative evaluation.

(b) Evaluation can also be used to examine program or personnel processes 
which contribute significantly to the achievement of goals or purposes. 
Through the study of these processes, the evaluator hopes to discover ways and 
means for enhancing effectiveness or, at a minimum, for making judgments about 
the conditions which would be needed in order to bring about necessary or 
desired improvements. When evaluation is used in this diagnostic sense, it is 
called formative evaluation.

There is general agreement that oversight agencies have a legitimate 
interest in program evaluation which is summative in nature. Such agencies 
should expect the institutions to document the degree to which programs 
achieved objectives related to the public good.

Formative evaluation, on the other hand, involves many intricate and 
esoteric professional issues. It is sensible to charge program officers, 
appointed largely on the basis of their specialized professional knowledge and 
skill, to deal with such questions—that is, to manage programs. Those with 
oversight responsibilities typically determine what programs to offer; internal 
managers typically determine the processes and personnel which should be 
employed to carry out these programs.

3). Technical limitations. In general, tests and other formal assessment 
activities have been most successful when they have been directed to specific 
objectives. These have tended to focus on relatively simple, low level types 
of development. For example, there are a number of useful tests available for 
assessing "spelling", "vocabulary", and "grammatical usage"; but instruments 
for assessing "proficiency in written communication" are relatively scarce, and 
there is little consensus about their value.

National testing agencies have developed substantive examinations in a 
variety of disciplines and in broad subject matter areas such as humanities, 
social sciences, and natural sciences. Although such examinations are usually 
developed on the basis of the highest technical standards, they are all subject 
to the criticism that the content and objectives do not adequately represent 
the emphases of a specific institution. As a consequence, examination results 
do not necessarily reflect how well students learned what was taught at the 
institution. Further, when such results are taken seriously as indicators of 
course or program effectiveness, they invite educators to "teach to the test" 
rather than to provide the educational experiences originally selected as most 
meaningful.

The assessment of "high level intellectual functioning" poses special 
problems. Cognitive psychologists now recognize that characteristics like 
"critical thinking", "reasoning", and "problem solving" cannot be assessed
satisfactorily without attention to such matters as specificity/generality of intellectual attributes, the influence of developmental differences, and students' prior knowledge and skill level. Furthermore, recent research has strongly suggested that these high level skills are not uni-dimensional. For example, one leading authority on critical thinking has recently expanded his definition to include 13 distinct dispositions and 12 different abilities.

Beyond concerns posed by the inability to assess complex intellectual characteristics are those posed by a lack of skill or experience in assessing important "affective" dimensions of education. With each new "scandal" in government or industry, comes a renewed demand for colleges and universities to promote "ethical development" on the part of their graduates. Unfavorable comparisons between the economic productivity of this country and that of other developed nations inevitably create a call for more commitment to the "work ethic" or to management styles based on subscription to "participatory democracy" as a personal value. Most colleges and universities will include affective development in their goals and objectives; in addition to goals relating to "ethical behavior", these may include such goals as developing a sense of personal responsibility, a personal identity, a personal value system or philosophy of life, a sense of curiosity, and a commitment to community participation.

Such goals are more than educational jargon. They represent serious commitments to essential types of student development. Yet no one would make an earnest claim that they can be meaningfully assessed with available structured instruments and technology.

Clearly, it is not true that attributes which can't be assessed (at least at present) are less important than those which can. This warns us about establishing assessment requirements which focus only on goals which are most easily measured.

4). Cost and expediency considerations. One of the easiest ways to respond to assessment pressures is to purchase examination services from one of the major testing companies. However, this option involves serious cost and expediency dilemmas. For example, the Academic Profile offered by the Educational Testing Service, costs about $8 per student for the short (1 hour) version or $15 per student for the long (3 hour) version. The latter will provide 7 scores for each individual related to some aspects of liberal education and to some basic skills; the former is considered to be too unreliable to provide scores for individual students. At a minimum, this would require an investment of over $90,000 to test the freshman class of the Regents universities each year. To assess progress over a given time period, a re-test would have to occur, so that the annual cost for the examination alone would approximate $180,000 for this portion of the assessment program. If the program were to be used to make decisions about individual students, these costs would be nearly doubled. In addition, if testing services were purchased to assess the achievement of seniors in their major fields, the annual charge of the testing companies would be approximately $130,000. These charges do not include any of the administrative and analytical costs which each university must assume.
Of course, such costs can sometimes be reduced by testing only representative samples of students. If the purpose is to judge the present status or growth of groups (e. g., juniors who have completed two years at University X) rather than to make decisions about individual students (e. g., to decide who should be admitted to the upper division, who should take additional courses of a given type, or who can graduate), a sampling procedure can reduce direct costs.

However, it can also introduce sizeable logistical problems. In a recent try-out experience at Kansas State, it was possible to test only slightly more than half of the freshmen sample who were selected to participate even though eight different evening testing sessions were scheduled and individual testing opportunities were made available to students on six different days. As a result, the representativeness of the results is in doubt. The testing of graduating seniors may pose even more difficult problems. For many fields of study, cost saving through sampling may be unrealistic because of the relatively small number of graduates. Further, testing would have to be scheduled during an extremely busy period of the seniors' collegiate careers. Beyond the problem of inducing students to participate voluntarily, there is the dilemma of motivating them to do their best. Under present arrangements, there are no "consequences" of a given test performance; in fact, unless one uses a 3-4 hour test, results are not even provided for individual students.

Despite the obstacles created by the four considerations just reviewed, it is desirable for the Regents institutions to make a bona-fide effort to respond to the requests by the Board of Regents and the Legislature that documentation be provided about the impact and effectiveness of undergraduate programs. At the same time, it is also desirable that this response be an integral part of institutional planning and not an isolated activity unrelated to management needs. In this connection, the response should be integrated with other assessment-related activities of the universities; in particular, accreditation and program review activities.

CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE UNDERGRADUATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Those characteristics of undergraduate programs which should be assessed were identified earlier. Although there will be substantial differences across both institutions and curricula in specific content and objectives, each undergraduate program should be able to identify its general expectations with respect to:

1. basic educational skills.
2. general/liberal education (breadth of knowledge and understanding).
3. specialization (depth of knowledge and understanding).

Given agreement on this general expectation, three characteristics of a sound assessment program can be identified. First, such a program will make provision for determining the degree to which those who complete a given undergraduate program have made progress toward each of these general goals. Second, it will report results and conclusions of its assessments to agencies with responsibilities for protecting the public interest (e. g., the Board of
Regents, accrediting agencies, etc.). Third, it will incorporate assessment findings into its program planning and decision making processes. Clearly, the last of these needs involves assessment of both outcomes and process. Thus, it requires a more comprehensive assessment than that needed for accountability purposes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Academic Affairs Officer of the Board staff has already provided the Board of Regents with a description of the general type and level of assessment activities which are in effect at Regents' institutions. More detailed reports have also been filed by the institutions with the Board office. These reports serve as a backdrop for considering the following recommendations.

The Council of Chief Academic Officers recommends that:

1. Each institution describe its undergraduate program assessment plan to the Board of Regents by January 15, 1989. This description should include:
   a. a general characterization of expectations of the undergraduate program's responsibility for basic educational skills, general/liberal education, and specialization.
   b. methods for assessing progress on basic educational skills.
   c. methods for assessing progress on goals related to general/liberal education.
   d. methods for assessing progress related to specialization.
   e. a schedule for reporting outcomes in these three areas to the Board of Regents. The specialization component should be integrated into accreditation, program review, and "role and scope" assessment processes.
   f. the process of incorporating assessment findings into institutional program planning activities.
   g. projections of additional annual costs which the institution will experience as a result of implementing its undergraduate program assessment plan.

2. In developing local assessment plans, institutions are urged to consider plans which are cost efficient. The comprehensiveness and elegance of an assessment plan are constrained by its resource demands. In arriving at an appropriate plan, it is essential that its benefits be justified relative to those which could be expected if comparable expenditures were made in other high priority areas (e.g., libraries, undergraduate equipment, etc.)

3. Each institution is encouraged to utilize assessment procedures to improve its program development and management strategies. It is expected that the assessment plan will be improved and revised in the light of experience and new developments. It is desirable that the Board of Regents be informed of any new major efforts or innovations. In making such reports, institutions are encouraged to follow an outline which identifies the focus of the assessment effort, describes its intent (the types of assessment measures which will be related to student and/or program characteristics), depicts its purpose (the planning or management group/process which will profit from the effort), and establishes a schedule for implementation.
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SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT ISSUES

In December, 1987, the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee appointed the Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment. The committee's charge was to devise a plan for communicating to the university faculty the issues concerning assessment. This report, summarizing the committee's view of outcomes assessment, represents one aspect of the plan for communicating with the faculty. Notice, this report by committee charge, does not make recommendations; rather the intent is to increase understanding of the concept.

Major topics of the report include definition and examples of assessment, current status, benefits and concerns, organization and implementation, uses of data, and costs.

DEFINITION AND EXAMPLES

Assessment, sometimes called valued added, in its simplest form tries to: (1) link educational objectives to measures of student achievement, and (2) determine what the college experience adds to students' knowledge and attitudes.

Typically, assessment programs use a combination of commercially-prepared tests, opinion survey's, and institutional data to gather information on student learning and attitudes.

Commercially-prepared tests. Some examples of commercially-prepared, standardized tests include:

1. ACT College Outcomes Measure Project (COMP)
2. ETS Academic Profile
3. College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (BASE)
4. ACT Freshman College Entrance Exam
5. Graduate Record Exam
6. UAP Business Test
7. NTE Music Education Test
8. GRE (Mathematics Test)
9. ETS Major Field Achievement Tests
10. CLEP Subject Tests

Other forms of evaluation. In addition, other evaluation methods include:

1. Tests developed by the institution
2. Licensure examinations
3. Recitals, exhibits, terminal projects
4. Field experiences
5. Oral exams
6. Capstone Courses
7. Departmental exit exams

Some of these tests may be administered at the beginning of programs and others after the completion of programs; some are general knowledge exams while others are program specific.

Opinion surveys. Most assessment programs also conduct periodic opinion surveys to register opinions, attitudes, and/or values. Examples of opinion surveys may include:

1. Survey of students
2. Survey of alumni
3. Survey of employers
4. Survey of faculty

Institutional data. Some institutional data may also be used in assessment programs, for example:

1. Student retention rates
2. Demographic data
3. Job placement
4. Faculty turnover
5. Instructional/administrative costs

This is not intended to be an exhaustive list, only illustrative, and we surely do not imply that any institution employs all of these activities.

STATUS OF ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS

In the broad sense, universities have been engaging in some type of assessment activities since their beginnings. However, in the past few years, many institutions, often with the prodding of legislative and accrediting bodies, have formalized assessment activities.

According to a survey sponsored by the Education Commission of the States and the American Association of Higher Education, two-thirds of the states have some type of formal assessment program. While some fear that the current focus on assessment is just another of those passing educational fads, most authorities believe that states and universities will become even more interested in assessment in the future.

Thus far, universities and colleges in Kansas have begun to document their assessment-type activities. At the Board of Regents' request, they are now putting forth plans for developing formalized assessment in their respective schools.

MAJOR BENEFITS AND CONCERNS

If done properly—that is, with the participation of the faculty in the design of the program, with a clear set of goals that focus on improvement of student learning, with the opportunity of the faculty to assess administrative
and governing bodies' roles, and with the needs of continuing faculty
development built into the system—some potential benefits may occur.

**Potential benefits.** Major potential benefits of assessment programs appear to be:

1. Improvement of teaching and learning
2. Raising faculty expectations for and increasing understanding of the educational process
3. Providing mutual feedback about performance among faculty, students, administrators, and external governing bodies
4. Providing for institutional strengths
5. Aiding student retention and enhancing student employability

Other potential advantages include: offering consumers information on which to base informed choices about education, organizing assessment activities already in place, providing feedback to students on their performance (midstream assessment), highlighting role of university in state economic development, promoting academic introspection and awareness of the consequences and impact of institutional performance, and preventing loss of institutional control of assessment process to external agencies or governing boards.

**Potential concerns.** Major potential concerns regarding assessment programs appear to be:

1. Assessment is often linked to the improvement of instructors, yet no data exists to demonstrate the link. Funding of assessment furthermore may deprive instructional programs of needed resources for improvement of instructor
2. The assessment process may trivialize education and eliminate intangible benefits, particularly in fields (liberal arts and fine arts) where some outcomes are correctly ambiguous, unpredictable and serendipitous
3. Assessment instruments may not be able to measure higher order cognitive and critical thinking skills
4. High cost of implementation—both in budget and in faculty and administrative time—are typically underestimated
5. Some confusion exists concerning uses of assessment data—collecting and using data to show accountability to outside agencies may not be compatible with the need to improve educational programs.

6. Outside individual case studies, little or no research data exists to demonstrate clear results of assessment activities.

Other mentioned concerns involve: outside agencies sometimes tend to rush implementation schedules (implementation may take three to ten years), some parts of the institution are more compatible with assessment profile than others, and may have minimal utility for external evaluators.

**Commercially-prepared, standardized testing.** Other benefits and concerns are more directly related to commercially-prepared, standardized testing. The major advantage of commercially-prepared, standardized testing seems to be that it provides, with relatively little effort from the university, an objective means for evaluating output. Other potential advantages are: low development costs, standardized administration and grading, developed norms, and high level of item quality. Such tests appear to be particularly useful in measuring basic skills. Concerns about commercially-prepared, standardized testing include: fear that a single index number will be used to judge a program, tests may limit or be inappropriate to the curriculum and they may encroach upon academic freedom of the faculty who feel some pressure to teach to the test, standardization may not consider uniqueness of institutions/programs, tests may promote unfair comparisons among institutions, and tests are available only in limited fields and very few subscores are available. There is also a general concern for the value of standardized tests (racism, classism and sexism of items).
IMPLEMENTATION AND ORGANIZATION OF PROGRAMS

Most states (governing boards) take a position of encouraging institutions to develop assessment programs, but about twenty-five percent of the programs have been mandated by the state.

Typical implementation and organization. Although each program is unique, a typical implementation program, occurring over a three- to five- year period may include three phases.

First, the institution usually identifies its current assessment activities and forms a committee to study the issues. The committee involves and helps the faculty understand the central issues of the program.

In the second phase, faculty and/or administrators: (1) identify objectives of their programs, (2) explain how their programs attempt to accomplish these objectives, and (3) identify ways of measuring whether the programs actually accomplish their objectives. Faculty and/or administrators usually decide, if given a choice, which data is reported to outside agencies and which data is used for internal improvements.

Pilot programs, the third phase, run in selected areas and results and procedures are evaluated. Finally, assessment activities are formalized for the entire institution.

After programs are in place, machinery is set up to administer the programs. Some institutions create a position such as Coordinator of Assessment. This office oversees, engages in, and coordinates data collection. The office may also distribute data to appropriate users. For instance, information on program accountability may go to the Board of Regents and data on internal improvements may go to deans, program chairs or directors. In turn, these people analyze the data and design strategies for program improvement.
In other institutions, the above functions are performed by administrators and faculty committees. Many institutions also coordinate assessment with the university's regular long range planning and budgeting.

DATA COLLECTION AND USES

There are three major points where data collection for assessment may take place.

Prior to admission. Often called screening, admissions, diagnostic, or placement tests, these data are typically collected when a student is applying for admission to the institution, transferring from another institution, or when a student is applying for acceptance to a specific program. Common examples include: SAT, ACT, GRE, Miller Analogies Test, TOEFL, High School GPA, and PPST Writing and Mathematics tests.

During attendance. Assessment data gathered while a student is in a program often check for progress during the program. Information may be used for correcting problems prior to graduation. Common examples are: instructor grades, course grades, clinical observations, juried performances.

Culmination. Often called credentialing, certification, or licensure exams, these procedures may or may not require a passing score prior to awarding a degree. Common examples include: NTE, CPA Exam, National Board of Dental Hygiene Exam, individual program comprehensive exams. Data collection may also occur several years after students have completed programs.

Use of data. Assessment data is used for two primary purposes: program improvement and accountability, i.e., to demonstrate the effectiveness of the institution to a variety of constituencies.

While these two uses need not be mutually exclusive, they often offer some conflict in choices and procedures. For instance, program improvement data requires activities that go far beyond standardized tests; improvement takes a
long time; and administrators must recognize the need to persuade a sometimes suspicious, reluctant and powerful faculty. By contrast, data for accountability must be externally credible, capable of supporting comparative judgments between institutions/programs or over time, and must be simple enough to be understood by lay audiences.

Effective assessment requires resolving potential conflicts created by these two uses of data, particularly in the areas of designing and implementing the program, dimensions of student performance to assess, kinds and degree of standardized instruments, responsibility for assessment, and how to use and communicate results.

**FUNDING AND COSTS**

Most institutions receive some budget from the state to implement their programs. Others have begun their programs with small grants from foundations or private donors. The University of Houston, for example, received a $50,000 grant from a private donor to begin their assessment process. Tennessee, with a unique approach, offered incentive grants to departments to develop assessment programs and makes available to its colleges and universities up to five percent addition to their budgets for implementing assessment activities and achieving specified improvement goals.

In almost every case, institutions report that costs were more than anticipated. Since each institution's program is unique, it is virtually impossible to get "standard estimates" for implementing assessment programs. However, some cost data are available. Most assessment programs begin rather modestly by using data that is already available. Some add, or modify currently-used, opinion surveys to their data base. Such modest beginnings may cost as little as $10,000 to $20,000, depending upon institution size.
At the other end of the continuum are universities with comprehensive assessment programs. The University of Tennessee at Knoxville (UTK), with 25,000 students and a very comprehensive program, estimates a cost of $250,000 annually for assessment. UTK uses commercial tests extensively at both entry and exit levels, although they do sample their population.

James Madison, with a student population of 10,000 has an annual assessment budget of more than $260,000 or roughly $26 per student. Their program uses commercial tests extensively in testing for basic skills, general education objectives, and achievement in majors. They also test at the entry, junior, and exiting senior levels. And they test 100 percent of their students. Additionally, they use surveys and other institutional data in making their assessments. A partial breakdown of their expenses is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Assessment Coordinator</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Testing @ $10 per student</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Information</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items, including:</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four full time staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two graduate assistants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing within major (developed by faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $260,000
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BUDGET COMMITTEE

a. Composition: 4
   1 member who are expert in accounting
   2 members with broad knowledge of the university
   1 senior accountant from the community, non-voting

b. Selection: Standard

c. Charge: The Budget Committee:

1. Will consult with the standing committees of the faculty senate and other faculty constituencies and develop a list of budgetary questions the answers to which are necessary for the faculty to be knowledgeable participants in their proper role in faculty governance.

2. Will develop a standard format for the presentation of this information and present such information annually to the faculty senate.

3. Will examine, from a faculty perspective, in the development of the above information all funding sources of the university, including the state budget, the Endowment Association, the Alumni Association, the Board of Trustees, the City of Wichita/Sedgwick County mill levy funds, and such other sources as are identified in their work.

4. Will continue to work with existing faculty committees and ad hoc committees to provide whatever budgetary information is necessary for the knowledgeable participation of these committees in meeting their charges.
Some Notes on the Summary

1. Unless otherwise noted, the figures are based upon a nine month full time equivalent. The salary for those individuals who have more than a nine month appointment or less than a full time appointment has been adjusted.

2. The data for Liberal Arts were provided by the affirmative action office; the data for business and engineering were from the University Budget document.

3. The numbers in ( ) are the n's used for calculation.

By College

Business: 37,370 (67)
Engineering: 39,017 (42)
LAS: 29,732 (230)
Humanities: 28,308 (86)
Natural Sciences: 31,211 (86)
Social Sciences: 29,738 (58)

By College By Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>LAS Hum</th>
<th>LAS NS</th>
<th>LAS SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>49009 (16)</td>
<td>44234 (17)</td>
<td>37649 (16)</td>
<td>43173 (20)</td>
<td>40215 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>40062 (18)</td>
<td>37705 (10)</td>
<td>29070 (35)</td>
<td>32321 (29)</td>
<td>32286 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>34534 (21)</td>
<td>33980 (15)</td>
<td>24487 (25)</td>
<td>27114 (22)</td>
<td>26148 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>22766 (12)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20847 (9)</td>
<td>19521 (12)</td>
<td>22000 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chair Salaries

The length of the chair contracts varies noticeably between the three colleges. Technically, a 12 month contract is really a 11 month contract; i.e., the Univ figures the 9 month equivalent by dividing by 11 rather than 12 then multiplying by 9. For this summary, all salaries are divided by the length of the appointment then multiplying by 9. As the longer contracts are concentrated among chairs, the chair means are calculated two ways: 1) dividing by the length of contract multiplied by 9, and 2) averaging the actual salary regardless of contract length (the value in [ ]).

ALL CHAIRS: 37327 [39980] (29)
Business: 41615 [41615] (5)
Engineering: 45265 [60350] (4)
### By Department

#### Liberal Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdepartment</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>34668</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>31582</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>38413</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>34643</td>
<td>(35543)</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### By Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>32506</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>41000</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>28442</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Computer Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>36112</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>40800</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>34150</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>23688</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MCLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>25857</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>31013</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>22233</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>25929</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>28588</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>30590</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>25150</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>25929</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Accounting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdepartment</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>36862</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>49538</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>36580</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>22892</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>42787</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>46380</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>37175</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>35825</td>
<td>(32670)</td>
<td>(39908)</td>
<td>(35497)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes of the meeting of April 25, 1988 (Vol. XXIV, No. 14).

SUMMARY OF SENATE ACTION

Motion: The Rules Committee moved the adoption of a proposal for a Budget Committee: the motion passed, as amended.


Members absent: Brady, Burdsal, Cavarozzi, Dreiford, Fatehi-Sedeh, Hucldstadt, McCormick, Milbrandt, Scudder, Snyder, Theerathorn, Washington.

President Rogers called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. He announced a reception in honor of Lucille Brodie, who is retiring this year from her position as secretary for the Senate. This reception will be held at 2:00 on May 9, prior to the regular meeting.

President Rogers then described the required procedure for the discontinuance of the Business Education program. After the College has made a recommendation, the proposal is supposed to come to the next Faculty Senate meeting; because the Senate agenda had already been set by the time the College reached a decision, this item will be considered at a special meeting next week or at the regular meeting on May 9. In response to a question from Senator Gosman, President Rogers explained that the Senate can decide to take no action, to recommend discontinuance, or to recommend continuance of the program. Any recommendations will come from the floor rather than from a committee.

In response to a question from Senator Johnson concerning the percentage of salary increase money retained by the President and the deans, Vice President Scott explained that there was no set amount or limit; the percentage was determined each year according to specific needs and problems.

President Rogers reported on the present status of the Margin of Excellence situation. The proposal came out of conference committee with a recommendation for funding 82% of the request for faculty salaries and for program enhancement: $850,000 for salaries, $191,000 for programs.

The minutes for the regular senate meeting on March 28 and the special meeting on April 11 were approved as circulated.

President Rogers introduced Tom Shupe, Athletic Director, for a report to the Faculty Senate.
Mr. Shupe explained that WSU was one of the 292 members of NCAA Division 1AAA (the triple A indicates we do not have a football team). We sponsor 15 sports, 7 for men and 8 for women: 3 to 4% of the participants in these sports do not receive aid in some form. The Intercollegiate Athletic Association has 52 employees, with 19 full-time coaches, 8 people in direct support of student services. The Association is directed by the ICAA Board, chaired by Dr. Gosman. There are 12 voting members on the board: 6 faculty members plus Vice President Lowe; 2 student members; 2 members from the donors group; the alumni president.

The budget is approximately 3.1 million. Twenty-four percent of the revenue is from student fees (approximately $785,000); 26% from donors ($875,000); gate receipts, primarily from men's basketball (1.2 million); 16% from state appropriated dollars ($532,000). Those dollars are restricted for salaries for coaches and support for women's athletics, as well as the A.D.'s salary. Expenses include approximately $375,000 in tuition and fees and $150,000 for the residence halls for room and board, plus utilities and physical plant maintenance.

Mr. Shupe then reported on the debt situation. As causes for the debt, he listed replacement of contracted personnel, ensuing start-up costs with football and basketball, and capital improvements that exceeded funding. The ICAA was forced to borrow money to cover expenses that had been incurred as a result of the football drain; suspension of the football program was a direct result of this debt.

Short, or medium, range planning involves restoring the fiscal balance, which is well on the way to being accomplished. It includes amortization of the loan, which has a five-year pay back; these payments are built into the budget. An additional debt was incurred when capital improvements were made; he hopes to service this debt separately so that it will not be at the expense of the on-going ICAA programs, perhaps with special projects and fund raising. Currently, the athletic budget is tied into the University mainframe and goes through the general university accounting system, with monthly financial reports.

Mr. Shupe indicated that he feels the non-revenue programs (14 of the 15 sports) need shoring up or enhancement, having suffered financially in previous years. He anticipates all programs will be competitive in their respective conferences and within the Regents System. He feels the men's basketball program, which bears the responsibility for generating revenue for the department, has the ability to compete for a national championship and to become the primary sports entertainment in Wichita. This program, then, deserves attention, monitoring, and direction from the ICAA. He also feels a national championship is definitely a possibility in baseball, which would bring good will and support from the community.

As far as football is concerned, Mr. Shupe noted that there is currently a committee studying the possibility of reinstituting this program and that he will wait until this report is available before commenting extensively. He pointed out that there is a growing sentiment that there is a widening gap.
between the 'haves' and the 'have nots'--and he doesn't know if WSU could support an Oklahoma or Nebraska type program.

He concluded by stating that he feels intercollegiate athletics are important on the campus, that he wants to provide an ambitious, aggressive, recruiting arm for the University, and that he intends to continue to recruit students who will become good athletes, good students, and good qualified alumni.

In response to a question from Senator Gosman, Mr. Shupe pointed out that four of the ten members of the Academic Team in men's basketball were from WSU. He noted this was an unprecedented percentage and said he felt it was a tribute to Coach Fogler, who was dedicated to the academic aspect of that program. He said we also had members on other academic teams, and the Director's Honor Role (3.0 or better) had 53 representatives.

In response to a question from Senator Zoller about program assessment methods other than win/loss statistics, Mr. Shupe said clear goals were set and constant monitoring of academic progress was conducted. Senator Zoller raised the possibility of exit interviews with athletes, and Mr. Shupe agreed this might be a good idea.

In response to a question from Senator Bereman about the tutoring procedure, Mr. Shupe explained that after the ICAA was notified that an athlete was in trouble, he or she was assigned mandatory study hall hours and tutoring; those who did not comply could not attend practice.

In response to a question from Senator Kitch, Mr. Shupe noted we have a total of 150 students in the intercollegiate program.

Dr. Graham presented an interim report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment. He pointed out that it is now clear that some kind of assessment procedure will be mandated by the Legislature and that it is to be hoped the faculty can enact a program that will be helpful. In response to a question from Senator Gosman, Dr. Graham explained that a comprehensive assessment program was extremely expensive, approximately $250,000 per year--and had been implemented at only a few institutions, most of them small. However, he noted that most institutions are doing some kind of assessment already, and if we could pull together some of the techniques we're using right now, we might be able to establish a program that would be worthwhile and not terribly expensive.

In response to Senator Barrett's inquiry about a procedure to establish goals and objectives, Dr. Graham acknowledged no process had yet been set up.

Vice President Scott noted that the General Education Program had set up goals for basic skills and that these would have to suffice until the new General Ed program was in place. She also pointed out that the arts and sciences represented the greatest challenge, since there are assessment procedures of some kind in most of the special areas.

Senator Greenberg asked about the possibility of personnel decisions being made on the basis of assessment. Dr. Graham replied that in the programs the
committee had looked at, evaluations covered programs rather than individuals, and that the studies by and large had aggregate scores only. Senator Greenberg then inquired about financial decisions made on the basis of evaluations. Dr. Graham said the committee hadn't seen that; in general, he stated, the effect seemed to be that weak programs were brought up to standard. He saw the biggest advantage to assessment being the exchange of information by faculty, the preparation of goals, and the collecting and reporting of data.

Senator Kitch pointed out that it is always necessary to distinguish between the two major ways assessment can be used: externally, by bodies outside the university, and internally, by faculty in order to improve programs and instruction. She noted that we must be sure we don't think we're doing one thing when we're actually facilitating something else.

Senator Baxter raised the question of whether the committee was looking for a single assessment method that could be used across the entire university or for different methods within different colleges. Dr. Graham said probably the latter, which could function with historical or like-institution comparisons.

Senator Robbins pointed out the inevitable link between the existence of selective admissions and any assessment data: the ability of incoming students is inherently a part of their performance. Dr. Graham agreed, and added that the University of Tennessee had suggested that the value added process may not be the best way to test programs.

Members of the committee indicated these difficulties in collecting data:
1. There is no institution that is quite comparable to WSU as far as diversity of student body, programs, etc., is concerned.
2. We have a large number of transfer students--60%--which makes "tracking" and assessing quite complicated.

Dr. Graham concluded by suggesting that any assessment program depends on faculty action and involvement—and that such assessment could be valuable, above and beyond the Regents' interest.

Senator Zoller, for the Rules Committee, presented a proposal for the formation of a Budget Committee; the proposal received unanimous support from the Rules Committee.

Senator Greenberg moved, Senator Clark seconded, that the proposal be amended by adding the following provision: Item 5: After consultation with the Faculty Senate, will make budgetary recommendations to the central administration.

Senator Zoller explained that the assumption had been that the Budget Committee would serve primarily to provide information and explanation to the Senate and to the Executive Committee, which would then make recommendations. This was one of the reasons for keeping the Budget Committee small.

Arguments in support of the amendment focused on the right and need of the Senate to indicate priorities and to have a voice in the general way in which money is spent. Arguments opposing the amendment focused on the possibility for inappropriate interference in department or college budgetary matters.
A friendly amendment was accepted, as follows: After consultation with the Faculty Senate, may make budgetary planning recommendations to the central administration.

The motion passed; the meeting was adjourned.

Susan Nelson, Senate Secretary
Lucille Brodie, Recording Secretary