



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1987-1988

Volume I

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of February 08, 1988

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:
<http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/14157>

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Meeting Notice: February 8, 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 January 25, 1988
(Vol. XXIV, No. 7).

Rules Committee report:

- a) Everett Johnson nominated to replace William Wentz
on the Faculty Affairs Committee
- b) Thomas Izbicki nominated as a Senate replacement
for Janet Wilke from the Library

IV. Old Business:

Continuation of the discussion "Should The Sunflower be
a lab paper?"--Dr. Robert Ross, Chair of the Publications
Board; Angela Windham, SGA President.

V. New Business:

Preliminary report on planned activities of the ad hoc
Committee on Assessment--Dr. Gerald Graham, Chair.

VI. Adjournment

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

<u>Name</u>	<u>Box</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Ben Rogers, Senate President	74	3125
Orpha Duell, Senate Vice President	28	3322
Sue Nelson, Senate Secretary	14	3130
Peter Zoller, Senate President-elect	14	3134
Gary Greenberg, Elected by Senate	34	3171
David Childs, Elected by Senate	53	3532
Elmer Hoyer, Appointed by Senate President	44	3415

FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

SUMMARY OF SENATE ACTION

Motion: Everett Johnson to replace William Wentz on the Faculty Affairs Committee; motion passed.

Motion: Thomas Izbicki as a Senate replacement for Janet Wilke from the Library; motion passed.

Members present: Armstrong, Barrett, Benson, Bereman, Blessing, Brinkman, Brown, Burdette, Burdsal, Campbell, Cavarozzi, Childs, Clark, Daugherty, Dreifort, Duell, Edgington, Eyada, Feleppa, Foster, Gosman, Greenberg, Hardy, Hoyer, Jeffers, Johnson, Kelly, Kitch, Laptad, Nelson, Neufeld, Paske, Rogers, Scott, Scudder, Snyder, Soles, Sutterlin, Theerathorn, West, Wherritt, Windham, Yeager, Zoller.

Members absent: Adamson, Baxter, Brady, Christ, Connor, Fatehi-Sedeh, Graham, Huckstadt, Lynch, Martin, Mays, McCormick, McKellar, Milbrandt, Robbins, Washington.

Guests: John Mesh, Kathy Bradshaw, Charles Romig, Donald Biggs, Kelly Shand, Linda Starnes, John Schuh, Chris Wesche, Jeff Compton, Thomas Izbicki, Virgil Pangburn, Gina Spade, Kevin Dreiling.

Minutes of the meeting of February 8, 1988 (Vol. XXIV, No. 8).

President Rogers called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and asked for informal proposals and statements.

Senator Greenberg requested that the Executive Committee consider a University response to the recently publicized FBI investigation of campus groups.

The minutes of January 25 were approved as circulated.

Senator Zoller, for the Rules Committee, made the following nominations: Everett Johnson to replace William Wentz on the Faculty Affairs Committee; Thomas Izbicki as a Senate replacement for Janet Wilke from the Library; both motions passed.

President Rogers introduced Dr. Robert Ross, Chair of the Publications Board, to continue a discussion of a proposal before the Board to make The Sunflower a lab paper. Dr. Ross reminded the Senate that the proposal was still only that--a proposal--and stated that additional suggestions and a proposal from Angela Windham had been received by the Board and would be considered. He then introduced Les Anderson, who summarized the rationale for the proposal:

- 1) Currently, the advisor to The Sunflower is unpaid and therefore must limit the time spent in this capacity.
- 2) There is a lack of continuity in the present situation; students often

need assistance on use of equipment and on resolving personnel conflicts.
3) They also need guidance on maintaining the proper level of professionalism.
4) There is a lack of consistency in leadership--illustrated by the fall semester of 1986, when serious problems arose and the reputation of the newspaper was threatened.

Mr. Anderson noted that while a lab paper might not solve all of these problems, it would provide help in some areas. He also noted Wichita State was the only major degree granting institution in the state without a lab paper. He pointed out that at the present, WSU journalism students had no guaranteed way of having the kind of valuable experience a lab paper would provide.

He described the general proposal as follows:

- 1) Two additional faculty members in Journalism (a News Editorial Advisor, who would teach one class and serve as full-time advisor, and an Advertising Manager, who would teach two ad classes and work with the student newspaper). Student credit hour production would fund one of the faculty positions; the other would be in an advisory capacity.
- 2) Each faculty advisor would have an assistant (a graduate student or junior/senior major); these would be paid positions.
- 3) Although there would still be some paid positions on the newspaper, most of the writing and advertising duties would be handled by journalism classes.
- 4) Non-journalism majors could still contribute to the paper; however, they would not be paid.
- 5) The position of business coordinator would be a full-time, non-student post.

He reported that approximately \$3,000.00 a month would be saved by having the writing and editing done in classes. This amount, however, would not include the salary for the two additional faculty members, whose positions would be funded by the University at large.

The lab paper would have an advisory board, but policy would be made by the Journalism Department; the Department would recommend an editor, who would be approved by the Board. Members of the Board would include a News Editorial Sequence Head, the News Ed Advisor, the Advertising Advisor, one professional from the community selected by the Journalism Department, the SGA president, one student appointed by the SGA president, one journalism student chosen by the Journalism Department. The Sunflower editor would act in an ex officio capacity.

Mr. Anderson introduced Charles Pearson, a member of the Journalism Department, who expressed his concern that every journalism student have an opportunity to work on a school newspaper before leaving the University. He stated that it was a standard requirement of prestigious programs in general and had been a key point that emerged from a series of focus interviews with more than 50 professionals in mass communication in this region. Mr. Pearson noted that at present, the Journalism Department cannot require this because The Sunflower does not have that many positions and the editor is responsible for the newspaper. Mr. Pearson also added that as far as

student fees were concerned, the pattern usually followed was that lab papers did gain support from these fees--which were regarded as subscription fees much like the admission fees for concerts or plays. He concluded by observing that the argument that a lab newspaper would be stifled by Morrison Hall was, he felt, preposterous; it impugned the professionalism and reputation of the journalism faculty, as well as suggested bad faith on the part of central administration, which was not the case. He pointed out that the proposal had originated ten or twelve years ago in the Journalism Department and had been revived by the Communication Committee, which was unanimous in its recommendation that a lab newspaper be established.

Robert Illidge, also of the Journalism Department, indicated three items he wished to discuss:

- 1) A questioning of the professionalism of the department, which he refuted by listing the qualifications and experience of the members of the department;
- 2) His opinion that the proposed School of Communication would strengthen the Journalism Department and that all journalism students should receive experience on a newspaper;
- 3) The necessity for having a lab paper in order to give students the professional experience they need.

Angela Windham, Student Government Association president, indicated that while she understood the desire for an increase in professional quality, she felt the loss of an independent student voice was a price too high to pay. She suggested that perhaps some middle ground could be found which might be more advantageous.

At this point, the matter was opened for Senate discussion and the following issues were raised:

Given the current status of the proposal, it is impossible to compare costs; a saving on salaries for Sunflower employees must be balanced against two new faculty positions.

There are enough journalism students to staff the lab paper; both writing and advertising would be handled in the laboratory portions of regular classes. At this point, no additional equipment or new facilities are planned.

A survey of other school papers done by the SGA elicited mixed responses on the issue of press censorship.

Three general attitudes emerged:

- 1) The need for a professional newspaper in order to train journalism students,
- 2) The need for an independent student voice, along with the freedom and responsibility to fail,
- 3) The possibility that some compromise might evolve.

At this point, Senator Greenberg moved to conduct a straw vote to give a sense of the Senate; Senator Laptad seconded. Several senators indicated that no final proposal had been made and they did not, therefore, feel they

had enough information to make a decision.

President Armstrong reminded the Senate that the proposal for the lab newspaper existed within the context of the Journalism Program review; he also rejected the notion that administration censorship should be an issue.

The question was called and the motion to take a straw vote failed.

Dr. Ross indicated that the final proposal, plus any alternative plans, would be sent to Vice President Scott by the Publications Board, and that the Senate would be kept informed.

Gerald Graham, Chair of the ad hoc Committee on Assessment, presented an interim report. As instructed by President Rogers, the committee has begun an investigation of the issue; it has examined 15-20 articles, arranged for attendance at two national meetings coming up, and has gathered information from other universities. The area is extremely far-ranging, but can be broken down into three categories:

- 1) The administration and use of standardized testing,
- 2) The use of the data acquired: for accountability/for learning improvement.
- 3) The cost.

Dr. Graham speculated that assessment was very likely coming and we might be able to shape it--or state our support or rejection of certain conditions--if we were knowledgeable.

A general discussion followed, including questions about how useful such assessment data was, how difficult to obtain, and how beneficial. It was suggested that improvements in programs might be created through the examination which such discussions instigated.

In response to a question from Senator Dreifort, Vice President Scott said a report on a future time-line would be due from COCAO in two months. She also explained that the departments that were currently doing experimental programs in assessment were using pilot tests supplied by the Educational Testing System.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Susan Nelson, Senate Secretary
Lucille Brodie, Recording Secretary