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AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Meeting Notice: October 12, 1987 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 Minutes for the meeting of September 28, 1987 (Vol. XXIV, No. 3)
IV. New Business:
   A. Nominations
      For Senator representing Math/Natural Sciences--Mary Edgington for Math/Natural Sciences Senators
      For vacancies on Senate Committees--Orpha Duell for the Rules Committee
      Traffic Committee - Antoinette Tejeda replacing Elena Bastida
      Athletic Committee - Jean Cuthbertson replacing Marilyn Myers
   B. Recommendations Concerning Selective Admissions--Academic Affair Committee, Nancy Snyder, Chair
   C. Results of the Latest Cycle of Program Review by the Regents--Joyce Scott, Executive Vice President
   D. Report from the Executive Committee Concerning Summer Support for the President of the Faculty Senate

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>Sue 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>
WSU Faculty Response to
"Recommendation for a Selective Admissions Policy"

The faculty of the Wichita State University is committed to the tradition and heritage of our unique mission as Kansas's urban university and to the mission of the Kansas Regents System "to help individuals increase their intellectual, social, personal and moral potentials. . . [and] to make a positive difference in peoples' lives and to improve society through the works of those it educates." We are also committed to do everything in our power to improve the quality and substance of the education received by students attending this institution.

The constituency of The Wichita State University is diverse. Among those in need of our service are young high school graduates with various degrees of ability and preparation and various amounts of financial support (a large portion must live at home and/or work); older members of the community just entering or re-entering the university (including persons preparing for a new career, those returning from the military, former dropouts, women who have raised families and displaced workers); graduate and other advanced students recruited by local business and industry; business, industrial, cultural and social institutions that benefits from the research and service performed at the university. As a faculty we take very seriously our distinctive mission to serve the educational needs of this population. We have a strong moral commitment to helping all of our students, from the best and brightest to the most ill prepared, be the best that they can be.

Regents Staff Proposal on Selective Admissions

The faculty at WSU has found it very difficult to respond to a proposal that includes no arguments in favor of selective admissions and that presents no research documenting its refutation of arguments against selective admissions.

The current proposal leaves many unanswered questions. Does the proposed policy apply to part-time as well as full-time students? How does the policy propose to deal with GED and TOEFL students? How do we handle residents who did not attend Kansas High schools? What grade point criteria apply to transfer students from private Kansas colleges and Universities and from other selective regents institutions. Would the proposal require a change in the articulation agreement? Do we really want to require a higher grade point for students who might be transferring from high quality out-of-state schools? More importantly, what criteria will be used for admission through the window, i.e. who defines "promising"? What will be the nature and extent of changes in the funding formula required under a system of selective admissions?

It is also unclear to us what criteria were used to establish the proposed selective admissions standards. What is the rationale for
requiring an ACT score of 23? Use of class rank fails to acknowledge that there are differences in the quality and absolute size of the state's high schools.

Our research indicates that although there are a number of urban institutions that have moved toward selective admissions none of them has eliminated remedial education. A system that seeks to provide educational opportunity in an urban environment cannot work without remediation. Remediation serves many functions. At WSU large portions of remedial offerings, particularly math, serve as review for students who are not recent high school graduates. Remediation can also meet the needs of students who suffer from unbalanced preparation, i.e. they have excellent records in some fields but are weak in others. Finally remediation can compensate for high school work that was either unavailable to the student or not taken by the student. The required preparatory curriculum will not eliminate all these needs, particularly if the selective admissions policy exempts everyone over age 21 and an additional ten percent of the freshman class. We should develop regulations that will reward those who have good high school preparation without penalizing those who do not.

The proposal position paper contends that differential admissions standards do not necessarily stratify an educational system and that they "in no way diminish the role or quality of students or instruction at the three regional universities." The proposal goes on to demand higher than passing grade point averages from these universities and from the community colleges. The proposal in fact enforces a deeply stratified educational system. We acknowledge the legitimacy of differential missions among Regents institutions. We do not acknowledge that different missions necessarily imply a hierarchy of importance to the economic, cultural, social and civic health of the state. This question of stratification needs to be addressed more directly.

Our final concern deals with access to higher education in the state of Kansas. Under the recommendation, students who do not meet selective admissions criteria will be allowed to enroll at one of the three regional universities or a community college. Yet the geographical distribution of these institutions is such that many of the urban students most likely to need open admissions will be unable to afford to travel the distances and to give up the employment opportunities necessary for them to pursue a post-secondary education. We are gravely concerned that proposed policy will exclude a majority of the state's minority citizens from admission to the selective admission schools. Serving the needs of the minority community is an important part of WSU's mission. We are not ready to abandon the concept of affirmative action.

Without answers to these questions and concerns we have no choice but to oppose the Recommendation for a Selective Admissions Policy presented to the Board of Regents.
Selective Admissions

Nevertheless, the faculty of The Wichita State University wishes to pursue the concept of selective admissions in order to determine its likely impact upon the quality of the education process. It is axiomatic that improving the quality of incoming students will improve the quality of the graduates. The relevant question is whether or not restricting admission to better prepared students can be expected to improve classroom content and performance over what they would have been with open admissions. The proposal submitted by the staff of the Board of Regents offers no evidence on this question.

We believe that it may be possible for a modified selective admissions policy to serve some constructive purposes. Among them are the improvement in the quality of the education process, better advising and enhanced curriculum; greatly improved secondary education; improved image and prestige that can help to attract and keep top students.

The University ought to be doing more to support the school districts in their efforts to improve secondary education. We encourage the implementation of a required core of high school courses for admission to Regents institutions. We urge the Regents to be very careful in determining the content of that core and suggest that they include at least one unit of fine arts.

We also realize that it will be very difficult for many school districts in the state to meet the recommended college preparatory curriculum. One possibility would be for students with deficiencies to take college courses, receive credit but have a higher hour requirement for graduation.

The Faculty at WSU proposes an alternative system of selective admissions. Although there are numerous details that would have to be worked out, we suggest a dual system that would admit traditional students who meet selective criteria directly to degree-granting colleges or with minimal exposure to university college. Students who do not meet those criteria would be admitted to University College (or some equivalent) for a specified period of time using criteria determined by each institution. When these students have secured evidence that they meet selective admission criteria, they would be admitted to a degree granting college. Remedial education would be available to all those in need.

We want to emphasize that this dual system must be developed in such a way that it prevent stratification within the universities. We are vehemently opposed to any structure that would divide either the faculty or the student body along hierarchical lines.

Although we are generally favorable to some form of dual selective admissions policy, there are a number of questions that need to be addressed before we can express unqualified support. Among them are:
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The faculty of the Wichita State University is committed to the tradition and heritage of our unique mission as Kansas's urban university and to the mission of the Kansas Regents System "to help individuals increase their intellectual, social, personal and moral potentials... (and) to make a positive difference in peoples' lives and to improve society through the works of those it educates." We are also committed to do everything in our power to improve the quality and substance of the education received by students attending this institution.

The constituency of The Wichita State University is diverse. Among those in need of our service are young high school graduates with various degrees of ability and preparation and various amounts of financial support (a large portion must live at home and/or work); older members of the community just entering or re-entering the university (including persons preparing for a new career, those returning from the military, former dropouts, displaced workers and women who have raised families); graduate and other advanced students recruited by local business and industry; business, industrial, cultural and social institutions that benefit from the research and service performed at the university. As a faculty we take seriously our distinctive mission to serve the educational needs of this population. We have a strong moral commitment to help all of our students, from the best and brightest to the most ill-prepared.

Regents Staff Proposal on Selective Admissions

The faculty at WSU has found it difficult to respond to a proposal that includes few arguments in favor of selective admissions and that presents no research documenting its refutation of arguments against selective admissions.

The current proposal leaves many unanswered questions:
- does the proposed policy apply to part-time as well as full-time students?
- how does the policy propose to deal with GED and TOEFL students?
- how do we handle residents who did not attend Kansas high schools?
- what grade point criteria apply to transfer students from private Kansas colleges and universities and from other selective Regents institutions?
- would the proposal require a change in the articulation agreement?
- do we really want to require a higher grade point for students who might be transferring from high quality out-of-state schools?
- more importantly, what criteria will be used for admission through the window, i.e. who defines "promising"?
- what will be the nature and extent of changes in the funding formula required under a system of selective admissions?
It is also unclear to us what criteria were used to establish the proposed selective admissions standards. What is the rationale for requiring an ACT score of 23? Use of class rank fails to acknowledge that there are differences in the quality and size of the state's high schools.

Our research indicates that although there are a number of urban institutions that have moved toward selective admissions, none has eliminated remedial education. A system that seeks to provide educational opportunity in an urban environment cannot work without remediation. Remediation serves many functions. At WSU large portions of remedial offerings, particularly math, serve as review for students who are not recent high school graduates. Remediation can also meet the needs of students who suffer from unbalanced preparation, i.e., they have excellent records in some fields but are weak in others. Finally, remediation can compensate for high school work that was either unavailable to the student or not taken by the student. The required preparatory curriculum will not eliminate all these needs, particularly if the selective admissions policy exempts everyone over age 21 and an additional ten percent of the freshman class. We should develop regulations that will reward those who have good high school preparation without penalizing those who do not.

The proposal position paper contends that differential admissions standards do not necessarily stratify an educational system and that they "in no way diminish the role or quality of students or instruction at the three regional universities." The proposal then goes on to demand higher-than-passing grade point averages for students who transfer to the selective admissions institutions from these universities and from the community colleges. The proposal in fact enforces a deeply stratified educational system. We acknowledge the legitimacy of differential missions among Regents Institutions; however, we do not acknowledge that different missions necessarily imply a hierarchy. This question of stratification needs to be addressed more directly.

Our final concern deals with access to higher education in the state of Kansas. Under the recommendation, students who do not meet selective admissions criteria will be allowed to enroll at one of the three regional universities or a community college. Yet the geographical distribution of these institutions is such that many of the urban students most likely to need open admissions will be unable to afford to travel the distances and to give up the employment opportunities necessary for them to pursue a post-secondary education. We are gravely concerned that proposed policy will exclude a majority of the state's minority citizens from admission to the selective admission schools. Serving the needs of the minority community is an important part of WSU's mission; we are not ready to abandon the concept of affirmative action.

Without answers to these questions and concerns we are unable to support the Recommendation contained in the document "Selective Admissions: Toward a Distinctive System of Kansas Universities" as proposed by the staff of the Board of Regents.
Selective Admissions

Nevertheless, the faculty of The Wichita State University wishes to pursue the concept of selective admissions in order to determine its impact upon the quality of the education process. It is axiomatic that improving the quality of incoming students will improve the quality of the graduates. The relevant question is whether restricting admission to better prepared students can be expected to improve classroom content and performance over what they would have been with open admissions. The proposal submitted by the staff of the Board of Regents offers no evidence on this question.

We believe that it may be possible for a modified selective admissions policy to serve some constructive purposes. Among them are the improvement in the quality of the education process; better advising and enhanced curriculum; greatly improved secondary education; improved image and prestige that can help to attract and keep top students.

There are, however, a number of questions that need to be addressed before we can express unqualified support. Among them are the following:
- would selective admissions keep more good students in Kansas?
- would selective admissions improve student quality or would it just inflate high school and community college grades?
- would selective admissions improve retention?
- would selective admissions improve advising and curriculum?
- would selective admissions improve the quality and substance of secondary education?
- would selective admissions guarantee better student preparation and obviate the need for remedial education?

A proposal for selective admissions has obvious, though as yet unquantified, implications for the Regents Institutions. It also has implications for numerous other agencies. Among the factors that need to be considered are the impact on the community colleges, the implications for governance and funding of post-secondary education, the demand for secondary teachers, the implications for teacher education programs, the implications for the school districts, the potential for litigation over admission exceptions. All of these issues must be considered before legislators can make a reasonable assessment of the costs and benefits of a selective admissions policy for some of the Regents Institutions. It strikes us as irresponsible to proceed with a policy of selective admissions without adequate study and detailed justification of the propositions presented in the position paper and without acknowledgement of the interrelationships that exist among educational institutions and agencies throughout the state.

Selective admissions is a proposition worth pursuing as long as it does not preclude the Regents Institutions from meeting the needs of their students. However, implementation of a policy of selective admissions is such a dramatic break from the heritage of populism in Kansas and has so many implications for so many different institutions and individuals, that a recommendation should not be forwarded before more information is available. While we are aware that there is a danger in overanalyzing a proposal in order to avoid change, we believe that in this case we are in no danger of reaching that point. We trust that the administration, the Regents and the Legislature agree.
Would selective admissions keep more good students in Kansas? Would selective admissions improve student quality or would it just inflate high school and community college grades? Would selective admissions improve retention? Would selective admissions improve advising and curriculum? Would selective admissions improve the quality and substance of secondary education? Would selective admissions guarantee better student preparation and obviate the need for remedial education?

A proposal for selective admissions has obvious, though as yet unquantified, implications for the Regents institutions. It also has implications for numerous other agencies. Among the factors that need to be considered are: the impact on the community colleges, the implications for governance and funding of post-secondary education, the demand for secondary teachers, the implications for teacher education programs, the implications for the school districts, the potential for litigation over admission exceptions. All of these issues must be considered before legislators can make a reasonable assessment of the costs and benefits of a selective admissions policy for some of the Regents institutions. It strikes us as irresponsible to proceed with a policy of selective admissions without adequate study and detailed justification of the propositions presented in the position paper and without acknowledgement of the interrelationships that exist among educational institutions and agencies throughout the state.

Selective admissions is a proposition worth pursuing as long as it does not preclude WSU from meeting the needs of its client population. However, implementation of a policy of selective admissions is such a dramatic break from the heritage of populism in Kansas and has so many implications for so many different institutions and individuals, that a recommendation should not be forwarded before more information is available. While we are aware that there is a danger in overanalyzing a proposal in order to avoid change, we believe that in this case we are in no danger of reaching that point. We trust that the administration, the Regents and the Legislature agree.
FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the meeting of October 12, 1987. (Vol. XXIV, no. 4).

SUMMARY OF SENATE ACTION:

Motion: Peter Sutterlin to replace Bruce Koehn: Passed by acclamation.

Motion: Antoinette Tejeda to replace Elena Bastida on Traffic Appeals Committee: passed by acclamation.

Motion: Jean Cuthbertson to replace Marilyn Myers on Athletic Committee: passed by acclamation.

Motion: Approval of Recommendations Concerning Selective Admissions, as amended. Motion passed.


Guests: Mawhiney, Pangburn, Kruger, Sutterlin, McDougall, Konek, Snyder, Sarachek, Harmon, Neubeg, Herman.

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

Senator Johnson suggested that perhaps the Senate should consider some method of expediting the handling of procedural matters so it could get to more substantive matters. President Rogers concurred and indicated the Executive Committee was hoping for the same emphasis.

The minutes of the September 28 meeting were approved as distributed.

Senator Edgington nominated Peter Sutterlin to replace Bruce Koehn representing Math/Natural Sciences. Senator Gosman moved, Senator Duell seconded, to elect by acclamation; motion carried.

Senator Duell, for the Rules Committee, nominated (1) Antoinette Tejeda to replace Elena Bastida on the Traffic Appeals Committee, and (2) Jean Cuthbertson to replace Marilyn Myers on the Athletic Committee. Senator Jeffers moved, Senator Hoyer seconded, to elect by acclamation; motion carried.

Nancy Snyder, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, moved acceptance of committee recommendations for a faculty statement in response to the proposal for Selective Admissions as submitted by the staff for the Board of Regents. (The report was distributed to Senators prior to the meeting)
Dr. Snyder, in an introductory statement, said the Committee's attitude was that the faculty at W.S.U. does take its urban mission seriously; that it does not reject outright the concept of selective admissions; but that, given the serious implications of such a major shift, it feels more study is necessary.

Senator Greenberg pointed out that the language at the bottom of page 2 suggested a definite and final rejection of the recommendation and asked if this needn't be softened. After some discussion, Senator Wherritt moved, Senator Childs seconded to amend the first sentence, paragraph nine, to read "Without answers to these questions and concerns we have no choice but to oppose recommendations contained in the document "Selective Admissions: Toward a Distinctive System of Kansas Universities" as proposed by the staff of the Board of Regents." Motion passed.

Senator Soles moved, Senator Greenberg seconded, an additional amendment to this same sentence: the words "are unable to support" would replace "have no choice but to oppose." Discussion followed, with division occurring on the best way to indicate the University's attitude and at the same time remain effective in presenting a case.

In answer to a question about what other Regents' schools were doing, President Rogers reported that (1) they were divided on the issue, (2) most of them had indicated they needed to retain remedial courses, (3) Hays had expressed general support for some kind of selective admissions, and (4) the majority shared our sense that it was not a well-thought-out proposal.

The amendment passed.

Senator Feleppa moved that the sentence "We believe there is much merit to the general idea of selective admissions and encourage continued consideration. However. . ." precede the above amended sentence. Senator Dreifort seconded. Senator Gosman pointed out that a similar sentiment was expressed in the paragraph following the amended sentence and after some discussion, the motion failed.

Dr. Snyder accepted a friendly amendment to clarify the term "displaced workers," page 1, paragraph 2.

Senator Paske moved that paragraphs 3 through 7 on page 3 be omitted because they represented unsupported conclusions—the very criticism the Senate was leveling against the proposal itself. Senator Laptad seconded.

Senator Duell suggested a friendly amendment, which Senator Paske accepted, to leave in paragraph 7. After some discussion, it was also agreed that most of paragraph 6 should be included, beginning at the end of the second clause as follows: "There are a number of questions. . ." The motion passed as amended; house was divided.

Senator Baxter requested that the format of the recommendations be modified so that the report would be clearer and more accessible.

Senator Lynch moved to add "the Regents' Institutions" in place of "WSU" in the last paragraph. Senator Scudder seconded. Motion passed.
Vote was called on the document as amended: motion passed.

Vice-President Scott requested that Dr. McDougall present the results of the latest cycle of the Program Review by the Regents. Dr. McDougall reported that the review was divided into four parts this year:

1. One report must be submitted in May, 1988: it has to do with the Computer Science program and with strengthening it at the doctoral level.

2. Response to last year's review of Business, Economics, Health Professions, and selected programs in Liberal Arts and Sciences, including the Bachelor of General Studies, Master of Liberal Studies, associate degrees, and Women's Studies. Our responses must be back to the Regents by November 1.

3. Completing Cycle 1 Review of the entire system, academic support is undergoing review. This includes all of the deans' offices as administrative offices, the library, M.R.C., academic computing, museums and galleries, the TV station. These documents have to be submitted to the Regents by December 1.

4. The beginning of Cycle 2, which is now an 11-year process. Engineering will come up for the second time and will be the only set of programs being reviewed this year as part of the beginning of the second cycle of reviews. Those reports are due in May, 1988.

He reported cordial interviews with Regents' sub-committees on the reviews of programs conducted last year, with no general disagreement on the actions taken. Dr. McDougall concluded his report with the observation that if there was a single theme this year, it was assessment of outcomes.

In response to a question from Senator Soles, Dr. McDougall noted that the Regents were still interested in the number of majors, as well as the number of degrees conferred, in a department.

President Rogers, reporting for the Executive Committee in regard to summer support for the president of the Senate, indicated discussions had begun on this issue. It has been agreed that the president does need to be here and that some compensation is in order; it is also clear that the specific support may need to be flexible to meet different demands, so the Committee is exploring options.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Susan Nelson, Senate Secretary
Lucille Brodie, Recording Secretary
Whereas the University Senate, the General Faculty, and the President have endorsed and affirmed their commitment to the AAUP's 1966 Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, and

Whereas that statement clearly identifies the Faculty as having the responsibility for decisions affecting the curriculum of the institution, and

Whereas all constituencies of The Wichita State University are negatively affected by the current academic program recommendations of the Board of Regents,

Therefore, be it resolved that the University Senate requests the Administration of The Wichita State University to express the University Senate's objections to the Board of Regents about the procedures, criteria and results of the Regents Policy of Program Review; and to reaffirm its commitment to our institutional policies which include substantial involvement of the Faculty in the academic program review process.