



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1988-1989

Volume II

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of December 12, 1988

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:
<http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/14158>

AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE

THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Meeting Notice: Monday, December 12, 1988

Order of Business:

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
- II. Informal Proposals and Statements
 1. Charge for Senate Committee on Assessment
The Senate Ad Hoc Assessment Committee will monitor assessment activities at Wichita State University and make written, monthly reports to the Senate Executive Committee. The reports should summarize the university's assessment activities and comment on them.

The reports will begin in early December.

Further, the committee will respond to requests from departments, programs and the Steering Committee on Assessment regarding questions concerning assessment activities.

- III. Approval of Minutes
- IV. Old Business
 1. Continued discussion of software copying policy
- V. New Business
 1. Proposed Honors Curriculum (Att. A)
 2. Evaluation of Teaching (Att. B)
- VI. Adjournment

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Peter Zoller, Senate President	Box 14	3130
Gary Greenberg, Senate Vice President	Box 34	3171
Tom Izbicki, Senate Secretary	Box 68	3591
Elmer Hoyer, Senate President-Elect	Box 44	3415
Gayle Davis, Elected by Senate	Box 82	3358
Ben rogers, Elected by Senate	Box 74	3125
Jack McCormick, Appointed by Senate Pres.	Box 51	3120

Proposed new Honors Program curriculum:

1. Students will be required to take 21 honors hours in at least two different departments, and at least 9 of these hours must be in the upper division (300-level and above).
2. At least five of their honors courses should be regular honors sections (as opposed to honors-options or independent study).
3. At least two of those five regular honors courses should be in the upper division. (Thus six of their nine upper-division hours should be in regular honors sections.) Students enrolled in programs which severely restrict elective hours may petition the Director to substitute honors-option courses for regular upper-division honors courses.
4. Graduate (~~600~~(700) level courses (excluding workshops) may be taken in place of regular upper-division honors courses. *Appropriate (600) level courses may also be taken.*
5. Students should make regular progress toward completion of their requirements. They will be expected to complete two courses in their first 35 hours and a total of five courses by the time they reach 90 hours.

The requirement for a continuous 3.25 g.p.a. will remain in effect under the proposed new curriculum.

Rationale:

If anything can assure that being an Honors Program graduate means more than simply managing a 3.25 g.p.a., it is the experience in honors classes; but current requirements do not put students in sufficient contact with these classes. First, 15 hours represents too small a percentage of total credit hours to adequately distinguish the learning experience of the honors from the non-honors student. Secondly, fairly regular continuity is important, and present requirements permit gaps of three or more consecutive semesters in a student's exposure to honors classes. Additionally, students may rely heavily on honors-option courses to fulfill requirements, and such courses typically do not measure up to regular honors sections in content and quality of classroom discussion.

The proposal is also designed to increase emphasis on upper-division honors courses, which we believe provide the best environment for honors-quality education. Here, too, we want to encourage enrollments in regular courses, though we are willing to provide leeway to students willing to try their hand at graduate courses. This requirement should also encourage departments to offer more upper-division honors courses.

Finally, in light of discrepancies between the numbers of entering and graduating students, we wish to ensure that regular progress is made toward fulfilling requirements. Encouraging early and active involvement in the program should enhance its impact on learning, ensure firmer program identification on the part of students, and provide incentive to complete it.

17-1

THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
Interdepartmental Memorandum

Faculty Senate

FROM: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
SUBJECT: Motion on Evaluation of Teaching

Moved that the Faculty Senate supports the right of the chair of a department to require formal evaluation of the instruction offered by a member of the faculty in cases of formal complaint in writing by student or students in that faculty member's class or classes. In case of complaints regarding a chair's teaching, recourse should be had to the dean of that chair's college. Complaints may be brought during the term in which the class or classes were taught or in the next subsequent term. Choice of the means of evaluation and the number of classes in which that evaluation is to be done will be determined by the chair in consultation with that member of the faculty. This procedure is in addition to the other complaint procedures in the Faculty Handbook.

FACULTY SENATE

The Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of December 12, 1988

MEMBERS PRESENT: Barrett, Bennett-Kastor, Benson, Bereman, Bostick, Brown, Burdette, Burk, Campbell, Cavarozzi, Christ, Clark, Crum, Davis, Dotzour, Dreifort, Duell, Edgington, Elizondo, Eyada, Feleppa, Foster, Graham, Greenberg, Hardy, Harper, Horn, Hoyer, Huntley, Izbicki, James, Martin, Mays, McKellar, Nelson, Neufeld, Paske, Rogers, Snyder, Sullivan, Sutterlin, West, Williamson, Zoller

MEMBERS ABSENT: Adamson, Armstrong, Baxter, Brady, Brinkman, Burdsal, Fatehi-Sedeh, Gosman, Laptad, McCormick, Scott, St. John, Wherritt, Windham, Yeager

GUESTS: Bradshaw, Gotterbarn, Haydon, McDougall, Ott, Pangburn, Rhoads

Summary of Senate Action

Motion to adopt a new Honors curriculum - passed as altered by the Honors Committee. *Policy*

Motion to endorse the ability of a chair to require Evaluation of Teaching under certain circumstances - passed as amended. *Policy*

Motion to appoint new members to three committees - passed.

Call to Order, "Informal Proposals and Statements."

Senate meeting was called to order by President Zoller at 3:30.

CHARGE FOR SENATE COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENT

Charge to Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment as printed in the agenda was discussed. Pres. Zoller reiterated the respective responsibilities of the Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment and of the Steering Committee on Assessment.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Pres. Elect Hoyer, as a representative of the faculty of WSU, and Exec. Asst. to Pres. Armstrong, Fred Sudermann, attended a meeting of the legislative Joint Committee on Economic Development in Topeka, Dec. 8. Sen. Hoyer spoke on the faculty issues of incentives and disincentives, and Mr. Sudermann spoke on institutional issues. Sen. Hoyer stated he was the only faculty member in attendance from the Regents Universities.

Minutes of November 28 were approved.

Old Business

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF SOFTWARE POLICY

Pres. Zoller asked the chairperson of the Faculty Support Committee, Senator Bereman, to continue the presentation of the draft plan for a policy on software at WSU. Gary Ott, Dir. of Univ. Computing and Telecommunications, and Donald Gotterbarn, Computer Science, attended the Senate Meeting at the chairperson's request. Gotterbarn reaffirmed the violations involved in copying software and stated Kansas was one of the first states to develop substantive laws. Ott stated that he realizes the University has tremendous funding problems for software.

In response to Sen. Greenberg's query how to prove software was purchased instead of copied, Bereman suggested putting one's name on the program on the computer and/or to send in the card with the serial number on it. Gotterbarn restated that one doesn't buy software, one has a license to use it for a period of time. He also stated that agreements can be made with contractors for multiple CPU licenses to purchase software for all computers in a department at a reduced amount. Sen. Barrett ask if there is any preferential treatment of universities as institutes of higher learning by the software manufacturers. Bereman said there is no educational out. Greenberg suggested there might be a way to modify the law.

Chairperson Bereman said it has been suggested to delete four words in the Policy Statement: "or permit violations of". She suggested to Sen. Sutterlin the placing of a statement on all software floppys that software is subject to a licensing agreement that prohibits illegal copying. This informs students that copying would be a violation of the law.

Sen. Rogers questioned the status of the copyright policy document. Pres. Zoller said it was going back to the committee, and the Senate would probably see the rewritten version on the January 23 agenda. He suggested the committee should bring back guidelines paralleling the Agreement on Guidelines for Classroom Copying, Appendix N, in the Faculty Handbook. Sen. Rogers stated there is little in the handbook relating to forms or actions of discipline.

Sen. Izbicki stated the library could only state the illegality of violations of copyright through photocopying and that the University had to do same about software. Consensus emerged that informing students of the seriousness of violations was primary.

Sen. Hoyer saw little information available on planning for site licenses or other methods of obtaining multiple software. He said that all involved faculty, etc. should be kept informed of new developments. Gary Ott stated he would forward all new information to those interested.

New Business

PROPOSED HONORS CURRICULUM (Att. A)

Adoption of the proposed policy was moved by the Honors Committee Chairperson, Randy Haydon, who named the members of the committee: L. Bakken, L. Milbrandt, A. Gythiel, W. Horn, Chair R. Haydon and student member C. Perel. Chairperson Haydon then read a letter from C. Perel (attached), who was unable to attend the Faculty Senate meeting. Haydon stated a change to be made in the proposal under #4 to: "Graduate (700) level courses (excluding workshops) may be taken in place of regular upper-division honors courses. Appropriate 600 level courses may also be taken." Sen. Paske disagreed with the wording of the last sentence, describing it as excessive. Sen. Clark moved to table the amendment but was ruled out of order. Sen. Dreifort suggested that 3.25 g.p.a. is too low. Sen. Greenberg moved to amend the proposal so that the requirement to enter the Honors Program would be changed to 3.5 g.p.a. Dreifort seconded. Discussion followed. Sen. Snyder offered a substitute motion but was ruled out of order. Sen. Greenberg withdrew his motion for amendment on the understanding that the committee would study the possibility of raising the required g.p.a. Original motion was voted on and passed.

MOTION ON EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Sen. Rogers summed up the thinking of the Executive Committee in regard to the motion which supports the ability of the chair to require evaluation as part of their official duties of oversight of teaching. Williamson asked about the time frame, and Rogers replied that some limit was needed. Nelson moved an amendment adding to the wording; but this was replaced by McKellar's friendly amendment moving sentence 2 to the position of next to the last sentence in the motion, which was accepted.

"Moved that the Faculty Senate supports the right of the chair of a department to require formal evaluation of the instruction offered by a member of the faculty in cases of formal complaint in writing by student or students in that faculty member's class or classes. Complaints may be brought during the term in which the class or classes were taught or in the next subsequent term. Choice of the means of evaluation and the number of classes in which that evaluation is to be done will be determined by the chair in consultation with that member of the faculty. In case of complaints regarding a chair's teaching, recourse should be had to the dean of that chair's college. This procedure is in addition to the other complaint procedures in the Faculty Handbook."

Use of the phrase "recourse to" was queried, but this remained unchanged. Dreifort asked about number of complaints, and Rogers replied that one formal complaint sufficed. In reply to Sen. Barrett, Rogers said the faculty member had a voice in the selection of a means of evaluation but could not stonewall the

process. Greenberg asked about vindictive use of evaluation by chairs, and Paske replied that the grievance procedure could deal with such cases. West asked whether student input was being described as an abuse, but Paske noted that misuse of the input was being queried.

Motion passed.

MEMBER REPLACEMENT ON COMMITTEES

Sen. Hoyer made a motion to appoint members to three committees:

Ken Pitetti, Health Professions
Land Use and Planning

Bill Jarnagin, Business
Budget

Curtis Terflinger, Business
Academic Affairs

Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00.

MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY:

Please forgive me for not appearing in person, but certain personal and legal matters require my attention. Do not take my absence as evidence that the piece of legislation before you is not important. On the contrary, it is of the greatest importance, and I ask for your support.

You have before you a proposal that seeks to increase the hours required for graduation with University Honors to 21. In addition, it would require nine hours of upper division course work, six of which must be in regular honors classes. The call last year was for two things: upper division course work and an "honors experience." This proposal meets the first guideline, and is the first step on the way to meeting the second. By requiring upper division course work, the research and writing ability that is required of scholars may be encouraged, developed and enhanced. It will provide an opportunity for honors students to interact in an atmosphere more conducive to the concept of a well rounded education.

A concern last year was the attitude of the new Honors Director. It is my feeling that Dr. McKenney will support this measure. We met during the early part of the summer. At that time, he expressed his desire to raise the number of required hours to 21. He was also of the opinion that some sort of upper division requirement was necessary.

It is my hope, and the hope of the committee, that departments, now seeing the demand, will increase their upper division honors offerings. Last year the call was for a different type of program - one of substance. Realize, please, that the commitment to improving the Emory Lindquist Honors Program must be a university wide commitment. Its potential as a strong, viable, competitive program lies, not so much in the hands of the committee, but rather, in the hands of the university faculty and their representatives - the Faculty Senate (aid from the administration notwithstanding).

Let me assure the members of the Faculty Senate that this is only the first step of many. The changes required to improve the Honors Program must be at a steady pace. It must be a process of evolution, not revolution.

Sincerely,

(signed) Catherine S. Perel
Senate Honors Committee
student member