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AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE

THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Room 126 CH  3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, March 27, 1989

Order of Business

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Proposals and Statements

III. Approval of Minutes

IV. Formal Reports
   a. President’s Report to Kansas Board of Regents - EVP Scott (Attachment A)
   b. Continued discussion of Tenure and Promotion Policy - Dr. Rohn. (Charge to Faculty Affairs Committee is Attachment B)

V. Old Business: None

VI. New Business: None

VII. Adjournment

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

NAME                      BOX  PHONE
Peter Zoller, Senate President  14  3130
Gary Greenberg, Senate Vice President  34  3171
Tom Izbicki, Senate Secretary  68  3591
Elmer Hoyer, Senate President-Elect  44  3415
Gayle Davis, Elected by Senate  82  3358
Karen Brown, Elected by Senate  26  3114
Jack McCormick, Appointed by Senate Pres.  51  3120
Wichita State University continues to make significant progress towards achieving its potential in undergraduate and doctoral education, research focused on community needs, and economic development.

**DOCTORAL PROGRAMS:** Continued advancement in doctoral programs speaks to the quality of our faculty and their commitment to excellence in a dynamic competitive world requiring greater and greater amounts of investment in human capital. For example:

**A. Engineering:** Doctoral programs in engineering have already exceeded the initial five-year enrollment goal of 60 with 80 doctoral students now enrolled.

**B. Chemistry:** Thirteen doctoral candidates are enrolled in Chemistry with 3 to 5 additional expected next year.

**C. Applied Mathematics:** There are 12 doctoral students in mathematics, with another 3-5 anticipated to join the program next year. Dr. Victor Isakov, a distinguished mathematician in the area of differential equations recently joined the department to participate in building the program to a high level.

**D. Communicative Disorders and Sciences:** Eleven doctoral students are currently numbers expected to increase with the addition of three doctoral fellowships. Five degrees will be awarded during 1988-89.

**E. Psychology:** A proposal for establishing doctoral studies in psychology with concentrations in community-clinical and human factors has been submitted to the Board of Regents and will undergo external review this Spring.
F. Educational Administration: Preliminary discussions are underway within the College of Education which will lead to the submission of a unique proposal for Board consideration shortly.

APPLIED RESEARCH: Research focused on community needs and economic growth go hand-in-hand with doctoral program development and other advanced studies. Wichita State University is committed to those research investments that provide a basis for successful regional, national, and international competition. For example:

A. The Institute for Aviation Research: Initial goals have been realized. Expectations for FY's 90 and 91 were outlined in a business plan for KTEC and resulted in increased funding for WSU's first Center of Excellence.

B. The Center for Energy Studies: A proposal to establish the Center for Energy Studies as WSU's second KTEC Center of Excellence was recently approved by the KTEC Board. We expect this center and the research it supports will help ensure that Kansas has access to the energy resources, production capacity, distribution system, and conservation techniques to support economic growth and development through the next century.

C. The Center for Economic Development and Business Research: The Center has extended its extramurally-funded research in support of economic development statewide. Current projects support Kansas Inc, WI/SE, and a City of Wichita employment project. Just recently, the Center helped publish an up-to-date, comprehensive fact book for promoting new business development and expansion in the Wichita area, and completed an analysis of detailed employment trends which provides a road map to the year 2010.

D. Materials Science Research Group: The College of Arts and Science has organized a faculty team from chemistry and physics to promote focused research in materials science.

MINORITY STUDENT SUPPORT: Wichita State University's advances in doctoral education and applied research complement and enhance its role in undergraduate education and the promotion of opportunities for disadvantaged and "at-risk" students. The university not only recognizes its responsibilities to promote equality and opportunity, but accepts gladly the challenge to provide the skills, knowledge, and insight which allow individuals to be successful in taking an opportunity and making it a reality. With respect to our special commitment to minorities,

A. Freshman Survey: A survey of entering, degree-bound students (Fall 1988) shows that the proportion of minority
students entering WSU (19.6%; 7.4% black) exceeds the national percentage (15.8%, 7.1% black). We are doing better than the national averages but not as well as we would like. Additional efforts will be made to attract minority students and to provide them the academic support and mentoring which increases the probability of success.

B. Minority Scholarships/Fellowships: 17% (112) of the undergraduate scholarships supported by local mill levy funds were awarded to minority students; while 12% (6) of graduate scholarships and 44% (16) of graduate fellowships were awarded to minorities. We must attract minority students to our graduate programs if we are to be successful in developing role models among our faculty and professional staffs for the future.

C. Cooperative Education: Efforts are also underway to increase the minority representation in Cooperative Education. Because of its location in the commercial, financial and manufacturing center of the State, Wichita State University has a unique opportunity among Regents' institutions to provide cooperative work arrangements which allow students to acquire the education and work experience that help insure a successful transition from university student to productive citizen.

My comments have touched on three significant areas (minority recruitment and support, applied research focused on economic growth, and doctoral program development); they understate WSU's achievements in many other areas. Extensive revision of the curriculum may be seen in a 6-year inventory of program changes (distribute). Other advances have been made in the performing arts to the improvement of our quality of life and our efforts to reach and serve the nontraditional student looking to enhance old skills or acquire new ones.

STRATEGIC PLANNING: Whether a carrot or stick, Regents' Program Review and Margin of Excellence initiatives have prompted strategic planning and carried a long-term perspective down to college and department levels. One example of change is provided by the pro-active involvement of Medical Record Administration faculty in enhancing student recruitment and program productivity following last year's program review. The development of a recruitment brochure, better lines of communication with KU where students take the professional phase of their program, and improved advising and admissions processes are the result. In other departments, program review has occasioned a reexamination of curricula in the context of mission and the inauguration of internal processes for discontinuance (Secretarial Training and Business Education).

The revised mission statement and the Margin of Excellence, however, have had the greatest impact on strategic planning at WSU. Within the parameters of the new mission statement and the
Margin of Excellence guidelines a university-level planning effort involving the colleges and divisions through the Council of Deans and the Vice Presidents Council was launched in Spring 1987. It resulted in a three-year set of priorities which are reviewed and modified annually and are reflected in our comprehensive budget plan as submitted to the Board in June 1987 and revised in June 1988. Separate collegiate strategic planning activities are underway or completed in the Barton School of Business and the Colleges of Education, Fine Arts, and Health Professions. From a curricular perspective two major task forces have been charged with analyzing our present situation and making recommendations for sweeping changes in International Education and the Undergraduate Experience.

To complement the program planning activities, facilities planning activities were launched in Summer 1988. With funds made available through the Board of Trustees, the University commissioned Planning Development Services (PDS) to update the 1973 comprehensive campus plan. This report, to include recommendations relating to the current campus and contiguous golf course is due July 1989. In addition, a process involving departments, divisions, and colleges in identifying most important needs for remodeling and new construction is underway. To date it has resulted in numerous requests which will be prioritized by the Vice Presidents and myself and ultimately integrated with PDS recommendations this summer.

Planning for programmatic and facilities improvements will be integrated in the next twelve months to guide institutional direction in the out years of the Margin of Excellence and toward reassessment of mission in 1991-92.

The evidence presented above speaks to WSU's realization of its mission and our maturing position as one of the major university research centers in the Regents' system. Credit belongs to the dedicated faculty who are supporting this advancement, and to the Board members who recognize the pivotal role Wichita State University plays in nurturing excellence in the next generation of Kansans.
RESOURCE REALLOCATIONS
AN INVENTORY OF PROGRAM CHANGES AT WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY*
(1983-1989)

I. Academic Programs Discontinued:
Certificate in Physician Assisting
Certificate in Nurse Clinician
Certificate in Cytotechnology
Associate of Arts in Administration of Justice
Associate of Arts in Secretarial Training
Associate of Arts in Humanities
Associate of Arts in Social Science
Associate of Arts in Mathematics and Natural Science
Bachelor of Science in Engineering Technology
Bachelor of Arts in Administration of Justice (Outreach)
Bachelor of Arts in Religion
Bachelor of Arts in Italian
Bachelor of Arts in Latin American Studies
Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics
Bachelor of Business Administration in Production Management
Bachelor of Business Administration in Business Education
Bachelor of Arts in Education: Business Education
Bachelor of Fine Arts in Dance Performance
Bachelor of Arts in Communication: Theatre
Bachelor of Science in Engineering
Bachelor of Science in Physical Therapy
Master of Administration of Justice (Outreach)

II. Academic Programs Added:
Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Mathematics
Doctor of Philosophy in Chemistry
Master of Science in Physical Therapy
Bachelor of Science in Physician Assisting
Bachelor of Fine Arts in Performing Arts

SUMMARY

| TOTAL NUMBER OF MASTERS DEGREES DISCONTINUED: | 1 |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF BACCALAUREATE DEGREES DISCONTINUED: | 13 |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS DISCONTINUED: | 3 |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF ASSOCIATE OF ARTS DEGREES DISCONTINUED: | 5 |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF DOCTORAL DEGREES ADDED: | 2 |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF MASTERS DEGREES ADDED: | 1 |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF BACCALAUREATE DEGREES ADDED: | 2 |

*The PhD in Engineering also now is designated by area: PhD in Aerospace Engineering, PhD in Electrical Engineering, PhD in Industrial Engineering, and PhD in Mechanical Engineering.

Office of Academic Affairs
3/15/89
TO: Faculty Affairs Committee
FROM: Ben Rogers, Chair
The Executive Committee requests that you consider the following item:

**Topic**
Tenure and promotion process and guidelines: a fairly extensive review

**Considerations**

1. There has been concern expressed from a number of different quarters as to whether there is the proper consistency between the characterization of performance expected for tenure and promotion by the university guidelines and those of the several colleges.

2. It is not clear that the present tenure and promotion calendar permits sufficient time for petition and response to petition while still allowing the University to present its recommendations to the Regents at the time they request.

3. There is concern as to whether individuals receive adequate guidelines as to the level of performance expected of them. This is particularly true of new faculty who face tenure review, but it also holds for promotion. This was probably the most frequently voiced concern among faculty senate members as I visited with them in collegiate groups. Vice President Scott expressed the point to the Executive Committee thus: "I am concerned that we lack a coherent and supportive system to assure faculty a clear understanding of their role and our expectations from the outset of their appointment, one which is amenable to updating as the faculty member's role changes. One approach would be to set up a process that provided for a formal job description with time allocations at the start of the appointment, to use this same definition for all reappointment reviews and annual evaluations, and to insert it as the 'role statement' in the tenure/promotion review."

4. There is concern with regard to the influence of deans on the University Tenure and Promotion Committee. What is the agenda when a dean is invited to comment on a case from his/her college? There are no guidelines with respect to the information produced. Does the candidate have the right to respond?

5. The University Tenure and Promotion Committee in the past has felt that
it needed information directly from department and college committees giving the reasons for their decisions, rather than merely receiving the vote of these committees.

6. As the University develops more extensive research programs, it is likely that persons will be hired who will only be engaged in research on soft money, yet may be expected to be with the University for extended periods. Such persons are not covered by present tenure policies.

7. Some faculty have expressed the belief that the University is now in a stage of development where the University Tenure and Promotion Committee cannot give proper review to the variety and number of cases coming before it, and that it should be eliminated. Others feel equally strongly that this committee plays a very important role in holding the university community together.

8. External review of faculty research and creative activities outcomes is becoming more frequent, but there is no university-wide policy governing the solicitation of such reviews. This raises questions of equity for the faculty whose cases are reviewed under processes which are quite different in form.

Actions Requested

The Executive Committee is asking you to undertake a fairly extensive review of the University Tenure and Promotion policies and guidelines. In the process we ask that you consult widely as to the views of the faculty, the department chairs, college tenure and promotion committee members, the deans, and the executive vice president for academic affairs with regard to the concerns noted above. This process should include a preliminary report to an open meeting of the Faculty Senate to which all interested members of the faculty are invited. More specifically, we ask that you take the following actions:

1. Review the tenure and promotion guidelines of each of the colleges and compare them with those of the university with respect to expectations for tenure and rank. After consultation with the groups mentioned above, recommend university guidelines which reflect the university's present state of maturity. This request does not preclude you finding that the present guidelines remain appropriate.

2. If needed, recommend a new tenure and promotion calendar.

3. If after consultation you agree that it is needed, recommend policy and guidelines for the implementation of role statements for faculty. It is important that if such statements are instituted that, with regard to new faculty who will be reviewed for tenure, the college tenure and promotion committees are advised at the time of hire of the nature of the role statement, so that they may indicate if they feel it is compatible with college guidelines for tenure. If there is no such provision and a department writes a role statement which fulfills
departmental needs but does not take adequate account of college expectations and the faculty member fulfills the provisions of the role statement, a very bad situation arises.

4. The concern expressed in consideration 5 (above), led the 1986-1987 University Tenure and Promotion Committee to make recommendations concerning required reports from department and college committees regarding the basis for their recommendations. These recommendations have been sent to your committee by the Faculty Senate for your review and action. In the recommendations as written, the right of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee to request an interview with the dean of the college in which a case originated was reaffirmed. This right, in its present unrestricted form, is questioned in consideration 4 (above). Your recommendations on this issue are also sought.

5. With regard to faculty on soft money, if appropriate, recommend a tenure policy for them, after consultation including review of the policies of other institutions and AAUP recommendations.

6. The issue joined in consideration 7 is an over-riding one. If you determine that the University Tenure and Promotion Committee is no longer desirable, recommend the appropriate and extensive revisions in the University Tenure and Promotion policies and guidelines necessary to implement the change. If this is the position taken, many of the above requests for action are probably inappropriate and should be dealt with accordingly.

7. The 1986-1987 University Tenure and Promotion Committee recommended establishment of a university-wide policy concerning external review. Their recommendations are forwarded to you by the Faculty Senate for you review and action.

Schedule

We ask that you be prepared to present your final recommendations regarding tenure and promotion policies and guidelines to the Faculty Senate on Monday, March 28, 1988. We ask that final copy be to the Senate office no later than March 14. The open meeting requested above should be scheduled for the latter part of January or early February at the latest. At the open meeting you should be prepared to give the faculty appropriate background information and provide a preliminary draft of your recommendations for discussion.
The committee recommends:

All recommendations received by the University Tenure, Promotion and Academic Freedom Committee should be accompanied by written justifications. Separate statements should be prepared by the department level committee, the department chair, the college committee, and the Dean. (These written justifications become part of the primary dossier.)

In regard to these written statements of justification the committee further recommends:

1. The statements prepared by the department committees and the college committees be developed in consultation with the committee membership and be reviewed and signed by all committee members.

2. When a candidate's file is complete at the department level the candidate should be given access to the file for review and be given the opportunity to add a statement to the file. The candidate would then sign a statement that the file has been reviewed and the candidate has had the opportunity to include a response. In addition, when a candidate's file is complete at the college level the candidate should be given access to the file for review and be given the opportunity to add a statement to the file. The candidate would again sign a statement that the file has been reviewed and the candidate has had the opportunity to include a response.

Point of Information: The committee also observes that the above recommendations shall not limit the committee from requesting additional verbal clarifications from Deans or other parties during the university committee's deliberations.

C. External Review Policy (Response to Senate President memorandum of 1/27/87)

The committee recommends the following:

Initiation of Review

Tenure and promotion decisions affect the University's overall quality and standing in the larger academic community. Such decisions cannot be divorced from external professional considerations. Although external review is not required, the university recognizes the value of properly conducted external reviews. The university provides the process be initiated by the candidate prior to the departmental review or by the review committees or administrators at any time during the review process.

The Review Process

Any external review shall be conducted in accordance with the following procedures:

1. Administration

The Dean shall administer the process at the department or college level. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs shall administer the process at the university level.

2. Selection of Reviewers

a. It is required that the experts chosen as reviewers be competent to make the necessary evaluations.

b. At the time the process is initiated, the candidate will make the choice as to whether the review process will be confidential or non-confidential. The candidate will submit to the administrator a list of three names along with an indication of his/her association with each. The candidate may also submit a list of no more than three people who are not to be used as outside reviewers. The administrator will prepare an additional list of qualified reviewers. The administrator, in consultation with the faculty member, will select an equal number of reviewers from each list.

c. In the event that a body of scholarly work is to be evaluated, the candidate will assemble a vita and a representative sample of scholarly and/or creative work. The administrator will send a packet to each reviewer along with a cover letter which includes:
1) A request for a written evaluation of the material submitted and, if appropriate, the quality of the journals and publishers cited.

2) A statement, if the reviewer's letter is to be confidential, that the candidate has signed a waiver of his or her right to see the original letter but will receive a copy with all identifying information deleted.

**The Review Document**

The opinion of the reviewer must be in writing and will be included in the candidate's secondary dossier. It is not the task of the outside reviewer to recommend for or against tenure or promotion. Upon completion of the file at each level of review, the candidate will have the right, subject to the confidentiality provisions, to review the file and add a written statement.
FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Meeting of March 27, 1989


MEMBERS ABSENT: Adamson, Burdette, Cisneros, Crum, Dreifort, Duell, Harper, Hutcherson, Mays, Yeager

GUESTS: Farnsworth, Fast, Kelly, Malcolm, Pangburn, Paulson, Starnes

Call to Order, "Informal Proposals and Statements"
President Zoller called the meeting to order at 3:30. He announced the date of the next meeting will be April 10, but it is likely another meeting will be necessary the following Monday, April 17, to complete debate and voting on the Tenure and Promotion document. The meeting will be adjourned at 4:45 so members may attend a gathering to be given for the Faculty Senate by President Armstrong.

Approval of Minutes
Motion for approval made by Nelson, seconded by Hoyer. Motion passed.

Formal Reports

PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS - EVP Scott
Remarks relating to the report and its importance were made by President Zoller. EVP Scott referred to pg. 5, Resource Reallocations, emphasizing that WSU had discontinued 22 programs and added 5. She noted the Regents' approbation of WSU's response to its changing mission. The report of the cross-cultural commission will be addressed in the coming year.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY - Dr. Rohn
Discussion was resumed with questions on the points covered during the previous meeting. Concern was expressed about the conformity of the committee's refusal to assign weights to the criteria for tenure with the charge to the committee. Further concern was expressed about the phrase 'terminal degree.' Rewards for teaching and service once more were queried, as was exclusion of tenured assistant professors from the college and university committees. The exclusion of members of applicants' units from discussion and votes on those cases was questioned. The issue of conflict of interest was raised in reply. The mention of 'unassigned faculty' was queried.
Discussion moved to the remainder of the document.

V. External Peer Review

Persons approached to do outside review most often decline on grounds of time or of confidentiality. The mention of publications was interpreted to include performances and exhibitions, but service would be excluded. Reviewers are asked to address only materials submitted to them, not individual cases. Reviews are intended to help, not hurt candidates.

VI. Appeals

The limit on appeals was clarified to cover one in the tenure procedure and one in the promotion procedure.

GENERAL DISCUSSION IN CONCLUSION.

Differing views of the role of faculty in the campus community, broad involvement vs. narrow focus, were noted. The keeping of written records throughout the process was defended. The nature of the involvement of administrators in the process was queried. The ability of members of the university committee to succeed themselves was queried. The suggestion that the individual colleges/units were not mature enough to review their own faculty was questioned.

Graham offered Rohn and the Faculty Affairs Committee the Senate's thanks for their work.

Old Business - None

New Business - None

Motion for adjournment at 4:45 p.m.