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AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
Room 126 CH 3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, December 11, 1989

Order of Business:

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Proposals and Statements

   Analysis of Results of the Survey of Incoming Students - Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, David Meabon

III. Approval of Minutes

IV. Old Business

   * 1. Policy for Investigation and Resolution of Misconduct in Research

V. New Business

   Position Statement on Academic Calendar (Attachment A)

   Coordination with USD 259 on Spring Break

   Regents Staff plan to fix the number of days and have a uniform calendar for all 7 Regents institutions.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Elmer Hoyer, Senate President  Box 44  3415
Sally Kitch, Senate Vice President  Box 82  3358
A. J. Mandt, Senate Secretary  Box 74  3125
David Alexander, Senate President-Elect  Box 32  3190
Mark Dotzour, Elected by Senate  Box 88  3219
Diane Huntley, Elected by Senate  Box 144  3614
Karen Brown, Appointed by Senate President  Box 26  3114

* Indicates action required
Wichita State University Policies and Procedures

SUBJECT: Transfer of Credit and Concurrent Enrollment Policy

INITIATING AUTHORITY: Faculty Senate

ACCOUNTABILITY: EVPAA

The Faculty Senate, at its December 4, 1989 meeting, passed the following statements of policy on transfer of credit and concurrent enrollment to be implemented in the earliest possible university catalog:

1) Transfer of credit should be granted only for work in which the student earned a grade of C or better. Adopted unanimously.

2) Students may not enroll concurrently at another institution and at WSU without prior permission. Adopted.

3) Degree-bound WSU students wishing to take courses as guest students at another institution must get prior approval if they wish the credits earned to transfer. Adopted by a vote of 26 yes, 9 no.

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate was empowered to work with the administration to draft the appropriate catalog language.

Approved: ___________________________ Date: _______________________

Warren B. Armstrong, President
WSU FACULTY SENATE POSITION STATEMENT
ON
THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR

Examination of the quality of the academic experience in universities in the Kansas Regents system should focus on qualitative factors and will be appropriately addressed in the assessment activities currently in progress. The relationship between number of instructional days and quality of educational experience or student performance has not been established. While counting the number of instructional days is an easy task, it does not in any way assess the quality of the instruction that occurs each day nor the amount or quality of learning which occurs outside of class.

As students progress through their educational careers, there should occur a steady change from almost total dependence on the teacher for the learning that occurs toward increased independence on the part of the student. Successful education occurs when a student has learned how to learn, not when a certain set of information has been mastered. While many of the facts students learn in school will change during their lifetimes, if they have learned how to find and understand new information as it becomes available they will never become out-of-date. At the university level, a great deal of learning occurs outside the classroom, through independent projects, interactions with faculty outside of class, and a wide variety of assigned activities, while classroom activity serves to motivate, guide, and facilitate independent learning by the students. By design, learning occurs when classes do not meet.

Although the need for change in number of instructional days has neither been documented nor justified, if change must occur, Option C outlined in the report on The Academic Calendar in the Kansas Regents System would be preferable because it provides some institutional flexibility. Every attempt should be made to avoid developing a system which forces Regents universities into a rigidly uniform calendar.

If the number of instructional days is to be studied, it is important to recognize the unique character of WSU in the Regents system. For example, comparing instructional days disregards differences in scheduling practices (e.g. Saturday classes, our heavy reliance on evening classes, televised instruction, or variations in the length of the instructional "hour") among the Regents universities and between 1960 and 1989. The examination of calendars should also consider the variation in number of final exam days and holidays, which is needed to allow institutions some flexibility in scheduling. For instance, scheduling spring breaks to coincide with those of local public schools would require flexibility among the various Regents universities.

Restoring the WSU calendar to 1960 levels of 153 instructional days would involve the addition of only one or two instructional days each semester. Given the nature of most WSU courses, this change would add at most one additional class session for most courses, while some courses would have no increase in class time at all. There is no evidence to conclude that the change in number of instructional days over the past thirty years has had any adverse effect on either faculty expectations of student performance or student learning.
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Minutes of the Meeting of December 11, 1989

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ackerman, Adams, Alexander, Armstrong, Bair, Baldridge, Benson, Brady, Brewer, Burk, Campbell, Cavarozzi, Clark, Daugherty, Davis, Dotzour, Dreifort, Duell, Erickson, Germann, Gotterbarn, Graham, Gythiel, Haydon, Hoyer, Huckstadt, Huntley, Izbicki, James, Jones, Kelly, Kiralyfalvi, Kitch, Kruger, Lambert, Mandt, Murdock, Rogers, Scott, Soles, Sullivan, Sutterlin, Wherritt, Williamson, Yeotis


GUESTS: Bereman, Gray, Hawley

Summary of Senate Action
1. Passed a misconduct in research policy, as mandated by the federal government.
2. Passed a resolution recommending that the administration appoint a faculty member to rewrite the policy section of the undergraduate catalog for clarity and consistency.

I. Call to Order
President Hoyer called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

II. Informal Proposals and Statements

SURVEY OF INCOMING STUDENTS
Associate Vice President Meabon summarized some of the results of recent surveys of incoming WSU students, including individuals from seven different groups of students. Among the findings:
- 75% of entering students report themselves satisfied or very satisfied with their WSU experience to date;
- many aim at a professional or graduate degree;
- Kansas State and Kansas are the universities with which we most compete for students, KSU being our primary competitor;
- WSU’s strengths compared with KSU and KU are perceived to be: business, engineering, music/fine arts, good faculty, attractive campus; KU’s strengths: athletics, medicine, "don't know," engineering, law; KSU's strengths: agriculture, engineering, "don't know," veterinary medicine, athletics;
- among expectations students bring to the university, 90% report an expectation of career advancement through higher education, 70% look particularly to increasing their general knowledge, 65% seek to become an expert in their chosen field of study (a faculty survey found that faculty suppose students expectations to center on preparing to communicate more effectively, increased ability in problem solving, and judging and expressing ideas more effectively);
- when asked to compare their own "ideal" university with WSU, students generally found a fairly close fit (the same items on the faculty survey found a greater variation between ideal and actual).
Vice President Meabon's presentation is available to interested departments and colleges, although there is not, as yet, a written summary report. The total data collected is voluminous, and is available for study.

III. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the November 27, 1989 meeting were approved as submitted. The minutes of December 4, 1989, distributed at the meeting, were corrected as follows: In the final main paragraph, it was Senator Sutterlin rather than Senator Rogers who suggested substituting "academic" for "scientific" in the "Misconduct in Research" policy. (Senator Rogers supported this suggestion.) Senator Wherritt indicated that in the fourth paragraph under "Undergraduate Transfer Policy," it was his intent to express his own opinion that the Mathematics Department would be disinclined to administer an exit exam to all entering transfer students, rather than to report a department view on this subject. He noted that the Department of Mathematics and Statistics is completing development of an exit exam in College Algebra. With these corrections, the minutes were approved.

IV. Old Business

MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH POLICY
For the Executive Committee, Senator Dotzour moved adoption of the Policy for Investigation and Resolution of Allegations of Misconduct in Research. The motion was seconded.

Professor Hawley, chair of the ad hoc committee that developed the policy statement reviewed several additions to the previous draft introduced on the advice of Regents counsel. These changes have the effect of clarifying some details with respect to due process guarantees. The Executive Committee added to the previous draft the specification that in appointing a hearing panel, the Research Officer would consult with not only the Senate President, but also the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. This addition had been inadvertently left off the previous draft circulated to senators. A sentence has been added to the "Policy" section noting that in non-scientific disciplines, standards in those disciplines would apply.

Senator Izbicki and Senator Kiralyfalvi made several corrections of typographical errors, and Senator Izbicki suggested that the final sentence should read "Other misconduct investigations concerning federally funded research . . ." This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Senator Williamson asked whether the policy shouldn't be explicit about the involvement of colleagues from the department, division, or college of the suspected individual(s) in any hearing panel. Professor Hawley replied that the reference to "objectivity and competence" in the qualifications for panel members was intended to assure that its members have the proper qualifications to judge the activities under investigation. This might require, in some cases, bringing in someone from another institution to assure competency. Senator Williamson also asked whether or if so when the chair and dean should be informed of an investigation, urging that at some point they should be apprised. Professor Hawley suggested that if a case
proceeded to a hearing, it would be "public knowledge." Several senators suggested that they would expect the process to remain confidential, analogously to what would be expected in a dismissal for cause proceeding under current policy. Vice President Scott indicated that she would expect strict confidentiality to be maintained, unless this was waived by the suspected individual, such a waiver removing any liability from the University for damaging information that might come out.

Senator Rogers moved that the general guidelines relating to confidentiality provided for in the dismissal for cause policy be incorporated into the procedures for hearings on misconduct in research. The motion was seconded.

Senator Clark asked whether the requirement for reporting cases to federal agencies would not vitiate confidentiality. Senator Soles asked whether Rogers' proposal implied a right to legal counsel. Vice President Scott replied that as an internal process, dismissal proceedings involve no such right of representation (although individuals may, of course, consult an attorney). Existing policies on these matters are consistent with requirements for confidentiality in personnel matters under Kansas law. The Vice President suggested that the sense of the Rogers motion should be understood in line with these statutes.

Senator Rogers suggested that the Executive Committee could review the dismissal policy to assure that it provides specific guidelines for confidentiality, and amend the policy accordingly. With this understanding of the intent of the motion, President Hoyer put the question on the amendment. The amendment passed unanimously.

The motion to adopt the policy passed unanimously.

V. New Business

ACADEMIC CALENDAR

The agenda for the meeting included copies of the position paper on the academic calendar submitted to the Board of Regents by the Executive Committee. President Hoyer reported that the Regents are considering proposals to establish a uniform calendar for all institutions, and to specify the number of instructional days required. Plans to coordinate the Spring Break with that of Wichita Public Schools could be contingent on the outcome of these discussions. President Armstrong reported that he had very recently talked with Mr. Koplik, Executive Director of the Board, who found no problems with the Spring Break coordination.

REWRITE OF ACADEMIC POLICIES IN THE UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG

For the Executive Committee, Senator Alexander presented a resolution urging that the administration appoint a suitable faculty member for a one-half time summer appointment to rewrite the academic policies in the undergraduate catalog for clarity and consistency—qualities that have faded with the accretion of changes in policy over the years. The resolution provided that the Academic Affairs Committee and the Office of Academic Affairs would exercise oversight of this effort.

In the discussion that followed, Senator Wherritt suggested that there
should be a survey of some sort to determine particular problems before work commenced, and wide review of the new catalog text before final approval to assure that no unintended policy changes were introduced, and no working interpretations of policy overturned inadvertently. Senator Dreifort suggested a time limit on the work. Senator Alexander suggested that it might not be wise to do it at all until revisions of the General Education Program are complete. Vice President Scott suggested that the catalog serves as a policy document, in lieu of a clear statement of policy, and suggested that instead of writing the catalog by committee, that academic policies be pulled out, reviewed, and confirmed by the Senate, leaving catalog rewriting to a later date.

The resolution was adopted.

The meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

Submitted by A. J. Mandt, Secretary