



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1989-1990

Volume III

Agenda and Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting of May 14, 1990

THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

AGENDA

GENERAL FACULTY MEETING

May 14, 1990

1:30 p.m.

208 HH

1. Review of Executive Committee Activities
2. Remarks by President Armstrong
3. Discussion Period

QUESTIONS FOR PRESIDENT ARMSTRONG
3 May 1990

The following questions have been compiled from those submitted by the general faculty to various members of the Executive Committee. It is understood that you cannot provide detailed answers to all of them in the May 14th meeting; however, you might wish to convey to the faculty your plans for answering those you cannot get to at that meeting and a timetable within which the faculty can expect to have the answers.

1) Questions concerning the Endowment Association:

- a. What is the real relationship of the Endowment Association to the University?
- b. People understand the need to protect the identity of donors, but they do not understand why expenditures and the process of deciding upon expenditures need to be secret.
- c. Isn't Hartsook paid by the state? If so, why isn't he accountable to the University?
- d. Isn't Hartsook's consulting business in competition with his job at the Univ.? (There is evidence that, among other offenses, he used his university phone number on his private consulting business stationery.)
- e. Does the \$100 million raised by the E.A. really represent gifts to the Univ.? Were research grants counted in that total? How much did it cost to raise that money? Will the information from the Endowment Association (dated April 30th) be widely circulated?
- f. Are the expenses of the Endowment Association reasonable, i.e., 12% or less of its total income? (There is much feeling that Woodman Alumni Center is too sumptuous, given the deteriorated state of much of the rest of the campus.)

2) Questions about annuities and bonuses:

- a. People perceive a conflict of interest in having money targeted to you or to other administrators rather than to the programs of the University.
- b. Some have expressed a feeling of discomfort with your being singled out for help with your family problem when so many less well-paid University employees must bear expenses for handicapped children, aged parents, etc. on much smaller incomes. (There is even the suggestion that you turn your annuity into a fund for WSU employees with handicapped children.)
- c. Does Bob Hartsook have an annuity? Was he paid bonuses? Where did the money for these "perks" come from?
- d. How was money for these annuities and/or bonuses raised? What role did the Endowment Association play in raising funds?
- e. Was any Margin of Excellence money used for bonuses or

raises for you or other administrators?

3) Questions concerning cost of PhD programs:

- a. What additional resources have been received by the University from the state to assist in doctoral program development?
- b. Has any assessment been made of costs of PhD programs and what the impact might be on other programs at the University if the state does not provide adequate funding for doctoral programs?
- c. When you were installed as President of WSU, John Montgomery of the Board of Regents said you should not ask for any new programs. He suggested that the state would or could not provide adequate funding for new programs. Has anything changed since then?

4) Other financial concerns:

- a. How do you justify reducing the percentage of mill levy funds spend for student scholarships and faculty development while increasing the percentage spent for buildings, such as the Alumni Center and the proposed new Marcus Center?
- b. The deteriorated state of the infrastructure, including the problems in McKinley Hall, are evidence of administrative neglect. Shouldn't the mill levy be used on these issues before new buildings?
- c. When will the elevator be installed in the Math-Physics/Neff Hall complex?
- d. What is the effect of hiring faculty "stars" on the salary system?
- e. Is the Board of Regents taking any action regarding finances at WSU? Are they investigating use of the mill levy, bonuses, annuities, etc.?
- f. Might the faculty establish their own Faculty Endowment Fund over which they would have control?
- g. Has any salary money (i.e., from "held back" positions) been used for the construction of buildings?
- h. If V.P. Lowe's office, or physical plant, or other Univ. offices make a profit on their services, why not return a percentage of the academic units for faculty professional development funds?
- i. If the above method is not feasible, how will funds be found to provide developmental support for the faculty?
- j. Will you provide the faculty with a detailed accounting of the use of Margin of Excellence funds?
- k. Are you prepared to provide a clear, unambiguous guarantee that the business of this public institution will be public, consistent with legally mandated restrictions?

5) Policy questions:

- a. How will you involve faculty in institutional planning?
- b. How can we reassert the University's commitment to the life of the mind?
- c. Can we reformulate a consensual mission statement with appropriate and meaningful faculty participation?
- d. Suggestions: Provide retreats for chairs and senior administrators to get a sense of how we are working together and to solve problems (such as the infrastructure); use some resources from ORA to help faculty build bridges to funding agencies in Washington.
- e. There is distrust of the associates and appointees of the former EVPAA. Are you willing to take a stand that such persons must also be evaluated before they be permitted to continue in their positions?
- f. Questions have been raised about the justice and wisdom of allowing Dr. Scott to continue making policy and salary decisions under the present circumstances. Are you willing to take responsibility for those decisions and to deal directly with any complaints or grievances that may arise?

copy mailed to all faculty



The
Wichita
State University

Faculty Senate

MEMORANDUM

80

TO: Members of the University Faculty
FROM: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
SUBJECT: The Faculty Caucus of May 14, 1990
DATE: May 16, 1990

We have received many questions about arrangements for the Faculty Caucus of May 14, 1990 from colleagues who had expected an opportunity to address questions directly to President Armstrong.

Although Hubbard Hall 208 had been previously reserved by another group at 3:00 pm, we would like to assure you that it was the plan to provide considerable time for direct questions and discussion. President Armstrong was aware of this schedule for the meeting, and we had discussed with him the best means of doing all the business scheduled. It was our understanding that the President would limit his response to some general points, and more specific responses to a handful of questions -- all in order to assure time for genuine discussion. We only learned of the President's intention to respond to every written question at the opening of the caucus itself.

We regret that circumstances made it impossible for faculty members to engage the President in discussion. It would be our expectation that there will and should be future occasions for give-and-take discussion. It does not seem feasible to arrange such an occasion for this month. There is plenty of time in the fall. Certainly the issues that have been raised by faculty across the University, and to which the President has partly responded, will not go away over the summer. If you would like to submit additional written questions for the President to the Executive Committee, we will present them to the President at appropriate intervals during the summer.