



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1990-1991

Volume IV

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of September 24, 1990

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Room 126 CH

3:30 pm

Meeting Notice: Monday, September 24, 1990

Order of Business:

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
- II. Informal Proposals and Statements
 1. Continuation of report to the Faculty Senate - Dave Alexander
 - d. Discussion of issues for the fall
 2. Report on Regents' September meeting
 3. Preparations for Regents' meeting at WSU in October
- III. Approval of Minutes of August 27
- IV. New Business
 1. Nominations to fill vacancies - Rules Committee
 2. Sense of the Senate resolution on the use of an external search firm (Attachment A - Green)
 3. Discussion of the draft report to the Regents' on Post-Tenure Review of faculty (Attachment B - Yellow)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dave Alexander, Senate President	Box 32	3190
Bob Wherritt, Senate Vice President	Box 33	3160
Jolynne Campbell, Senate Secretary	Box 43	3147
A. J. Mandt, President-Elect	Box 74	3125
James Clark, Elected by Senate	Box 78	3220
Mira Merriman, Elected by Senate	Box 67	3555
Elmer Hoyer, Appointed by Senate President	Box 44	3415

On the Use of External Search Firms

After listening to the discussion in the Senate on the use of an external search firm to assist in the search for a Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and after several discussions of its own, the Executive Committee of the Senate has concluded that the use of such a firm could benefit the University.

This search will be one of the most important undertakings of this year, and our success in this endeavor is of paramount importance. The cost to the institution of an unsuccessful search, in terms of lost opportunities, or a poorly advised choice would affect us all for years to come. Among the potential benefits of the use of an external consulting firm are an enhanced pool of candidates, a lightened burden of routine search tasks, improved information about serious candidates, and assistance in brokering the final selection. Of course, none of these benefits will accrue if we abdicate our responsibility to participate fully in the identification and screening of candidates. It is essential that there be full and wide participation of faculty and other constituencies in the search process and in the selection and evaluation of candidates.

While the added costs associated with the use of an external search firm are not insignificant (approximately \$16,000 to \$20,000 if this is the third search conducted with the assistance of one firm), the potential benefits to the University are worth the cost, especially if the added costs of using the firm can be identified as coming from portions of the budget of the University and associated organizations which have not been allocated for faculty or student support. For these reasons, the Executive Committee recommends for your consideration the following resolution:

It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that the use of a search firm to assist in the search for a Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs is a reasonable means to improve the quality of the search and the likelihood of a successful conclusion for the search.



KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

SUITE 609 • CAPITOL TOWER • 400 SW EIGHTH • TOPEKA, KANSAS 66603-3911 • (913) 296-3424

May 30, 1990

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Members, Council of Chief Academic Officers
From: Martine Hammond-Paludan *M.H.P.*
Re: The Study of Post-Tenure Review

As you are probably aware, the proposal to conduct the study outlined by COCAO in consultation with the Faculty Senate Presidents regarding faculty productivity was approved by the Board in May. That study should answer the following questions:

Identify the criteria and process through which each Regents university

1. Awards tenure and promotion
2. Evaluates and rewards faculty productivity
3. Encourages post-tenure productivity
4. Assists faculty to maintain satisfactory performance

August 3, 1990

Minutes, Subcommittee on Data Gathering
for Review of Tenure and Faculty Evaluation

The requests for information for the institutional reports to the Board on Tenure and Faculty Evaluation have been modified in the following ways:

Recommendation 1. The report should begin with a brief discussion describing the search and screen process before a faculty member is hired for a tenure track position, followed by information on items 1 through 4 of the originally approved study.

Recommendation 2. The following information should be provided to answer question 5. Each institution should select two cohorts of assistant professors who entered the tenure track for Academic Year 1981-82 and Academic Year 1982-83. From those two cohorts, identify those remaining and those who left by the seventh year. Organize the information to reflect the percentage who (a.) departed for a better job; (b.) were counseled out; (c.) were denied tenure; (d.) were granted tenure. Through case study methods and interviews with the department chair and/or dean describe the process that led to the departures and why they left. Do those who left and those who stayed differ in their characteristics?

Recommendation 3. The following information should be provided to answer question 6. Each institution should select two cohorts of faculty who were tenured in April 1974 and April 1975. From those two cohorts, identify those present at the institution in Academic year 1989. Through case study methods and interviews with the department chair and/or dean describe those who left and the process that led to their departure. Of those who stayed, what has been the institutional response to (a) limited productivity? (b) to expected productivity or (c) exceptional levels of productivity? Have efforts been made to retain individuals in all three groups? Findings should be presented with no names but as a composite of a type.

POST-TENURE REVIEW REPORT

SEPTEMBER 1, 1990

Introduction:

Hiring & Selection Process:

Faculty are recruited and selected on the basis that they will be awarded tenure. When an academic department has an opening whether through attrition or through the allocation of a new budgetary position, the recruiting process begins. [The university's "Procedures for Filling Vacancies" is attached.]

The department meets to discuss the vacancy and the type of Ph.d. speciality necessary to fill the vacancy. Typically, the department has a plan that indicates areas of new growth or areas that need strengthening. The level of experience is limited by the amount of money allocated to the department to fill the position. Departments generally replace at the Assistant Professor level, but departments with particular needs can replace at the Associate or Professor level.

After approval of the job description and the search procedure by the Affirmative Action Officer, the department will advertise the position in national publications specific to the discipline. Applications are received and screened by a departmental committee. Often the department will choose to make initial contact with some twenty applicants at the national meeting for the discipline. The results of these contacts are reported to the departmental search committee. Likely candidates are asked to send full dossiers and publications for further scrutiny by the department. From the twenty, the department will usually ask permission to bring three or four candidates to campus for an interview. While on campus, the candidate will meet with departmental members, students, administrators, and will usually deliver a paper. Telephone checks are made of references to determine whether the candidate is suitable for the specific position in the department.

After the three or four candidates are interviewed, the department will forward a recommendation to the Dean for appointment. In cases where none of the candidates are acceptable, the department will ask to interview another candidate or will delay filling the position until the next year.

The department, the chair, and the dean discuss the amount of prior service for which to give credit toward tenure, the salary, and the specific role of the person in the department. The nature of the appointment and the terms under which tenure will be granted are discussed at this time as well.

In virtually all instances, the department scrutinizes the candidate from the point of view of his or her becoming a tenured member of the department. Often the initial response to an advertisement may be one hundred or more. Initial contacts are made with twenty, and three or four are brought to the campus. In short, the process is exhaustive and exhausting.

Materials: [Note: Examples will be attached.]

1. Untenured Evaluation Forms & Faculty Activity Record

These forms are supplied to department chairs by Academic Affairs and should be considered the beginning stage of the tenure and promotion process. Departments require an untenured faculty member to prepare a dossier that supplies evidence of teaching effectiveness, research and publication, and service. Departmental committees meet to review the untenured faculty member and forward their evaluations to the Chair. The Chair reviews the dossier and the committee's evaluation. The Chair establishes goals for the faculty member. During a meeting with the faculty member the Chair discusses the review and the prognosis for tenure and promotion. The forms are sent to the dean, who reviews both performance and goals. The forms are next sent to the Academic Vice President for evaluation and comment. These forms are distributed to all concerned parties and become part of the tenure document, if the faculty member subsequently applies for tenure. (forms attached)

2. Tenure procedures from Faculty Handbook

[Note: Promotion and Tenure Procedures are established by the Faculty and approved by the President.]

These procedures outline an extensive procedure for faculty and administrative review of all faculty seeking tenure as well as those seeking promotion. The two procedures constitute separate decisions on the part of each committee and administrator at each stage of the process. Frequently, promotion to associate professor and to professor follow the tenure review and should be seen to constitute post-tenure review. Candidates for tenure or for promotion prepare a primary dossier of twenty-five pages that outlines teaching effectiveness, research and publication, and service. The candidate also prepares a secondary document that includes copies of articles, papers, books, etc. The departmental tenure committee reviews the dossier and votes whether to recommend tenure or not. The Chair of the Department also supplies an evaluation of the candidate and independently recommends whether tenure should be awarded or not. This process is repeated at the College level where the College Tenure & Promotion Committee evaluates each candidate and recommends for or against tenure. The Dean recommends independently. Next the application moves to the University Tenure & Promotion Committee which makes recommendations. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs makes independent recommendations. Finally, the President of the university evaluates each case and decides the recommendation to

be transmitted to the Board of Regents. At every stage except at the Presidential level, appeals are possible. Typically, the process begins in September and is not completed until April of the faculty member's sixth year of appointment. The procedure for promotion replicates the procedure for tenure.

3. Merit pay considerations

[Note: By Board of Regents policy all pay increases for unclassified appointments are based upon merit. Whether a faculty member holds tenure or not, he/she must prepare a dossier that justifies a merit increase on the basis of teaching, research/publication, and service for the previous year. Consequently, merit pay constitutes one of the major methods of post-tenure review for tenured faculty.]

Beginning in December faculty are notified that merit pay deliberations will begin, usually in January. Most departments use a college and university style analysis which requires the faculty member to submit evidence of teaching effectiveness, research/publication, and service for the previous year. Faculty complete dossiers to justify their merit raises. Departmental committees and chairs judge the dossiers and recommend percentage increases from 0 to X, percentage increases are dependent upon legislative appropriations and distributions to universities, colleges, and departments. A department may not be able to distribute 5% if 5% is appropriated because institutional priorities may dictate withholding a certain percentage. Deans of colleges evaluate the departmental materials and support or modify departmental recommendations. In turn, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs examines the departmental and college recommendations and approves a percentage increase for each faculty member. Affirmative Action requirements and market considerations are introduced at this stage. The process begins in January and usually is not completed until May. (Sample forms from two colleges are attached)

4. Sabbatical Leave Requests

Sabbatical leave is granted on the basis of merit to those who have attained tenure. While not normally thought of as a post-tenure review, it does function as such for those who request consideration. The faculty member must prepare a request that indicates both what is intended and also what has been accomplished. Faculty Committees with Administrative overview recommend sabbatical on the basis of the proposal and on past performance. (Forms attached) (Policy from Faculty Handbook attached)

5. Graduate Faculty Status

Every five years each department offering a graduate degree is reviewed by the Graduate School. This review focuses upon requirements, curriculum, and faculty. Faculty are required to

submit a complete vita detailing efforts under the broad categories: teaching, research/publication, and service. These vitae are evaluated by internal members of the Graduate Council and by specially chosen external reviewers who are experts in the field. Faculty are approved for or removed from graduate faculty standing according to past performance.

6. Board of Regents Program Review

According to Board of Regents schedule, every program is reviewed in terms of degree productivity, student accomplishments, requirements, and faculty accomplishments. Faculty are required to submit vitae according to BOR format and are asked to list such items as courses taught, research and publications, and service. Program review is familiar to the BOR and is seen by those involved as one possible form of post-tenure review.

7. Research Grants (Regular and Summer)

Research grants whether awarded by the University Endowment Association or by the university from general state funding or by colleges from restricted funds are competitive. Requirements include the submission of a current vita with appropriate documentation of the faculty member's past record of research productivity.

8. Faculty Development Grants

WSU also awards faculty development grants which are intended to aid faculty who wish to resume research or who wish to develop a new area of teaching expertise.

9. Teaching Awards

Every year each college and the university offer Excellence in Teaching Awards to meritorious faculty. The university offers two awards for excellence as well as two research awards, one of which is designed for a younger scholar. Colleges offer comparable awards. These awards are seen as an effort to reward superior teaching, but also as an effort to improve teaching through healthy emulation of successful teachers. Selection committees and procedures exist at all levels.

10. Course Reductions

Each semester faculty are eligible for course reductions on the basis of productivity in research. Such reductions may be for 3 to 6 hours, but are based upon previous performance in research activities and upon credit hour production. To be eligible, faculty must have the authorization of the Chair and the Dean whose decisions are guided by the vitae routinely collected for merit increases. Awards of course reduction are reviewed on a regular cycle to ensure productivity warrants continuation of the reduction.

AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE CAUCUS

THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Room 126 CH

3:30 pm

Meeting Notice: Monday, October 1, 1990

Faculty Senate Caucuses were initiated last year to provide faculty an opportunity to discuss informally issues of concern. For this first caucus of the 1990-1991 academic year, it is suggested that we focus our discussion on an identification of the important issues which faculty should address during the year. Because many of the issues which confront our institution are very complex, we may want to take this opportunity to identify priorities among them and to define appropriate processes for addressing them.

In his comments at the General Faculty Meeting in August, President Armstrong identified 7 issues which he felt the University should address this year. Statements which identify and define each of these issues have been prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs. These statements are attached for your consideration.

6

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY ISSUES: 1990-1991

Office of Academic Affairs
July 1990

ISSUES STATEMENT: STRATEGY FOR MISSION REVIEW

ISSUE - STRATEGY FOR MISSION REVIEW 1992 & 1995: What is the best approach for the review of WSU's Mission Statement in 1992 & 1995? The current mission statement was developed under time constraints set by the Board of Regents that prevented extended campus discussions. Although department Chairs and Deans were consulted, various groups felt they were left out of the process.

The Mission Statement can be a source of strength for us in guiding decisions, and it can be the foundation stone upon which we build our long-range planning, etc. How can we implement a process for review and revision of our Mission Statement that involves the various constituent groups and that inspires the entire university to work as harmoniously as possible toward the development of WSU as a major and respected Urban University?

PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY: What individuals or groups from faculty, staff, students, and administration should be responsible for evaluating the current mission statement and making recommendations for revision and modification?

PLANNING PROCESS/RESOURCES: to whom should the responsible group go for:

- a. **Information:** Wichita State University needs to establish what is meant by an "Urban University." Never has the time been better to analyze what this term means and what we can make it mean for us. We can achieve excellence in this area. However, we need our faculty, staff, and students to help define this vision and to be committed to it. For example, the President could establish a Committee to discuss what an Urban University can be--what faculty profiles would look like, what programs we would establish, what our relationship with the community would be, what models we have, what issues we foresee (for example, research vs. service, status, involvement by business and community, involvement in social problems, the important role of liberal education in an urban institution). This could include a speakers series involving external consultants brought to campus. To make this part work, the President may have to work very closely with the committee.
- b. **Review and Comment:** What process of review and comment should be established to ensure broad faculty involvement. How can we ensure that faculty are not only invited to participate, but do participate? We could involve the faculty through the Senate and its regularly delegated committees. However, if we can achieve agreement on the statement, we can work out the details over time.
- c. **Approval:** What chain of approval is appropriate, leading to Presidential approval and submission to the Board of Regents? Throughout this process, the President and Vice Presidents should work with Deans and Directors to establish firmly in the minds of those who are asked to plan that (a) we are committed to being an Urban University and (b) we will implement what comes out of this planning process.

ISSUES STATEMENT: INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW

ISSUE - INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW: Considerable time was spent during the 1989-1990 Academic Year developing and prioritizing an agenda for the discussion of infrastructure needs. The entire administrative structure of the university, from President to Department Chair was included in the establishment and prioritization of the agenda. Discussions were carried out at the departmental level to involve as many faculty as possible.

The next issue is follow-up and the development of a strategy for addressing infrastructure issues. What has happened as a result of the Infrastructure meetings? Where are we and what do we need to do over the next few years to improve, if not resolve these problems? What are institutional priorities? To answer these questions and to prepare for further infrastructure planning, we need to develop an on-going process of reporting progress and review. We need to consider how to develop such a process, how to review the process, and to whom to report the results.

The Deans' Council should continue its involvement with infrastructure planning and priorities, and faculty need to be kept informed about priorities, status, and implications, as well as involved in the process. With the advice of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the VPs could match Faculty Senate Committees with Infrastructure priorities and routinely include the chair of the Senate Committee in the flow of information.

PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES: What individual/group should be responsible for planning, follow-up and implementation of a strategy for addressing infrastructure issues? For ease of reporting Infrastructure Task Force Chairs could keep the Vice Presidents' Council informed. Task Force Chairs could report to the Deans Council who have the responsibility for informing their units. Inside WSU can supply information, as can periodic briefings of the Faculty Senate, inclusion of Senate Committees in the flow of information, briefings of the SGA, and briefings of the Alumni Association.

PLANNING PROCESS/RESOURCES: To whom should the responsible individual/group go for:

- a. Information: These units should be briefed on the status of the previous year's infrastructure accomplishments and should be asked what our needs are, and what our priorities may be: (1) Vice Presidents, (2) Deans, Directors, and Chairs, (3) Faculty Senate Executive Committee. We could also designate Academic Affairs & Administration/Finance to prepare a fact sheet on current status of infrastructure issues; request a procedure for updating and evaluating progress; ask for suggestions from planning groups about continued infrastructure planning; and show how infrastructure relates to long range planning.
- b. Review and Comment: Should we continue with the broad campus meetings involving VP's, Deans, Directors, and Chairs? Or should we establish a different process for review and comment?
- c. Approval: What chain of approval should be established for the plans recommended?

ISSUES STATEMENT: INSTITUTIONAL DIVERSITY

ISSUE - INSTITUTIONAL DIVERSITY: Although WSU can document both formal and anecdotal efforts to meet the needs of its diverse student body, it would be wrong to allow ourselves to believe we have gained significant ground dealing with the issue of diversity. To a disenfranchised group some progress is not very comforting. Recruitment of minority faculty, especially black faculty, is low to non-existent. We have lost more minority faculty and administrators than we have recruited. Black, Hispanic, and Asians are under represented among our classified employees.

During the last few years, WSU has been criticized for being insensitive to minority issues, including our relations with the Northeast Community. The Commission on Cross Cultural Assessment: Achieving the University Mission was discussed, but the discussion produced few tangible results. Meetings of the Citizens' Advisory Committee are poorly attended.

Involved in the broader issue of diversity are issues of age, gender, ethnic, and racial backgrounds, differently able, and part-time students. Despite the difficulties of generalizing about such disparate groups, we must question how successfully Wichita State University functions within our pluralistic environment.

Various groups believe our campus lacks an environment for involvement and acceptance. Under-represented groups believe they have experienced institutional insensitivity. As an urban institution, WSU should provide leadership in raising the social consciousness of its faculty, staff, and students.

Does WSU have the will to provide such leadership? This challenge has fundamental institutional implications for grappling with such complex issues as: diversity of faculty and staff, mission and values, educating for diversity, and dealing with conflict.

PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY: We have dealt with this issue in various ways in the past. A new approach is necessary. Our previous activities have not attracted nor retained a diverse faculty and a multi-ethnic work force. The mandate is for immediate change with leadership and direction from the top level of the University. Once the vision has been articulated, the question becomes who are the best individual(s), University group(s), community agencies and individuals to insure that the ideal is achieved. To be a participant in the educational development of the diverse population of our community is the challenge for WSU.

PLANNING PROCESS/RESOURCES: To achieve this objective will require an institutional commitment and a University climate of awareness toward issues of inclusion, acceptance, and involvement. The employment and retention of a multi-ethnic staff and work force will require a commitment to aggressive recruitment at every level of the University's hiring process. Faculty, staff, and administrators need to be trained in effective recruitment techniques and be provided with resources to meet employment goals. Educational activities must be undertaken to insure that each unit within the University understands the need for institutional diversity.

WSU's administrators must help resolve the perceived conflict between quality and diversity. Issues related to quality in hiring are perceived to be lessened when employment is held accountable to affirmative action goals. This situation creates an adverse climate for recruitment and retention of both faculty and students.

Biases against other groups identified within these issues deserve attention. Barriers that prevent an environment of acceptance require an open forum for discussion within the University's policy making groups. A formal agenda to increase WSU's diversity cannot be successful without campus-wide involvement at all levels.

ISSUES STATEMENT: WSU STUDENT BODY PROFILE

ISSUE - WSU STUDENT BODY PROFILE: What is the desired profile for WSU's student body? Within what time frame should this profile be achieved? The current enrollment goal for WSU is 20,000 students by the year 2000 but mixed messages and different expectations are prevalent. Until there is a definite statement about what we want the student body to be, it will be difficult to develop effective recruitment and retention programs and policies.

PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY: Planning for strategic enrollment requires both near term and long term goals. The initial vision and direction must come from the top levels of the University. Should the Enrollment Management Task Force be charged with the development of recommendations consistent with WSU's mission? If not this campus group, what individual or groups on campus should begin that process? What parameters will be provided to the planning group?

PLANNING PROCESS/RESOURCES: The question of whether Wichita State desires to continue enrollment growth is central to a number of issues surrounding recruitment efforts at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The latest budgetary crisis in the State of Kansas coupled with the continued Board of Regents interest in qualified admissions question the wisdom of pursuing enrollment growth. The question of growth needs to be settled to enable us to develop a recruitment program that will meet institutional objectives. Quality is a concomitant issue. The recruitment and retention of high ability students is a competitive activity.

Demographic conditions for the next ten years are problematic for the traditional student cohort. College going adults present a challenging opportunity for WSU to assure that WSU meets its mission related responsibilities. For example: questions need to be answered along the following lines: Is WSU interested in building its full-time or part-time enrollment? Is this an either or question? What priority should minority recruitment take at WSU? If WSU is interested in building its part-time student enrollment, what accommodations to delivery system, programmatic offerings, and student services is WSU willing to maintain?

Recruitment is only one aspect of the enrollment picture. Retention is a second important element that affects overall enrollment. The student body of the future increasingly will be composed of various minority groups who may be less well prepared for success at the University. Can WSU afford to recruit students and not provide opportunities for financial assistance and academic success? Programs that promote retention need to be developed for the students we wish to enroll.

ISSUES STATEMENT: WSU RESPONSIVENESS TO MARKET DEMAND

ISSUES - INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIVENESS TO MARKET DEMAND: WSU has been slow to respond to market demands for course and programmatic offerings. Numerous institutional studies of market need have been completed within WSU's service area. Each of these studies point to the interest business and industry, area private colleges, community colleges, and public school systems have in specific program or course offerings. During the past four years, Emporia State and Pittsburg have moved into areas that have been left open by WSU's unresponsiveness to requests for service.

Does WSU wish to respond to changing market demands for its services, programs, and degrees? Does WSU wish to pursue modifications to its traditional curricular offerings and delivery systems to accommodate requests for services? What are the costs and available resources to respond to these markets? Should WSU investigate the possibility of participating in evaluating non-collegiate instruction for academic credit?

PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY: What individual, professionals, and faculty groups should be responsible for evaluating WSU's commitment to market responsiveness? Faculty, faculty senate, committees, community leadership, and institutional administration must play an active role in modeling WSU's response to community market demands.

PLANNING PROCESS/RESOURCES: As WSU looks ahead, growth in enrollment will come from place-bound professionals within the WSU service area. Friends University, Kansas Newman College, and Butler County Community College are aggressively pursuing various options to accommodate the professional who desires to continue career development. At the same time, WSU has taken steps to curtail its services to the part-time adult population. WSU has emphasized full-time credit hour production at the expense of part-time student service and academic colleges have created policies that restrict course completion without degree-bound status.

With the loss of associate degrees, WSU offers no sub-baccalaureate degree to a segment of our community that needs post-secondary education. While WSU is responding to request from Wichita area vocational technical schools and the Derby school system regarding AA degree completion possibilities, academic colleges have created academic policies that block options for the non-degree bound, non-traditional learner to pursue college credit offerings at either the undergraduate and graduate level.

College credit for non-college instruction and corporate educational training are areas that might be explored. The Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York can provide direction in this arena. However, the question remains: Is WSU interested in responding to a market that is served by other creditable institutions in a way that would broaden our institutional response to community needs?

The Division of Continuing Education (or some other academic unit and not a current academic college) should be evaluated to determine what role it could play in providing courses and programs to meet the needs of potential students.

One other issue that should be explored is that of a WSU consortium with area private colleges. Students at area private colleges can register for WSU courses through their own Registrar's Office. The purpose of this arrangement is to preserve the student's full-time status at his/her home institution while allowing him/her to take a course at WSU not available on the home campus. It also allows the private college a broader range of course "offerings," and promotes enrollment at WSU. Only one private college uses this arrangement, probably because it has not been advocated by the administration. There may even be the opportunity for WSU to offer certain courses on consortium campuses.

ISSUES STATEMENT: COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF POLICY ISSUES

ISSUE - COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF POLICY ISSUES: Various policy issues are presented to the Deans' Council, to the Vice Presidents' Council, and to many other units. The Faculty Senate's Budget, Scholarship, and Retrenchment Committees, as well as other units recommend policy. These units may or may not include a cost/benefit analysis with their policy recommendations. As a result, policy decisions may be made that have an unknown but real financial impact upon both previous and subsequent policy decisions. Departments make academic policy decisions without considering the costs, both real and hidden. For example, the cost relationship of departmental major requirements to staffing is seldom considered. At the college level cost/benefit analysis is better understood. Departments and committees are prepared to consider cost/benefit implications but will need help in two areas: (1) where such information can be found and (2) how it should be used in formulating policy.

A start has been made in including cost/benefit analysis in some of the Infrastructure planning. How can we develop an appreciation for the tradeoffs and opportunity costs of actions. How can we help departments, colleges, and other offices to include costs, benefits, and net gains? This type of framework is foreign to many faculty, especially in evaluating academic activities and proposals.

PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY: Eventually every unit should be encouraged to analyze the cost/benefit relationship of major policy decisions. However, WSU will have to use discretion in encouraging such analysis. Departments and faculty units may be uneasy with such an approach and may fear that "accounting" has superseded academic policy. Deans could work with chairs to help analyze one area of a department that would benefit from such an analysis. The Scholarship Committee could be used to experiment with the effectiveness of this approach in formulating academic policy.

PLANNING PROCESS/RESOURCES: Both departments and faculty committees will need help and examples in how to do this type of analysis as well as some sense that it makes policy formation more effective. To whom can academic units, committees, and planning groups go for:

Information and data: Institutional planning and analysis has some kinds of information. Financial and accounting information is not readily or easily available. Case studies could be implemented to demonstrate a planning process that would include cost/benefit kinds of analysis. For example, the Scholarship Committee could, in working with appropriate administrators, be shown how to use this approach and how it helps. A simple manual with examples might be developed. Crucial in this process will be tangible results.

ISSUES STATEMENT: PLANNING FOR CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

ISSUE - PLANNING FOR WSU'S CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION: The Wichita State University is approaching its centennial year (1995) and we need to begin planning for special events and appropriate recognitions. The centennial year provides an opportunity for WSU to celebrate its unique historical relationship with the City of Wichita, its advancement as an urban university; its contributions to higher education, and the past and present accomplishments of faculty and students. The centennial provides us with the opportunity to call attention to our academic programs, faculty, and students, and the University's contributions to the quality of life.

By focusing on academic achievements, we can bring statewide attention to WSU, over an extended period. It should not go unnoticed that the Centennial comes when the Kansas Board of Regents will be reviewing institutional mission statements.

Some key issues are (1) assuring broad faculty and collegiate participation, (2) deciding what events to support and the kinds of support available, (3) balancing the appearance of extravagance with the desire to say something about WSU, (4) involving external constituencies, (5) assigning appropriate roles to Advancement, the Alumni Association and the Board of Trustees. Perhaps most important, (6) how can we assure that the centennial emphasizes the academic side of the university.

PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY: What individual/group/organization should be responsible for developing WSU's plan for celebrating the centennial and implementing this plan? How can we balance the competing desires of interested constituencies (eg, Advancement, Alumni Association, Board of Trustees, Board of Regents, city/county government) who may wish to use the Centennial to make a statement about a variety of things?

PLANNING PROCESS/RECOURSES: To whom should the responsible individual/group go for:

- a. **Advice:** What individuals/groups should be involved with the planning and organizing? What individuals/groups should be a direct part of the centennial celebration? What should be the relationships among the University, Advancement, the Alumni Association, the Board of Trustees. Should a planning committee be established that would begin in Summer 1991 to develop answers to some of these questions and identify projects that deserve special university support. Some meaningful projects may require substantial time and effort on the part of faculty and staff. Should the committee report initially on a bimonthly basis.
- b. **Information:** What should be celebrated? Who has information or knowledge about historical events and accomplishments? Who could be invited to campus and what kind of special events could be held? What regular or ordinary activities could be enhanced for the Centennial?
- c. **Review and Comment:** What process should be established for review and comment on Centennial plans? To what extent are external groups and constituencies involved in reviewing and commenting.
- d. **Approval and Implementation:** What chain of approval is appropriate and who has final approval authority? Who has responsibility for implementing the plan, including financial support, logistics, and organization?

FACULTY SENATE

THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Meeting of September 24, 1990:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ackerman, Alexander, Bair, A. Bajaj, P. Bajaj, Baldridge, Billings, Brady, Breazeale, Brewer, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Clark, Combs, Daugherty, Davison, Duell, Erickson, Foster, Gosman, Griffith, Gythiel, Haydon, Horn, Hoyer, Hubbard, Huckstadt, Huntley, Johnson, Kelly, Kruger, Lansing, Lee, Mandt, J. Merriman, M. Merriman, O'Flaherty, Olivero, Perel, Rogers, Sethi, Soles, Sweney, Webb, Wherritt, Yeager, Yeotis

MEMBERS ABSENT: Armstrong, Baxter, Benson, Cavarozzi, Christensen, Hartman, Izbicki, Lambert, Parkhurst

GUESTS: Bowman, Brunner, Pangburn, Zoller

Summary of Action Taken:

- 1) Approved minutes of August 27 as corrected.
- 2) Accepted recommendation of Rules Committee for Senate and Senate committee positions
- 3) Carried with dissent the Sense of Senate resolution on use of an external search firm

I. Pres. Alexander called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. INFORMAL PROPOSALS AND STATEMENTS:

Before continuing his report, Pres. Alexander noted a change in the agenda. The discussion of the draft report to the Regents' on Post-Tenure Review of Faculty would be moved from OLD BUSINESS to INFORMAL PROPOSALS AND STATEMENTS:

1. Continuation of report to the FS - D. Alexander

- d. Discussion of issues for the fall. Many items are carryovers from the Rules Committee last year.

Revision of committee structure. Review of charges: possibly adding committees.

Revision of grievance procedures. From FS of two years ago. Bring to FS this fall.

T&P procedures. From FS last spring. Faculty Affairs Committee's revision was returned for reconsideration. FS suggested changes.

Post-Tenure review. Due in Topeka on Oct. 10.

Central Administration Structure. Definitions committees were formed in agreement with Pres. Armstrong, VP Breazeale and FS Exec Committee. The Academic Definition Committee will meet 9-25-90.

New committees, Advisory for Advancement and the Capital Improvement Planning Committee, have met. Will report to FS late fall or early spring.

A/Pass/Fail. Proposed by SGA. Sent to Academic Affairs Committee. Report due January 31.

Grading Practices. Practice of using grade distribution for evaluation of faculty. Sent to Academic Affairs Committee. Report due February 16.

General Education Reform. Committee is a joint committee of faculty and administration. It is reviewing the GE policy. It will meet with respective colleges for policy discussion. It will report to FS.

Joint Appointments. Faculty Affairs will review the policy and report to FS. The committee looks at policies, both creation and maintenance of, for appointments in more than one academic unit.

Vacant Faculty Positions. Faculty Affairs Committee will give report on October 8.

Faculty Benefits Comparison. Report was received last meeting.

Absence from Campus Policy. Policy is under review by FS Exec Committee. Will report this semester.

The Agenda for the Faculty Senate Caucus. The meeting is for general discussion of faculty concerns and priorities about the University issues. Methods of approaching the issues will be considered.

Senator Griffith asked that the Exec Committee have a round-table discussion of their perception of the atmosphere with the Administration. Pres. Alexander said it was a good idea since it is often difficult to translate atmosphere into a document.

Senator Billings asked for the membership of the Definition committees. She said she had understood that there was some dispute about the membership. Pres. Alexander reiterated that the membership came out of a mutual agreement on the selection from the nomination lists. He stressed that it did take several discussions. The Exec Committee met with Pres. Armstrong and VP Breazeale last Friday (9-14) and formed the list. The Deans' member is Billy Mac Jones.

Senator Gosman asked if the task of the committees was still the same: to establish the overall scope of the positions, work with the firm to set up the job description, and to set the procedure for the searches. Pres. Alexander replied that they were the same. Senator J. Merriman asked if there would be a committee for each search and D. Alexander replied yes. Senator M. Merriman asked if the Definition committees would be reporting to the FS before their task was completed. Pres. Alexander was not clear on that point. It may be too late to do much of any revision. That was why the members of the committee were selected for their broad range of experience.

2. Discussion of the draft report to the Regents on Post-Tenure Review of Faculty.

Dr. Zoller pointed out that this was a mandated review with specific questions asked by the Regents. The draft is the yellow attachment and is a rough draft. The report is now due November 1. Dr. Zoller shared his narrative with the FS. His perception is that administrators are using the Corporation as a model and

it does not work well in academia. He addressed the many ways that faculty are already evaluated (recruitment and selection process, yearly nontenured evaluation process, T&P procedures, merit pay evaluations, etc.). The term productivity is very difficult to define. It differs from discipline to discipline. The cohort study (1974-75 & 1981-82) was used to analyze productivity rather than the merit increases that the Regents suggested. Some markers of productivity were with the cohort. Dr. Zoller mentioned a study where 53% of all faculty with Ph.D's never publish, many work at teaching. Dr. Zoller said the report also asks how the administration is at helping faculty be productive.

Senator Daugherty expressed her appreciation for the thoroughness of the report. She said the report missed the point that the lack of state funding turns incentives into disincentives. With only 2% salary increases, it is hard to distinguish productive from nonproductive faculty. It affects morale. Some faculty ~~teach and do service with little research.~~ The University need not demand publications from these persons. People can be terminated for cause, but the administration doesn't discipline them for fear of lawsuits. Senator Perel commented that it is a false assumption that in corporations deadwood is fired. Some local industries are good examples of that. The Regents should be told that. Senator Soles referred to the T&P process in the Handbook. The fact that an external review is available to the faculty should be included in the report. Senator Erickson argued that one can get rid of "useless faculty;" it is usually done on an informal basis. Tenured faculty are not immortal. Senator J. Merriman referred to the sabbatical leave as a marker. He reminded the Senate that only a limited number of faculty can be on leave in a given year. Therefore, a rejected application does not mean an unfavorable report. Senator Hoyer added that professional schools with accreditation undergo periodic reviews, including review of faculty. Senator Kruger said that many departments are unable to find candidates because the salaries are not competitive.

were hired primarily to teach and do service with little expectation for research. In those cases...

Dr. Zoller will return to the Senate to report on items 5 & 6.

3. Report on Regents' meeting in Topeka, September 20. The agenda was light on substantive issues. They affirmed the responsibility of the CEOs on each campus to keep athletics clean. They approved the 1993-95 calendars (Spring Break in '93 will coincide with the public schools). Six faculty members were awarded tenure. They approved continued funding for the Science building and for remodeling on campus. They approved a Position Paper on the Margin of Excellence. It included a cigarette tax and qualified admissions.

Senator Gosman questioned tenuring of faculty in summer. Pres. Alexander replied that these were senior faculty hired with tenure. The procedures were discussed in FS last spring. The faculty in each area had approved award of tenure to those persons.

4. Preparations for Regents' meeting at TWSU in October. The past Senate President plans the event. It is October 17 & 18. The faculty is to meet with them on Wednesday at four locations with tours of facilities. All of the meetings are open. The formal meeting on Thursday morning is with a gallery.

Senator Rogers reported that the KSU Exec Committee met with the Regents at a breakfast meeting.

III. Motion made to approve, with corrections, minutes of August 27, 1990. Motion was seconded. Passed. Corrections: add K. Griffith name to list of those in attendance; VP Breazeale to be listed in attendance as member, not as guest.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

1. Nominations to fill vacancies - Rules Committee

Senator Mandt moved to approve nominations for Senate vacancies for 1 year term:

Jan Zytkow, Computer Science
Alvin Sarachek, Biological Sciences
Charles Martin, Mktg. and Small Business

Motion passed.

Senator Mandt moved to approve nominations for Senate committee vacancies for 1 year terms:

Asrat Teshome to be member of Library/MRC
Sam Yeager to be member of Faculty Support

Motion passed.

Senator Mandt said he had some informational items concerning non-Senate Committees:

Robert Borresen to be faculty representative to the University Alumni & Faculty Club Board - 3 year term
John Hutchinson to be faculty representative to the Heskett Center Advisory Board - 3 year term

2. Sense of the Senate resolution on the use of an external search firm (Att. A).

There was much discussion of the issue during the Senate meeting of September 10. No closure was achieved at that time. The resolution comes from the FS Exec Committee.

Senator Daugherty said she was inclined to support the resolution, but was still skeptical. However, if we don't employ the firm we may come up short. Senator Gosman asked how many of the Exec. Committee supported the resolution. Pres. Alexander replied that all six of the members present supported the concept of the resolution. One member was absent. Senator Perel asked if the University of Oklahoma had hired the same firm. Senator Mandt said that Oklahoma was on the list of President searches. Senator Johnson asked who would interface with the firm. Pres. Alexander answered that the search committees must do the work. Senator Griffith felt that it would be a duplication of efforts if both groups did the screening of candidates. Pres. Alexander said the firm was not going to make the decisions. It would work more like a T&P committee; one person would present the case with all members reviewing the documents. The committee can trust the search firm to whatever degree they feel necessary. Senator M. Merriman said the Definition committees must give a refined list. The firm can get rid of those who don't fit. Pres. Alexander agreed that in the primary stages it will be easy for the committees to eliminate some candidates. The firm may also recommend eliminating some. The distinction is a fine one. The main saving will be time and solicitation. Senator J. Merriman concurred that the real contribution is to turn up "heads." The firm may save time by doing scheduling and paperwork. Things hang on the firm developing candidates that we could not. Senator Mandt said he was full of uncertainties, but considered the

time frame. We are very late in beginning the search. The value of developing candidates is a good point. The screening value is more moot. Senator Lee asked if the FS knew who the search committee members would be. Can the committee research the referral sources, or question the firm for references. Could faculty here make calls. How many draws would come from the firm and how many from other sources. Pres. Alexander replied that the search committee composition had not been discussed with him. Senator Wherritt said it is crucial to get a strong search committee. Senator Erickson asked if it was necessary to fill position this year? Pres. Alexander said that VP Breazeale wants to return to retirement. It is not good to operate too long with an interim appointee.

Senator Duell moved the previous question. The motion passed. Motion to accept the resolution was carried with dissent.

Senator Perel raised the issue of administration starting a policy to summon to Dean Rhatigan or the President's office any student who writes letters to the media. If it was meant to frighten students, it is not working. They are mad. They should not have their right to speak inhibited. The administration can answer this. VP Breazeale said he knew of no such policy. If it is so, he supported Senator Perel's concern.

Senator Billings expressed her concern over the CAC's policy against the distribution of political materials in the lobby. Three lawsuits confirm their right to do so. It is state law. The Senate should put the CAC's policy on the agenda.

Senator Rogers moved to adjourn.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
SUMMARY OF MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 25, 1990 MEETING

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alexander, Campbell, Clark Hoyer, Mandt, Merriman, Wherritt

The meeting was convened by D. Alexander at 12:30 p.m.

The Exec Committee discussed the white paper, Tenure and the Evaluation of Faculty. The report was requested by Regent Don Slawson and prepared by the Regents staff. The paper will be submitted with the institution report on the review of tenured faculty. VP Breazeale said the Regents and staff would be receptive to comments on the report. The Exec Committee felt two important issues come from the report:

1. During the development of the report, there was no opportunity for faculty input. The FS President will send a memo to the Regents with copies to Koplik and Hammond-Paludan stating the report is a "breach of faith."
2. The content of the report is in question. The corporate model was used inappropriately to evaluate the academic system. A TWSU white paper could be written in response to the report.

D. Alexander and E. Hoyer are to meet with Pres. Armstrong to discuss the scheduling of the Regents during their visit to TWSU in October.

The Transfer & Concurrent Enrollment Policy passed last year in the FS raises some issues. Dean Meabon will be invited to discuss the issues at a FS meeting. Material concerning the issues can be circulated to the faculty before the meeting.

The Exec Committee reviewed the attendance policy for the Faculty Senate caucus. Suggestions for the "Voice of the Caucus" were made. The position is important since no formal minutes of the meeting are made.

The FS election/nomination procedures were addressed.

Faculty Senate Caucus agenda for October 8:

Faculty Affairs Committee report on vacant positions.
Post-Tenure review report, #5 & #6, P. Zoller
Sense of the Senate Resolution on Senate representation

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.