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AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
The Wichita State University

Room 126 CH 3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, October 26, 1992

Order of Business:
I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
II. Informal Statements and Proposals
III. President's Report
IV. Approval of Minutes:
   1. October 5 (attached to agenda of October 19)
   2. September 21
V. Old Business (4:00)
   1. Program Review
      a. President's first draft (copies will be sent to you prior to the meeting, if possible)
VI. New Business (4:45)
   1. Planning and Budget Committee replacement

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Kathryn Griffith, President 3165  Box 17
Keith Williamson, Vice President 3185  Box 31
Joyce Cavarozzi, Secretary 3541  Box 53
James Clark, President-Elect 3220  Box 78
Albert Gosman, Elected by Senate 3402  Box 35
John Dreifort, Elected by Senate 3150  Box 45
Elmer Hoyer, Appd by Sen. Pres. 3415  Box 44
A. J. Mandt, Past President 3125  Box 74
FACULTY SENATE
TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NOVEMBER

NOVEMBER 2
1. Program Review (3:45 - 4:15 p.m.)
   Senate Report on President's Draft
2. 20 year Capital Improvement Plan (4:15 - 5:00 p.m.)

NOVEMBER 9
1. 20 year Capital Improvement Plan
   This should include discussion on the University Capital Improvement Committee

NOVEMBER 16
1. Program Review
   President's final report due November 13. Discuss and consider response if appropriate.

NOVEMBER 23
1. Program Review (if necessary) - (3:45 - 4:15 p.m.)
2. Ad Hoc Tenure and Promotion Policy Committee Report (4:15 to 5:00 p.m.)
   The report will be mailed to you shortly so that you may read it and discuss it with your colleagues prior to the meeting.

NOVEMBER 30

DECEMBER 7

Again, this is a tentative schedule that we will adjust according to developments regarding each issue. We very much hope to take final Senate action on the tenure and promotion report before Christmas. This is an important issue and deserves our careful attention.
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Nursing

MEMORANDUM

TO: Provost Rex Cottle
FROM: Donna Hawley, Director Graduate Nursing Program
DATE: September 25, 1992
RE: Clarification and concern from recommendations

We appreciate the Provost's recommendation for enhancement of the graduate program in nursing and for support to explore a PhD in Nursing. We wish to clarify and add specificity to the recommendations.

The graduate program in nursing was selected for enhancement by a peer review panel in the Graduate School. Such enhancement will be used to increase the research and grant funding to strengthen the foundation for a doctoral program. We strongly urge support of such enhancement.

In response to the documented need for nurses who provide primary health care services in both rural and urban areas of the state, the Department of Nursing began a family nurse practitioner specialization within the graduate program in the fall, 1992. This effort is partially supported through December 1993 by a grant from the Kansas Health Foundation and additional support is being sought from a variety of sources including this same agency. The University of Kansas, Fort Hays State University and WSU are submitting a cooperative grant proposal November 1 to the Kansas Health Foundation for support for an additional 16-24 months of a statewide cooperative program for preparation of nurse practitioners. As part of this proposal the Foundation requests assurance that we will have faculty positions necessary to continue the program at the end of their funding. To respond to this request as well as to meet our philosophical commitment to preparing advanced nurse practitioners for Kansas, faculty have taken the following steps: (1) specific faculty are re-tooling to become better prepared to teach in this new specialization, (2) current specializations within the program with low enrollment have been consolidated or are schedule for elimination, and (3) two common courses have been established as replacements for specialized low-enrollment courses. These reallocations, planned and supported by faculty, are not enough to address the need in Kansas for nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists nor to meet the Kansas Health Foundation's demand for guaranteed continuation of the nurse practitioner specialization. The shortage of nurses prepared at both the master's and doctoral levels is predicted to continue well into next century. Student demand for advanced degrees remains high. We need a minimum of 2 faculty positions to address both the shortage of nurses prepared at both the master's and doctoral levels and the demands of the Kansas Health Foundation.

cc: Dean Diane Roberts
    Dr. Susan Kruger
The Department of Nursing has reviewed your Program recommendations. We cannot agree with the position of non-enhancement of the Undergraduate Nursing Program. The Department asks reconsideration of the request for one position to cover the RN-BSN completion courses and one position to cover generic nursing courses for the following reasons.

There exists a shortage of nurses with the BSN degree who are prepared for leadership positions. The shortage of BSN nurses is escalating as acuity of care continues to intensify in both hospital and community facilities with the increase in the aging population and the AIDS epidemic. Also BSN education is basic to nurse practitioner preparation. Currently the equivalent of two positions are being temporarily financed through lecturer monies. These positions are critical to the coursework and integrity of the BSN program. Without undergraduate enhancement, the only courses which can be cut to accommodate the positions needed for the generic nursing student is the RN-BSN completion program. With the large numbers of Associate Degree RNs needing an opportunity to achieve the BSN, cutting the RN completion program is not an attractive option or one that addresses the mission of the department, college or university.
Response to the President’s Preliminary Program Review Recommendations

The Provost’s recommendation to reallocate funds for the support of undergraduate instruction was justified as an opportunity to improve the quality of our academic programs, although attention was also drawn to the pattern of funding for instruction at other Regents’ institutions. Even though he did not raise the issue of disinvestment in undergraduate instruction, I feel that we must respond to the President’s counter argument to this issue. The statistics that the President cites on pages 2 and 3 of his preliminary recommendations, as supported by Attachment A, contain significant distortions and are singularly unconvincing when subjected to close examination.

For example, the President asserts that we spend $86.94 per undergraduate credit hour while the Regents’ average is only $84.46. Several factors must be analyzed before accepting this comparison. The figures are based upon aggregate figures which combine both lower division and upper division credit hours. Is the mix of those credit hours the same at all Regents’ institutions? This factor is especially important at the graduate level, where KU and KSU will have a much greater proportion of graduate 2 instruction than we do. Even at one level, the figures are aggregates over all disciplines. Since some disciplines are much more expensive than others, such aggregations are meaningful for cross institutional comparison only if the disciplinary mix is the same at all institutions. This is unlikely to be the case. Similar problems exist with the President’s use of expenditures per FTE student.

The only way that expenditures per credit hour can be analyzed appropriately is to compare figures by level of instruction for individual disciplines. While the data exists for such a comparison, it has not been performed to the best of my knowledge. Even if it were to be performed, the results would still not be definitive. To understand why, we must understand how the cost figures are generated.

Each year, the cost figures are obtained by multiplying a department’s budget with the proportion of their weighted credit hours produced at one of the levels and then dividing by the number of unweighted credit hours produced at that level. Unfortunately, the multipliers used to obtain the weighted credit hours are based upon activity logs collected from faculty for just one or two weeks in the early 1970’s. It is questionable whether information gathered over such a brief period was ever truly representative of our efforts. It is also no longer clear to me how non-instructional activities of faculty were accounted for in determining the weights. To the best of my knowledge, those multipliers have not been updated in nearly twenty years, despite the fact that the instructional mission of many of our programs has changed dramatically during that period. It is amazing to me that the Regents and the legislature are willing to base their budget calculations on such antiquated and misleading figures. In the present context, however, the use of these statistics is particularly unconvincing since the instructional mix in many of our programs has changed so dramatically over the intervening years, more so than is probably the case at most other Regents’ institutions.

The President’s justification for the declining percentage of expenditures for instruction, presented on page three of his preliminary recommendations, is also unconvincing. I am not
sure why the percentage of our total expenditures allocated for instruction should decrease with decreasing enrollment when the percentages for scholarships/fellowships and student services have not decreased by comparable amounts. Institutional decisions are also reflected in the percentage of expenditures allocated for research and public service, as well as in some parts of the other expenditure categories. All of these decisions should be reviewed and justified as a part of the program review process.

Still another set of decisions that should be reviewed as a part of the program review process are the fee schedules established within various units of the university. For example, when the physical plant charges a department for repair or remodeling work, GU funds in the department budget are converted to RU funds in the physical plant budget. Those RU funds could be effectively reallocated for instructional uses by altering the fees set by physical plant. Several other examples of the conversion of GU funds to RU funds exist throughout the budget, although I am unprepared to offer specific recommendations without more detailed information.

The program review process has raised many important issues for extensive discussion across campus. As we continue the discussion of those issues, it is imperative that we base our discussion on reasoned and appropriate analyses of relevant data. We cannot allow the discussion to be obscured by the use of misleading statistics.
TO:  WSU FACULTY SENATE
FROM:  SUSAN KRUGER, CHAIRPERSON, DEPARTMENT OF NURSING  
DONNA HAWLEY, DIRECTOR, GRADUATE NURSING PROGRAM  
BETTY SULLIVAN, DIRECTOR, UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

RE:  PROGRAM REVIEW: PRESIDENT’S PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

DATE:  OCTOBER 27, 1992

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

The Department of Nursing wishes to express grave concerns for the lack of response in the President’s report for "the improvement of academic programs critically important to the achievement of the University’s mission". The President states in his report that he needs to know "whether, in fact, there has been an erosion of support for instruction at WSU ... at any level." We believe that there has been an erosion of support in nursing and have therefore presented appeals at every level for additional faculty. Please see attached.

We wish to note that the Academic Advisory Committee recommended that the Undergraduate Nursing Program be enhanced with additional faculty through reallocation of funds. The Provost supported this recommendation. The graduate nursing program was recommended for enhancement on the basis of decisions made by Selective Enhancement Review Committee. The faculty of the Department of Nursing is requesting that the President consider the needs of the Department of Nursing in light of the service it provides to the community, the demand for its programs (40 BSN and 15 MSN graduates, December, 1992) and the excellence of its graduates.

Background information:  The Department of Nursing experienced a drop in enrollment in the mid-1980’s when the health care reimbursement system was drastically changed and hospitals responded with nurse lay-offs. Unfortunately, prospective students at WSU and nationally also panicked and looked for other professional programs. The Department of Nursing undertook an energetic recruitment approach and began to see a reversal of this trend and by 1988 there was a 65% increase of students enrolling in nursing. The drop in enrollment caused nursing to lose 5.8 EFT’s during the period of 1887-89. We have been unable to respond to high enrollment demands because we do not have sufficient faculty and have been unable to gain more EFT’s. The shortage in nursing caused us to take action to meet the student demands and the community’s demand for nurses. We capped enrollments, hired lecturers to assist with clinical teaching, eliminated elective courses, and offered courses less often for certain groups of students, the increasing numbers of ADN nurses
seeking the BSN and the School Nurse students. Since that time we have turned many students away. There are usually 2 1/2 qualified students for every position available in nursing. It needs to be recognized that undergraduate nursing students are required to have 61 prerequisite hours, including basic skills, general education and supporting courses.

We are requesting additional faculty to address primarily two issues: to respond to the large number ADN students seeking the BSN who have now dropped from our program because of infrequent course offerings and to respond to the large number of lecturers hired for clinical teaching.

The ADN students are nontraditional students returning to school to achieve the BSN. The RN students require special advising and offering of classes to meet their work and family schedules. We have been unable to meet their needs adequately. The enrollment of RN students has dropped by at least one third at WSU while the national need for BSN practitioners increases. The state and national levels continue to challenge the efficient articulation of ADN students.

The hiring of lecturers to teach clinical courses is problematic in that lecturers usually accept these positions on top of their own workload. We believe that although lecturers are qualified clinicians, they frequently do not have a strong background of curriculum and student teaching/learning. To strengthen the undergraduate nursing program we need to have adequate positions so that all students can benefit from strong full-time faculty.

In addition, the faculty wish to recognize that the graduate nursing program is launching out in a new direction, the nurse practitioner specialization, which is in direct response to the health care needs of Kansas. Funding has been received from the Kansas Health Foundation (KHF) for the start-up of this specialization and further funding is currently being sought. The Kansas Health Foundation is requiring that this specialization be continued following the funding period. Three universities, KU, Fort Hays and WSU are collaborating in the development of common courses and plan to share faculty for the nurse practitioner program. Fort Hays has been guaranteed continued faculty support. We have not. We believe this development is a strong area for growth for nursing and for WSU. We have already been approached to develop other nurse practitioner specializations.

We request that the needs in the Department of Nursing be reconsidered.
TO: University Faculty Senate
FROM: College of Engineering Program Advisory Committee
       College of Engineering Department Chairmen
DATE: October 28, 1992

SUBJECT: College of Engineering Reaction to President's "Program Review: Preliminary Recommendations"

We have reviewed the President's preliminary recommendations for program review and have the following reactions:

1. We appreciate the President's recommendation to accept the majority of the College of Engineering's program review proposals.

2. We support the President's recommendation to have "students declaring a major enroll immediately in the academic unit of their choosing." We view the recruitment, advising, and retention of students as essential elements of the College's role and mission. However, to adequately perform these functions will require additional resources. Therefore, we request that he identify in his plan the resources necessary to support these activities.

3. We would like for the President to reconsider the proposal for merging the National Institute of Aviation Research with the College of Engineering. We feel that this is important for the following reasons:
   a. It will strengthen the ties between the research and academic programs. Currently the NIAR views itself primarily as a research enterprise and linkages to the academic programs are very weak. As an example, graduate students have difficulty in having access to the NIAR's facilities in the evenings and on weekends.
   b. We believe that the principal reason for the limited participation of non-engineering faculty members in the NIAR is rooted in the other college's lack of incentives and rewards similar to those available in the College of Engineering. By merging the NIAR with the College of Engineering, Dean Wilhelm will work with the other deans to establish proper incentives in their colleges to facilitate the expansion of research in these units. He will also encourage participation of faculty members from other
colleges in being active NIAR research associates.

c. We also feel that the merging of the NIAR and the College of Engineering would result in reduced administrative costs.

Dr. Albert Gosman  
Advisory Committee, Chair

Dr. Elmer Hoyer  
Advisory Committee

Dr. Walter Horn  
Advisory Committee

Dr. Mark Jong  
Acting Chair of EE

Dr. Bert Smith  
Chair of AE

Dr. Richard Johnson  
Chair of ME

cc: Dr. Warren Armstrong, President
FACULTY SENATE
The Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of October 26, 1992

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alexander, Allen, R. Armstrong, Bair, Bajaj, Behrman, Benson, Bereman, Billings, Brady, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Clark, Daugherty, Davis, Dreifort, Duell, Erickson, Farnsworth, Fisher, Furtwengler, Gosman, Griffith, Gythiel, Hawley, Horn, Hoyer, Hundley, Jeffers, Kahn, Koppenhaver, Mandt, Martin, Masud, May, Merriman, Moore, Murdock, Romig, Shanahan, Sheffield, Teshome, Wherritt, Williamson, Yeager, Zytkow

MEMBERS ABSENT: Berger, Chopra, Martin, Merriman, Murphy, Parkhurst, Pitetti, Sweney, Thomson, Widener

GUESTS: Brunner

Summary of Action Taken: Straw votes taken

I. CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER. The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Griffith.

II. INFORMAL PROPOSALS AND STATEMENTS. Senator Erickson invited the Senate to a Halloween Party Saturday at his home.

III. PRESIDENT’S REPORT.
   a. Sidney Warner from Cimmaron, KS is the new member of the Board of Regents.
   b. Washburn University was discussed. At some point the Senate Presidents will be asked for faculty opinion.
   c. There was further discussion of the disposition of the Program Review. Mr. Montgomery and Ms. Hammond talked about the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents. COCAO asked if they would have a chance to respond to the reports. Mr. Montgomery said there is no problem with dialogue between the various groups. COCAO expressed concern about the lack of opportunity to talk directly with the Board. The recommendations of the staff will be discussed with COCAO, then they will go to the Academic Advisory Committee, then to the Board of Regents. Mr. Montgomery said it might be May before there is action. There will be a review of the Mission Statements in December.
   d. President Griffith asked for responses to the tentative agenda. Senator Hawley asked if there will be time for the Senate to respond to the President’s Program Review Draft. Senator Hoyer said we need to raise the issues we want the President to look at and to take straw votes.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.
   Senator Daugherty corrected the spelling of Tina Bennett-Kastor’s name on p.2, P.4 of the September 21 minutes and requested that 'about the de-emphasis on writing across the curriculum' be added to the last sentence for clarification. Senator Mandt moved, and Senator Masud seconded, approval of the minutes of September 21 as corrected. The minutes were approved. Senator Gosman moved, and Senator Billings seconded, approval of the minutes of October 5. The minutes were approved.

V. OLD BUSINESS.
   There was discussion of President Armstrong’s “Program Review: Preliminary Recommendations.”
   a. President Griffith said President Armstrong has been forthcoming. He initiated a brief meeting on Friday, and he has consulted twice with the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee met at 1:30 and believe the preliminary recommendations are generally favorable. If there are department and/or college problems, the Executive Committee invites the faculty to talk to Senators and the Senators report to the Executive Committee.
Senator Hoyer said the President has concern about money allocations in the Provost's report. The President came with some specific recommendations and a 10 year analysis of the General Use Budget. Senator Hoyer gave a summary of that analysis. The President wants to move to 53.54% GU funding of instruction. That is an increase of 2.1% and an approximate value of $1.36 million. If allocated proportionately among non instruction that would amount (roughly) to $900,000 from non-academic and $460,000 from academic areas other than instruction. Senator Hoyer said the President likes to give %, not dollars, so money cannot be taken away from our budget.

Senator Carroll said that as she reads the document, we will only get the money if we get increases in student population, etc. Senator Hawley said there is no mention of reallocation in the document. There is no commitment to change anything. Senator Masud said it's clear President Armstrong's goal of achieving the new rate is contingent on increases in enrollment. Senator Alexander said he shared the concern. President Armstrong could take increases in budget and allocate them. The implication is he won't allocate.

Senator Hoyer said the President is not specific about where the funds come from. He said there were concerns on the part of the Executive Committee. They were: (1) How, in general, are we to achieve this? Is it all to be done by enrollment increases? (2) How are faculty to be involved in the redistribution? (3) Will there be erosion in GU to RU by interdepartmental transfers?

Senator Alexander said the Provost's proposal emphasized exclusively undergraduate support. The President has added graduate programs. Senator Daugherty said she was concerned about enrollment driven funding. There is potential conflict between enrollment numbers and academic quality.

Senator Romig asked if the President was optimistic that in 3 to 7 years enrollment declines will turn around and this money would be available? Senator Hoyer said the President said it must. Senator Romig said to reallocate this money to academic affairs now, and re-allocate to non-academic affairs if we get money in the future.

Senator Billings said she hoped everyone had read Professor Saviano's editorial. In her opinion, it puts the blame on enrollment decline on the user-unfriendly campus, and the elimination of Minority Studies rather than enhancement of the program. Senator Wherritt said the major decline in our enrollment is coupled with a major increase at a nearby community college.

Senator Hoyer said there are some concerns about undergraduate/graduate programs. Do any undergraduate programs suffer? Is there any impact on particular programs? These figures are averaged which is a problem. We should be spending more on undergraduate education, because we have more part-time students. Senator Duell said that these are based on FTE. Senator Masud asked what was included in Instructional Services. Senator Mandt read from the WSU budget. It includes each college with departments, but doesn't include college offices. It includes University College, travel, etc. Senator Campbell said that non full-time students require a lot of money. Senator Wherritt said there is another type of distortion. One undergraduate program on campus has entry level salaries of $50,000. In Math the entry level salary is $35,000.

Senator Alexander said the Provost argues if we want to improve academic program quality we need to invest in them. Senator Hoyer said the Provost also said that money is needed for the new general education program, and most of the money should go to undergraduate programs. This is not in the President's document. Senator Masud said the President added 'graduate.' Senator Williamson said one of the President's concerns was that whatever reconfiguration of the budget comes about that it can't be construed that WSU is over funded. Senator Kahn said there is a definite
difference in WSU now and 20 years ago. Now few faculty teach introduction to Math, Psychology or English.

j. Senator Williamson said the President recommended KMUW be transferred to the Media Resource Center. Patty Cahill recommended this a number of years ago. A question is if GU funding should be withdrawn? Realistically, it means there would be no radio station. Senator Alexander said he tended to agree if all GU funding was withdrawn, but the original proposal from LAS might work. It was $60,000 over five years. Senator Cavarozzi pointed out that there was also a recommendation from the University Program Review Committee to review KMUW’s status after 3 years, and they were to receive fund raising help. Senator Billings said that 5 to 6 years ago the Senate needed to organize some kind of advisory committee. The communication areas of the university are all arms of the administration. We need Faculty Senate Advisory control over Channel 13 and KMUW. Senator Romig said that the Provost wanted all GU money from KMUW, and the advisory committee said no. Senator Carroll asked if we need to take a straw vote on this? Senator Masud asked what instructional role KMUW plays, Is it an open lab? Senator Williamson said some students enroll for credit, and some students are hired. Senator Masud said if the university doesn’t have access to it, why fund it? Senator Wherritt said faculty should have opportunity and access.

k. Senator Romig said that the nursing program is in a crisis situation. He said he reviewed the document closely, and if this goes through, all the time he spent on the advisory committee will be wasted. He will vote against it.

1. Senator Mandt proposed a straw vote on the following: The President articulate a commitment to reallocate resources to achieve at least 53.54% instruction support in 3 to 7 years regardless of contingencies. Senator Hawley recommended 3 to 5 years. Senator Mandt agreed. The straw vote was 31 yes, 0 no, and 2 abstained.

m. Senator Mandt proposed a straw vote on the following: The Senate ask the President for an explicit commitment to seek increased support for (a) New graduate programs in the proposal, (b) Lower per section enrollment in General Education, and (c) Maintain or increase the % of instruction provided by full-time faculty. Senator Alexander suggested adding (d) Support for high student demand programs. Senator Mandt agreed. The straw vote was 33 yes, 1 no, 2 abstained.

n. Senator Mandt proposed a straw vote on the following: The Senate ask the President for an explicit commitment to assure faculty involvement in reallocation decisions, for example, using the University Budget Committee. The straw vote was 35 yes, 1 no, 2 abstained.

Senator Hawley said she was concerned about the politicizing of the Research in the document.

Senator Duell moved to meet again on Friday at 3 p.m. There are more issues to discuss. The proposal recommends moving advising of declared majors to the college of the major, but no adjustment in funding. These students make up about 50% of the student population. Senator Davis seconded. Senator Carroll said since our written report is due on Friday, we need to meet on Wednesday. Senator Duell said she would change her motion to read Wednesday. Senator Horn asked about meeting on Wednesday evening. President Griffith took a quick count of when Senators could meet. The Senate voted to meet at 3 p.m. on Wednesday, October 28.

Senator Bereman asked if the Senate would receive college reports on this matter. President Griffith said yes.

Meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Cavarozzi, Faculty Senate Secretary