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AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
The Wichita State University

Room 126 CH  3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, September 27, 1993

Order of Business:
I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
II. Informal Statements and Proposals
III. Approval of Minutes
IV. President’s Report
V. Committee Reports
VI. Old Business
   A. Grade Replacement Policy (blue attachment to Sept. 13 agenda)
      2nd Reading
   B. Sexual Harassment Policy (buff attachment to Sept. 13 agenda)
      2nd reading
VII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

James Clark, President  3220  Box 78
Dwight Murphey, Vice President  3219  Box 88
Gayle Davis, Secretary  3358  Box 82
Joyce Cavarozzi, President-Elect  3541  Box 53
Walter Horn, Elected by Senate  3410  Box 44
Jolynne Campbell, Elected by Senate  3147  Box 43
Sue Bair, Appt’d by Senate Pres.  3340  Box 16
Faculty Senate President's Report

for the September 27 Faculty Senate Meeting

I. Proposed University Budget for FY95

The Board of Regents had their first meeting of the academic year on Sep. 16. Most of the agenda was routine, but there were two items worth noting:

1. The Regents appointed a standing committee on Budget Development, to make annual recommendations for areas and initiatives to be included in the Regents' budget requests. Not only are the Regents moving toward more thoughtful development and planning for budget requests, they are also involving campus representatives, rather than just Regents' staff people: the committee includes a Faculty Senate President, representatives from the Council of Presidents [COPS - the Presidents / Chancellors of the Regents universities], the Council of Chief Academic Officers [COCOA - the Academic Vice-Presidents or equivalents], the Council of Business Officers [COBO], and a student government representative.

2. The Regents are being somewhat resistant to a request from Washburn University for an FY95 budget increase from state funds that is substantially larger than the budget increases proposed for the Regents' universities.

II. Search for Vice President for Academic Affairs

The search committee met on Sep. 20, and narrowed down the pool to nine primary applicants, plus a few candidates in “limbo.” The committee is in the process of making contact with the nine, to determine whether they are still applicants, and to set up telephone interviews for the week of October 11. Following a review of the outcomes of the telephone interviews, the committee will decide on how to proceed from there.

The committee will be seeking substantial input from faculty and other groups. At present, the committee is looking for ideas for specific questions to ask, areas to explore, etc., during the upcoming telephone interviews and later interviews. By Sep. 24, department chairs will receive copies of the questions used in the last Provost search. The committee asks that the faculty take a look at those questions, and let the committee know if they see any areas being missed or specific questions that should be asked of the candidates, or if there are any suggestions they would like to offer to the committee. Materials should be sent to the committee chair, Dean Diane Roberts, at box #43, or given to any other member of the search committee:

Jim Clark (Faculty Senate representative)
J. C. Combs (Fine Arts representative)
Larry Davis (LAS Humanities representative)
Kathy Downes (Academic Services representative)
III. Senate Executive Committee Meetings

Agenda for September 10, 1993:

1. Committee appointments
   - Faculty Committee on Athletics
   - Faculty and Alumni Club Advisory Committee

2. Information exchange and updates

Agenda for September 20, 1993:

1. Set agenda for September 27 Senate meeting

2. Consideration of Sexual Harassment Policy
   - Possible alternative approaches
   - Possible ways to handle any needed revisions determined at Sep. 27 meeting
FACULTY SENATE
The Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, September 27, 1993

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ackerman, Allen, Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Brady, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Chambers, Ciboski, Clark, Daugherty, L. Davis, DeSilva, Dreifort, Duell, Flentje, Furtwengler, Greywall, Gythiel, Hanrahan, Hawley, Hay, Horn, Houts, Hoyer, Hundley, Kelly, Koppenhaver, Lancaster, Mandt, Masud, Matson, May, Merriman, Murphey, Paske, Romig, Shanahan, Sharp, Terrell, Thomson, Wahlbeck, Wherritt, Williamson, Zandler

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chopra, Combs, G. Davis, Kraft, Kuchment, Lansing, Masud, Parkhurst, Pitetti, Teshome, Yeager

GUESTS: Brunner, Bowman

Summary of Action Taken:

1. Grade Replacement Policy. Revised the first five points of the proposal.

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER by President Clark at 3:30 p.m.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS.

Senator Paske stated in President Armstrong's letter of 6/29/93, the Mission review consumed 27,000 person hours/675 weeks/12.9 years. He felt that the process was worthless and an example of the tremendous waste of faculty time that is being imposed on the University and that we should not take anymore. We should stand against such proposals from Topeka.

Senator Mandt stated that Saturday, Oct. 2, 1993, the fall meeting of the AAUP will be held in Topeka. Linda Rae Pratt, National AAUP President will be the guest speaker. Car pooling will be available for those faculty who wish to attend.

Senator Merriman inquired as to what we can do about the problems Senator Paske mentioned and suggested a Faculty Senate resolution. Senator Paske agreed and also suggested we see how the current administration feels about this. Were the results of value? President Clark suggested that during campus visits by the Regents we voice our opinions. Senator Horn suggested that the Administration should tally the hours this project required and ask the Regents if the money was well spent. IVPAA Dreifort agreed. Senator Kelly wondered if other Regent schools felt the same. President Clark noted some comments were made as to the expensive process for what the Regents received. Senator Wherritt wondered if there was a deeper issue, one of control, and that such things as the Mission statements are just apologies for a position and Administration and Regents use the information to further their own aims. Senator Murphey suggested that these items may be coming to the Regents from national seminars and literature and that other universities may also be suffering through these problems.
III. Minutes.
Senator Bajaj moved to accept the minutes of 8/30/93. The motion was seconded and passed.
Senator Murphey moved to accept the minutes of 9/13/93 with the correction of Senator DeSilva being present. The motion was seconded and passed.

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT.
Senator Carroll inquired as to if this had been the first listing of the VPAA Search Committee members. President Clark didn't recall. Senator Duell noted I.2. President Clark stated that the Regents listened to the Washburn presentation and postponed action.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS.
Senator Cavarozzi reported that the Rules committee had met twice to address a grievance.
President Clark introduced Senator Terrell, chr. of the Ad Hoc Comm charged with responding to the Regents initiative on Faculty evaluation. Senator Terrell said that in '91 or '92 the Regents established a document called Faculty Performance Evaluation and that the university must respond to this document. The Faculty Senate appointed R. Christ, J. Carroll, E. Flentje, W. Horn, K. Pitetti, B. Rogers, M. Zandler, R. Zettle and W. Terrell. Senator Terrell was elected chair of what was the "best university committee ever". The committee received a set of detailed guidelines from the regents staff which the committee gave to the department chairs and faculty in the form of a survey. The survey is due 9/29 and they will meet 10/1 to tally the results and report to the University. One disturbing aspect of the policy is that there is to be an appeals procedure at the department level to deal with salary recommendations. Senator Terrell is not aware that such a procedure exists and feels perhaps Faculty Senate may want to work on this. This committee will draft a reply for the University which may include comments from chairs and faculty who seen outraged and want to quit wasting faculty time. Senator Mandt recalled that two years ago the Regents wanted to issue a structure and document on which faculty would be evaluated. It was maintained then that there should be institutional variations and that uniform faculty evaluation at Regents level would not accomplish their or our legitimate purposes. The Guidelines constitute an attempt to bring back what they could not obtain earlier. Also several years ago they tried to institute a Post Tenure review and Peter Zoller demonstrated that WSU didn't have any problem. He suggested that we should go back to that report and repeat its arguments and analysis. Senator Terrell noted that the guidelines are for a response from the university, not as to how the university should impose evaluation. President Clark stated that the committee was formed not only to respond to the Regents initiative, but also to respond to a Faculty Senate charge. Senator Carroll mentioned that the survey has two parts, 1-11 respond to the Regents and 12-25 are to respond to the Senate charge. IVPAA Dreifort noted how well the committee had worked and that the administration planned to use this document as the institutions response. It will also be the basis for information to answer the mission role & purpose for COCAO. Senator Mandt suggested that Faculty Senate Presidents should agitate this issue with the staff and Board who often miss the problems when they address these kind of initiatives.

VI. OLD BUSINESS.
GRADE REPLACEMENT: President Clark recalled that at the 9/13/93 meeting a committee was to study the SGA proposal. The Committee suggests that the Senate accept the first five points of the proposal and drop the points regarding Notification of Repeat, that a student must enroll within two semesters and that
the repeat policy would not apply to transfer courses. These changes were acceptable to the SGA and the Registrar. Discussion followed:

Senator Wherritt wondered why only a D or F. Senator Carroll mentioned that Education requires a B or better, therefore some of their students would have to leave school. Senator Paske moved an amendment that the first item be struck. Second by Senator Bair. Senator Carroll noted that the Academic Standards and Practices committee had studied this in 1986 and had put forth a policy that was not in line with a honest transcript. The policy had passed the Senate but was not accepted by the Deans Council; they suggested an honest transcript. Senator Carroll suggested that the Senate look again at anything that has to do with averaging and go back to what the committee agreed on originally. Senator Bajaj called the question. Senator Paske’s motion passed.

Senator Mandt requested interpretation of what is meant by "5 times" in the third item. President Clark responded the intent is you can repeat 1 course up to three times under another University policy which would equal three repeats. Senator Mandt moved to amend the third item to read no more than five courses may be repeated. Seconded by Senator Bair. Discussion followed: Senator Bajaj supported. Senator Carroll reminded the senate that the ’84-85 draft stated a student could repeat up to five courses and have grade replacement, and each course may be repeated twice. This was passed by the Senate and vetoed by the Deans Council. Senator Wherritt suggested the problem this will solve can also be handled by the Exceptions Committee or the Deans Council. We need students to take responsibility for their grades. Senator Mandt suggested that this is for students with grave difficulties. Senator Bair supported the amendment because the University Exceptions committee changes and this will be a consistent way for all students. Senator Ackerman stated that it is admirable for students to try to better themselves. Senator Brady questioned the wording, would it replace all grades. President Clark said yes, one grade for a specific class and clarified that the ninth item was also to be dropped. Senator Terrell stated that the policy originates in how GPA is computed. Why not compute more than one transcript? Senator Hawley called the question. The amendment passed.

Senator Duell moved to add "For graduation honors. only the first grade be used." Seconded by Senator Horn. Discussion followed: Senator Paske said that if a student masters a subject why not receive honors. Senator Terrell wondered is we would be required to supply two GPA’s. Senator Allen felt the information would be valuable to employers. The motion was defeated. 12+ to 11.

Senator Mandt offered a friendly amendment to the fifth item to read "Only the most recent course(hours) will be counted towards completion of degree requirements". Senator Hundley offered a point of clarification, should it be stated that only hours from WSU may be repeated, transfer credits do not apply. Senator Mandt added "transfer credit may not be used to repeat a course". Senator Thompson noted that the second and third items of the Baylor policy are very clear regarding this. Senator Carroll questioned what would happen with "W". President Clark noted that the second and third items of the Baylor policy are very clear regarding this. Senator Carroll stated that it would count as a repeat. Discussion followed regarding "W" as a grade. Senator Wherritt moved to continue the discussion. Senator Wahlbeck seconded. Senator Ackerman suggested we have the revised policy to look at and Senator Terrell suggested we have a transcript expert present. Senator Paske called the question. The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Jolynne Campbell. Acting Faculty Senate Secretary