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AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
The Wichita State University
Room 126 CH 3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, November 8, 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. Election of Planning and Budget Committee Member
VII. New Business
   A. Athletics at WSU
      Athletic Director Bill Belknap
      Presentation / Discussion
   B. Resolution on Washburn University (Blue attachment)
      Requested by Council of Faculty Senate Presidents
   C. Community College Issues and Concerns (Pink attachment)
      Discussion of COCOA reports to COPS
      Discussion of proposal to test students transferring Basic Skills classes to WSU
   D. Senate Goals and Priorities for 1993-1994 Year
      Please be prepared with ideas and issues of concern to the faculty and the university.

VIII. 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, App’t’d by Senate Pres.  3340  Box 16
RESOLUTION:

The Faculty Senate of Wichita State University strongly opposes making Washburn University a part of the Regents system, until two conditions are met:

First: the Governor and the Kansas Legislature fund the current six Regents' universities at parity with our peer institutions;

Second: sufficient funding is provided to the Regents' system that the entrance of Washburn University into the system will not cause resources to be diverted to Washburn from the current six Regents' universities.
October 27, 1993

President Jon Wefald
Chair, Council of Presidents
Anderson Hall
Kansas State University

Dear President Wefald:

The Council of Chief Academic Officers has done a collective analysis of concerns about community colleges in Kansas. While we continue to develop recommendations for solutions, we suggest that the Council of Presidents consider the issues described below. Resolution of these issues would be in the best interest of Kansas taxpayers and the Regents universities. This is especially so, given that the state has no plan for educating the forthcoming 19% increase in high school graduates. This will require the most effective possible use of all the state's post-secondary educational resources.

First is the issue of cost. The general perception is that it is cheaper to send students to community colleges. However, when one isolates the cost of lower division courses in the Regents universities from research, service, and upper division courses, community colleges appear to be more expensive, not less. Students, parents and many citizens and legislators do not realize this because of the way community colleges are funded (few, if any, Regents have ever seen an in-depth analysis of this issue).

Students and parents view community colleges as cheaper because the tuition is lower. However, county out-district payments, plus state match of those payments, plus additional funding received from local sources, plus added fees for technical courses, runs the actual cost to three or four times the tuition cost. This cost should be compared not with the average cost per credit hour at Regents universities, but with the cost of lower division courses after the cost of the research and service mission has been deducted out. This was done in a legislative post audit in 1988, and showed the Regents universities to be much more economical. We further believe community college funding is at or above that of comparable states, while Regents universities are far below. To the extent this is so, it should be made clear to the Regents and legislature and to all the counties who pay out-district payments.
Second, community colleges appear not to be monitored effectively either by the Board of Education or their own Boards of Trustees (there are exceptions to the latter; Johnson County CC is an obvious example). This is evident in a number of important ways:

1. In their curricular offerings, community colleges often teach specialized courses at the freshman and sophomore level that are more appropriately offered at the upper division at Regents institutions. These courses are then transferred into Regents institutions through the Transfer and Articulation Agreement. Such course duplication is an inefficient use of state resources and clearly goes beyond the abilities and mission of the community colleges. Alternatively, these colleges often turn sub-post-secondary educational experiences into college credit offerings in order to maximize their tuition returns.

2. Community colleges increasingly are producing credit hours with part-time faculty. There is a large variation in how many courses their faculty teach. While Regents universities do this, there are Board-imposed guidelines and we are under constant scrutiny and review.

3. Community colleges often lack laboratory facilities for science courses. It is our perception that dry-labbing is not uncommon. The same is true of library resources; it is our perception that these are sadly lacking and probably absent altogether in most outpost operations. Obviously, this also relates to the cost issue. For example, large numbers of Butler County Community College students use the WSU library. Butler County Community College gets the out-district tuition, while WSU eats the cost.

We believe definitive and persistent work needs to be done here and will collaborate with the Regents staff to address the issue if the Presidents/Chancellor and the Board of Regents believe it to be worthwhile. In doing so, we would focus on data, facts and proposed solutions. The main objective would be a constructive one -- specifically, to work toward a more effective relationship aimed at providing high quality post secondary education to more students cost-effectively.

Based on preliminary thinking, we believe several steps should be pursued:

1. The financing issue should be thoroughly characterized and equitable effective funding strategies developed.
2. Do whatever it takes to restructure governance in a manner that coordinates the strategies of community colleges and the Regents universities.

3. Specific programmatic actions should be considered such as those shown below:

   ▶ No course offered by a community college will be transferred to a Regents' institution and classified as a Junior-Senior level course.

   ▶ Regents' institutions will not award academic credit for course work taken by a student prior to graduation from high school unless that course work is taken on the campus of a community college or on the campus of a Regents' institution or originated from the campus of a Regents' institution. Exceptions to this may be made by individual Regents' institutions if they choose to award credit for courses taken while in high school based on satisfactory performance on the final examination of the course material developed by the Regents' institution.

   ▶ No Regents' institution will accept transfer of more than 64 hours of credit from a community college.

   ▶ The International Baccalaureate program and Advanced Placement tests will be the primary means for high school students to earn college credit.

Best personal regards.

Yours truly,

James R. Coffman
Provost
Chair, COCAO

cc: Members of COPS
    Members of COCAO
    Dr. Hammond-Paludan
DATE: 20 October 1993

TO: Gerald D. Loper, Acting Dean
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

FROM: Lawrence M. Davis, Chairperson
Department of English

Buma L. Fridman, Chairperson
Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Vernon A. Keel, Director
Elliott School of Communication

RE: Validation and Assessment of the Basic Communication, Mathematics, and Writing Competency of Students Transferring from Non-Regents Institutions

We propose to validate transfer credits for Communication 111, English 102, and Mathematics 111/112 from non-Regents institutions. Our reasons for doing so are as follows:

1. At the present time, we require all WSU students to take and pass competency examinations at the end of Communication 111, English 102, and Mathematics 111. In addition, the Department of English has been validating the transfer credits of all international students for some time now, including those from such outstanding institutions as Singapore Polytechnic, Hong Kong University, and the University of Hamburg, who must write a validation examination to ensure that they meet our basic graduation requirements for writing competency. Fairness demands that we test all our students in this manner. Anything else would be to continue a policy which could be considered discriminatory.

2 Exit testing in our Basic Skills courses has been WSU policy for years—and for good reason. These tests in Communication 111, English 102, and Mathematics 111 allow us to assess whether students have reached the minimum competence levels which all the Regents universities require in these three areas. Without assessing the competencies of students transferring Basic Skills credits from non-Regents institutions, we have no way of guaranteeing...
that all our students have reached these minimal levels required by the Kansas Board of Regents for graduation from WSU. Since the Board of Regents requires that all its universities comprehensively assess their Basic Skills programs, we need not validate the Basic Skills transfer credits from other Regents universities.

Our proposal follows:

1. Students who wish to transfer credits in Communication 111, English 102, and/or Mathematics 111/112 from non-Regents institutions will take a Basic Skills Competency Examination in the relevant area(s) to establish that they meet WSU's (and the Regents') minimum competence levels. Students not achieving those levels will have to enroll in the appropriate WSU Basic Skills course(s). There will be a $4.00 fee for each of the Communication, Mathematics, and Writing Competency Examinations. This is the fee we currently charge for other validation and placement procedures.

2. The “Transfer Agreement and Articulation Guide” between Kansas Public Community Colleges and Kansas Regents universities applies only to “Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degree transfers” [our emphasis], and stipulates that such transfer students “will be accepted with junior standing and will have satisfied the general education requirements of all Regents universities.” Point of Clarification 2.b of this Agreement also states the following: “Transfer students are subject to the same institutional assessment policies and procedures as resident students of the receiving institution.” Our proposal would require holders of AA and AS degrees from Kansas public community colleges to achieve, as a requirement for graduation, the same minimum levels of competence in WSU's Basic Skills as we require of other students. The Agreement also means that we cannot require these particular transfer students to repeat our Basic Skills courses; we can, however, offer them the opportunity to do so in order to meet WSU’s minimum requirements for graduation.

Harold Veeser discussed this matter with Judith Siminoe, who responded to him as follows:

I had the opportunity to ask Marty [Hammond-Paludan, Director of Academic Affairs on our staff] whether WSU could require students who had taken comp. elsewhere to pass an exam demonstrating basic (minimal) skills. She said that if it is a graduation requirement, there is precedent—the Assessment policy you and I referenced addresses “measures of performance,” not a course grade specifically.

The issue we are raising here clearly involves “measures of performance” “in basic (minimal) skills” required for graduation. Moreover, if this principle is true for basic composition requirements, it surely is equally valid for basic communication and mathematics requirements as well.
3. We propose that this policy apply to all students transferring credits in Communication 111, English 102, and/or Mathematics 111/112 beginning with the 1994-95 academic year.

4. Finally, we propose leaving the details for implementing this procedure to the three departments involved in consultation with your office.

Accepting our proposal will close what we consider to be unintentional and infelicitous loopholes in our current practices, and will thus result in the equal treatment of all WSU students within an equitable assessment policy.

We would also urge you to recommend strongly to Interim Vice President Dreifort that he bring this issue to the attention of the Council of Chief Academic Officers. Our hope is that the other Regents universities will initiate competency examinations similar to those recommended here.

Please let us know if we can provide you with additional information on this matter. We will also be more than willing to meet with the CAPC or any other WSU body dealing with this proposal.

pc: John Dreifort
Martine Hammond-Paludan
Martha Shawver
Judith Siminoe
Minutes of the meeting of Monday, November 8, 1993

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ackerman, Allen, Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Brady, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Chambers, Chopra, Ciboski, Clark, Daugherty, G. Davis, L. Davis, DeSilva, Dreifort, Duell, Gythiel, Hanrahan, Hay, Horn, Houts, Hoyer, Hughes, Kelly, Koppenhaver, Kraft, Kuchment, Lancaster, Lansing, Mandt, Matson, May, Merriman, Murphey, Parkhurst, Paske, Romig, Shanahan, Sharp, Terrell, Teshome, Thomson, Wahlbeck, Wherritt, Williamson, Yeager, Zandler

MEMBERS ABSENT: Burk, Combs, Flentje, Furtwengler, Greywall, Hawley, Hundley, Masud, Pitetti

GUESTS: Brunner, Loper, Veeser

Summary of Action Taken:

2. Elected Anneke Allen to the Planning and Budget Committee.
3. Passed Council of Faculty Senate Presidents Resolution on Washburn University.

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

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS
There were no informal statement and proposals.

III. MINUTES. None.

IV. PRESIDENT’S REPORT
President Clark mentioned a letter from George Platt, a member of the committee that had made the changes from the hour to the half hour in scheduled class time. (Part 1 of the President’s Report) This change was announced without providing the logic that led the committee to recommend the changes. President Clark requested that faculty who have input regarding the changes contact the committee immediately. It was suggested by Senator Mandt that 8:30 is not a prime slot for students. Senator Horn questioned the logic of changing. President Clark said there is an interest in giving students time to get to work by 1:00 and said that no one wanted the 7:00 a.m. classes. IVPAA Dreifort stated that they are trying to find additional prime slots and that the scheduling of classes is still in the thinking stages. Senator G. Davis suggested that there was a need for wider communication about this issue, since others were
advocating different scheduling changes to accommodate students’ preference for twice a week courses, calling for Monday/Wednesday course scheduling. Senator Wahlbeck suggested that 12:00 was not prime because we associate that time with eating. Senator Duell asked why we have evening classes scheduled at 7:05 and 5:35 instead of on the hour or half hour. Senator Brady said that this was a decision of a past committee that reasoned that the extra 5 minutes would give more travel time from Boeing to campus. Senator Sharp suggested other schedules to get increased prime time scheduling, such as Tuesday/Thursday/Saturday schedules.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Senator Cavarozzi of the Rules Committee nominated Senator Mandt for the At-Large position on the University Tenure and Promotion Committee. Senator Matson moved to close the nominations, Senator Campbell seconded, and the positive vote was unanimous.

Senator Mandt nominated Senator Allen to the Planning and Budget Committee. Senator Hoyer seconded the nomination, Senator Murphey moved to close the nominations, and Senator Hay seconded. The positive vote was unanimous.

VII. NEW BUSINESS
A. Athletics at WSU

President Clark introduced the new Athletic Director Bill Belknap to the Senate. Mr. Belknap asked for the input of the faculty on the athletic program. He named three challenges he faces in his program: the issue of bringing back football and the related issue of the condition of the stadium; the athletic program’s financial problems (though the former figure of $2 million in debt is now approximately $500,000 with some additional obligations); and the inadequate sports facilities except for those serving baseball and tennis. He said that there is a false perception of fiscal mismanagement in the athletic program. Since 1988 there has been an annual financial surplus which has been used to reduce that debt. Mr. Belknap sees his program as a part of the university, operating under similar rules and regulations as the rest of the campus. He intends for the department to be financially responsible. He intends to change WSU’s reputation as a school that repeatedly breaks NCAA rules. He reported that the academic performance of WSU student athletes has been good, as reported to the ICAA board last week. He wants student athletes to have a higher graduation rate than that of the larger student body. He intends to do away with factions within the athletic department and have the department function as a team. Recently the program underwent a Title IX compliance review, and he pledged to continue to support the guidelines. Mr. Belknap stated he will continue to demand high standards of conduct from his student athletes. He will operate his program as one which primarily serves as a state institution, and one focus will be to recruit in-state student athletes. He said he
sees the faculty on the ICAA Board as an advisory, governing body, and promised to keep the board well-informed in monthly meetings.

President Clark asked what the role of the faculty was on the ICAA board, and how Mr. Belknap sees the influence of "downtown" boosters. Mr. Belknap said the faculty would be watchdogs over the program. He acknowledged the influence of off-campus boosters, but stated that while he will listen to their input, he will make the decisions for the program based on campus needs and values.

Senator Mandt stated a concern about the different academic monitoring policies of different teams at WSU. Mr. Belknap said that the monitoring is generally the same for all teams, but some additional requirements apply to some students. Senator Mandt suggested that he select a range of faculty to act as resources to the program when academic concerns and strategies for the athletes are developed. Mr. Belknap will consult with Jennifer Keyes about this idea.

Senator Murphey asked about Mr. Belknap’s vision for the basketball program, especially concerning recruiting better student athletes. Mr. Belknap said "vision" is a big challenge for the whole athletic program. He said that basketball coach Scott Thompson feels his recruits are better student athletes already but they are young and will need to develop as players. He reminded the Senate how competitive basketball recruitment has become. The increased academic achievement demanded of student athletes decreases the number of qualified high school graduates and increases the level of competition. He believes there may be more and more junior college transfers on university teams.

Senator Merriman asked how we will resolve the football issue and what compromise there may be between the university and the "downtowners". Mr. Belknap thinks the conflict is overstated, but there is a conflict with some. He said that the financial realities will be a big factor, and he explained some of them. It is estimated that between $9.5 and $24 million will be needed to get the stadium up to Division 1A standards. The budget for 1A football is huge, we have no money dedicated to it, and no conference alignment for football with access to TV or Bowl monies. Therefore, 1A football is out of the question. The next option is 1AA level. It requires fewer scholarships and coaches, and a smaller stadium. Nationally, those 1AA programs are in trouble financially because the operating money has to come from the state, student fees, etc. There is a possibility of a low cost, "Division 3" model of football at Division 1 institutions. It is lower in cost, offers no financial aid, has few coaches, no spring games, and permits little recruiting. Its budget would be approximately $500,000 per year. This is the only possibility for WSU football, and even then, WSU would have to refurbish the stadium. Senator Bair said she understood that WSU Football was no longer an option and asked if he was saying that there may be football but not at the Division 1A level. Mr. Belknap responded that a low cost program or club level football
had not been investigated as an option. Senator Murphey asked whether we can go to low cost football without ruining our image with potential students. Mr. Belknap named some schools among about 30 in the country with this type of program. President Hughes said that the Ivy League has low cost football. Senator Kraft said in fact maybe our reputation would be enhanced, since low cost football players are really students. Senator Merriman said that there are some who think all athletics should be at that level.

Senator Lancaster asked whether having the baseball regional in Wichita would be a high priority. Mr. Belknap said it would. He mentioned that we will have the NCAA tennis and basketball regionals here this year.

B. Resolution on Washburn.

President Clark said this resolution came from a recent meeting of the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents. There is a more concerted effort to get Washburn into the system this year because taxpayers in Topeka are unhappy supporting Washburn with their 18 mill levy, and Washburn has been getting more money from the state every year, anyway. The resolution isn't in opposition to Washburn's entering the system per se, but it states opposition to the change if it has a negative financial effect on the other Regents universities. Senator Bair expressed concern about duplication of academic programs in the state and suggested adding a condition to the resolution to eliminate program duplications at Washburn if it comes into the system. Senator Mandt reported a rumor that Washburn may become a branch of another Regents university. President Clark couldn't confirm that, but he has heard that someone suggested freezing the Topeka mill levy where it is in trade for an agreement to qualified admissions in Kansas. There is also a proposal to look at the whole system of higher education in Kansas, a system that many think is too big for the size of the state's population. Senator Duell asked if anyone has studied the population base here and compared it to other states so that we could publicize the number in public statements. Senator Mandt suggested we think about whether Washburn should be a full, separate institution. Senator Wherritt reminded the Senate that when WSU came into the state Regents system, it was suggested that we be an extension of another university. He called for a vote on the resolution. Senator Murphey said that neither point of the resolution is achievable, so he questioned why it was written this way. President Clark said the Senate Presidents thought this was the best approach. Senator Lancaster moved the question, Senator Horn seconded, and the positive vote was unanimous. As a point of information, Senator Mandt asked if the resolution is to be sent to legislators or if it will be used as a focus of lobbying. President Clark said it was the latter.

C. Community College Issues and Concerns

President Clark mentioned the two reports, one from COCOA and one report regarding Validation and Assessment prepared by
Senator Larry Davis (English Department chairperson), Buma Fridman (Department of Mathematics and Statistics chairperson) and Vernon Keel (Director of the Elliott School of Communication). President Clark said that these reports were for discussion regarding the relationship between community college and Regents institutions and that no vote was required. He said that Ft. Hays State University is thinking of some sort of a merger with their community college competitor, that the University of Kansas is concerned about the community college competition issue, as is Pittsburgh State University. All the community colleges have learned the benefits of out-of-district tuition payments, copying Butler County Community College.

Senator Sharp asked, concerning the validation issue, what happens if a student flunks the exam? Senator L. Davis explained that it is not so much a validation as it is an assessment in communication, math, and English. The student can take the test again or take basic skills classes until he or she meets the requirements. Some students take the tests 5-6 times. This proposal wouldn’t let them graduate from WSU unless they passed.

Senator Williamson, speaking as a former director of the communication program, said this proposal was not discussed with the faculty in his unit as a whole. He reported that Susan Huxman, Assistant Professor in the Communication School, estimates about that 250-500 students transfer to WSU per year, so he foresees many difficulties in handling that many oral demonstrations, etc. This policy would be different from that followed at KSU or KU, and we would again be seen as user unfriendly. He also wondered if these standards would be in conflict with the Admission Policy the Senate passed. He feels we need a pilot study to see if basic skills levels of achievement are problematic in transfer students so that we have real data as a basis for suggestions for change. President Clark said other campuses are discussing this option, too.

Senator Brady said to be careful about the language used in describing this policy as assessing and not passing a basic skill. Senator Wherritt with regard to #1, p. 2, suggests we make it clear how many attempts the students can have to pass. Senator L. Davis said the document should read, on p. 2 #1, "encourage" to enroll not "have to." Senator Mandt asked about the problem of meeting all the basic skills requirements on time if a transfer student fails the tests. Senator Carroll said the College of Education has data related to this issue in preprofessional test situations. The past data shows less of a basic skills problem with community college transfers than with transfers from four-year schools. She suggested we study it more before we jump into this big change. President Clark will get the Education data from Professor Marcus Ballenger.

Senator Lancaster asked if the issue would go before the curriculum committees in all the colleges and whether it will be decided in time for inclusion in the fall catalog. Senator L. Davis explained that Dean Loper had approved the policy and had sent it to IVPAA Dreifort, who then took it to COCOA. IVPAA
Dreifort said it was prematurely put on the COCOA agenda, but he sees it as a valuable issue to discuss with that group in this early stage of the discussion. Senator Wherritt said we need a longitudinal study to compile real data and not rely on anecdotal information. Senator L. Davis said this policy isn’t about the community college issue but that now we test some students and not others. Equity is the point. Dean Loper said that IVPAA Dreifort had asked Associate Vice President Martha Shawver and him to conduct a formal study of the level of transfer students’ basic skills. Senator Paske said he was impressed with the COCOA report since it does focus on community college problems and he supported discussing it with all regents institutions. Senator Williamson questioned how there is an equity issue here. Senator Daugherty said there are overlapping problems. When non-native speakers take English at community colleges, they sometimes fail. She thinks we should get on with this instead of waiting for a statistical study and to take the lead in this matter. IVPAA Dreifort said the COCOA letter came directly from the WSU Senate deliberations earlier this year. Senator Cavarozzi said she appreciates the work of the people who worked on this policy proposal. She would like to include the faculty of the affected groups in developing this further. President Clark supported conducting a pilot study in at least one basic skills area. Harold Veeser, Associate Professor of English, said that assessment demands from last year prompted this policy. The equity issue is true, because the only students we don’t test are the transfer students. Approximately 800 students will transfer in, in the fall 1994, but he is sure we can find a way to hold these tests.

D. Senate Goals and Priorities

Senator Cavarozzi asked that people hand in suggestions for future goals for the Senate since we keep running out of time before getting to this agenda item. She asked that we send them to President Clark.

Senator Terrell moved to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gayle Davis, Senate Secretary