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WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 126 CH 3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, February 28, 1994

Order of Business:

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order

II. New Business (3:30 - 4:30)

Guest: Steven Jordan, Board of Regents Executive Director will make introductory remarks, then be available for questions and discussion

III. Informal Statements and Proposals

IV. Approval of Minutes

V. President’s Report

VI. Committee Reports

VII. New Business (continued)

Modifications to Proposed Tenure and Promotion Policies
(2nd reading - see Feb. 7, 1994, agenda for information)

VIII. As May Arise

Next Senate Meeting: March 7, 1994

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 February 28 Faculty Senate Meeting

I. Vice President for Academic Affairs Search

The Search Committee sent its list of recommended candidates to the President last Wednesday (Feb. 23), along with the committee’s views on the strengths and weaknesses of the recommended candidates. The committee will meet with the President shortly to discuss its recommendations.

II. Regents Meeting

Several items from the Regents meeting in February are of interest to WSU:

1. the Council of Presidents approved WSU’s four new degree proposals. These are expected to be approved by the Board at its March meeting.

2. the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents was scheduled to meet with Regent Hiebert to discuss appropriate methods for conducting and improving faculty evaluation. Due to illness in his family, the discussion was postponed to March.

3. the Partnership for Excellence package of faculty salary increases seems to still have a reasonable chance of passage this year. The Regents’ discussion of this plan stressed the point that part of the package is a substantial increase in need-based financial aid funds to help lower-income students pay the higher tuition costs involved.

4. the Regents discussed reviving a reasonable phased retirement plan for faculty and unclassified professionals. A bill to accomplish this has been submitted in the legislature.

III. University Cabinet Meetings

The University Council met on February 14 and 23. Among the items discussed were:

1. Enrollment: WSU is down about 0.5% from last spring in the official 20th-day figures. This represents a major improvement over the past few years, when Spring enrollment dropped by several percent each year. WSU’s enrollment drop is also much smaller than the enrollment drops this Spring at both KU and KSU.

2. Class scheduling: The Fall 1994 class schedule will show the results of several initiatives to provide additional scheduling options for WSU students: a coordinated block of afternoon classes that will allow incoming freshmen to take most or all of their classes in the afternoon, allowing them to work mornings if they wish; more weekend, eight-week, and other nontraditional schedules. There was again discussion of shifting class schedules to an on-the-hour format; any such change has been put off until Spring 1995 at the earliest, pending further study.
IV. Executive Committee Meeting

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on February 21. The agenda was:

1. A discussion with VPAA Dreifort of program discontinuances resulting from Program Review, as required by WSU’s handbook.

2. A discussion of the draft policy on sexual harassment provided by the ad hoc committee formed last fall (Nancy Bereman, Gayle Davis, Dwight Murphey). The policy will be brought to the Senate for discussion at its March 7 meeting.

3. A confidential discussion with President Hughes about several initiatives he is considering. Some of the initiatives will probably be announced at the March 9 General Faculty Meeting.
TO: Faculty Senate Members  

FROM: Jim Clark  

SUBJECT: Latest Revisions to the Revisions to the Tenure and Promotion Policy

Based on the Senate discussion on February 8, the following language is suggested for the proposed modifications to the new Tenure and Promotion Policy. The list below is keyed to the numbered points in the Dean’s memo distributed with my February 1 memo on "Proposed Changes in Tenure and Promotion Policy." Full copies of the T & P Policy with these changes incorporated will be available at our February 28 meeting.

1. No changes from Feb. 1 version.

2. On page 14, in the paragraph following the header "The Use of External Evaluation," omit all language discouraging use of external review; policy remains as approved last spring by the faculty.

   In the same paragraph, add the following sentence before the sentence starting "Candidates will receive ..." at the end of the eighth line of the paragraph:

   "Individual colleges are free to develop their own policies regarding pursuit of non-responding or late evaluators; these policies should be applied consistently whenever external review is sought."

3. Change the sentence printed in boldface on page 5 to read:

   "If the college guidelines in effect at the time of initial appointment differ from those in place at the time a tenure case comes forward for consideration, the current guidelines can be used in place of the earlier guidelines only if both the candidate and the department agree."

   This wording allows promotion decisions to be based on current guidelines, but allows tenure cases to be based on the guidelines in effect when a faculty member is first hired.

4. In the second paragraph on page 5, delete the last sentence (as shown in the Feb. 1 version).

   Change the second sentence of the paragraph to read:

   "The purpose of this review is to ensure that the college guidelines and statements are consistent with university guidelines as outlined in section 3.143, and ..."

5. No changes from Feb. 1 version.

(continued on back)
6. The library has requested two changes to address this point:

A. Modify the wording of section 3.142 (pages 4-5) to treat academic services in the same manner as a college. The wording changes are as follows:

   a. In the first sentences of each of the three paragraphs of section 3.142, change "college(s)" to "college(s) and academic services."

   b. Change all other references to "college statements" and "college guidelines" to "statements" and "guidelines."

B. Delete the following paragraph on page 13 under the heading "Nomination and Review of Academic Services Faculty:"

   "A statement describing the procedures must be reviewed by the university committee and approved by the vice president for academic affairs."

Also keep the Feb. 1 wording on service as an expectation for assistant professors.
WSU Faculty Handbook

Statements on Tenure

3.081 / Recruitment Procedures

The university has established procedures and policies concerning the recruitment of new faculty. These procedures and policies can be obtained from the Affirmative Action Office. All units of the university are responsible for following those procedures and policies. The academic rank conferred at the time of initial appointment should be consistent with the appropriate college guidelines for promotion to that rank.

3.10 / Interpretative Statements on Tenure at Wichita State University

Acting under the provisions of the Kansas Board of Regents’ policy on tenure and promotion, the university may recommend to the board that tenure or promotion be awarded to faculty members based on demonstrated excellence in scholarship, teaching/librarianship, and community and professional service. The granting of tenure or promotion is at the initiative of the university and is based on sustained achievements demonstrating that the faculty member meets the qualitative standards of the appropriate discipline and the requirements of the university. Tenure or promotion is not acquired simply by meeting assigned duties with a record free of deficiencies.

Tenure or promotion is conferred on the basis of: a) the qualifications of the individual, b) the objectives and needs of the university’s academic programs, and c) the resources of the university as these are determined by faculty committees and administrator’s reviews at departmental, college, and university levels.

3.101 / Terminations

In cases of termination of tenured faculty not involving termination for cause, the university has the obligation to make every effort to find a suitable position within the institution for the affected faculty member. The suitability of any proposed position shall be by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the receiving department or equivalent unit. Faculty relocated within the university will not automatically, by virtue of their tenure, displace tenured, probationary or temporary faculty within the receiving department or equivalent unit.

3.11 / Nontenurable Positions

Positions at Wichita State University that are not eligible for tenure are those which are part-time, carry the rank of assistant instructor, have less than a 50 percent responsibility for teaching, librarianship, research, scholarship, and/or creative activities, or are designated as temporary.

3.12 / Regents’ Tenure Policy

Effective June 1987, the Kansas Board of Regents approved the following amended policy concerning tenure and academic freedom of faculty at regents’ institutions, as contained in the Kansas Board of Regents’ Policy and Procedures Manual:

a. After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or instructors should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, program or unit discontinuance, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigency.
b. In the interpretation of the principles contained in Section a of this policy, the following is applicable:

1. The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.

2. Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution it may be agreed in writing that his new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person’s total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years; except when the interests of both parties may best be served by mutual agreement at the time of initial employment, institutions may agree to allow for more than four years of probationary service at the employing institution provided the probationary period at that institution does not exceed seven years. Notices should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period. [Editorial note: The last sentence has been modified by the Regents’ adoption of revised standards for notice of non-reappointment. See section 3.07.]

3. During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.

4. Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, shall, if possible, be considered by a faculty committee which will make recommendations to the administration. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher must be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges against him and shall have the opportunity to be heard in his own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon his case. He may have with him an adviser of his own choosing who may act as counsel. There shall be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence, the testimony should include that of teacher and other scholars, either from his own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.

5. Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.

b. Within this general policy, each school may make such operating regulations as it deems necessary, subject to the approval of the board of regents.

c. Lists of individuals recommended by the chief executive officer at a regents’ institution for tenure shall be submitted by the chief executive officer of that institution to the board for consideration and action at its April meeting. Any tenure recommendation approved by the board shall be limited to tenure for the recommended individual at the institution consistent with the tenure policies of that institution.

d. The provisions of this policy shall be applicable only to faculty of baccalaureate degree granting institutions.

e. Regents’ tenure policy is substantially based on the 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors, which is extensively quoted in section a and b, above.

3.13 / Probationary Period

3.131 / Time Limit

The regents’ tenure policy defines the time limit for the probationary period in 3.12.b,2, above.

The following university regulations apply to the probationary period as defined in Kansas Board of Regents policy.
1. At the time of initial appointment, agreement between the appointee and the institution must be reached on the prior service, if any, to be applied against the probationary period. This agreement shall be contained in the initial letter offering the position and in the initial contract.

2. When a probationary period is interrupted by a leave of absence other than a scholarly leave, such leave will not be counted toward eligibility for tenure. A scholarly leave will count toward tenure unless the faculty member and the university agree in writing to the contrary at the time the leave is granted. If a faculty member takes a part-time administrative or other non-academic appointment during the probationary period, that time is counted toward eligibility for tenure if he/she maintains at least a half-time academic appointment and is not counted if their academic appointment is less than half-time.

3. If a faculty member terminates and subsequently returns to the university, rules for tenure consideration will apply as they do for previous service at other institutions of higher education.

3.132 / Annual Evaluation of Nontenured Faculty

All faculty members holding half-time or more appointments who have not attained tenure will be evaluated at least once a year. Faculty members will have the opportunity to present documentation of performance for the purpose of this evaluation. The evaluation will be recorded on official university forms provided by the office of the vice president for academic affairs to department chairpersons. In addition to reviewing the faculty member’s performance during the preceding year, these annual reviews will also contain a section on "progress toward tenure" in which the faculty member’s overall performance at WSU will be evaluated in the context of the tenure review which will occur at the end of the probationary period. However, these annual reviews do not constitute a definitive review for tenure. The chairperson will review with the faculty member the results of the evaluation and transmit them to the dean. Copies will be retained by the faculty member, the department, the college dean’s office, and the office of the vice president for academic affairs.

In order to ensure as consistent a review process as possible prior to tenure decision, the annual review of probationary members of a department is to be conducted exclusively by the tenured members of the department or the elected tenure committee of the department. The chairperson of the department will be present. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning a case. The chairperson of the committee of tenured members records the evaluation and the vote of the group. The department chairperson shall provide a separate evaluation and recommendation. The vote count, evaluations, and recommendation will be shared with the person being reviewed, who shall be afforded the opportunity to submit a written rebuttal to the evaluations. In departments in which two or fewer members are tenured, an ad hoc review committee, consisting of tenured faculty members who might be involved in the ultimate tenure decision, shall be appointed by the dean of the appropriate college. Untenured chairpersons shall not participate in their own reviews.

The annual evaluation is an important activity for which faculty members should be well prepared. It is a cumulative record of performance that in the case of probationary faculty shows progress toward consideration for continuous tenure.

3.133 / Early Consideration for Tenure

Within the usual probationary period, a faculty member who demonstrates exceptional merit may be afforded one opportunity to stand for tenure prior to mandatory review. In such cases, the faculty member, in consultation with the chairperson, shall determine the advisability of early nomination according to the following criteria of eligibility:
1. The faculty member shall hold the rank of assistant professor or above.

2. The faculty member without prior higher education service shall have completed two years of full-time service at Wichita State University before early review may be undertaken at the departmental level.

Should the faculty member decide to stand for early tenure review, the following conditions shall apply:

1. The tenure review shall be conducted under the standard deadlines, policies, and procedures governing tenure considerations at that time.

2. A faculty member who is unsuccessful in the early application for tenure shall have the right to continue on probationary status and stand for mandatory tenure review without prejudice.

3.134 / Initial Appointment with Tenure

In exceptional circumstances an individual may be awarded tenure at the time of initial appointment. Individuals being considered for appointment to an administrative position can be granted tenure at the time of appointment only on the basis of their scholarly and academic credentials. Review for the award of tenure with initial appointment shall be initiated by the tenured faculty of the relevant academic department in accord with college and university guidelines in force at the time.

Department faculty recommendations for award of tenure with initial appointment shall be forwarded for action through the chairperson to the dean and the vice president for academic affairs. In such cases where additional consultation is deemed desirable, the dean or vice president for academic affairs may convene the college or university-level committees to effect an ad hoc tenure review.

The vice president for academic affairs shall convey the recommendations to the president who, at his/her discretion, shall submit the case to the board of regents for approval at the April or September meeting. Upon approval by the board, the president shall notify the individual in writing of the award of tenure.

3.14 / Guidelines and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Guidelines and decisions related to tenure and promotion are developed by all the constituencies involved in the review process, including the president, the university tenure and promotion committee, the college, and in some instances the departments. The subsections that follow identify the guidelines and criteria that are operative at the university level. Reference is also made to college guidelines and criteria.

3.141 / General Policies for the Awarding of Tenure

The judgments of all faculty committees in tenure decisions are to be based on the academic credentials, qualifications, and merits of the candidate. These judgments will always be made primarily at the departmental and college levels. Ranking of candidates for tenure is neither necessary nor appropriate.

3.142 / College Guidelines and Criteria

Detailed guidelines and statements of criteria for tenure and promotion have been adopted by all the colleges and academic services, and in some instances at the departmental level. Each college statement
should include explicit statements of expectation for teaching, librarianship, research, scholarship, or creative activities, and academic and professional service. These statements should define the relative significance of different activities within each area and the nature of documentation which candidates must provide to establish their accomplishments in each area. The college statements may specify guidelines for faculty with unusual appointments, consistent with the university guidelines for tenure or promotion contained in section 3.143 below. It is acceptable for the college to establish differential criteria for tenure or promotion for faculty with different assignments, so long as the differential criteria and the nature of the faculty assignments are clearly identified.

The college and academic services guidelines and statements of criteria shall be submitted in the spring for review by the university tenure and promotion committee on a three-year cycle. The purpose of this review is to ensure that the college guidelines and statements are consistent with university guidelines employed by the university committee, as outlined in section 3.143, and provide an adequate degree of clarity and specificity so that candidates for tenure and promotion will understand the criteria which will be utilized to evaluate their cases. In cases of unusually diverse or complex colleges, divisional criteria may also be developed.

The college and academic services guidelines and statements of criteria developed for tenure and promotion shall be distributed annually to all untenured faculty at the time of their annual evaluation. The evaluation of individual candidates at the university level should take into account the degree to which the individual has met the college guidelines in effect at the time of their initial appointment or last promotion, as well as his/her role statement and annual performance criteria identified in the annual evaluation of untenured faculty. If the college guidelines in effect at the time of initial appointment or last promotion differ from those in place at the time a tenure case comes forward for consideration, the current guidelines can be used in place of the earlier guidelines only if both the candidate and the department agree.

3.143 / University Guidelines and Criteria

Promotion

1. A terminal degree in a field appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate teaches or conducts research, scholarship, or creative activities is normally required for appointment or promotion to the rank of assistant professor, associate professor or professor. Exceptions to this guideline will require careful documentation based upon an adequate rationale.

2. Under normal circumstances, a faculty member should not expect to be considered for promotion with less than six years in rank.

3. The standards for teaching, librarianship, scholarship, and service for each rank are indicated below. The relative significance of teaching; librarianship; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service may vary from case to case, as outlined in section 3.142.

Assistant Professor: Demonstrated adequacy in teaching/librarianship and evidence of potential for achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activity, and some university service appropriate to the mission of the department and college is normally expected.
**Associate Professor:** Documented evidence of effective teaching/librarianship, a record of research, scholarship, or creative activities which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level, and some professional or university service is normally expected.

**Professor:** Documented evidence of sustained effective teaching/librarianship, a record of substantial accomplishment in research, scholarship, or creative activity which has led to recognition in professional circles at the national level, and demonstrated academic leadership in the form of service to the university and the profession is normally expected.

**Tenure**

All full-time faculty with 50 percent or more responsibility for teaching, librarianship, research, scholarship, and/or creative activities with the rank of instructor or higher must undergo review for tenure during their sixth year of employment at Wichita State University unless their employment at the university is to be terminated at the end of their seventh year of service. Those individuals given credit for prior experience in higher education at the time of initial appoint shall undergo review for tenure according to the policies stated in section 3.12.b.2.

Expectations of performance in and the relative importance of teaching; librarianship; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service will be defined at the time of the initial appointment. Specific performance goals will be established each year during the annual evaluation of untenured faculty. These expectations and goals form the foundation for evaluation for tenure in the context of the tenure criteria established by the faculty of the college, but do not constitute a definitive review for tenure. The terminal degree is preferred for the granting of tenure except in exceptional and well documented cases. The award of tenure normally requires documented evidence of effective teaching/librarianship and a record of research, scholarship, or creative activities which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level.

**University Committee Procedures**

In the process of reviewing tenure and promotion cases according to its charge, the University Tenure and Promotion Committee applies the respective college guidelines as approved by the college and university tenure and promotion committees. It is important to emphasize that these guidelines are not rigid rules.

**3.15 / Tenure and Promotion Review Process**

The tenure and promotion review process is governed by the "Tenure, Promotion, and Appeals Procedures" document, which was adopted by the university faculty on November 29, 1982. The text of this policy, as amended, is present in the Appendix. Individual units may adopt by vote of the faculty of the college additional procedures, policies, and interpretive statements to govern their internal review of tenure and promotion cases, so long as those procedures, policies, and interpretive statements are consistent with all higher level procedures, policies, and interpretive statements, as determined in the triennial review of policies and procedures conducted by the university committee (see section 3.142). These additional statements should be provided in writing to all candidates for tenure and promotion and to all probationary faculty at the time of their initial appointment and at each annual review.
3.151 / Presidential Review of Nominees for Tenure or Promotion

The laws of the State of Kansas provide that, subject to the board of regents, the president shall appoint employees and administer the affairs of Wichita State University. In matters of tenure and promotion, the president has delegated the authority to make recommendations to certain faculty committees and administrators. However, the president retains the authority to make the final decision on the tenure and promotion of faculty members, subject to approval by the board of regents.

A person dissatisfied with committee or administrator recommendations concerning his/her tenure or promotion may, after exhausting the procedures and appeals in the tenure and promotion review process, petition the president of Wichita State University for a favorable decision on tenure or promotion.

3.16 / Policy of Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action

(Unchanged from current copy)

3.17 / Tenure and Promotion Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>2nd Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for faculty records manager to notify deans of faculty scheduled for mandatory tenure review with copies to institutional planning and analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1st Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for dean of college to notify faculty scheduled for mandatory tenure review with copies to vice president for academic affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for faculty applying for promotion and/or early tenure review to notify chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for candidates requesting external review to notify chair and dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1st Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for chair to notify dean of faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for sending initial request for external reviews, if any are to be solicited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1st Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for dean of college to notify vice president for academic affairs of faculty scheduled for early tenure review and/or promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for course data to be mailed to applicants for tenure and/or promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>2nd Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for completion of basic documents and secondary dossiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for chair to notify eligible faculty tenure and/or promotion files are available for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Friday</td>
<td>Deadline for inclusion of letters from external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Friday Deadlines for departmental reviews and votes on tenure and/or promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for department to notify dean of recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for dean to notify nominees of the department’s recommendation, the chair’s independent recommendation, and the candidate’s right to appeal a negative decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Friday Deadlines for submission of appeals of or rebuttals to department-level recommendations to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for college committee to transmit recommendations to dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for dean to notify candidates and department chairs of committee’s and dean’s independent recommendations and the candidate’s right to appeal a negative decision or to rebut an evaluation statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for dean to transmit materials to vice president for academic affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for vice president for academic affairs to transmit materials to university tenure and promotion committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for appeal of or rebuttal to college-level recommendations to vice president for academic affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for adding materials to the secondary dossier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for university tenure and promotion committee to report recommendations to vice president for academic affairs and to notify candidates and department chairs of the committee’s recommendations and the candidate’s right to rebut the committee’s evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for submission of rebuttal statements by candidates to the vice president for academic affairs of the university committee’s evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for notification of candidates of recommendations to be made to the board of regents by the president.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Friday Deadlines for appeals, rebuttals, and/or petitions to the president of negative recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Friday Deadline for university committee to identify problems in tenure policies and tenure and promotion guidelines for the faculty affairs committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Friday Transmittal of Wichita State University recommendations to the board of regents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Friday Decisions by board of regents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Tenure, Promotion, and Appeals Procedures

Outline of the Process of Review for Tenure and Promotion

Any faculty member may nominate himself or herself for review for tenure or promotion. Nominations may also be made by the chairperson. For faculty members with probationary appointments, review for tenure must occur during or before the year prior to the last year of the probationary period. No review for tenure will occur during the last year of a faculty member’s probationary period.

The process of review for tenure and promotion involves these steps:

1. Nomination for review.
2. Departmental review of nominees by the departmental committee and by the chairperson.
3. In favorable or appealed cases, college review of department nominations by the college tenure and promotion committee, and by the college dean.
4. In favorable or appealed cases, university review of college nominations by the tenure and promotion committee.
5. In favorable or appealed cases, approval of recommendations by the president of the university.
6. In all favorable cases, approval of recommendations by the board of regents.

Procedures have been established for appeal in the case of an adverse tenure or promotion recommendation at the department and at the college level.

The calendar for the tenure and promotion review process is described in section 3.17 of the Wichita State University Handbook for Faculty.

Review for Tenure or Promotion: Procedures

Nomination for Review for Tenure and Promotion

1. The department chairperson will write to all full-time faculty members of the department to tell them that nominations of persons to be reviewed that year for tenure or for promotion must be given to the chairperson by a specified date. The chairperson must nominate all faculty whose tenure review is mandatory for that year. All others may be nominated by the chairperson or by the faculty member himself or herself.

2. The department chairperson will send copies of the list resulting from Step 1 to all full-time departmental faculty and specify a second date by which any additional nominations must be provided in writing to the chairperson.

3. The department chairperson will confer individually with all nominated faculty members
and provide information about departmental, college, and university criteria for tenure or promotion.

4. Except for those whose review for tenure is mandatory, faculty who have been nominated must inform the department chairperson in writing by a date specified by the department chairperson (which will be no sooner than two days after their conference) of the faculty member’s decision to remain in nomination or to withdraw.

5. The final, typed list of those nominated will be sent to the dean and to all members of the department electorate. Each person on the list will be notified in writing by the dean that he or she is officially a candidate for promotion or tenure. In addition, the dean will inform the candidate of the criteria for tenure or promotion and will instruct the candidate to give his/her supporting materials to the department chairperson by a specified date.

**Department Review for Promotion and Tenure**

The candidate will present a primary dossier and may prepare a secondary dossier.

**Primary Dossier:** The primary dossier consists of the basic document, the required cover sheet which records each step of the review process, copies of the annual reviews (and rebuttals if filed) for untenured faculty, the chairperson’s non-evaluative role statement, statements of evaluation by the committee and administrator at each level of review and rebuttals (if any are filed), and items added during the review process.

The basic document will follow the standard format recommended by the university tenure and promotion committee and approved by the faculty senate. Deviations from the established format should be clearly explained. The basic document may be no more than 25 pages.

The chairperson will provide a statement of the role of the candidate in the department which is purely descriptive and not evaluative. If the candidate’s role involves a weighted distribution of responsibility among the three categories of professional activity, that should be indicated in the role statement.

The chairperson will make copies of the primary dossier available for all voting faculty.

**Secondary Dossier:** A secondary dossier may be submitted to the chairperson by the candidate. It consists of such additional materials as the candidate wishes to submit. Examples might include, but are not limited to, copies of publications or other evidence of scholarship, letters of external reviewers (if any were obtained) and rebuttals (if any were filed), copies of student evaluations or course materials, etc. The candidate may add items to the secondary dossier during the review process (see calendar in section 3.17).

The secondary dossier will not be duplicated but will be available to committee members.

As the review proceeds through the various levels, the primary dossier and the secondary dossier will be in the custody of the administrator at each level. Items may be added to the primary dossier by the

---

1 By action of the college faculty and as incorporated in the college handbook, a group of departments may decide to act as a division rather than as a single department. Such a decision must be approved by the dean of the unit and by the provost.
The administrator as called for in these procedures, but the administrator must give the candidate a copy of the additions and provide the candidate an opportunity to write a rebuttal that will also be included in the primary dossier.

The complete files of all faculty members under review in the department must be available for a reasonable time (at least five working days) to all voting faculty.

Tenure cases will be reviewed at a meeting of the tenured faculty of the department or a committee of tenured faculty members chosen by these faculty members. In departments having fewer than three voting tenured faculty members, the college faculty will develop appropriate procedures for the review, subject to the approval of the college dean. Each eligible person except the department chairperson will vote on each case under consideration and will sign the tally sheet. The tally sheet will not identify individual voters with their votes but must account for all eligible voters. If a committee wishes, straw ballots may precede the final ballot. Only the votes on the final ballot are binding and recorded. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member on a committee declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning a case. A positive recommendation by the committee results when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention have voted to recommend tenure. A copy of the tally sheet will be kept in the departmental office for three years.

Promotion cases will be reviewed at a meeting of the departmental faculty who hold rank equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered or of a committee of those with appropriate rank chosen by these faculty members. The limitation of voting to persons of equal or higher rank need not apply to votes at the college or university level. In departments having fewer than three faculty members with appropriate rank, the college faculty will develop appropriate review procedures subject to approval of the college dean. Each eligible person, excluding the department chairperson, will vote on each case under consideration and will sign the tally. The tally will not identify individual voters with their votes but must account for all eligible votes. Straw ballots may precede the final ballot. Abstentions may occur only in cases involving declared conflict of interest. A positive recommendation will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots (i.e., other than abstentions) have voted to recommend promotion. Copies of the tally sheets will be kept in the departmental office for three years.

Chairpersons do not participate in their own evaluation or in evaluations of faculty when the chair has a conflict of interest. Such cases automatically go forward without prejudice for review at the next level.

The results of the departmental deliberations and the chairperson’s separate recommendation will be sent to the dean by the department chairperson. When the committee’s discussion of a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee’s evaluation of the candidate. The department chairperson will also provide a written evaluation to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In cases where the chairperson’s recommendation differs from that of the voting faculty, the case will go forward to the next higher level without prejudice, and that transmittal will not constitute an appeal. The chairperson will also send forward the copies of the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

The dean will inform each candidate in writing of the department’s recommendations, the chairperson’s recommendation, the right to appeal, and the procedures for appeal. The dean will also notify the candidate that he/she may request meetings with the department chairperson and/or the chair of the departmental tenure and promotion committee, at the candidate’s option, to discuss the decision.
College Review of Nominees for Tenure or Promotion

The dean will give a copy of the primary dossier of each faculty member favorably recommended for promotion and/or tenure and of all appealed cases to each member of the college committee and will indicate the location of the secondary dossiers. These materials must be available to the committee for at least five working days prior to deliberation.

The committee will meet with the dean to receive information about the schedule of meetings and about administrative matters related to the cases to be reviewed. The dean may also request other meetings with the committee. Each college shall adopt procedures regarding the role of the dean in these other meetings. If the committee discovers that information is lacking in a dossier, it can ask the dean to acquire the information. Consistent with the department procedures, the dean must provide the candidate a copy of the material and allow the candidate to write a rebuttal. The college committee may, at its option, adopt a policy which prohibits a committee member from the same department as a candidate for tenure or promotion from speaking about the case during the committee’s deliberations. If such a rule is adopted, it must apply to all cases before the committee. If additional information about the departmental committee’s deliberations is desired, the committee may request explanatory information to be submitted in writing from the chair of the departmental committee. This statement will be added to the primary dossier, and the candidate will be provided an opportunity to place a rebuttal in the primary dossier.

The committee will then consider the cases before it, whether regular or appealed. Straw ballots may be taken, but these are neither binding nor recorded. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member on a committee declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning the case. At a meeting without the dean each case will be discussed and the committee will conduct its final vote. A positive recommendation by the committee will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention vote to recommend tenure or promotion.

The committee must notify the dean in writing of its final ballot on each case. (Note: The college committee may meet with the dean as it sees fit but it must hold a discussion on each case and take its final vote in the absence of the dean.)

The results of the college deliberations and the dean’s separate recommendations will be sent by the dean to the vice president for academic affairs. When the committee’s discussion of a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee’s evaluation of the candidate. The dean will also provide a written evaluation to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In cases where the college committee’s recommendation differs from that of the dean, the case will go forward to the next higher level without prejudice and the transmittal will not constitute an appeal. A positive recommendation requires the affirmative vote of more than 50 percent of those voting. The dean will also send forward the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

The dean will notify each candidate in writing of the college committee’s recommendation, the dean’s recommendation, the right to appeal, if any, and the procedures for appeal. The dean will also notify the candidate that he/she may request in writing meetings with the dean and/or the chairperson of the college committee, at the candidate’s option, to discuss the recommendation.
Nomination and Review of Academic Services Faculty

Faculty eligible for tenure or promotion review and not assigned to an academic college or department will be nominated and reviewed for tenure and promotion within their administrative units according to procedures consistent with those used in academic colleges.

A statement describing the procedures must be reviewed by the university committee and approved by the vice president for academic affairs.

University Review of Nominees for Tenure or Promotion

The vice president for academic affairs will give a copy of the primary dossier of each faculty member favorably recommended for tenure or promotion and of each appealed case to each member of the university committee. In addition, the vice president for academic affairs will indicate the location of the secondary dossiers. The materials must be available to the committee for at least five working days prior to deliberations.

If the committee discovers that information is lacking in a primary dossier, it can ask the vice president for academic affairs to acquire the information, which will be placed in the primary dossier. Consistent with college procedures the vice president for academic affairs must provide the candidate a copy of the material and allow the candidate to write a rebuttal, which will also be placed in the primary dossier.

The committee will then consider the cases before it, whether regular or appealed. The committee may request a written response from the dean on matters of interpretation of evidence, the academic needs of the unit, or its current resources, but the committee will not invite the dean or other outside persons to meet with the committee. Consistent with college procedures, the candidate shall be provided a copy of any additional written material provided to the committee and shall be provided an opportunity to write a rebuttal. Both the statement and the rebuttal will be placed in the primary dossier. Straw ballots may be taken, but these are neither binding nor recorded. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member on a committee declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning a case. At a meeting without either the vice president for academic affairs or the dean of the graduate school present, each case will be discussed and the committee will conduct its final vote. A positive recommendation will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention vote to recommend tenure or promotion.

The committee must notify the vice president for academic affairs in writing of its final ballot on each case. When the committee’s discussion of a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee’s evaluation of the candidate when the evaluation is different from that of the candidate’s college committee. This statement will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review this statement and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier.

The vice president for academic affairs will review each case transmitted by the university committee and meet with the president to determine which cases will be favorably recommended to the board of regents. In any case where the proposed presidential recommendation to the board differs from that of the university committee, the president and vice president for academic affairs will meet with the committee to discuss the reasons for their position.

The vice president for academic affairs will notify the candidate, the candidate’s dean, and the chairperson, in writing, of the recommendation to be made to the board of regents. Any person not
recommended by the university committee may request meetings with the vice president for academic affairs and/or the chairperson of the university committee, at the candidate's option, to discuss the recommendations. Any person not recommended by the president may request a meeting with the vice president for academic affairs and the president to discuss the recommendations. The candidate may invite a faculty colleague to accompany him/her, in either case.

The president will inform each candidate, in writing, of the action of the Kansas Board of Regents within a week of the April board meeting.

The Use of External Evaluation

The use of external peer reviews is optional. For those candidates who elect to employ them, a standard procedure should be followed. The dean's office will assume responsibility for obtaining the reviews in accordance with the procedures described below. The same questions will be asked of all reviewers. In general, the dean may ask reviewers to comment on (1) the originality and creativity displayed in the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative work and (2) the significance of the work and its impact on the field. Reviewers will be specifically instructed not to remark on the promotability or tenurability of candidates. Individual colleges are free to develop their own policies regarding pursuit of non-responding or late evaluators; these policies should be applied consistently whenever external review is sought. Candidates will receive a copy of the reviews which identifies the reviewer. If they wish to do so, candidates may provide their written rebuttal to the external reviews in the secondary dossiers.

External reviewers should be distinguished scholars in their fields capable of providing an un-biased professional assessment of the quality of the candidate's work.

The process for obtaining external reviews should be started at least two months before the campus review begins. The following process should be followed if external reviews are to be obtained:

1) The candidate will give the departmental chair the names and addresses of five potential peer reviewers, six sets of reprints or copies of work that the candidate believes best represents his/her research, scholarship, or creative work, and six copies of a complete bibliography that clearly delineates the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative work. Any material that the candidate wishes to have returned should be so marked.

2) The department chair will forward to the dean information provided by the candidate along with five additional names and addresses of potential peer reviewers. The department chair may wish to seek the counsel of the faculty in developing this list. For cause, the candidate may challenge to the dean the names selected by the department chair.

3) The dean will draw by lot three reviewers from each list of names supplied. If these reviewers do not respond in a timely fashion, the dean may call them to encourage them to respond. If fewer than three responses are obtained within a reasonable time, the dean may send additional requests for reviews to other persons named on the original lists, in rotating order from both lists.

4) The dean will send to each reviewer a letter requesting a professional opinion of the quality of the candidate's work following the guidelines stated above, along with the material supplied by the candidate.

5) Copies of the reviewers' comments will be returned to the department chair and the candidate immediately upon receipt by the dean. The department chair will add the reviews to the
candidate’s secondary dossier. The chair, in consultation with the candidate, will place in the secondary dossier a brief summary of the reviewers’ academic credentials. Candidates are permitted to place in the secondary dossier comments on or rebuttals to the letters provided by reviewers.

6) Reviews can be added to the candidate’s secondary dossier up until the time that the college committee begins its deliberations on the candidate.

Appeal of Decisions Related to Tenure or Promotion

A candidate may make only one appeal during the entire review process. The appeal is made to the next higher level. No hearing is provided, and the appeal must be written. Some typical reasons for appeal are violation of academic freedom, failure to follow procedures concerning time periods or committee operations, inadequate consideration, discrimination, etc.

The committee to which the appeal is made will give full consideration without prejudice to the case in that the committee will review it in the same manner as favorably recommended cases and will apply similar standards.

No Publication of Names of Tenure and Promotion

Names of faculty being considered for tenure or promotion will not be published. The right of privacy of such faculty members was affirmed by vote of the faculty on March 6, 1978.

Confidentiality of Proceedings

All deliberations are confidential. However, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed if the case goes to litigation.

Disposition of Dossiers

The vice president for academic affairs in each case will keep a copy of the primary dossier for three years and return to the candidate the remaining copies of the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

Precedence of University procedures

If department and college tenure or promotion procedures differ from those of the university, university procedures take precedent.

Student Members

Students will not cast a vote regarding the award of tenure or promotion to individual faculty members.

Definition of Terms

Committee: The tenure review committee at the departmental level will consist of all tenured members of the department or a committee of tenured faculty chosen by those faculty members and reported in writing to the dean. In departments with fewer than three tenured members, the college faculty will develop appropriate procedures for the review subject to the approval of the college dean.
The review committee at the college level is the college tenure and promotion committee. Members of these committees are all tenured, full-time faculty with the rank of assistant professor or higher. The total membership of the committee is an odd number, with a minimum of five members. The majority of the committee are elected by the faculty, according to a representational formula adopted by the college. Members are elected or appointed for either two or three year terms (depending upon the college policies), staggered to maintain continuity. If a replacement is required due to a resignation, the replacement is selected only for the duration of the unexpired term. The committee chairperson is elected at-large in the college for a two year term and holds the rank of associate professor or higher by the committee. No person can serve on the committee in a year in which he or she is considered for promotion or for more than two consecutive terms.

The review committee at the university level is the faculty senate tenure and promotion committee, whose general charge is established in the faculty senate rules. No person may serve on the university level review committee in a year in which he or she is considered for tenure or promotion.

Administrator: The administrator at the departmental level is the department chairperson. The dean is the administrator at the college level, and the vice president for academic affairs is the administrator at the university level.

Calendar: The tenure calendar is contained in section 3.17 of this Handbook.

Documents: The basic document consists of the 25 page statement prepared by the candidate in accordance with the standard format. The primary dossier consists of this basic document, a standard cover sheet, a role statement from the department chairperson, the annual reviews for untenured faculty, and such other statements as may be developed during the review process. Candidates must be notified of any items added to the primary dossier and be provided an opportunity to submit a written rebuttal to such items, which will be included in the primary dossier. At each level of review, each committee member has a copy of the primary dossier. The secondary dossier consists of such additional materials as the candidate wishes to submit. Examples might include, but are not limited to, copies of publications or other evidence of scholarship, letters of external reviewers (if any were obtained), and copies of student evaluations or course materials, etc. Only one copy of the secondary dossier is maintained.

Mandatory Review Year: The next to the last year of the allowable probationary period is the mandatory review year.

Straw Ballot: A non-binding vote taken for the purpose of monitoring progress toward a final decision is a straw ballot.

Favorable Case: A favorable case occurs at any level of review if either the faculty committee or the administrator makes a positive recommendation concerning the case. Such cases automatically move forward for review at the next level.

Academic Services Faculty: Persons holding unclassified appointments carrying faculty rank who serve in units other than degree-granting colleges are academic services faculty.

Probationary Appointment: A probationary appointment is an appointment that may, on the basis of continuing satisfactory performance, lead to review for the award of tenure. However, probationary appointments carry no expectation or promise that review for the award of tenure will be undertaken or that tenure will be awarded. Probationary appointments are reviewed on an annual basis and may or may not be renewed. Probationary appointments may not be continued for more than seven years.
Temporary Appointments: A temporary appointment is for a fixed term. Such appointments carry no rights to the consideration for the award of tenure.
TENURE AND PROMOTION

a. **Composition (12 members)**

- 7 Chairpersons of tenure and promotion committees
- 2 Faculty-at-large
- 1 Student (non-voting)
- 2 Ex officio: vice president for academic affairs (non-voting); dean of the graduate school (non-voting).

b. **Selection:** Chairpersons of tenure and promotion committees in the degree-granting colleges and for unaffiliated faculty are chosen according to procedures established in Appendix D on Promotion, Tenure and Appeals Procedures. They are elected to two-year staggered terms. Faculty-at-large are selected according to standard procedures for naming members to faculty senate committees, except that they shall be from different degree-granting colleges and shall be full time, tenured faculty members with the rank of associate professor or higher. Faculty-at-large serve three year terms.

c. **Charge:** The functions of the tenure and promotion committee shall be:

1. To implement university-wide policies and procedures for awarding tenure and promotion. This shall include such items as:
   
   a. Tenure and promotion calendar.
   
   b. The format for documentation in support of tenure and promotion review with a view to developing comparable standards throughout the university while recognizing essential college differences.
   
   c. Transmittal, reporting, and appeals procedures.
   
   d. Consideration of information to be provided by the administration, when the committee requests it; about patterns of promotions related to time in grade; promotion projections based on current faculty rank ratios and historical precedent; patterns of promotion across comparable universities; study of changing tenure and promotion guidelines of organizations such as AAUP, NCATE, Regents, and the like; and budgetary restrictions.

2. To ensure that there are university procedures for notifying the relevant administrators and those faculty members for whom tenure decisions must be made before reappointment.

3. To review tenure and promotion cases in accordance with procedures defined in tenure, promotion and appeals procedure and approved by the University faculty.

4. To review every three years the guidelines for tenure and promotion adopted by the various colleges and units from the perspective of their review of tenure and promotion cases from throughout the university.

5. To identify to the faculty affairs committee problems in tenure policies and tenure and promotion guidelines within thirty days of submitting their final recommendations to the vice president for academic affairs.
FACULTY SENATE
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the meeting of Monday, February 28, 1994

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ackerman, Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Brady, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Chopra, Chambers, Ciboski, Clark, Daugherty, L. Davis, Dreifort, Duell, Flentje, Furtwengler, Greywall, Gythiel, Hanrahan, Hay, Horn, Houts, Hoyer, Hughes, Hundley, Kelly, Koppenhaver, Draft, Kuchment, Lancaster, Lansing, Matson, May, Murphey, Parkhurst, Paske, Sharp, Teshome, Wahlbeck, Williamson, Zandler

MEMBERS ABSENT: Allen, Combs, G. Davis, Desilva, Hawley, Mandt, Merriman, Pitetti, Romig, Shanahan, Terrell, Thomson, Yeager

GUESTS: Brunner, J. Eaglesfield, J. Mitchell, J. Snyder

Summary of Action taken:
Voted on selected items in the revised Tenure & Promotion document

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

II. NEW BUSINESS (3:00 - 4:30)

President Clark introduced guest speaker, Steven Jordan, Board of Regents Executive Director.

Mr. Jordan said he was pleased to have the opportunity to speak with the Faculty Senate about the board happenings. He remarked that the structure of the Regents Board is similar to the Arizona system, so he feels comfortable. He has observed, however, that the system doesn't provide much opportunity for direct dialog with the presidents in board meetings. He would like to find ways to have more direct dialog, not only with the presidents but also with the faculty and students. He would like to move to a "consent agenda." He also would like to establish a policy agenda that states the goals and objectives of the board with a time-table. It would allow for accountability and get away from single regent agenda items. The board would discuss agenda items to see if they fit with the established goals. He would like to have a board retreat with the presidents to focus on a couple of issues. For example, the issue of faculty work-load; teaching versus research. The questions to ask are: what is teaching/advising? How does teaching differ in the various institutions/universities? The same questions should be asked about research. The issues should be discussed with administrators, faculty, etc, and then see how it fits with the Regents' policies. Mr. Jordan then asked the Senate for questions.

Discussion followed: Senator Hoyer said that in the past the Regent staff had the tendency to pick a subject in vogue and write a paper which would be enacted without any dialog.
Mr. Jordan replied that the staff does need to inform the regents of issues, but not pick the items. He wants to get away from single regent issues. The staff should have first cut at the paper but there needs to have a broader discussion before presentation to the regents. The staff should reflect the attitudes of the director. Senator Duell said that the board often requests information that takes lots of faculty time and effort and then does not look at it with the same degree of time and effort. Mr. Jordan replied that if the board wants the information, then all the information available should be collected. But the focus should be on a limited agenda. Senator Hoyer commented that the program review took a tremendous amount of time. Will the board be made aware of the cost of the endeavor in time and effort? Mr. Jordan replied that program review was an important issue. The legislators used program review as part of the Regents' appointment interview. Senator Paske continued the discussion by stating that an enormous amount of time was spent on program review and absolutely no changes of substance were made at WSU. Program review in terms of accreditation actually is an ongoing process. Mr. Jordan said that program review should be considered in the broader context, we shouldn't look at it in single intervention, but longitudinally. It is the first time that the legislature agreed that all of the dollars reallocated should be returned to the institution to strengthen existing programs. Senator Paske voiced a concern about faculty workload. Data on workloads is a fact that is nationally known and not necessary to repeat. We need to avoid generating information that is known. Mr. Jordan said he begged to differ. It is critical for faculty to engage in that type of dialog. Senator Williamson commented that all departments are reviewed on a cycle and that this process should continue, not try to review each and every program at the same time and engage the whole university at one time. Mr. Jordan agreed. Senator Flentje commented that Mr. Jordan had experience in two states that have had hard times in higher education and asked what he had learned from those experiences. Mr. Jordan said it was a hard question. He had learned that Kansas funds higher education well per capita, but there is a such high student participation rate, the results are lower per student monies. He stated that you must be careful about how the University sector itself is compared and find elements that make sense to legislatures in trying to judge its relative position. Also, as state revenues have gotten tight, they are focusing on funding K-12, SRS, etc., so they tend to support increases in tuition. The state, however, has a basic responsibility for funding higher education. Senator Daugherty mentioned Washburn entering the system and WSU withdrawing some masters proposals after some political pressure and wondered if something could be done to decrease the rivalry among the institutions? The answer was probably not. The best that can be done is to get a level playing field. He mentioned there was a perception that WSU didn’t do as much in program review
as the other institutions, so they shouldn’t have come forward with eight new programs. Also, the board has sent mixed messages on the issues of associate degree programs which has not helped the situation. Bob Wherritt said the staff should bring the board members up to speed with dialog not with projects. Mr. Jordan agreed. He said a good example was the AAUP luncheon. A KU faculty member gave an inspiring speech about what teaching entails as an educator. Senator Matson commented that there was a time when the board was less interested in what the institutions do. Mr Jordan replied that he is not interested in micro-management. He wants more interest in broader policies. Senator Plentje asked why the board can’t delegate some of the time consuming agenda items? The reply was that by statute the board can only approve, not delegate, but that the consent agenda would help. Senator Cavarozzi mentioned that faculty spent the equivalent of 40 hours per week for 52 weeks for 12 years in reported hours on program review and the perception that WSU had done less than the other institutions is disconcerting. Mr. Jordan said that is why he encourages the Regents to get out to the campuses. It may take a board member three years to get up to speed. Senator Horn asked if there were to be any dramatic changes in the next 5 years. Mr. Jordan replied that changes could be in the use of technology and the impact on institution boundaries; and in governance and interaction with community colleges. For example, articulation agreements might see more courses to transfer; more of a voluntary affiliation between community colleges and the universities. Senator Horn asked if there were to be any drastic cuts. The reply was no. In general, the basic core was in place and program review is just taking off the old and adding new. Senator Lancaster commented that some of the issues impacting the regents’ institutions really come out of the grade and High schools. For example, new math. Are Board of Education issues included in the regents’ policy issues? The reply was yes and that a task force is working on them. The board needs to be careful about interfering in faculty issues. Senator Paske commented that teaching and research are the best contributions a faculty can make to the state and the Regents need to consider that when they are making more work. Mr. Jordan said that this board wants to make things easier for faculty, that is why they have supported qualified admissions. Senator Kelly asked how the board will go about identifying the urban goals of WSU. The reply was that President Hughes will do that. The Regents need to come to campus and see the contrast. Program duplication for example, WSU may have a similar programs, but with a different focus for its population. The board needs to consider an institution’s role and mission. Mr. Jordan closed with reiteration of his availability to faculty concerns.

III. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS

There were none.
IV. MINUTES: February 7, 1994
The minutes were approved.

V. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

President Clark reported that the VPAA Search Committee had given its recommendations to President Hughes and the committee requested a meeting with him to discuss the candidates. There will probably not be a long wait for the decision because of the two dean searches which are on hold.

Regarding Section III, #1 of the President’s report, enrollment is down 2.8% at KSU and 1.6% at KU overall, but that is somewhat masked by the increase at the medical school.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Modifications to Proposed Tenure and Promotion Policies (2nd reading) The senate received a copy of the revisions (goldenrod attachment to 2/28 agenda) and were asked to vote on the changes one at a time.

1. Election of chair by the committee. Passed
2. The use of external evaluation. Discussion followed: Senator Lancaster asked if a college didn’t establish a policy, would the dean do it. Pres. Clark said it wasn’t clear. Senator Carroll pointed out a conflict with number 3 on page 14 of the policy. Senator Cavarozzi said it could be in conflict if it is against college policy. Senator Mandt commented that although external review is optional, some wording could be added to help the candidate decide. Some senators pointed out that external review is usually helpful to a case. Senator Cavarozzi commented that we must be careful how we word the statement, so it doesn’t become mandatory, as the student evaluation did. President Clark suggested the item be put aside to work on the wording. It was tabled to March 7 meeting.
3. Promotion decisions based on current guidelines; tenure decisions on initial (at hire) guidelines. No discussion. Passed
4. Editorial change to the second paragraph on page 5: "The purpose of this review is to ensure that the college guidelines and statements are consistent with university guidelines as outlined in section 3.143, and…” Passed
5. No changes to Feb.1 version (p. 12) on the role of the college dean and the committee meetings. Passed
6. Review of Academic Services faculty will be consistent with those used in academic colleges. Passed
    Voted to maintain the wording on service as a expectation for assistant professors.

Senators Hoyer and Duell commented that now that the document has passed, it would be helpful if the college deans were informed on the new statements and policies so they could be implemented. Senator Carroll pointed out that a modified calendar needed to be drafted. President Clark said when the document is approved, a copy would be mailed to everyone.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

JoLynne Campbell, Acting Secretary