



# **Faculty Senate Archives**

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1993-1994

## **Volume VII**

### **Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of March 28, 1994**

---

**Additional information:** Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at: <http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/14179>

**WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE  
AGENDA**

Room 126 CH

3:30 p.m.

**Meeting Notice: Monday, March 28, 1994**

### **Order of Business:**



**NOTE: Next meeting will be April 4, 1994. The Senate  
will probably need to meet every Monday through  
May 9.**

## **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

James Clark, President	3220	Box 78
Dwight Murphrey, 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

March 22, 1994

# Faculty Senate President's Report

*for the March 28 Faculty Senate Meeting*

## I. Regents Meeting

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

1. the Board of Regents approved WSU's four new degree proposals: Manufacturing Engineering bachelors degree, Masters of Public Health degree, and Associate degrees in Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy.
2. the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents met with Regent Hiebert to discuss appropriate methods for improving faculty evaluation; we had a very frank and useful discussion on a variety of points, including research showing problems associated with relying too heavily on student evaluations in judging the quality of teaching. Regent Hiebert is chair of the Board's Academic Affairs committee for the 1993-94 academic year.
3. the Regents held an open discussion, including university presidents and senate presidents, of ways to improve the chances of passing the Partnership for Excellence package of faculty salary increases this year.

The five new Regents (Conger, Hammond, Hiebert, Krepps, and Nolan) have been invited to visit WSU and spend a day with the faculty. The rest of the Regents, most of whom visited the WSU faculty last year, will be invited for a return visit this fall.

## II. Questions Regarding Graduate School Policies

At the March 14 Senate meeting, two questions were asked regarding Graduate School policies. Dean Tilford has provided the responses:

1. Are Deans full members of the Graduate Faculty *ex officio*?  
Yes. This has been a long-standing Graduate School policy.
2. Could minutes of the Graduate Council be distributed in a more timely manner?

Dean Tilford will check into anything delaying distribution of minutes within his office. One factor that introduces a time lag is the Graduate Council's policy of not distributing minutes until they have been approved by the Council at its next meeting.

People with concerns about the above policies should contact their Graduate Council representatives.

## III. Executive Committee Meeting

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on March 14. The agenda was:

1. A discussion of reorganization proposals for the Hugo Wall School. The matter will be placed on the agenda for the Senate's March 28 meeting, with invitations for participation extended to Dean Loper of LAS and Joe Pisciotte of the Hugo Wall School.
2. A report from the KSU Senate President and President-Elect was distributed; last January, they attended an AAUP-sponsored meeting to discuss "Faculty Senates and the Fiscal Crisis: Strategies for Survival." Their report has many useful ideas for the role of faculty in university budgeting, even during non-crisis periods. Copies of the report have been distributed to the Planning and Budget Committee, and to President Hughes and Vice Presidents Dreifort and Lowe. Anyone interested can get a copy by calling the Senate office, x3504.
3. A discussion of other agenda items for future Senate meetings.

15

## **University Curriculum Committee Report Three-Year Baccalaureates March 28, 1994**

In late November 1993, the president of the Faculty Senate charged the University Curriculum Committee to examine the feasibility of three-year baccalaureate programs at WSU. The charge included the following tasks:

1. Research and report how other legitimate colleges and universities are implementing three-year degree programs.
2. Examine and report on the feasibility of offering concentrated three-year programs consisting of three regular fall/spring academic years, plus two or three summers.
3. Examine and report on ways for students to begin earning legitimate college credit while completing high school, and how to structure programs to use such credit (AP, International Baccalaureate, Honors in Transition [HIT]) to reduce the number of actual semesters needed to graduate."

### **Process**

The University Curriculum Committee undertook this task at a meeting in mid-January. Meetings were scheduled at three-week intervals over the next two months. An ERIC search provided some background information on three-year baccalaureates. President Hughes met with the group on February 11 to explain his rationale for this request and provided more written information for the committee. On February 25 the committee met to discuss concerns about the programs and to review the written materials, the comments from the president, and the responses of fellow faculty. The committee members were asked to examine the possibility of scheduling programs within their colleges in a three-year format. The results of these efforts were examined at a meeting March 11. This report contains information concerning each of these efforts.

### **Assumptions**

After meeting with President Hughes the committee felt it best to state clearly what they felt were basic assumptions about three-year baccalaureates at WSU:

1. The three-year baccalaureate program is an alternative scheduling strategy for existing programs.
2. A three-year program can and should be academically sound.
3. Faculty would not be required to design new courses to aid in the acceleration. In fact, program faculty would be cautioned against doing so if academic quality were compromised.
4. No new programs would need to be designed for the purpose of implementing the three-year baccalaureate.
5. Not all programs lend themselves to a three-year schedule.
6. The program is targeted for full-time, academically talented students.

### **Advantages**

From the discussions with President Hughes, from the readings provided by the ERIC search and by President Hughes, and from faculty comments, the committee concluded that three-year baccalaureate programs offer several advantages:

1. Such programs can reduce the costs for students by allowing them to enter the work force one year earlier. In addition, housing costs are reduced. If more than fifteen hours of credit can be taken at the cost of fifteen credit hours, tuition costs are also reduced.
2. We compete in this area with universities offering degree completion programs. A three-year baccalaureate as described above would provide an accelerated program for qualified students without reducing the academic quality. We should be responsible to our students, increase our recruitment efforts and meet our competition.
3. The three-year baccalaureate would attract excellent students and at the same time allow us to expand enrollment.
4. The three-year baccalaureate provides yet another alternative for students.
5. The program might allow students to enter as freshmen and complete the bachelor's and some master's degrees in fewer than six years.

### **Concerns**

Committee members were encouraged to express all their concerns after considering and discussing the issues. Following is a summary of those concerns and responses from the committee:

**Three-year programs could potentially weaken the general education program and the curriculum in the first two years of college. A fear exists that we would reduce requirements.**

The premise is that we won't change the quality of the program.

The three-year baccalaureate will contain 124 hours.

The program should not be watered down.

There may be a concern that retroactive credit actually lessens the number of credits required for graduation.

**There's more knowledge to learn; why take less time to learn it?**

We need to develop life-long learners. They can't learn everything in four years either.

As far as knowledge is concerned, we may need to be selective, discarding "old" as the "new" enters.

Better students can and should proceed to graduate school. By taking basic courses in a shortened time, they proceed quickly to in-depth study.

**It's a mistake for universities to tie degrees to time served.**

This is true. The three-year plan is another way of scheduling the required courses for a baccalaureate degree.

Do not reduce requirements.

**Since we have to provide so many remedial courses, how can we offer an accelerated program as well?**

The three-year baccalaureate is focused on a different group of students.

Three-year scheduling is not for remedial or marginal students.

**Seasoning and reasoning don't come fast.**

Some courses lend themselves better to compressed delivery than others. Skills courses may require more time than content courses emphasizing content.

Many students will go on to graduate programs which allow for more seasoning and reasoning.

**There seems to be no real demand from the students for a three-year degree. The attempt results from pressures by other universities in the area.**

We don't know what the demand is. Most students probably have not thought about a three-year baccalaureate. We might try it in a couple of areas, keying in on a couple of programs.

We might need a plan for creating the demand.

Funds from the Campaign for Students might be offered as loans to those who are qualified.

**Most students take more time now to complete college than ever before. Nationwide, only 1-3% of the students take advantage of such an alternative.**

The three-year baccalaureate at WSU would focus primarily on a few students. We need to ease the financial pressure on good students working to support themselves.

**The majority of college students (and especially ours) work.**

We need to provide financial incentives to attract potential three-year baccalaureate students. The Campaign for Students could offer loans for their three undergraduate years and perhaps for an additional year of graduate work. We might need to focus on the financially disadvantaged or medium-income students who are intellectually advantaged.

**A student ill-advised to complete the program in three years may be led to failure or burnout.**

Advising is the key. We need to target capable students.

Students need to be assured they can slow down at any time.

Flexibility is also necessary.

Academically-talented students can also burn out by being slowed down.

**The three-year degree encourages further use of credit by examination or exemption from requirements.**

When students have sufficient skills, there is no need to repeat the instructional process.

In most skills classes rigorous testing can determine a level of competence.

**Most universities offer accelerated programs to handle rising enrollments. This is not presently our problem.**

We are attempting to add diversity to our offerings in order to attract students.

**A three-year degree might result in lost revenue to the institution.**

We should retain the tuition reduction for 15+ hours for students taking more than fifteen hours. Otherwise the program could fail to attract those for whom it is designed.

If the 15+ tuition reduction is eliminated students could leave the institution to get the reduced tuition elsewhere.

#### **Summer School Concerns**

A core of classes will have to be offered every summer.

Presently there are few financial rewards for teaching in the summer.

Many faculty use the summer for scholarship.

#### **Programs Appropriate for Three-year Scheduling**

It was the general feeling of the committee that some programs are more suitable for three-year scheduling than others, because some educational approaches allow

for compression and some don't. It seems that programs which demand skill development (music, art, math, creative writing) would be less likely candidates. Those courses which are more content-based might be more suitable.

Further, the committee believes that programs suitable for three-year scheduling would necessarily be those in which enrollments are large enough to warrant frequent offerings of courses.

Although several deans have voiced interest in three-year scheduling, the committee believes that department and program faculty should be polled. In fact, committee members agree that any changes in scheduling or curriculum should be approved by program faculty.

### **Needs**

Although students can presently complete many programs in three years if they are carefully advised and have the ability and desire, some needs should be addressed before WSU advertises an accelerated program.

1. The decision to implement three-year programs should be made in consultation with faculty. Each program faculty should examine the appropriateness of its program(s) for three-year scheduling.
2. Colleges would have to commit themselves to offering required courses frequently enough to meet the needs of these students.
3. The administration would have to commit itself to running the general education program all year, with full offerings in the summer.
4. The administration would have to commit itself to utilizing intersession times. This means providing for enrollment and support for faculty (class rosters, grade sheets, heat and air-conditioning, custodial services, audio-visual equipment, access to offices) year round.
5. WSU program faculty would need to work more closely with area high schools.
6. Faculty/advisors should be made aware of the many options for receiving alternative credit (credit by exam, CLEP, HIT, AP/Course Equivalency, SAT, quizzing out). These alternatives should not be kept secret from faculty or students.
7. Student advising would make or break this program. Students who begin the program and choose to withdraw should not be penalized, but guided with care and compassion.
8. Programs should consider increasing course offerings in high schools through the use of electronic classrooms. We need to offer more courses in area schools to meet the challenge of area institutions, while monitoring our own sense of academic integrity and respectability.
9. Departments, colleges and the university will need to look at alternative scheduling for courses, not just programs.
10. We should reexamine the Honors Program to see how it might fit into this model.
11. Monies should be targeted for students in the three-year programs.

### **Recommendations**

The University Curriculum Committee applauds the efforts of the administration to meet needs of the community by recruiting and retaining academically talented students.

We suggest that the administration poll the deans, department chairs, and program faculty to determine the feasibility of three-year scheduling of degree programs. Once this is done, we suggest trying this approach in limited areas first and attempting to create demand. The university faculty will need to make a concerted effort to provide alternative program scheduling in an academically sound and legitimate way. The university administration and staff will need to make a concerted effort to outline the process, advertise, recruit, advise, and retain students for these programs.

### References

- Callahan, C. (1992). The Jefferson-Penn State B.S.-M.D. Program: A 26-year experience. *Academic Medicine*, 67(11), 792-797.
- Levine, A. (1993, December 21). College: More than serving time. NY: *Wall Street Journal*.
- Three-year college degree gains support in US. Reprinted in *Manhattan Mercury*, September 30, 1993 from the *New York Times*, 1993.
- Harman, R. (1993, November 5). The three-year baccalaureate: Equal or more learning for less cost. Press Release picked up by *Topeka Capital-Journal*, *Manhattan Mercury*, *Lawrence Journal World*.
- Noble, J. H. Jr., & Hepler, J. B. (1990). A closer look at the advanced-standing program in social work education. *Evaluation Review*, 14(6), 664-676.
- Starr, S. F. (1993, September 6). The benefits of a three-year degree. *Higher Education and National Affairs*, ACE, (pp. 5-6).
- Wu, C. Y., & Connelly, C. E. (1992). Profile of nonnurse college graduates enrolled in accelerated baccalaureate nursing programs. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 8(1), 35-40.
- The committee suggested the purchase of the following book:
- College Board Publications. (1992). *Index of majors and graduate degrees*, 1993. New York: Author.

FACULTY SENATE  
Wichita State University

Minutes of the meeting of Monday, March 28, 1994

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Brady, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Chambers, Ciboski, Clark, Daugherty, G. Davis, L. Davis, DeSilva, Flentje, Greywall, Gythiel, Hanrahan, Hawley, Hay, Horn, Houts, Hoyer, Kelly, Koppenhaver, Kraft, Kuchment, Lancaster, Mandt, Matson, Murphey, Passe, Romig, Teshome, Williamson, Yeager

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Allen, Chopra, Combs, Dreifort, Duell, Furtwengler, Hughes, Hundley, Lansing, May, Merriman, Parkhurst, Pitetti, Shanahan, Sharp, Terrell, Thomson, Wahlbeck, Zandler

**GUESTS:** Brunner, Seyb

**Summary of Action Taken:**

1. Referred Sexual Harassment policy back to committee.
2. Received Curriculum Committee report regarding Three-Year Baccalaureate program.

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

**II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS:**

Senator Mandt mentioned the Sunflower article that reported that President Hughes is concerned about the safety of his home. Senator Mandt said this is an opportunity to mobilize WSU's resources and influences to help solve our local community problems and urged the President to consider the safety issue from this perspective.

Senator Larry Davis reminded the Senate that in a previous meeting he had asked whether deans were considered full graduate school members. President Clark answered that they were, and Senator Davis asked why that was so. President Clark suggested that we send this question to the graduate school.

**III. Approved Minutes of March 7, 1994**

**IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT:**

President Clark said the House of Representatives is considering the salary raises for the state's faculty now and is thinking over the Cronister plan that would give a lump sum (\$10 million less than last year) to Regents to distribute. Washburn University probably won't be allowed to enter the Regents system this year. The Governor's response to the Cronister plan is unpredictable. She is devoted to getting Washburn into the system and the Partnership for Excellence salary increases were tied to Washburn's fate, so she may turn down the salary plan. Senator Mandt asked if the tuition increase that was tied to the Partnership for Excellence was passed. If salary increases don't come

through, then the state has broken faith with the students who agreed to the tuition increase based on faculty salary enhancements.

**IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

There were none.

**V. OLD BUSINESS:**

**Sexual Harassment Policy:**

Senator Mandt said the committee had done what the Senate had asked, but some finer details of the process need to be addressed. He felt it was too soon to vote and said we need another committee to do the fine tuning on the document. He suggested a select committee of senior senators, appointed by the Executive committee, who have knowledge of how the senate thinks, draft the final version, since the Senate as a whole can't do such fine tuning. He moved to form the committee and take time now in Senate to discuss any general principles the members want to suggest to the committee.

Senator Murphey said fine tuning suggestions were almost all of what the committee had gotten from the Senate so far. Senator Mandt reminded the senators that the tenure and promotion document was handled in the way he had suggested. IVPAA Dreifort asked if the documents passed by the other senates should be considered by the select committee and whether the campus needs one document for all. Senator Murphey said the current document includes five to six pages that apply to everyone in the university. There are many wording differences among the various senates' documents but maybe not many substantial differences. Senator Daugherty suggested that AAO Barbara Bowman be consulted during the course of the select committee's work. Senator Murphey said the SW Missouri State University document and the Sheffield et al document were quite different from each other. He urged us not to start from scratch again. Senator Mandt said the intent was to start from the Murphey/Bereman/(G)Davis draft.

Senator Paske said problem is with the enforcers, not the document or the procedures and that we should solve the problem at that level. He suggested going back to the committee to find out why problems aren't being solved and how we can change basic attitudes and failures including those of the senior faculty. Senator Carroll asked Senator Mandt's definition of a "short calendar" for this procedure. Senator Mandt said it would be a timeline that allowed for a vote on the document this spring semester. Senator Mandt's motion passed.

Senator Mandt suggested four principles to be considered: (1) to leave innocence until proven otherwise as a principle throughout, including when a romantic relationship is involved; (2) to guard against infringing on the academic rights of faculty (so that, as in the "hostile environment" issue, holding particular views wouldn't be held against you, per se). Senator Murphey agreed the policy could stifle opinion. Senator Larry Davis said the legislation of 1991 concerning sexual harassment will help with

this issue. Senator Gayle Davis asked Senator Mandt for an example of an expression of opinion that would be acceptable but may be read as creating a hostile environment. Senator Mandt agreed that the limits of those expressions would be hard to define. Senator Mandt continued with the principles he wants the committee to consider: (3) that no unsubstantiated prior accusations will be considered relevant to the case. Senator Larry Davis asked what "unsubstantiated" would mean. Senator Mandt said that such would be the case if a person were simply accused but no official process found him/her guilty. Senator Larry Davis said that substantiation isn't always that clear. Senator Mandt's last principle was, (4) that any third person effort mediation or resolution of a complaint should call on the good offices of someone both parties consider to be fair, impartial and unbiased. Senator Murphrey said that could give either side a veto and a person could refuse any mediator. Senator Mandt said we shouldn't have coercive mediation. Senator Murphrey prefers the present draft, with the change to leave the department chair out of the possible pool of mediators. Senator Larry Davis said he would hate to have department chairs taken out of the pool, across the board.

Senator Romig acknowledged the importance of the policy development process, but asked, in the interest of time, to move on to other issues. All of Senator Mandt's principles were approved through a straw vote, except the third, on which there was no vote taken.

#### VII. NEW BUSINESS:

Plans for Re-organization of the Hugo Wall School -

President Clark said Director of the Hugo Wall School Joe Pisciotte and Dean Loper wanted to wait to come to the Senate until the scheduled faculty meeting is held and a final proposal is developed for this re-organization. Their intention is that it will go through a faculty vote and the usual program discontinuance process. IVPAA Dreifort will attend the meeting with the School's faculty.

Senator Romig asked where this step is in the program discontinuance process. President Clark answered that it is described in paragraph nine in the faculty handbook. Senator Romig asked about the short time frame for the process, scheduled to be finished by July 1. President Clark said it could be done if they move quickly. If not, they will still have to go through the whole process. Senator Mandt asked if the proposal is consistent with the Program Review plans made for the Hugo Wall School. Senator Mandt didn't think Program Review decisions that would have this great an impact could be rewritten easily just a year later. Senator Mandt asked for comments from the visitors present from the Hugo Wall School about whether Senator Benson's view that the proposal wasn't discussed with the faculty was widely shared. A member of Administration of Justice said it had been said they'd try the plan for two years, but never that the departments would be dissolved. Senator Matson said that Social Work will lose accreditation if its department status is removed. The impacts of

these decisions aren't discussed in the document. Senator Romig quoted the faculty handbook on discontinuance: it says this is only done for academic reasons. He is concerned about Minority Studies losing its identity and asked how a faculty can advocate for the needs of a program under the proposed structure. Senator Flentje said the consulting process is going on now, and he urged us to wait until all the plans are made before reacting. Senator Benson repeated his objection from a previous Senate meeting that the memo said faculty had been consulted when they weren't. IVPAA Dreifort said that this is the start and not the end of the process, and that everyone's concerns will be addressed. Senator Larry Davis asked for more information on the memo being referred to in the Senate's discussion. President Clark explained and summarized the memo sent in January as a result of Director Pisciotte's initiative and his conversations with Dean Loper and IVPAA Dreifort. Senator Cavarozzi said her concern was the three months it took for this information to get to faculty. She's also concerned with the budget needs for these changes to take place, specifically the difference in resources between saving approximately \$4000 on three department chairs and the amount needed to hire the other department personnel proposed. IVPAA Dreifort said this is not a proposal to downgrade the unit, but to enhance its resources so it can do better. Senator Mandt warns that we may ruin the concept of the Hugo Wall School. Senator Bair supports Mandt's view and adds that we've taken a big step backward with this situation in terms of faculty involvement. Senator Campbell said she's dismayed that what Gerontology was afraid of happening in Health, was now happening in LAS. Senator Romig said we don't have time to wait and see what will happen in the end. President Hughes needs to be concerned about how the community will react when the Minority Studies department is dissolved. Senator Cavarozzi said we've always shared a commitment to our community even before President Hughes came. We have an opportunity to strengthen that commitment, but we can't lose our commitment to education, our students, our faculty. Senator Williamson said when the Elliott School was formed it took three years, but it was finally a unanimous decision. Consultation takes time, so he suggests we relax the timeline. Senator Paske said we should ask the central administration to reject the memo and send the director back to his faculty for consultation. Senator Hoyer so moved, Senator Matson seconded, and the vote was unanimous in its approval.

#### **Report on Three-Year Programs -**

President Clark introduced this topic from the Senate Curriculum Committee, chaired by Senator Carroll. Senator Carroll said the committee started in late January, had a session with President Hughes and then a series of committee meetings. The committee feels recommendations for specific programs to be accelerated into three-year plans should come from faculty. Senator Lancaster related his personal experience with a three-year degree, which he saw as easier rather than harder for students. He could not understand faculty objections that this timeline would be too

difficult. President Clark said President Hughes has two objectives for the three-year programs: to make sure that departments can successfully offer such programs structurally, especially the smaller departments; and to advertise the programs as sound but faster degree programs, thereby competing with KU and KSU where it's hard to finish a BA in even four years. Senator Daugherty said many departments already offer such possibilities to talented students. She referred to page 3 of the report, concerning the work lives of our students and to page 4's list of "needs": in need #1, she pointed out that some departments would have special problems like music performance, math, etc. She wants to make sure departments and colleges take over the planning for these accelerated programs. Senator Carroll said they had surveyed the faculty to some extent and had gotten many responses that this could be or was being done. Senator Campbell said we also need to think about better marketing for what we already do. Senator Horn asked if this is strictly for marketing. Senator Paske supports three-year programs but asked about the "retroactive credits" to which the report refers. Senator Koppenhaver explained MCLL's use of those credits for high school language experience. IVPAAs Dreifort said he initiated the idea of 3-year programs after hearing about similar ones elsewhere.

The Committee and Senator Carroll were commended for their good and fast work. The vote to approve the report was unanimous.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gayle Davis, Secretary