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WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 126 CH            3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice:    Monday, April 11, 1994

Order of Business:

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Statements and Proposals

III. Approval of Minutes

IV. Presidents Report

V. Committee Reports

VI. New Business

A. Planning and Budget Committee Report
   (Grey Attachment) - Discussion of draft plan for allocation of "Partnership for Excellence" funds

B. Report from Ad Hoc Committee on "Faculty Associates" (Blue attachment) - first reading

VII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

James Clark, President          3220  Box 78
Dwight Murphey, Vice President  3219  Box 88
Gayle Davis, Secretary         3358  Box 82
Joyce Cavarozzi, President-Elect 3541  Box 53
Walter Horn, Elected by Senate  3410  Box 44
Jolynne Campbell, Elected by Senate 3147  Box 43
Sue Bair, Appt'd by Senate Pres. 3340  Box 16
Recommendation:
Allocation of Funds for Faculty Salary Increases, FY 1995

Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee
April 1994

Currently under consideration in the Kansas legislature are proposals that provide funding for faculty salary increases for FY 1995, beginning July 1, 1994, in two parts: (1) funds providing an overall increase of 2.5 percent for faculty salaries; and (2) additional funds targeted to teaching faculty (funds that may amount to as much as $2.232 million, providing an additional 9 to 10 percent, for faculty at Wichita State University) associated with the "Partnership for Excellence" recommended by the Board of Regents and Governor Finney. The Committee recommends that these funds be allocated as follows:

1. **2.5 percent salary increase**: These funds should be used to provide a general salary increase of 2.5 percent to faculty who have demonstrated satisfactory performance in their duties during the past academic year and should be allocated fully to academic units based on current year allocations of resources to those units. Recommendations for individual faculty should begin with the budget officer of each academic unit and would be subject to review and approval by the appropriate academic officers at the college level and university-wide.

2. **Partnership for Excellence funds**: These funds should be divided into three parts:

   (1) **Equity allocation**. 45 percent of total funds should be used to rectify systemic and individual inequities in faculty salaries. Allocations should be made based on salary discrepancies from nationwide or regional benchmarks (these benchmarks may be determined from data that is compiled by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges [NASULGC] and takes the discipline, rank, and level of seniority of faculty into account). Specifically, allocations to rectify systemic inequities should be based on evidence that:

   - salaries in a particular college or division are farther below NASULGC averages than those of the University as a whole;
   - salaries for a particular rank in a college or division are farther below NASULGC averages than other ranks in the same unit; and
   - salaries in a particular department, independent of considerations of the academic ranks of its faculty, are farther below NASULGC averages than those of other departments in the same college or division.

   Allocations to rectify individual inequities should be based on evidence that:

   - faculty in a particular classification such as gender, race, or national origin have salaries farther below NASULGC averages than for comparably-situated colleagues in their department, college, division, or rank;
   - salary compression, that is, similar salaries for faculty with disparate seniority, rank, and records of achievement, exists; and
• differences in salary may be traced to random factors such as date of employment or year of tenure or promotion awards, rather than differences in rank, level of seniority, or merit.

Systemic and individual equity allocations should be made by central administration after extensive consultation among appropriate academic officers at departmental, college, and university-wide levels and faculty groups.

(2) Merit allocation. 45 percent of total funds should be used to provide salary increases to faculty based on meritorious performance of their duties. These funds should be allocated to academic units based on the current year allocation of resources to those units. The budget officer of each academic unit should initiate recommendations based on merit, which would be subject to review and approval by the appropriate academic officers at the college level and university-wide.

(3) Central allocation. 10 percent of total funds should be allocated to central administration, some portion of which may be allocated further to academic colleges, as central administration may determine. These funds should be used to provide salary increases to faculty in cases of extraordinary merit and to correct other inequities as central administration may determine.

3. Definition of "teaching faculty:" Since funds associated with the Partnership for Excellence are targeted to "teaching faculty," these funds should be allocated only to: (1) full-time faculty who hold faculty rank; (2) graduate teaching assistants; (3) library faculty; (4) summer school faculty; and (5) unclassified professionals who teach full-time. These funds should not be allocated to: (1) deans who teach part-time; (2) vacant positions; or (3) lecturers.

1. Inequities in faculty salaries fall into two broad categories, systemic and individual. Systemic inequities are defined as those of similarly-situated faculty whose salaries as a group fall short of the salaries appropriate to faculty in their disciplines or at their rank and level of seniority in their disciplines. While many salary differences reflect merit judgments and do not raise questions of equity, disparities for broad groups of faculty are unlikely to be explained in this way. Individual inequities are defined as those of individual faculty or small groups of similarly-situated faculty whose salaries, when discipline, rank, seniority, and cumulative merit are taken into account, fall short of what is appropriate for individuals so situated.

2. These disparities may reflect merit evaluation of departmental performance over time, mitigating or eliminating the implication that inequities exist. Therefore, any such claim should be considered during salary review, and the salary of each faculty member should be reviewed individually.

3. These disparities may reflect merit over time; however, merit judgements may be subject to question if bias exists. Therefore, careful, comparative scrutiny is required in such cases.

4. Since funds for salary increases based on merit have been minimal for the last four years, the time period appropriate for evaluating meritorious performance should be determined on an individual basis by the budget officer of the respective academic units.
31 March 1994

TO: John Dreifort
Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Gerald Loper
Acting Dean, Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

SUBJECT: Faculty Associate Rank

Enclosed with this memo is a proposal for a new faculty rank which could lead to continuing appointments, but not to tenure. The ad hoc committee that drew up the proposal, consisting of Barbara Bowman, Jim Clark, Lawrence Davis, Steve Gladhart, Elmer Hoyer, Nancy Kraemer, Diane Roberts and me, recommends that the new rank be titled Faculty Associate. It became clear at an early stage of our discussions that there is a real difference in the needs of the College of Health Professions and Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for teaching assistance of the kind that can be granted continuing appointments. In CHP, 20 to 30 unclassified professionals serve as full-time teachers in clinical or laboratory settings. Concern was expressed by some members of the committee that these unclassified professionals, and others on campus who have full-time teaching assignments, would wish to become faculty associates because of the faculty status associated with the rank. It was thought that the Faculty Senate is not likely to approve a document that will result in so many people transferring to this rank. In LAS, the goal is to replace lecturers with instructors and faculty associates, with the number of people being hired into this latter rank probably being small over the next few years.

The committee realizes that in limiting the faculty associate rank to those who teach basic skills and introductory courses, the problems of CHP are not solved. We understand, however, that some flexibility exists within the new tenure and promotion guidelines for career advancement for the clinical instructors in that college. The committee recommends that the Faculty Senate accept this new rank, and grant the faculty status associated with it. Representatives of the committee will be pleased to meet with you to discuss the faculty associate rank at greater length should you wish.
Wichita State University recognizes the need for qualified, dedicated teachers to provide instruction of consistently high quality in the basic skills and introductory courses where student demand is great. Regular ranked faculty are not sufficient in number to cover all the sections that must be offered, so the university has relied upon temporary and adjunct faculty to meet this need. Some of the temporary faculty employed, particularly those at the instructor rank, prove to be caring and competent teachers of the kind that the university would wish to continue to appoint, but must terminate after six years of service or grant them tenure. In addition, some of these teachers are permanent residents of Wichita or the metropolitan area who have developed a loyalty to the university and would be satisfied to continue their employment at WSU. For these reasons, WSU proposes a new faculty rank, to be called faculty associate, which, as long as satisfactory academic performance and professional behavior is maintained, will lead to continuing appointments, but not to tenure. The nature of this rank, and the conditions for holding it, are described below.

Faculty associate assignments are academic appointments in which the primary duties are full-time teaching (12-15 hours per semester) of basic skills and introductory courses or a combination of teaching at this level and teaching-related activities such as advising, program coordination, service, or supervision of practica equivalent to a full-time load. Research and publication are not expectations for this assignment. Persons holding faculty associate rank have the same status as regular faculty, as defined in Article I, Section 1, paragraph (a) of Appendix B of the *Faculty Handbook*. Appointments to faculty associate rank do not lead to tenure.

Persons holding these appointments will have a standing identified as provisional or regular. Persons newly appointed to a faculty associate assignment will enter in provisional status and shall normally serve for three years in this status. Those who present prior service may be granted up to two years of credit toward the provisional appointment period. After satisfactory completion of three years of provisional employment, persons in the faculty associate service shall achieve regular status.

Persons in faculty associate rank will undergo an annual evaluation which will include a faculty review. Each college will develop its own procedure for the faculty review portion of the annual evaluation. Satisfactory evaluations normally will lead to continuing appointments, but tenure is neither granted nor implied by reappointment. Provisional appointments may be terminated at the end of a contract period without cause. After two years of provisional service, non-disciplinary termination shall require at least three months
notice prior to the end of the current appointment period. Regular appointments may be terminated at the end of any contract term for reasons of unsatisfactory performance or misconduct, providing that one month of notice is given. Terminations of appointments within a contract period must follow the same procedure as that for probationary faculty. Non-disciplinary termination of faculty associate appointments with regular status may also be made for reasons of program elimination or reorganization, with the provision of one year of notice. Faculty associate personnel shall have the right to appeal terminations through the faculty grievance procedure.
1 April 1994

TO: John Dreifort
   Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Gerald Loper
   Acting Dean, Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

SUBJECT: Faculty Associate Rank

Enclosed with this memo is a proposal for a new faculty rank which could lead to continuing appointments, but not to tenure. The ad hoc committee that drew up the proposal, consisting of Barbara Bowman, Jim Clark, Lawrence Davis, Steve Gladhart, Elmer Hoyer, Nancy Kraemer, Diane Roberts and me, recommends that the new rank be titled Faculty Associate. It became clear at an early stage of our discussions that we were addressing two very different issues: 1) that of part-time lecturers, adjuncts and temporary faculty, and 2) that of unclassified professionals with full-time teaching duties.

Regarding the first issue, it is the goal of LAS to replace lecturers, adjuncts, and some temporary faculty with instructors and faculty associates to provide a cadre of persons who will more fully meet our instructional needs for basic skills and introductory courses and who can be retained indefinitely contingent on need and satisfactory performance. Using these criteria, we believe that the number of persons hired into the faculty associate rank will be relatively small over the next few years, and we also believe that this new category will be acceptable to the Faculty Senate on this basis.

The second issue, that of unclassified professionals who teach, is more complicated. University-wide, approximately 40 - 50 persons currently hold unclassified professional positions with full-time teaching responsibilities, with a concentration of those persons in the College of Health Professions. CHP wishes to retain those persons as teachers and wants to provide some form of career advancement opportunities for them. Faculty representatives on the committee expressed doubt that the Faculty Senate would accept the faculty associate rank if the teaching unclassified professional personnel were subsumed into it. Unclassified Professional Senate representatives were concerned that including unclassified professionals as faculty associates with no guarantee of representation by the Faculty Senate would penalize these persons, would provide no career advancement opportunity, and would create the perception of these persons as "second class" faculty, thereby worsening rather than bettering their status as university employees.
The committee realizes that in limiting the faculty associate rank to those who teach basic skills and introductory courses, the problems concerning retention and career development for teaching unclassified professionals are not solved. We recognize that these are important issues, but we felt that these concerns could not be resolved in the short time available to the committee to develop its report. Therefore, after considerable deliberation, the committee makes the following recommendations:

1. The faculty associate rank should be created as described in the attached document for persons teaching basic skills and introductory courses. The committee also recommends that the Faculty Senate accept this new rank and the faculty status proposed for it.

2. For the present, unclassified professionals with teaching responsibilities should remain within the unclassified professional category, and new appointments should be made to this category as necessary to meet instructional needs.

3. Colleges should explore the new tenure and promotion guidelines to determine if sufficient flexibility exists within those guidelines to provide viable career advancement opportunities for teaching unclassified professionals. If this proves to be the case and if the incumbents agree, those positions could be converted at some point in the future to regular tenure-track faculty positions.

4. If it is determined that the tenure and promotion policy does not provide real options for these positions, the university should resume its study of an alternative career development path for persons in these roles.

Representatives of the committee will be pleased to meet with you to discuss the faculty associate rank at greater length should you wish.
Minutes of the meeting of Monday, April 11, 1994

MEMBERS PRESENT: Allen, Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Brady, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Chambers, Chopra, Daugherty, G. Davis, DeSilva, Dreifort, Duell, Flentje, Furtwengler, Greywall, Gythiel, Hanrahan, Hawley, Houts, Hoyer, Hughes, Hundley, Koppenhaver, Kraft, Kuchment, Lancaster, Lansing, Mandt, Matson, Merriman, Murphey, Parkhurst, Paske, Shanahan, Sharp, Wahlbeck, Williamson, Yeager, Zandler

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ciboski, Clark, Combs, L. Davis, Hay, Horn, Kelly, May, Pitetti, Romig, Terrell, Teshome, Thomson

GUESTS: Dr. Bobby Patton, Brunner, Eaglesfield

Summary of Action Taken:

Referred Committee report on Faculty Associate Rank back to the committee.

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER at 3:33pm by Vice President Dwight Murphey.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS

President Hughes reminded the Senate of the Shocker Pride picnic Tuesday and announced that there would also be a reception for faculty to greet the next VPAA Bobby Patton from 2:00-3:00 on Tuesday.

Dr. Bobby Patton briefly spoke to the Senate. He used three "C's" to frame his remarks. He sees "Challenge" as a road to growth at the university; "Community" as a double concept, including the community of Wichita in which our efforts will expand and the development of a greater sense of community at WSU itself, as we develop better relationships among faculty and students here; and open "Communication" as the key to building trust and remaining agreeable with each other even when we disagree.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

None.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

None.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Planning and Budget Committee - draft plan for allocation
of Partnership for Excellence funds.

Senator Mandt presented the report for Senator Flentje. Senator Mandt said he had talked to Vice President Fred Suderman in order to find out what the state legislature was considering regarding Regents system funding. The basic package that passed both houses, which now awaits Governor Finney's action, is for $30 million (half from tuition, half from the state's general fund). There would be increases of 2.5% for salaries, 2% for OOE, some support for buildings and program enhancements and a $5.4 million sum given to the Board of Regents to be distributed to campuses at their discretion. Most think the large proportion would go to faculty salaries, which would then total a 3% to 3.5% increase for the year. No one knows what the governor will do, especially since the legislature didn't pass the plan for Washburn University to enter the Regents system. She might accept only part of this package. The Partnership for Excellence probably won't pass this year. The tuition increase designed to raise faculty salaries didn't pass. Senator Mandt asked whether the Senate wanted to even consider the committee's report under these circumstances. Senator Paske moved to table the matter. There was a unanimous vote in favor of the motion.

B. "Faculty Associates Rank" draft - first reading

The report was presented by Senator Hoyer. The discussion centered on the draft of a proposal to create a Faculty Associate rank that was attached to the Senate meeting notice as well as a letter sent by Dean Loper that is more detailed. Senator Hoyer explained that there were two issues addressed by the committee: unclassified professionals who are full time teaching faculty, and those instructors who teach basic skills, but are limited to six years of work at WSU. The committee's recommendations refer to those in the second group.

Senator Hoyer read the four recommendations from the committee and invited discussion. Senator Merriman asked how AAUP feels about this idea. Senator Hoyer had looked it up in the AAUP Red Book and found that it has not taken a completely negative stand against hiring people in non-tenure track positions, but AAUP says that with indiscriminate use, the practice did no one any favors. The AAUP recognized that there are cases where this could be applied but they must be very "limited." The Committee proposal insists that the new rank not be applied in general. Senator Mandt disagreed with how the Red Book was being interpreted by the Committee. He thinks AAUP means "limited" as a temporary employment and not limited in number. Senator Mandt asked how to keep this from becoming a lower tiered faculty. Senator Hoyer said he doesn't have the answer to keeping this from proliferating. Senator Hawley said the description reads like the unclassified professional document. She asked why we are establishing a separate policy for one college only, for lower level course teaching and not upper division, etc. She explained that Nursing doesn't want these people tenured since that designation carries with it scholarship and peer review and indicates that they have
research responsibilities. Senator Hoyer said the Committee hoped each college’s guidelines would take care of the specific desires and needs of that college. Senator Lancaster asked how the status of these people after three years is any different from tenure. Senator Hoyer said this rank doesn’t carry an expectation of tenure after six years. The difference is these positions can be terminated with one year’s notice. Senator Merriman asked whether the Faculty Associate could be terminated with one year’s notice if another person with better credentials came around. Senator Paske spoke against the proposal on the grounds of the continuing exploitation of these people. They can’t have full faculty status without tenure. He pointed out we were misunderstanding what tenure is -- academic freedom. He asked why they shouldn’t have such academic freedom with some job security. A high percentage of people in these positions are women and minorities, and he feels we cannot keep exploiting them. Senator Williamson mentioned that the general faculty is unwilling to accept a tenured position that does not carry research as an expectation associated with the position. He also felt we are not solving the problem by eliminating one position and creating another, that the real problem is the notion of "tenure". Senator Duell asked if people in this category would never have any chance for promotion. Senator Hoyer said they would never have that opportunity in this status, but they could apply for other open positions. Senator Duell also asked if the committee envisioned salaries below those of assistant professors and if that would still be true even if they were in the position for 20 years. Senator Hoyer said he himself prefers tenuring lower levels of teachers instead of following this proposal. Senator Daugherty said the proposal would take a step in correcting a real problem. In English the best teachers of basic skills are these kinds of people. She would support tenuring instructors as teaching faculty, but it’s hard to sell when enrollments are down, etc. Taking an idealist position here means we’ll lose more people. Senator Merriman said we should be more flexible about what good university teachers are, so we could include these people. She is against the new category so as not to create a "peon" category. Senator Lancaster requested a clarification of "introductory course." Senator Hoyer said it’s not defined by the Committee yet. Senator Lancaster asked if the Faculty Associates would be eligible for membership on the CAPC to decide on upper level courses? Senator Hoyer said each college would decide in their election processes. President Hughes said that NAU has such a category developed by the Regents, used especially in Math and English. They were "lecturers" with a renewable contract year by year, who teach 12-15 hours. KSU has "instructor-tenure" and "instructor-nontenure" categories in place now. The key is to find a category for faculty who want to devote most of their time to the classroom. He further defined introductory courses as usually the first required course for a discipline’s major. Faculty Associates would be paid better than they are now working at local community colleges. He also said that the state wants to convert
many Unclassified Professionals to Classified employees. President Hughes would like to keep good faculty at WSU. Senator Koppenhaver said unclassified professionals who teach should be considered for this new status. The Regents use the term "faculty" when they talk about budget, and we don't need to leave them out. He also agreed with Senator Paske and said to Senator Lancaster that the CAPC is elected by each unit, so election would take care of his question. Senator Paske said he agrees with the President on the problem, but not on the solution. Situations with two or three tiered faculty are a problem nationally, and we should not copy other universities but lead the way. He said that people we judge to be capable of teaching at the university level should be guaranteed academic freedom and job security. Senator Williamson sympathizes with Senator Paske, but the Committee faces a problem like we had last year when we wouldn't tenure instructors or adjuncts. He feels we shouldn't create another category because we will have a competing faculty system that could threaten tenure. Senator Lancaster said he's worried that there's a perception that faculty who do research aren't as good at teaching. Senator Mandt said people who do great teaching should be tenured, returning to the original intent of AAUP of tenuring for teachers. If they teach a permanent part of our curriculum and do it well, they should be eligible for tenure. All who teach need tenure's protection. Senator Hoyer reminded the Senate that tenure protects from capricious acts, but doesn't give complete protection. Senator Paske said the administration side of dismissal for cause is often slow to action. IVPAA Dreifort said we have a need to teach these courses by competent individuals and we can't afford to take forever making these policies. The intent is to improve the life of these people, not to make it worse. Senator Cavarozzi agreed with Senator Lancaster that perhaps there is a perception of a "teaching faculty" and all the others. She felt that this is wrong, all professors are teachers. Senator Hawley said our mission requires some form of scholarly activity for continuing faculty. Senator Kraft agrees that the problem is with the faculty. Until we look at how the tenure process is conducted, nothing will change. Senator Paske agrees that all should be involved in scholarship, but that isn't just in publications, but rather in keeping intellectually active in one's own field.

Senator Carroll suggested we look at the document as it is, incorporate the teaching unclassified professionals into this rank and then within two years have the people in this rank help write a tenure procedure document to include all teaching faculty. Senator Hoyer suggested we remand this document to a Senate group to revise the wording and incorporate the other concerns of the Senate, then revisit the Senate in a few weeks. IVPAA Dreifort asked if the current committee could do this. President Hughes said he appreciates the dialogue here and if we approve such a category for a limited time, he suggests giving it enough time so that the process can work -- maybe six years. At NAU, it came from the Regents because the faculty couldn't agree. He supports our longer term debate but with a temporary solution agreed upon for
the time being.

Senator Hoyer moved the appointment of an ad hoc committee by the Senate Executive Committee to work on this problem. The motion was seconded. The committee would have two weeks from the time of their appointment to bring suggestions back. IVPAA Dreifort encouraged us to hurry so we can appoint these faculty this fall. Senator Hawley wanted the committee to include the clinical faculty as well as those teaching basic skills. The vote to approve was unanimous.

C. Vice President Murphey announced that Jay Decker can't serve as a senator and asked the fine arts senators to meet to choose another person.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Gayle Davis, Secretary