



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1994-1995

Volume VIII

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of January 23, 1995

11-24-94
Pres. Hughes was
unable to attend -
See minutes for actual
agenda items

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 126 CH

3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, January 23, 1995
Order of Business:

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
- II. Informal Statements and Proposals
- III. Approval of Minutes
- IV. President's Report
- V. Committee Reports
- VI. Old Business
- VII. New Business
 - A. Report on the Budget - President Eugene Hughes
- VIII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Joyce Cavarozzi, President	3451	Box 53
James Clark, Past President	3220	Box 78
Donna Hawley, Vice President	3610	Box 41
Michael Kelly, Secretary	3590	Box 68
Jolynne Campbell, President-Elect	3146	Box 43
Ron Matson, Elected by Senate	3280	Box 25
Keith Williamson, Elected by Senate	3185	Box 31
Sue Bair, Appt'd by Senate Pres.	3340	Box 16



WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Philosophy

December 12, 1994

TO: Vice Presidents and Deans
Faculty, Classified, Unclassified Professional, and Student Senates

FROM: Jay Mandt, Chair, Strategic Planning Task Force

SUBJECT: Task Force Report and Recommendations

Please find attached the Task Force report entitled "Planning at WSU." Vice President Patton has endorsed our recommendations and asked that we present them to the campus community for discussion. If there is broad agreement supporting our recommendations, the Vice President would like to implement them in the spring semester.

The Task Force was charged to review planning processes at WSU and make recommendations to improve them. We approached our task by examining various initiatives undertaken in the past decade to determine the factors that influenced our relative success or failure in identifying issues, problems, and mandates, designing and developing programs, facilities, and other initiatives to respond to them, and implementing the plans developed. We also considered some of the standard models for "strategic planning."

Our studies persuaded us that WSU's present circumstances and institutional history point towards a loose and flexible approach to planning, rather than towards the kind of highly formalized planning process often associated with the idea of "strategic planning." What we need to do better is anticipate problems and opportunities, disseminate important information, coordinate activities, and mobilize campus energies to deal with the issues we face. We do not think that a formal planning structure will improve our ability to do these things. That kind of structure simply is not a substitute for leadership from either central administration or many others on campus. The last thing we need is what we have had too often in the past--committee reports that "belong" to no one but their hard-working authors.

We recommend creation of a planning council charged with anticipating issues and coordinating university response to them. Specific planning tasks should be assigned by the council to working groups with the appropriate expertise and responsibility. It will not be the council's job to do "planning," but to assure that it gets done with optimum focus and coordination. The planning council might begin work, for example, by coordinating the university's accreditation self-study next year.

At this time, we would ask for your endorsement of the approach to university planning that we have outlined. If our proposals meet with general agreement, the Vice President intends to implement them quickly. Members of the Task Force will be available to discuss our recommendations. Please call on us if you have questions.

Task Force Members

David Alexander (Physics)
Orpha Duell (ACES)
Marla Mack (Center for Urban Studies)
Jay Mandt (Philosophy) (Chair)
Victor Markovich (Music)
Linda Matson (Cooperative Education)
Marlise McCammon (Director, Employee Relations)
Shelley Molz (Graduate Student, MALS)

Planning at WSU

December 7, 1994

Numerous planning activities have occurred at WSU in recent years. In many cases these efforts have been *ad hoc* efforts designed to respond to a particular issue or mandate. In other cases they have been much broader in scope (for example, the state-wide program review effort at all regents' institutions undertaken in 1992). Examples of the outcomes of these efforts include (in no particular order):

- the development of programmatically integrated academic units (Hugo Wall School, Elliott School, School of Performing Arts)
- college reorganizations (Education, Health Professions, Fine Arts)
- creation, revision, or deletion of doctoral, specialist, and master's programs
- expansion of physical facilities
- opening of downtown and westside centers
- reforms in university governance through the creation of several senates
- development of the National Institute for Aviation Research
- program improvements in all colleges
- development of cooperative arrangements with neighboring institutions

In all of the above cases, despite various difficulties, the university identified an objective and accomplished it with visible and concrete results. Each case involved, in various degrees, initiative and leadership from the administration, faculty and staff; cooperation between various units and constituencies; clear definition of the objective and the means to accomplish it; responsiveness to external constituencies, perceived educational needs, or imposed mandates; and channelling appropriate kinds of resources to support the effort.

In some cases, initiative and responsibility for change was relatively localized within the university; in other cases the objective required an all-campus response. No single model fits all cases. The scope and extent of these changes is probably greater than most members of the campus community appreciate. The degree of change within the university belies public perceptions that we are unresponsive to needs and incapable of change. An important part of building support for effective planning is the promotion of accurate public perceptions of the university's goals, its efforts to achieve them, and its successes in doing so.

As a result of these efforts there now exists on campus frustration concerning the time required for planning efforts in recent years and anxiety over the possible negative outcomes for individual units toward additional planning activities. Nevertheless, it is imperative that we remain adaptable to the changing needs of our community and to emerging opportunities available to us. Rather than add another broad planning program into this environment, we propose to establish a university planning council to identify potential areas where planning efforts should be focused. We conclude that a strategic planning process is not appropriate for us at the present time.

We propose that a university planning council be established to "keep its finger on the pulse" of educational issues and opportunities in our environment. It should consist both of individuals who

are broadly representative of the various campus constituencies and those who have broad responsibility for setting the future course of the institution. A possible membership roster for the council might be:

- University Planning Facilitator (chair)
- VP for Academic Affairs
- VP for Research and Governmental and Industrial Relations
- Associate to the President
- Associate VP for Enrollment Services
- a representative of the academic affairs management group
- four faculty, two unclassified professionals, two classified staff persons, and two students (the president of the senate for each group plus representatives selected by their respective senates)

The University Planning Facilitator should be a university staff member assigned half-time (for a three-year term) to serve as the coordinator for the council. This person will provide staff work and technical assistance to the council and its working groups. The council should be authorized to add members who have special knowledge or expertise as it explores specific issues or ideas. Administrative staff (e.g., Director of Facilities Planning, Director of Budgets) should be consulted as their expertise is needed.

The primary role of the council will be to identify those issues to which the university should respond and to form an appropriate group within the university to formulate that response. Only in rare cases would the council itself develop a response to a single issue. This two tiered planning structure is designed to give the university a forward-looking focus, to allow for rapid responses to specific issues, and to avoid "status quo-ism" and protectionism which may be present when planning occurs within existing administrative structures of the institution. Proposals for new activities or programs which emerge from this process will still be made through existing university decision making procedures, with final authority ultimately vested in the President or Board of Regents. The role of the council will be to gather and analyze information and to coordinate the university's response to changes in our mission and environment.

The planning council will:

- identify the mandates, environmental factors, issues, opportunities, and threats which the university should consider in response to its mission
- establish individual working groups to develop specific responses to issues identified by the council
- monitor the implementation of plans developed by the working groups
- periodically review our sense of institutional focus and working to establish broad acceptance both on and off campus

One of the first projects which should be undertaken by the university planning council will be to coordinate the development of the university's response to the upcoming North Central accreditation review. The self-study reports prepared for accreditation visits provide excellent opportunities for

reflection. We propose that one part of this effort should be to sharpen the focus on campus (and in the community) of what sort of institution we hope to become over the next few years. While there has been much discussion and debate over these issues in recent years, broad consensus has not yet developed among all campus constituencies. Recent changes in top administrative positions further cloud perceptions of who we are and what we hope to become. Broad involvement in the development and discussion of the self study report will provide the opportunity to resolve these issues.

FACULTY SENATE

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, January 23, 1995

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Boneh, Brown, Burk, Byrum, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Celestin, Chambers, Chaudhuri, Christensen, Ciboski, Clark, Combs, DeSilva, Eaglesfield, Erickson, Foster, Gupta, Gythiel, Hanrahan, Hawley, Hitchcock, Horn, Houts, Hoyer, Hundley, Kelly, Kraft, Lancaster, Lansing, Mandt, Matson, Parkhurst, Paske, Patton, Saalman, Schommer, Sharp, Swan, Terrell, Wahlbeck, Williamson, Yeager, Zandler

MEMBERS ABSENT: Allen, Badgett, Campbell, L.Davis, Duell, Fowler, Sutterlin

GUESTS: L.Murphy, A. Sethi, J. Dreifort, B. Bowman

I. CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by President Cavarozzi at 3:30 p.m.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS:

President Cavarozzi informed the Senate that President Hughes was called away from campus and could not address the Senate. She reported that President Hughes still plans to address the Senate when another time can be arranged.

Senator Eaglesfield made available a report on the library journal cuts. She requested that interested faculty contact her for a copy.

Senator Mandt reminded the Senate that the state AAUP chapter will be hosting "Higher Education Day on Capitol Hill" on February 6, from 9:30 a.m. until 1:30 p.m. Senator Mandt urged Senate members to attend.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of November 28, 1994 were approved as distributed.

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT:

President Cavarozzi reported on the January, 1995, Board of Regents' meeting. She shared with the Senate questions about the change to a two-week pay period which becomes effective in January, 1996. Questions included: how will benefits and taxes will be spread over the pay period; what will be the impact on the Employees' Association; and how much will this change cost and who will pay for it?

Senator Hoyer asked how grants for summer contracts will be handled. President Cavarozzi responded that these are the kind of questions that need to be answered. She reminded the Senate that the change to a two-week pay period is not a discussion topic, it has already been enacted by the state administrative office.

Senator Wahlbeck expressed two concerns about the change: (1) that the faculty will be paying more income tax during 1995, and hoped that the December 29, 1995, paycheck could be moved to January 1, 1996: and (2) that during ten months a year, individuals will receive only two checks which means an 8% pay cut.

President Cavarozzi responded that the amount of salary will be the same as before. She added that we are all concerned about this change.

Senator Erickson asked if the motive for this change was to allow the State to make more money by hanging onto state employees' money so they can collect more interest. President Cavarozzi responded that she has been given no real reason for the change.

President Cavarozzi encouraged anyone with other questions to please send them to the Faculty Senate Office.

President Cavarozzi thanked Senators Clark and Hawley and Associate Vice President Peter Zoller for their work on the new faculty handbook.

President Cavarozzi reminded the Senate of the caucus on Monday, January 30th, to discuss tenure and promotion issues.

President Cavarozzi reported on the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents' meeting with Ted Ayers and John Welsh during the January Regents' meeting. She reported that during the February Board of Regents' meeting the issue of faculty evaluations will be revisited. Of particular concern to the Council is the belief held by some Regents that a satisfaction survey should be part of the faculty evaluation process. The Council is strongly opposed to the linking of any satisfaction survey to the faculty evaluation process.

Senators Hundley, Swan and Erickson expressed their concerns about the value of such a satisfaction survey. Senator Erickson suggested that the Regents should survey potential employers to see if they are getting workers with the skills they need.

President Cavarozzi presented a budget report from the Regents' staff indicating that the universities fared well in the Governor's budget request with base salary increases of 3.5% for both classified and unclassified employees, a 1% cost of living increase and the approval of phase-two enhancements for libraries. She reported that no one is sure how the budget request will do in the legislature.

Senate Mandt reported on a meeting he participated in with legislators from both the House and Senate where the leadership indicated that the budget would have a good chance of passing in the Senate, but no one could predict the outcome in the House.

President Cavarozzi announced that faculty work load will be next on the Regent's agenda.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

From the Rules Committee, Senator Hoyer placed in nomination, as Senator from Mechanical Engineering, George Talia to replace Mahesh Greywall. Approved.

Manoj Gupta was nominated to replace Nancy Bereman on the Faculty Support Committee for the remainder of the year.

Approved.

Senator Carroll asked the Rules Committee to confirm a substitution for the General Education Committee.

Senator Houts mentioned that the Honors Committee is also missing one member.

VI. NEW BUSINESS:

President Hughes could not attend this meeting to discuss the budget situation. President Cavarozzi requested questions from the Senate for President Hughes.

Senator Byrum asked if the budget situation is a single-year or multiple-year problem. Vice President Patton responded that, as the university continues to get things in order, we should not have any surprises. Senator Swan asked if the shortfall is not found for this fiscal year, would it be taken out of the next fiscal year? V.P. Patton responded that the university will find the funds this year.

Senator Erickson asked why V.P. Roger Lowe wants to pay off the Liberal Arts' debt in one year instead of three years.

Senator Mandt asked for a definition of a college debt and how this overspending was allowed to happen.

Senator Lancaster asked about the cost of the Off-Campus Centers, including the cost of equipment and furniture. He also asked about the issue of unallocated salaries and why the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is now getting less.

Senator Paske expressed that there is some confusion as to what the issue is exactly, if it is not a financial crisis, then what is it? V.P. Patton responded that the university needs to return 2.8% of the budget for shrinkage; however, the university spent approximately 99% of the budget, so we are required to find funds to cover our obligations until the end of the fiscal year. This was the first year we have had this problem. Senator Paske asked what was the dollar amount. V.P. Patton responded that it is about \$2.8 million. Senator Byrum questioned if "shrinkage" allows Legislature to report more dollars spent on higher education than they actually spend.

Senator Lancaster commented that the faculty appears to be bearing the brunt of the budget problem and asked how the WSU shrinkage compares with other Regents' universities. V.P. Patton explained that getting the WSU shrinkage requirement reduced was the top budget enhancement requested; however, it was not approved. President Cavarozzi reported that WSU has the highest shrinkage of all the Regents' universities.

Senator Mandt summarized, from the discussions, that commitments were made that were not in the budget and the decision as to where the funds would come from was not made. He went on to say that some problems with financial management was evident. He urged that, in the future, reporting and accounting be made more accountable.

Senator Hawley moved to adjourn. Seconded by Senator Erickson.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Kelly, Secretary