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WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 126 CH 3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, April 24, 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

A. Annual Reports (salmon attachments)
   1. Academic Appeals Committee
   2. Faculty Affairs Committee
   3. Library Committee
   4. Tenure and Promotion Committee
   5. University Curriculum Committee

VI. Old Business

A. Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Faculty Evaluation
   William Terrell, chair
   (report attached 3/37/95 agenda)

VII. New Business

A. Sexual Harassment Policy - Update from A. J. Mandt (blue attachment)

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
APRIL 10, 1995

TO: JOYCE CAVAROZZI, PRESIDENT FACULTY SENATE

FROM C. ROBERT BORRESEN, CHAIR COURT OF ACADEMIC APPEALS

SUBJECT: ANNUAL REPORT

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

FACULTY
- RICHARD ARMSTONG
- PREM N. BAJAJ
- C. ROBERT BORRESEN, CHAIR
- MOHAMMAD DADASHZADEL
- BERT SMITH
- BERIL VAN BOER
- CANDACE WELLS

STUDENTS
- LARRY EASLY
- JULIE HORN - ALTERNATIVE
- ANGELA MEADOWS
- JACK NIBLACK
- ERIC NORDBERG

THE COMMITTEE MEETS AS NEEDED: THIS ACADEMIC YEAR WE MEET TWICE TO HEAR A TOTAL OF SIX CASES. WE WILL MEET ONE OR TWO MORE TIMES TO HEAR AN ADDITIONAL THREE CASES.

THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS READ THE STUDENTS WRITTEN REQUEST AND THE INSTRUCTOR'S RESPONSE TO THE STUDENTS REQUEST. AT THE HEARING EACH SIDE IS GIVE A BRIEF PERIOD OF TIME TO SUMMARIZE THEIR POSITIONS; THE COMMITTEE ASKS QUESTIONS; AND, AFTER THE PARTIES ARE DISMISSED, DISCUSSES THE CASE AND VOTES. WRITTEN NOTICE IS SENT TO THE PARTIES BY THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE. MOST OF THE CASES ARE REQUESTS FROM STUDENTS FOR A CHANGE OF GRADE IN SOME SPECIFIED COURSE. ONLY ONE CASE, SO FAR, AS RESULTED IN A CHANGE OF GRADE. THE CHANGE OF GRADE NOTICE IS SENT BY THE CHAIR TO THE APPROPRIATE OFFICE.

THERE ARE NO PENDING ISSUES OTHER THAN THE LAST SET OF HEARINGS.

WHILE THE COMMITTEE AS NOT DISCUSSED ANY RECOMMENDATIONS, THERE IS A GENERAL FEELING THAT THE CURRENT PROCEDURE IS SATISFACTORY.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

C. ROBERT BORRESEN, CHAIR COURT OF ACADEMIC APPEALS
To: Joyce Cavarozzi  
Bobbi Dreiling  

From: Fred Kraft  

Re: Senate Faculty Affairs Committee  

April 12, 1995

1. The members of the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee are the following:

   Anneke Allen  
   Deborah Baxter  
   David Farnsworth  
   Raymond Hull  
   Diane Huntley (secretary)  
   Fred Kraft (chair)  
   Kathy Payne

2. The committee met for the first time on March 14, 1995. Diane Huntley was elected secretary and Fred Kraft elected chair.

3. Only one item came before the committee, the task of revising the current "Tenure and Promotion Review, Faculty Personnel Record." The committee's charge was to make the document better reflect the "individuality and diversity of the faculty and their disciplines." The committee suggested several changes in the document and these are reflected in the attachment to this memo.

4. No other issues have been brought to the committee.

5. The recommendations for changes to the document are attached.
To: Faculty Senate  
From: Roger A. Berger, Chair, Library Committee  

1. List of Committee Members

A. Voting Members

Dharam Chopra (LAS Math/NS)  
Sharon Iorio (LAS Soc Sci)  
Benaham Bahr (Engineering)  
Roger Berger, Chair (LAS English)  
Susan Kovar (Physical Education)  
Katherine Murdock (Music)  
Jimmy Skaggs (Business)  
Janice Riordan (Health Professions)  
Gary Greenburg (Graduate Council Rep)  
Santi Johar (SGA Undergraduate Rep)  
Venkat Yanumula (SGA Graduate Rep)

B. Ex-Officio Members

Jasper Schad (Dean)  
James Eller (Associate Dean)  
Kathy Downes (Administrative Services)  
Jean Eaglesfield (Collection Management)  
Rebecca Schreiner (Reference)

2. Meetings

Meetings were held on the following dates:

Sept. 20, 1994  
Sept. 28, 1994  
Oct. 26, 1995  
Dec. 5, 1994  
Mar. 1, 1995  
Mar. 15, 1995  
May 3, 1995 (scheduled)

3. Description of Committee Activities

The Committee's discussions were dominated by the ongoing crisis in library funding and the resultant need to drastically cut back on journal acquisitions. To address these issues, the Committee discussed three basic aspects of the problem: first, the reasons behind the funding crisis (e.g., the history of library funding, the current levels of funding, the increases in journal prices); second, the impact of journal cuts on academic programs and scholarship; and third, the kinds of solutions (other than journal cuts) available to the library. The Committee also considered the impact of new University facilities and services (such as the Westside and Downtown centers) on the library and its budget, as well as the possibilities and problems presented by the new electronic information technology that will increasingly become an essential part of the library.
The Committee also took some action regarding the imminent journal cuts. First, in the Fall, the Committee directed the Library Dean and the Committee Chair to meet with the Senate Executive Committee and then to address the Faculty Senate. A large portion of a Senate meeting in October, 1994, was devoted to the crisis in library funding. Second, in the Spring, the Committee was asked to recommend a course of action concerning various plans for journal cuts. Instead of recommending any specific strategy, however, the Committee discussed, passed and forwarded the following resolution:

Whereas the Faculty Senate Library Committee has investigated and researched the threats to academic integrity because of insufficient library funding, we therefore oppose any additional journal cuts and urge the University Administration and the Library Administration to work together to find a permanent solution to library funding problems.

This resolution was sent to President Eugene R. Hughes, Vice President Bobby R. Patton, and Faculty Senate President Joyce Cavarozzi.

The Committee also discussed the ongoing problems of the Committee itself, namely, the difficulty of finding a time when every committee member could attend. The sheer size of the Committee makes it difficult, perhaps almost impossible, to identify such a meeting time. The Committee decided to encourage members to send substitutes when they were unable to attend meetings.

4. Pending Issues

Clearly, the future of the library is a pending issue. This future involves not only what kind of library will exist on campus but also what role the library will play in the Wichita State University community. With all of the current funding problems, the Committee will need to pose some difficult questions to itself and to the library: will the library be an electronic warehouse, a repository of paper-bound texts, a site of learning and reading, a combination of all these things, or something else? In addition, this Committee will have to continue to wrestle with the problems of inadequate library funding and the increased presence (and uncertain future costs) of electronic information retrieval technology.

5. Recommendations

All major constituencies of the University--the Administration, the Faculty Senate, the Faculty and the students--are going to have to address the issue of the library's future. We would suggest that the Faculty Senate play an important part in this discussion and that the Senate include a discussion of the library as part of its ongoing business.
April 15, 1995

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: University Tenure and Promotion Committee
SUBJECT: Annual Review of Tenure and Promotion Cases

The 1994-1995 academic year was the first year in which tenure and promotion cases were considered according to the newly adopted university guidelines. In general, there were no difficulties adapting to new procedures. The one exception was that several college committees neglected to incorporate written explanations of their decisions in case files as now required. However, they had prepared such explanations in writing, so that no information was lacking in subsequent consideration of cases.

As previously reported to the Senate, the committee found that until or unless colleges prepare detailed tenure and promotion guidelines, the general statement of criteria for tenure and for promotion to associate professor are too nearly identical for the committee to be able to distinguish between them as intended in the new guidelines.

At its organizational meeting in the fall, the committee elected Professor Mandt chair, and Professor Pitetti secretary. We discussed with Vice President Patton the appropriate role that he should play during deliberations, committee members urging that he should restrict himself to providing information as requested, and seeking clarifications from us as he felt it necessary to do so. Vice President Patton was entirely agreeable to this conception of his role, agreeing that he should not seek to influence faculty recommendations that he would subsequently have to accept or reject. The Vice President fully honored this conception of his role during our deliberations.

After individually reviewing files, the committee met for three days in January to deliberate and make its recommendations. The results are summarized in the attached tables. In the large majority of cases, the committee simply confirmed that departmental and college reviews had followed university and college guidelines, and arrived at reasonable conclusions. The committee gave special scrutiny to cases where there had been split recommendations or substantial minority votes at previous levels of review (this included the single case appealed to us). We had fairly lengthy discussions on the following issues: the relation between criteria for tenure and for promotion to associate professor; how to interpret research credentials for candidates engaged in what for most faculty are unusual kinds of work; whether strong research by itself is sufficient to justify promotion.

In our decisions, the committee reaffirmed that faculty should not be penalized for pursuing lines of research, scholarship, or creative activity that are not "typical" for their field. However, candidates with such credentials clearly need to take special care to provide evidence to assist review committees in properly evaluating their work. External review is particularly helpful in these cases. We also concluded that the provision
calling for a record of "sustained, effective teaching" from candidates for full professor should be strictly interpreted, regardless of the candidate's research achievement. On this basis we reversed department and college recommendations in one case. (At the conclusion of our debate on this issue, Vice President Patton—in his single substantive expression relating to any cases under review—signalled his agreement with the principle we had acted on. Our recommendation in this case was subsequently upheld by the President.)

The new guidelines require that the committee inform candidates being turned down for tenure or promotion of the reasons for doing so. We concluded that this explanation should be detailed and substantive to provide the candidate with a clear basis for appeal. Vice President Patton concurred that this was required in the interests of fairness. In the two cases where college recommendations were reversed, candidates received a detailed explanation of our action. The committee chair proposed to the vice president that we ought to inform all candidates of their status at the end of committee deliberations. He agreed that this would be an appropriate courtesy, consistent with the emphasis in the new guidelines on keeping candidates informed of the status of their cases. All successful candidates therefore received a note from the chair indicating that the recommendation of their college committee had been upheld by the university committee, and that now only the President's decision in the case was pending.

Unlike in recent years, this year's committee had the benefit of an active non-voting student member. He participated fully and effectively in our deliberations. At the end of our sessions, he stated that as the student representative he was pleased with the way in which his views had been taken into account, and particularly with the careful way that teaching effectiveness had been evaluated and weighed in decisions throughout the review process.

submitted by:

(Voting Members)

Gary Greenberg (At-large)
Michael James (Education)
Ward Jewell (Engineering)
Michael Kelly (Library)
Fred Kraft (Business)
Jay Mandt (At-large), Chair
Sal Mazzullo (Liberal Arts)
Ken Pitetti (Health Professions), Secretary
Francis Shelly (Fine Arts)

Non-Voting Members

Bobby Patton, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Bryan Pruitt, student
Michael Tilford, Dean of the Graduate School
### Candidates for Promotion to Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Cases Considered</th>
<th>Approved by Dept.</th>
<th>Disapproved by Dept.</th>
<th>Approved by Chair</th>
<th>Disapproved by Chair</th>
<th>Appealed to College</th>
<th>Approved by College</th>
<th>Disapproved by College</th>
<th>Approved by Dean</th>
<th>Disapproved by Dean</th>
<th>Appealed to Univ.</th>
<th>Approved by Univ.</th>
<th>Disapproved by Univ.</th>
<th>Favorably Recomm. by Pres.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Candidates for Promotion to Associate Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Cases Considered</th>
<th>Approved by Dept.</th>
<th>Disapproved by Dept.</th>
<th>Approved by Chair</th>
<th>Disapproved by Chair</th>
<th>Appealed to College</th>
<th>Approved by College</th>
<th>Disapproved by College</th>
<th>Approved by Dean</th>
<th>Disapproved by Dean</th>
<th>Appealed to Univ.</th>
<th>Approved by Univ.</th>
<th>Disapproved by Univ.</th>
<th>Favorably Recomm. by Pres.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Candidates for Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Cases Considered</th>
<th>Approved by Dept.</th>
<th>Disapproved by Dept.</th>
<th>Approved by Chair</th>
<th>Disapproved by Chair</th>
<th>Appealed to College</th>
<th>Approved by College</th>
<th>Disapproved by College</th>
<th>Approved by Dean</th>
<th>Disapproved by Dean</th>
<th>Appealed to Univ.</th>
<th>Approved by Univ.</th>
<th>Disapproved by Univ.</th>
<th>Favorably Recomm. by Pres.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No candidates from the Library faculty were reviewed this year in any category.
University Curriculum Committee  
Report to Senate  
Spring 1995

Members include Steve Brady, LAS Math/NS; Jeri Carroll (Chair 1/94-1/95), Education; Jharna Chaudhuri, Engineering; Diana Cochran, Health Professions; Jaunette Eaglesfield, Academic Services; David Ericson, LAS Social Sciences; Walter Mays, Fine Arts; Dwight Murphey (Chair 1/95-present), Business; Diane Quantic, LAS Humanities; Peter Zoller (ex officio, non voting), Academic Affairs.

The University Curriculum Committee met monthly during the 1994-1995 academic year to act on 4 major issues. Those issues and resolutions are listed below:

1. Request for change in prerequisites for CHEM 111Q (10/21/94)

When the University Curriculum Committee reviewed the change in prerequisites for CHEM 111Q, two new pieces of evidence emerged in the discussion of the proposed changes.

1. The change in prerequisites proposed could possibly delay 60 students in the Health Professions by as much as a year in their sequence of courses. Presently those students are taking Chemistry 111Q concurrently with Math 111. The college representative reports that the college is not seeing problems with this concurrent enrollment.

2. The Math Department has made a change in the prerequisites for Math 111. They will now require 2 units of high school math (instead of the present 1.5) or Math 011 and Math 012 (instead of Math 011) before Math 111.

Because of the potential delay for the Health Professions students and the change in the Math Department prerequisites with which the Chemistry Department might not have been familiar, the University Curriculum Committee decided to support the Chemistry Department in their request for changes in prerequisites 5 for, 1 against, but asks that the chair contact the Chemistry Department and ask that they consider a possible alternative as follows:

Two units of high school math or Math 011 and Math 012 and concurrent enrollment in Math 111.

2. Residency requirement for second bachelor's degree (10/21/94)

The resolution/recommendation presented by the Council of Deans and referred to the University Curriculum Committee for approval passed unanimously:

1. A student with a bachelor's degree from another university is required to satisfy the requirements of the department and the college as well as take a minimum of 30 hours at WSU in order to receive a bachelor's degree from WSU.

2. A student with a bachelor's degree from WSU is required to satisfy the requirements of the department and the college in order to receive a bachelor's degree from WSU.
3. AAS In Mechanical Engineering Technology
Murphey moved and Quantic seconded endorsing AAS in Mechanical Engineering Technology for presentation to the Board of Regents for approval. After lengthy discussion of the number and types of course offerings, financial obligations, monitoring of students in current AAS programs, university support, and quality control, the committee voted 4 in favor and 3 against supporting this proposal.

Committee members support the administration's attempt to provide service and support to the community with the implementation of this second AAS degree. This degree program, as others in at WSU, needs support from this institution in terms of course offerings, student monitoring, and follow-up surveys to determine the effectiveness of the program. Concerns about the proposal centered around the need for and use of university funds for additional programs off campus for specific and limited populations in times when monies are tight. In addition, there were questions of whether or not WSU had any control over the quality of the program beyond their 12 hours of coursework. Because there has been no additional support to Continuing Education for the first AAS degree approved 2 years ago, there has been no follow-up survey of students and faculty to determine the program's effectiveness.

4. University Curriculum Change Form
The committee began its examination of the university curriculum change process after questions from LAS concerning the form and the process were forwarded to the Vice President's office. Dr. Zoller referred the concern to our committee and we undertook the charge.

The committee discussed the form and process now in use. We met with other concerned groups (all college curriculum committee chairs, Dean Tilford, Diane Barnes, Ron Matson [General Education]). After discussion, the committee examined the process for clarity and drafted a flow chart and new form which was discussed at the April 14, 1995 meeting. The new form should be ready for Senate discussion by early fall.
April 18, 1995

TO: Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Jay Mandt

SUBJECT: Meeting with B. Bowman and D. Nance on Ted Ayers’ suggested revisions of Sexual Harassment policy

(1) Most of Ayers’ changes were grammatical or wording changes that made no substantive difference.

(2) Somewhat more important, although not apparently substantive, changes include the following:
   (a) Under "Responsibilities, #7," add an additional sentence, revising Ted’s revision as follows: "When unsupported allegations are deemed a form of harassment, the matter will be addressed under this policy. In other cases, the matter will be addressed under other University procedures."
   (b) Under Definitions, Ted proposes an additional paragraph following the present first paragraph. His suggestion reminds people that the University cannot protect them from rude, upsetting, or uncivil speech, and then addresses the scope of the "hostile environment" issue. The three of us found the conclusion of this sentence vague, and propose to revise the revision so that it refers to conduct which is "severe and pervasive enough in its effect on their education or work." Ted had simply "severe and pervasive enough to "alter" their work or educational environment. The operative language in this section follows this passage in the specific definition.
   (c) Ted asked what we mean in the Procedures section, D-4. What if a complainant or accused ask for legal counsel for their hearing? As we three understood the intent, it is to prohibit representation by counsel in this sort of internal University hearing (on the grounds that strict legal process is neither necessary nor desirable in such matters, and we are not proposing here to duplicate judicial process, but to provide for a full and fair inquiry by responsible persons who are not legal specialists). So, a sentence "Parties may not be represented by legal counsel in these proceedings." should be added to make the point entirely clear.

(3) A matter we simply could not resolve is Ted’s questioning of the "just cause" standard for when the VP or President could reverse a panel’s findings. Ted wondered whether we might not want to employ the "compelling reasons" standard, which is already in the Grievance Procedure, which this policy partly incorporates. My response, which Don seconded, was that we need a definitive statement from Ted of what these alternative "threshold" concepts mean, legally (and what additional concepts there might be). Barbara said she would ask for Ted’s interpretations of what these standards really amount to so that we could determine which one is reasonable here.
(4) The final item has to do with section D-2, concerning the relation between Dismissal for Cause proceedings and others. Presently, our text provides for a preliminary consideration by the administration as to whether or not they wish to seek Dismissal, leading either to a dismissal hearing, or to a finding (under the dismissal procedure) by an informal faculty appointed committee that they have not shown sufficient cause to warrant such proceedings. In that event, the case would come back to the proposed harassment procedure. Ted seemed simply unclear about the flow chart. Barbara said that based on her conversations with him, the real issue is a worry that this could all take too long. Courts have ruled that complainants have a right to speedy disposition of their complaints. What we came up with was this proposal:

2. All complaints of sexual harassment will be initially reviewed according to the procedures in this policy. In some cases, however, a formal hearing panel may recommend, or the administration may determine, that a faculty member found guilty of sexual harassment should be dismissed for cause due to the nature of his/her offense. In that case, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will refer the case to the Dismissal for Cause procedure. The issue in those proceedings shall be whether the offense of which the faculty member has been found guilty warrants dismissal, or whether a lesser sanction is appropriate. The dismissal proceedings may consider alleged mitigating circumstances, but shall not retry the question of guilt. If the dismissal case is rejected, the original hearing panel in the harassment case will, if necessary, recommend a lesser sanction, and the disposition of the case will proceed as provided for in this policy.

The practical effect of this proposal is that it would never be the case that the dismissal for cause procedure becomes the initial place for determining whether or not someone has sexually harassed someone else. I think there is a protection for the accused in this, in that the same panel that considered the facts of the case would not, in light of that unpleasantness, also decide the penalty. It is probably better that grave penalties be determined in a more impartial context. It also removes any confusion that might arise concerning whether some harassment cases are considered under "tighter" procedural rules than others. If cases involving particularly grave accusations went first to the dismissal procedure, an informal faculty panel would make the initial finding in the case. Without benefit of any prior review of whether the alleged offenses happened, or constituted harassment, they would have to determine whether they were severe enough to merit dismissal. Presumably, if they found that this was not so, and the case was sent back as a harassment case, no subsequent finding of the severity of the offense could lead to dismissal, since that question would already have been decided. In a matter like this, where penalties can range from reprimand to dismissal, it makes little sense to determine first what degree of penalty will be appropriate, and then determine whether, and of precisely what, the accused is guilty.

I recommend taking this last question to the floor for Senate consideration, and asking the Senate's permission otherwise for the Executive Committee to use its discretion in agreeing to essentially editorial changes in the draft document.
Minutes of the Meeting, April 24, 1995.
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GUESTS: J. Schad, L. Murphy

SUMMARY OF ACTION:
1. Accepted Annual Reports from:
   - Court of Academic Appeals
   - Faculty Affairs
   - Library
   - Tenure and Promotion
   - University Curriculum
2. Accepted Section A - B of Ad Hoc Comm. on Faculty Evaluation recommendations

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

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS:
   Senator Hundley asked for clarification concerning the total amount of the Capital Campaign and when the final decisions would be made. VP Patton explained that the amount discussed at the April 17, 1995 meeting was for Academic Affairs only and that other factors would be included before the final campaign amount would be reached. Senator Hundley invited VP Patton to come back to the Senate next year and report on the Capital Campaign.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: VP Patton corrected his statement in the April 17, 1995 minutes to read "He responded that he hoped to have at least half of the $96 million..." Minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. PRESIDENT’S REPORT: President Cavarozzi reported that Wichita State University’s Project Toward Mission report was well received by the Board of Regents.
   The Senate thanked Senator Allen for her many years of service to the Senate and wished her well on her retirement.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:
   Senator Campbell moved to receive reports. Seconded by Senator Byrum.
Senator Mandt reported for the Tenure and Promotion Committee that some substantial questions have come forward during this year's committee deliberations including the affirmation of the importance of the role of teaching in tenure and promotion decisions. He also drew the Senate's attention to the effective role played by the student member of the committee. He did correct two errors in the table titled "Candidates for Tenure" by adding the number "3" to the columns labeled "Approved by University" and "Favorably Recommended by President" under the College of Health Professions.

Senator Duell mentioned that the reports from Faculty Affairs and the Library Committee mentioned recommendations, but that none were attached. President Cavarozzi explained that the Faculty Affairs' recommendations will be brought forward during the next Senate meeting and the recommendation from the Library Committee will be added to the agenda of the Executive Committee for next year.

Senator Campbell moved to receive the reports from Academic Appeals, Tenure and Promotion and University Curriculum. Seconded by Senator Lancaster. Motion approved.

Senator Matson moved to receive the reports from Faculty Affairs and Library committees with their recommendations. Seconded by Senator Lancaster. Motion approved.

VI: OLD BUSINESS:

Senator Mandt moved to adopt the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Faculty Evaluations. Seconded by Senator Erickson. President Cavarozzi then opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Hawley asked if these recommendations were intended to be options or recommendations, and suggested changing "should" to "shall." Senator Terrell agreed. Senator Mandt moved to strike the last sentence in A.2. Seconded by Senator Hawley. Motion approved.

Senator Duell expressed concern that the Faculty Activity Record does not ask for the same information as the Tenure and Promotion document. She urged the Senate Executive Committee to find out who is responsible for developing the Faculty Activity Record form and to suggest that both documents contain the same information.

Senator Mandt offered a friendly amendment to Section B.3. to strike the words "at least three faculty (staggered terms)." Friendly amendment accepted.

President Cavarozzi offered alternative wording for Section C.2. to read: "Chairs are encouraged to meet with individual faculty prior to evaluation in the interest of gathering information that may not be covered by form request."

Several Senators expressed concern about Section C.1. where pay recommendations of the entire department are shared with each individual faculty member. Several Senators felt that this would violate the confidentiality of personnel files. Senators Terrell and Horn explained that this would allow a basis for appeal before the recommendations were finalized. Senator Erickson remarked that, with an appeal system, either you have no appeal or records
are not confidential. Senator Duell suggested that each department should be allowed to decide if it wants to disclose individual merit increases or use a range from highest to lowest.

Senator Terrell moved to amend the motion to divide the questions into Sections A-E. Seconded by Senator Mandt. Approved.

Senator Terrell moved the previous questions on Section A as amended. Section A approved.

Senator Terrell moved the previous question on Section B as amended. Section B approved.

Senator Byrum recommended that the Senators talk to their colleges about the issues brought up in the discussion of Section C.1.

Senator Terrell moved to adjourn. Seconded by Senator Erickson.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Kelly
Secretary