



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1994-1995

Volume VIII

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of May 08, 1995

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 126 CH

3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, May 8, 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
 - A. Faculty Affairs Report - Fred Kraft, Chair
 - B. Sexual Harassment Policy Update - A.J. Mandt
(distributed with 4/24/95 agenda)
- VII. New Business
 - A. Tenure and Promotion Committee Report
Jeri Carroll, Chair (green 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

**Ad Hoc Tenure and Promotion Committee
Response to Faculty Senate Charge
May, 3, 1995**

Faculty Senate charged the Ad Hoc Tenure and Promotion Committee to address problems encountered during the recent tenure and promotion hearings, concerns raised by Jay Mandt, Chair of the 1994-1995 University Tenure and Promotion Committee and Vice President Bobby Patton.

Response to University Tenure and Promotion Committee

The University Tenure and Promotion Committee's concerns centered around 3 issues: (1) the lack of authoritative and consistent distinction between the criteria for tenure and the criteria for promotion to associate professor; (2) the use of the word "normally" in University Handbook for Faculty AY 1994-1995 Revision, 3.1431/Promotion standards; and (3) the use of the word "is" in 3.1431/Promotion standards.

1. The University Tenure and Promotion Committee is correct when they suggest that these standards were never meant to be used without department and/or college guidelines and criteria. Department and college guidelines and criteria should address the unique needs of their faculty: "It is acceptable to establish differential criteria for tenure or promotion for faculty with different assignments, so long as the differential criteria and the nature of the faculty assignments are clearly identified." University Handbook for Faculty AY 1994-1995 Revision, 3.142/College Guidelines and Criteria (Chapter 3, p. 10). Because of this, faculty whose very job descriptions require them to have major loads in teaching and modified loads in scholarship may be tenured without significant service responsibilities as noted in the University Handbook for Faculty AY 1994-1995 Revision, 3.1432/Tenure (Chapter 3, p. 11). Tenure can be awarded at any level (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor). The standards as written allow the flexibility for different departments and/or colleges to connect tenure and promotion or to leave them separate.

No rewriting of the statement on the standard for tenure is necessary. The final sentence of 3.1432 is sufficiently clear. Implicit in this sentence, however, is the notion that the normal standard for tenure is the same as the standard for promotion to associate professor, with the exception of achievements in the service category. Exceptions to this should be dealt with by way of more specific guidelines and criteria established at the departmental and/or college level.

2&3. "Normally" in 3.1431/Promotion is part of the base sentence . . . "evidence . . . is normally expected." "Normally" was never intended to differentiate standards.

The Ad Hoc Tenure and Promotion Committee (1995) suggests the following revisions to University Handbook for Faculty AY 1994-1995 Revision, 3.1431/Promotion (Chapter 3, pp. 10-11) for purposes of clarity. **Additions are bold and italicized.** Omissions are ~~stricken out~~.

May 3, 1995

Assistant Professor: *Evidence is normally expected of the following:* (1) demonstrated adequacy in teaching/librarianship; (2) ~~evidence of~~ potential for achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activity; **and** (3) ~~evidence of~~ some university service appropriate to the mission of the department and college ~~is normally expected.~~

Associate Professor: *Evidence is normally expected of the following:* (1) documented ~~evidence of~~ **effectiveness of** teaching/librarianship; (2) a record of research, scholarship, or creative activities which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level; **and** (3) some professional or university service ~~is normally expected.~~

Professor: *Evidence is normally expected of the following:* (1) ~~documented evidence of~~ sustained **effectiveness in** teaching/librarianship; (2) a record of substantial accomplishment research, scholarship, or creative activities which has led to recognition in professional circles at the national level; **and** (3) demonstrated academic leadership in the form of service to the university and the profession ~~is normally expected.~~

May 3, 1995

Response to Vice President Patton

Dr. Patton's concerns centered around 4 issues: (1) the advocates and potential opponents of an individual's candidacy; (2) the distinction between the promotion to associate professor and tenure; (3) the constituency of the decision-making committees; and (4) contents of the candidate's file.

1. In its original lengthy deliberations, the Ad Hoc Committee for Tenure and Promotion spent considerable time debating whether or not the candidate's representative to the university committee should be allowed to advocate for the candidate. Because we felt that this person most often better knew not only the candidate's area of expertise, but the accomplishments of the candidate as well, we proposed no "gag" rule for the committee. However, with guidelines and criteria now being developed by the departments and/or colleges, we suggest an addition to the **3.1433/University Committee Procedures** as follows:

The college representative to the University Tenure and Promotion Committee should present, objectively, the department and/or college guidelines and criteria for tenure and promotion and explain how the candidate's document relates specifically to those guidelines and criteria. After the representative has answered specific questions during the initial discussion of the candidate, the representative should be excused for final discussion and voting. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee to state these procedures to the committee in its initial organizational meeting.

2. These standards were never meant to be used without department and/or college guidelines and criteria. Department and college guidelines and criteria should address the unique needs of their faculty: "It is acceptable to establish differential criteria for tenure or promotion for faculty with different assignments, so long as the differential criteria and the nature of the faculty assignments are clearly identified." University Handbook for Faculty AY 1994-1995 Revision, 3.142/College Guidelines and Criteria (Chapter 3, p. 10). Because of this, faculty whose very job descriptions require them to have major loads in teaching and modified loads in scholarship may be tenured without significant service responsibilities as noted in the University Handbook for Faculty AY 1994-1995 Revision, 3.1432/Tenure (Chapter 3, p. 11). Tenure can be awarded at any level (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor). The standards as written allow the flexibility for different departments and/or colleges to connect tenure and promotion or to leave them separate.

No rewriting of the statement on the standard for tenure is necessary. The final sentence of 3.1432 is sufficiently clear. Implicit in this sentence, however, is the notion that the normal standard for tenure is the same as the standard for promotion to associate professor, with the exception of achievements in the service category. Exceptions to this should be dealt with by way of more specific guidelines and criteria established at the departmental and/or college level.

3. Dr. Patton is concerned about the propriety of the present system of selection of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee allowing for associate professors to make recommendations for promotion to full professor.

May 3, 1995

Our feelings on this concern at this point in the university's history are that the substantive review of the candidate for promotion is a peer review--at the department level by those of higher rank. Each succeeding review is not one of "starting from scratch", but votes of confidence and/or affirmation of, or lack thereof, previous committee decisions. Because of this, it is imperative that each college have in place clear policies governing the lack of sufficient senior faculty in a department where a review is to take place. In addition to this policy being developed and implemented, candidates in these instances should again be reminded of their need to present the strongest case possible for their review.

4. Our response to Dr. Patton's concerns about the contents of the dossier are twofold. One, administrators presently may add any information at their level to the dossier. This includes **documented** evidence addressing any of the issues suggested (faculty members being reprimanded for research improprieties; faculty members being the subject of student protests; faculty members failing to keep office hours; or faculty members failing to attend meeting.) As with other additions to the dossier, candidates are allowed access to the information and the right to rebuttal.

Second, the contents of the files in Morrison Hall are not clearly defined. Until they are and faculty's rights to access these files are also clearly defined, this concern needs to be tabled. Presently the Academic Affairs Task Force on Records is formulating a recommendation to Vice President Patton concerning policies and procedures for these files. Once these policies and procedures are reviewed and implemented, Vice President Patton and the faculty may wish to work together to address this concern.

Jeri Carroll (Chair), Education
Randy Haydon, Business
Elmer Hoyer, Engineering
Bela Kiralyfalvi, Fine Arts
Fran Stephens, LAS

May 3, 1995

III. Research and Scholarly Activity Information

- A. Research grants
(If approved, state size, duration, and briefly describe work).
 - 1. Proposals submitted as principal investigator to external agencies
 - 2. Proposals submitted as joint effort to external agencies.
(State faculty member's role in submission)
 - 3. Proposals submitted to WSU college or university research committees
- B. Patents, major designs, etc.
- C. Presentation of scholarship (nature of activity; refereed/invited)
 - 1. Unpublished paper presentations
 - 2. Participation in outside symposia or colloquia
- D. Publication of Research and Scholarship
(Indicate extent of contribution made to jointly authored items.)
 - 1. Refereed articles in international, national, and regional journals which are refereed
 - 2. Articles in university publications and other state or locally supported and circulated journals (refereed?)
 - 3. Invited articles (compensation?)
 - 4. Articles in trade journals, magazines, professional newsletters and other publications (refereed? compensation?)
 - 5. Books published (nature of books, texts, general public, graduate state-of-the-art material, etc.)
 - 6. Monographs, Bulletins, and Chapters in books (nature of material, length, refereed, etc.)
 - 7. Publications in conference proceedings (not listed as presentations above; refereed?)
 - 8. Book reviews and Abstracts (refereed? compensation?)
 - 9. Citations of your work and reviews or abstracts of your publications or creative activity.
 - 10. Reports published by others (e.g. Federal agencies, trade associations)
 - 11. Work in progress
- E. Other research (provide documentation)

IV. Creative Activity Information

- A. Recitals and performances
(nature of activity; extra compensation? [Yes/No]; by invitation?; local, regional, national or international?; By WSU contract?)
- B. Exhibits of creative work
- C. Creative work in print (musical compositions, plays, poetry, novels, short stories and other creative writing)
- D. Exhibits personally curated, performances directed, set designs created, etc.
- E. Media developed (slides, tapes, films, etc.)
- F. Other creative activity (provide documentation)

V. Service Information

- A. Committee service (University, College, Departmental, nature and time spent on these)
- B. Special university, college, or departmental coordinator or other service functions.
- C. Service on Senate or Graduate Council
- D. Participation in student recruitment
- E. Serving as advisor to student organizations.
- F. Professional speeches and/or panel presentations not otherwise listed.
- G. Professional consultantships contributing to professional development. (in general, not routine, regularly scheduled activities.) (Nature of activity, impact of work on the field, extra compensation: Yes/ No)
- H. Editorial service for journals and other publications
- I. Service on proposal review panels for granting agencies.
- J. Service on national or regional boards with research or scholarly functions (nature of participation and of function of board, time required, etc.)
- K. Committee assignments in professional organizations (nature of work and time required)
- L. Other activities which enhance the image of the university, represent the university to the public, further the goals and direction of the university, or exercise one's professional competence for the benefit of the public.

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE HONORS COMMITTEE
May 5, 1995

To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
From: Bela Kiralyfalvi^{PK} Chair, Faculty Senate Honors Committee
Subject: Policy Goal Recommendations

On April 28, 1995, at its final regular meeting of the academic year, the Honors Committee unanimously adopted the following goals for the Emory Lindquist Honors Program:

1. Enough Honors courses will be generated, allowing students to satisfy the major part of their general education requirements through the Honors Program. The Honors Program will work with the General Education Committee and the Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee in order to attain this goal.
2. Effort will be made to increase the visibility of the Honors Program among the faculty.
3. The Honors Committee and the Honors Director will vigorously pursue active involvement of the Director with the Admissions Office for recruitment of new students to the Honors Program. Such cooperation is viewed as necessary for the development and maintenance of a quality Honors Program.
4. The Honors Committee strongly supports the development of an Honors Program Scholarship Fund.
5. The Honors Committee sees the following items as desirable components of the Honors curriculum:
 - a. capstone seminar;
 - b. research component during the senior year;
 - c. community service;
 - d. cross-cultural experience;
 - e. experiential-interactive course design;
 - f. travel/field trips.

We consider these items to be an important part of a unique and challenging Honors Program.

XC: Vice President Bobby Patton #13
M. Fast #68
S. Houts #25
J. McKenney #102
D. Murphey #88
E. Myers #102
B. Rogers #74
A. Vu #102
Incoming Director of the Honors Program

FACULTY SENATE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the 1994 - 1995 Faculty Senate
FROM: Joyce Cavarozzi, President
SUBJECT: Election of Officers

The following nominations have been submitted for election to the Senate offices. Nominees are listed by office, and those colleagues nominating them. Additional nominations may be made from the floor at the Election meeting, Monday, May 9, 1994, CH126, 3:30 P.M.

PRESIDENT-ELECT

- 15 PREM BAJAJ (nominated by Senators Bair, Boneh, Combs, DeSilva, Greywall, Gythiel, Romig, Sutterlin, Terrell, Zandler)
- 24 JOLYNNE CAMPBELL (nominated by Senators Bair, Cavarozzi, Clark, G. Davis, Horn)

VICE PRESIDENT

DONNA HAWLEY (nominated by Senators Campbell, Cavarozzi, Clark, Mandt)

SECRETARY

MICHAEL KELLY (nominated by Senators Clark, DeSilva, Terrell)

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SUE BAIR (nominated by Senators Campbell, Clark, Horn)
Appt by Pres.

RON MATSON (nominated by Senators Bair, Campbell, Clark)

KEITH WILLIAMSON (nominated by Senators Bair, Campbell, Clark)

MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE

	ANNEKE ALLEN (nominated by Senators Wahlbeck, Zandler)	23	1st	2nd
x	30 ELMER HOYER (nominated by Senators Gythiel, Mandt)	30		19
x	21 DOUGLAS SHARP (nominated by Senators Clark, Murphey)	23		21

FACULTY SENATE
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Meeting, May 8, 1995.

MEMBERS PRESENT:Allen, Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Brown, Burk, Byrum, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Celestin, Ciboski, Clark, DeSilva, Duell, Eaglesfield, Erickson, Foster, Fowler, Hanrahan, Hawley, Hitchcock, Horn, Hoyer, Kelley, Kraft, Lancaster, Mandt, Matson, Miller, Paske, Patton, Saalman, Schommer, Sharp, Swan, Terrell, Wahlbeck, Williamson, Yeager, Zandler

MEMBERS ABSENT:Badgett, Boneh, Chambers, Chaudhuri, Christensen, Combs, Gupta, Gythiel, Hay, Houts, Hundley, Lansing, Parkhurst, Sutterlin, Talia

GUESTS:L. Murphey

SUMMARY OF ACTION:

1. Heard Honors Committee report & recommendations-- accepted report, postponed action on recommendations.
2. Accepted Faculty Affairs Committee changes for the Tenure & Promotion Review Faculty Personnel Record Format.
3. Accepted Ad Hoc Tenure & Promotion committee report with modification.

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 Lancaster read the following statement:

"1. I understand that for at least one year, Dean Jacqueline Snyder has arranged for student surveys to be given in courses taught at off campus sites such as the West Side Center without the course instructor's knowledge or approval. As an example, a GTA had requested that the SPTE evaluation be given and was told that it would be administered on Wednesday, May 3, 1995. On Monday, May 1, he arrived at his classroom and was informed that student evaluations would be administered. He assumed that he had remembered incorrectly the date on which the SPTE would be administered; this evaluation during the last full week of class took one half hour of time from his lecture. On Wednesday, however, he was informed that the SPTE evaluation would be given. As a consequence, this GTA lost valuable class time at the end of the semester. Similar events involving faculty with tenure apparently also occurred; in some of these cases the faculty members refused to allow the unscheduled evaluation to occur. An investigation revealed that these evaluations were given at the insistence of Dean Snyder and this matter has been brought to the attention of the office of Academic Affairs. In any case, I hope the Faculty Senate would condemn this invasion of academic freedom. (For additional information contact Dr. Steve Brady.)

2. The Faculty Senate is intended to represent the interests of the faculty. The library is a resource used by (hopefully) all faculty and students at WSU. At a time when the library is subject to inadequate funding and severe cuts in periodical holdings, I am appalled that the Faculty Senate does nothing while the Senate's own library committee condemns these cuts and ordinary faculty members and students are forced to hold a rally to bring this problem to the attention of the public.

3. In several statements, Vice President Patton has suggested that

support for the library may depend in part on the elimination of some graduate programs. It is certainly the case that some graduate programs have been eliminated or suspended (e.g. masters in Political Science), but this was done for sound academic reasons and these programs might be subject to reinstatement if and when the academic difficulties were resolved. I am appalled by Dr. Patton's remarks. The suggestion that our graduate programs should be one of the first, rather than one of the last, areas to cut is appalling. If the cost to the library for journal subscription continues to increase at approximately \$200,000 per year and if reductions in graduate programs are expected to fund a portion of this increase, then annual eliminations of graduate programs would seem to be necessary. (Faculty members are expected to conduct research in their areas of expertise and without regard to the existence of graduate programs, the university is expected to provide adequate resources for them to do their jobs; therefore journals, equipment, etc would be required even if WSU had no graduate programs.) Any elimination of graduate programs for nonacademic reasons diminishes our university. This fact is clear even to the Wichita Eagle, hardly a friend of the faculty, which stated in a May 5, 1995 editorial "The latter idea (eliminating some graduate programs) is most unpleasant; WSU has fought hard for its graduate programs and it should try to keep them, though everything is on the table." It seems, however, that not everything is on the table. New administrators have been hired. New flowers seem to continue to spring forth around campus at the same rate as always. Money for "pet projects" seems to appear out of thin air. In fact, Dr. Patton's comments seem ominously like threats of retribution.

A committee of faculty headed by Professors Dreifort, Fridman, Leavitt, and Rillema has come up with a reasonable plan for funding the library into the future without requiring graduate programs to be cut or the university to be diminished. To the outside world, one feature which distinguishes WSU from Emporia State, etc is the broad range of graduate programs we offer. I hope the Faculty Senate would oppose a reduction in our graduate programs as a first response, rather than a last response, to budget difficulties."

Senator Benson thanked the Senate for its nomination of him for a distinguished service award.

Senator Bajaj read the following statement:

"To the best of my knowledge, this year, this body did not get any report from or on the University Traffic Policy Committee. In the meeting of February 13, 1995, it was indicated that the Senate "could request the Senate representative on the committee to make a report to the Senate." I wonder if such a request was made or not.

If not, may I request to ask the Police Chief, who Chairs the policy committee, to make a report to this body. He can, among other things, comment on the perception--created partially due of a statement by a staff member in the police office--among some students that "issuing parking tickets is a major percentage of the duties of all of WSU's police and the only duty of the three WSU police officers officially assigned to issue parking tickets." (The quote is from the Sunflower of April 5, 1995.)"

Senator Swan alerted the Senate that opportunities for minority students may lapse at the end of this semester. He went on to say that there has been no response from the administration about this issue. He stressed to the Senate how important its support is to save programs for minority students.

President Cavarozzi thanked the members of the Executive Committee for their service to the Senate. She also thanked Senator Duell for her many years of service to the Senate.

Senators Campbell and Mandt recognized President Cavarozzi for her contributions as Senate President.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Senator Campbell introduced the report and recommendations of the Faculty Honors Committee. Senator Mandt moved to postpone

a discussion on the recommendations until next fall. Seconded by Senator Bajaj. Senator Williamson suggested receiving the report now and delaying discussion of the recommendations until next fall. The Faculty Honors Committee report was received.

IV. OLD BUSINESS:

1. Faculty Affairs Committee report.

Senator Byrum moved the following changes to the Tenure and Promotion Review Format: on page 6, "4." to "E." and items "a-f" to "1-6"; on page 5, change "III.D.11" to "F" and "III.E." to "G"; and on page 6, change "V. Service Information" to "IV. Service Information."

President Cavarozzi confirmed with Senator Byrum that the title on page 5, III, would read "Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity Information." Seconded by Senator Carroll. Motion approved.

Senator Byrum moved to approve the entire document. Seconded by Senator Bair. Motion approved.

2. Sexual Harassment Policy Update.

Senator Mandt reviewed the changes proposed by Board of Regents' staff member Ted Ayers. He advised the Senate that several of the suggestions were substantial. Senator Mandt moved that the Senate Executive Committee be empowered to work on technical changes and to replace section D.2. Seconded by Senator Bair. Motion approved.

V. NEW BUSINESS:

Ad Hoc Tenure and Promotion Committee Report.

Senator Carroll presented the report. Senator Clark moved to strike the committee's suggested change concerning representation by the college representative. Seconded by Senator Eaglesfield. Motion approved.

Senator Williamson moved to accept the report as amended. Seconded by Senator Erickson. Motion approved.

VI. AS MAY ARISE:

Senator Campbell presented a resolution of support for the sentiments expressed by Dr. James J. Rhatigan in his address, "**The Threat to Alma Mater.**" Seconded by Senator Celestin. Resolution approved.

Senator Erickson moved to adjourn. Seconded by Senator Clark.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Kelly
Secretary