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FACULTY SENATE
The Wichita State University

Room 126CH 3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, December 9, 1991

Order of Business

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
II. Informal Proposals and Statements
III. President's Report
IV. Approval of Minutes
V. Old Business
   a. Continuation of Budget Committee Report
VI. New Business
   a. Report and Recommendations from Traffic Policy Committee (Blue Attachment)
VII. Special Executive Session - (Materials attached)
VIII. As May Arise.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A. J. Mandt, President 3125 Box 74
James Clark, Vice President 3220 Box 78
Joyce Cavarozzi, Secretary 3541 Box 53
Kathryn Griffith, President Elect 3165 Box 17
Albert Gosman, Elected by Senate 3402 Box 36
Robert Wherritt, Elected by Senate 3160 Box 33
Anneke Allen, Appointed by Senate President 3120 Box 51
David Alexander, Past President 3190 Box 32
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: R. Knapp, Traffic Policy Committee
DATE: December 9, 1991
SUBJECT: Activity Report and Proposals

1. Administrative activities in 1991

1.1 Traffic and parking control signage and designations

1.1.1 Library/MRC alley No Parking designation: yellow curbing
1.1.2 Fairmount-Perimeter Dr. crosswalk dual stop signs
1.1.3 Brennan Hall parking lot Faculty-Staff row

2. Proposals for Senate consideration

2.1 Hanging device for parking permits

Working policy of the WSU Police Department is that the parking permit is issued to the student or employee rather than to the specific vehicle. This liberalizes the manner of attaching or displaying the permit so that, for example, the police now recognize a permit taped inside the rear window or suspended from a suction-cup device. The key point is visibility of the permit from the rear of the vehicle.

The way is thus cleared for a hang-tag device which can be suspended from the rearview mirror or from the inside of the rear window. Committee's proposal is to adopt a hanging device large enough to accommodate the standard WSU parking permit. The employee or student has the option of hanging the permit from the inside mirror, or from a suction-cup in the rear window, or attaching it to the left rear bumper or left rear window glass (i.e., in the old way).

Two problems are anticipated: (1) Theft of the hang tags, reported to be a problem at Kansas State University and at Boeing, locally; and (2) If an employee drives a car to campus with an "O" permit and wishes to park in her/his normal "F" lot, she/he must transfer the hang tag "F" permit to the other car to avoid being ticketed. This requires the police officer to take a second look at an "O" permit found in an "F" lot to discern the temporary "F" permit, which outranks the "O" one.

In more than a year of discussions, the committee has been unable to resolve these problems.

2.2 Reserved parking

This matter has been contentious because, in part, the committee has had mixed messages from certain administrators, faculty, and staff. One message says "Reserved parking places are not considered sacred", while another makes it clear that many are "sacred". In recent years the committee has favored requests from employees whose jobs, in fact, regularly require them to leave the campus and return the same day, one or more times. We have not been favorable to requests for spaces for "clients" of the many "centers" that have evolved, beyond those spaces reserved for authentic clinical services. Such spaces, and those reserved for the handicapped, we regard as "sacred".
Committee discussions on the reserved parking issue in 1991 have emphasized three themes: (1) Centralize and "depersonalize" reserved areas so as to eliminate the patchwork quilt of widely dispersed, small groups of spaces assigned by job title. (2) Make more reserved spaces available than are now assigned, but do away with the annual "justification tournament". (3) Raise the fee for reserved parking spaces substantially. Those themes are the source of the following alternative proposals:

2.2.1 Extend reserved parking to the President, Former Presidents, the handicapped, and the clinical services for their clients. Rescind all other reserved parking designations and return the spaces to regular "F" status.

2.2.2 Retain Lot 8 (Morrison Hall) as fully reserved, but delete job title designations and eligibility except for the designations "President" and "Former President". Designate another 50 spaces as "reserved" in a more central location, such as Lot 4 (between Morrison and the stadium) or Lot 7 (CAC). These spaces and those of Lot 8 (per the foregoing) become available to the faculty, staff, and administrators on a first-come, first-served basis.

2.2.3 Retain lot 8 per item 2.2.2, and designate approximately 10 spaces as "reserved" in all parking lots which presently carry the Faculty-Staff designation (Lots 6: Ahlberg; 20: Wilner; 16: Duerksen; 10: Corbin; and 15: Heskett/LAS). This plan retains the untidy dispersal of reserved parking we now have, but it returns approximately 12 parking spaces to the students. As in paragraph 2.2.2, the job titles-eligibility links go away, and all reserved parking is on a first-come, first-served basis. The plan would increase the number of reserved spaces from the current 68 (only 43 actually assigned) to about 75. The plan also enables faculty who come to the campus at midmorning to reserve a space for themselves, so long as they come to campus early on the day spaces are "sold".

3. Follow on activities

3.1 Revisions of the WSU Traffic Regulations

Adoption of the hang-tag proposal will require revision of the language of the traffic regulations brochure, as will other evolutionary changes in the management of traffic on the campus. The committee hopes to have these revisions ready for approval by the end of the Spring semester of 1992.

4. New projects

4.1 Fines for violations

It is an old joke that parking on the sidewalk or on the grass at WSU is a bargain at $3.00. The committee feels it is time to review the fines schedule and propose some increases, particularly in the area of moving violations (two injury accidents in the Fall of 1991). These recommendations are targetted for late in the Spring semester.

4.2 Identifying parking lots

We have nearly 30 parking lots of various sizes and designations. Some can be identified in reference to adjacent buildings, but many cannot or are surrounded by several structures. Chief Rummery reports that his officers waste a lot of time looking for student motorists who need help because they cannot identify the lot they're in. The committee will be considering schemes for naming the parking lots, with recommendations made in early 1992.
The Executive Committee is calling an Executive Session of the Senate during the December 9th meeting, so that the Senate can be informed about and discuss a sensitive matter on short notice. The timing is dictated by the course of events and the fact that this will be the last scheduled Senate meeting for the semester. The matter at issue is the proposed Associate of Applied Science degree which WSU is to offer cooperatively with the Wichita Vo-Tech School. The Executive Committee brings this matter before the Senate without recommendation.

The Executive Committee learned of this proposal only when a faculty member reported that it had just received "faculty approval" at a meeting several days earlier, and wanted to know what it was all about. On Wednesday November 27th, we met with Provost Cottle for two hours to discuss the proposal.

In that discussion, we raised two kinds of concerns. First, we suggested that many faculty would have objections to such a degree program on the grounds that it is not an appropriate program for WSU. Second, we argued that the process by which it was approved for submission to the Board of Regents was grossly inadequate, and that the administration's failure to consult with the Senate concerning an appropriate approval process for such a precedent-making proposal was a violation of faculty governance rights. Although we advised the Provost on what we believed negative faculty views would be, we did not represent these criticisms as the faculty view, because, of course, there has not been general discussion of this matter.

After our meeting with the Provost, we decided to put the matter before the Senate for discussion. The issue raises a number of questions neither the Senate nor the faculty has debated extensively, and we do not want to attempt to formulate a faculty view on the issue without further guidance from the Senate. Attached are both a summary of the approval process employed and a summary of the proposal itself.
The Approval Process

1. The proposal does not correspond to any existing degree program. According to Provost Cottle, it was decided after consulting with several Deans that the program would be housed in the Division of Continuing Education. This has the effect of making Continuing Education a degree-granting entity for the first time.

2. Since Continuing Education has no faculty, some means for securing faculty approval of the proposal was required. The administration determined, without consulting the Senate, that an "associated faculty" should be constituted to play this role. The makeup of this "associated faculty" was determined by the administration. They invited representatives from each department that would offer a course in the program to participate.

3. The administration justified this plan on the grounds that it is analogous to the arrangements for the Urban Studies program, which is not housed in any degree-granting college. Although there is an Associated Faculty that serves as a curriculum committee for Urban Studies, the degree program itself was approved through regular processes within LAS.

4. The Executive Committee informed the Provost not only that the Urban Studies analogy was dubious, but that even granting it there were problems. In all other cases, faculty approval of a degree program involves both departmental approval and college or university level approval. No directly interested faculty is allowed to approve a degree program without endorsement by a larger faculty body. In this case, only representatives of the directly involved departments were consulted, and that on an ad hoc basis.

5. The so-called associated faculty did not meet until they were called together for the purpose of approving the proposal, and were not informed of the singular role they were expected to play in granting faculty approval for a new degree program. According to David Alexander, who was present, the group felt somewhat intimidated by the administration’s expression of urgency, and the Provost’s announcement that the program would be submitted to the Board, apparently regardless of their views. Additionally, the group had access to the proposal for only a couple of days before their meeting.

6. The Provost stated that he had carefully looked through the Faculty Handbook to determine which faculty body would have jurisdiction in this kind of situation. He did not respond to the repeated suggestion that he should have consulted the Senate on appropriate procedures, on the grounds that how the faculty should review and approve or disapprove a new kind of degree program is a governance question within the Senate’s jurisdiction. The Provost did not seem to think that this was a governance issue. The Provost stated several times that there were only four courses that needed approval.

7. The Executive Committee informed the Provost of faculty views several years ago regarding credit courses in University College. At that time, the faculty was very hostile to offering degree courses in a non-degree granting college,
Committee of the Whole
December 9, 1991

(a) Senator Lee asked about the history of the removal of the University Curriculum Committee, and if the current Regents document on new program review applied.

(b) Vice President Clark said the issue is how to set up a process for the future. There are processes better than the one used on this degree. Senator Alexander said the Regents policy has no call for any kind of faculty review for proposals. The appropriate procedure was followed in this case according to the Regents document. The Faculty Handbook of WSU has practically no mention of faculty review.

(c) Senator Paske asked if this program was being sent forward with a statement that the faculty has approved it. Senator Wherritt said it has been sent saying there was faculty approval.

(d) Senator Paske said this body is on record that programs must have faculty approval. If this faculty doesn't approve, then ask that faculty approval be withdrawn. Senator Erickson said if we can't speak up, we have no cause to gripe.

(e) Vice President Clark said that the Provost took the closest faculty approval process as a guide. It is the one used for Urban Affairs and he built a parallel from that. Senator Daugherty said Dr. Wineke, who attended the meetings for the proposal, said the response was highly skeptical. The Vo-Tech people wanted what corresponded to English 011 at WSU, not English 101. English 101 has a placement test to pass. There are real issues of quality control.

(f) President Mandt, who had just returned from the meeting in Topeka, said there would be a Missions (?) ask Jay) for every one to see in January. President Armstrong said they were closer to a meeting of the minds than anyone expected. Professor Billings asked if there was going to be essentially local autonomy. President Mandt said yes. The decision date is in January, not December. December is for response to the document.

Senator Rogers moved we rise and report. Seconded and Passed.
The Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of December 9, 1991

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alexander, Allen, R. Armstrong, Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Bereman, Billings, Brady, Burk, Campbell, Cavarozzi, Christensen, Clark, Daugherty, Duell, Erickson, Gosman, Griffith, Hawley, Hay, Horn, Hoyer, Hubbard, Jeffers, Kahn, Kitch, Koppenhaver, Lee, Merriman, Olivero, Parker, Paske, Perel, Rogers, Romig, Wherritt, Widener, Yeager, Zytkow

MEMBERS ABSENT: Baxter, Behrman, Bernhart, Carper, Carroll, Farnsworth, Mandt, Martin, Masud, Murdock, Muth, Parkhurst, Sethi, Sweney, Teague

GUESTS: Bowman, Brunner

I. CALLING THE MEETING TO ORDER. Meeting called to order by Vice President Clark. President Mandt is in Salina working on the System-Wide Mission Statement.

II. INFORMAL PROPOSALS AND STATEMENTS.
(a) Senator Perel commended the Sunflower staff for articles about the Mathematics question in general education.
(b) Senator Griffith, chair of the Rules Committee, said the inter-cultural person was left off the list of nominations for the General Education Committee. Please contact the Rules Committee about nominations. The committee wants general approval, and if there are any questions, please ask.
(c) Senator Romig said he appreciated the way the General Faculty meeting was held. Senator Lee thanked President Mandt for the Op Editorial in the Wichita Beacon. Senator Gosman noted there were letters from other senators and thanked them.

III. PRESIDENT'S REPORT. There was no report since President Mandt was in Salina.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES. There were no minutes to be approved.

V. OLD BUSINESS.
(a) The report of the Planning and Budget Committee was continued.
1. Vice President Clark had an addition in the dollar amount in his report. Senator Lee is working on a Guide to the Budget Handbook with Mary Herrin. The committee will meet with Provost Cottle on categories for the budget.
2. The Mill Levy Budget history is being prepared.
3. The committee met with Provost Cottle to discuss how they could be involved in budget issues. They are looking at a long term plan.
4. Senator Kitch is working on salaries of faculty and administration.
5. Senator Gosman said the bond issue is important to the faculty. The residue after bonds are paid off is to be used for "educational purposes."
6. Vice President Clark handed out per credit hour dollars chart. Inflation was figured out, and the figures are real growth. WSU has about 10% less dollars in instruction than the system, and administration spending it up.
7. Senator Lee said WSU doesn't have an overview budget that includes all budgets, so a guide is necessary. It should have 2 goals: 1. information for the faculty; 2. Where input can be given.
8. Senator Bereman said it might help to give time lines with the procedures. Senator Lee said they hoped to do a calendar in Part II and Part IV.
VI. NEW BUSINESS.
(a) Professor Knapp, Chair, Traffic Policy Committee reported.
1. The committee asked for stop signs on Fairmount, and yellow lines for MRC loading.
2. Hang tags have a theft and visibility problems. The Committee recommends a hanging device large enough to accommodate the standard WSU parking permit.
3. Reserve parking charges could be made. The number of spaces can be increased, or all of them taken away.
4. Any handicap decal is good for WSU. We need to address long term and short term handicap parking.
5. We need to revise the language of WSU Traffic Regulations if these issues are accepted.
6. There needs to be an overhaul of fine violations. Cross walk identification is needed on Yale. Lots need to be numbered on posts, and we cannot steal spaces from students.

Senator Bereman asked if there has been talk about lighting in the lots at night. The lights are not on late at nights. Senator Billings asked if the committee would look into a stop light for sorority houses instead of the street that empties into the university. Professor Knapp said that street probably won’t exist longer than five years.

Senator Wherritt asked if the committee can inquire about how fast motorized cars are allowed to run. Senator Duell said several colleagues feel as if the Faculty/Staff parking lots are not marked very clearly. Senator Bajaj asked why we can’t have hanging stickers. He pointed out that parking is a negative factor with students.

Senator Hawley asked if the committee wanted to vote on the three recommendations in the report. Professor Knapp said that advise would be helpful. Senator Wherritt commended the committee for taking their work seriously, and giving the Senate alternatives.

Senator Christensen said other campuses have parking garages. Why doesn’t WSU? Senator Lee asked that as proposals are being discussed with SGA, the parking garage be discussed. Senator Campbell said the students did raise one million dollars for a parking garage, and that money had been used to pave parking lots. Senator Hawley said the issue is that parking off campus is not safe. Senator Horn suggested getting information from faculty for paid reserve spaces.

VII. SPECIAL EXECUTIVE SESSION
Senator Bereman asked why an executive session was being called. This is not how the Senate conducts its business. Vice President Clark said it seemed appropriate so that quotes would not appear that seem to tread on the community. The issue of the A.A.S. degree is a sensitive one. The intent is to make discussion possible without pressure of quotes appearing in the press. Senator Alexander said that executive sessions can make matters worse, not better. If issues are important, let’s discuss them.

Senator Wherritt moved the Senate move into the committee of the Whole. Senator Bajaj seconded. The motion passed without dissent.

After rising from Committee of the Whole, Senator Rogers moved we take up the Applied Science degree issue as old business at a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joyce Cavarozzi, Faculty Senate Secretary