



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1995-1996

Volume IX

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of April 22, 1996

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 107 CH

3:30 p.m.

NOTE ROOM CHANGE FOR SPRING SEMESTER

Meeting Notice: Monday, April 22, 1996

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. New University Curriculum Change form
(pink attachment)- Curriculum Comm.
 - B. Chronic Low Performance statement
(green attachment)
 - C. University Evaluation Guidelines
(attached to 4-8-96 agenda)
- VII. New Business
 - A. Student Academic Integrity Policy - Dwight Murphey, University Curriculum Comm.
(attached to 4-8-96 agenda)
- VIII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Jolynne Campbell, President	3146	Box 43
Joyce Cavarozzi, Past President	3541	Box 153
Helen Hundley, Vice President	3150	Box 45
Jean Eaglesfield, Secretary	3591	Box 68
Donna Hawley, President-Elect	3610	Box 41
ELECTED BY SENATE		
Keith Williamson	3185	Box 31
Sue Bair	3340	Box 16
APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT		
Walter Horn	3410	Box 44

Wichita State University University Curriculum Change Form

Department and Course Number and Title

Check all actions applicable to the proposed course change.
Use a separate form for each course.

Type(s) of Change(s)

Routing Determination

1. New Course
2. Experimental Course seeking course status
3. Change in course number
4. Change in course title
5. Change in no. of credit hours
6. Change in prerequisites
7. Change in course description
8. Deletion of course
9. Change in requirements for major or minor
10. Other (describe)

11. This change affects students and/or programs in other colleges.
12. This course is cross-listed. (Requires Change Form from both departments.)
13. This is a general education course.
14. This course is numbered 500 or above.

15. Course replaces an existing course. If so, which course does it replace? _____
16. Semester changes are effective: Semester _____ Year _____
17. At what point do you want the old course off the books (if applicable)? Semester _____ Year _____

Please complete the following:

18. (a) Describe and (b) justify the change and its place in the department's overall curriculum plan.

19. What was the total enrollment figure for this class for the each of the last three times it was offered? What percentage of the students in each semester were majors in your department?

	Sem	Yr	Sem	Yr	Sem	Yr
Enrollment Numbers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Percentage of Departmental Majors	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

20. (a) Does this course replace, resemble, overlap, or substitute for courses in other departments and/or colleges? (b) What is the effect of this action on other departments and/or colleges and their students? (You are responsible for consulting with departments whose programs may be affected by your action. Attach letters of support from affected departments/colleges).

21. Aside from reassignment of current faculty and changes in current course rotation, what additional resources and personnel are required? (You are responsible for consulting with the dean of the library, director of media resources, and director of computing when additional library holdings, electronic/telecommunications, and computer resources are required. Attach letters from each affected division.)

Wichita State University
Course Outline

22. Department and Course Number _____

23. Course Title _____

24. Credit Hours _____

25. Catalog Description with Prerequisites to appear in the WSU Catalog.

26. Content Coverage and/or Major Topics

Please submit a copy of the course syllabus for each course change or new course.
All items above must be completed for each course change or new course.

**Wichita State University
University Curriculum Change Form
Routing Sheet**

A. _____ Date Initiated by Faculty

B. _____
Dept.- Course No. - Name of Course

Date	Signature	Approval	Level
C. _____	_____	disapproved* approved	Department Curriculum Committee (if no committee exists, faculty member signs)
D. _____	_____	disapproved* approved	Department Chair
E. _____	_____	disapproved* approved	College Curriculum Committee
F. _____	_____	disapproved* approved	College Dean
G. _____	_____		College Dean sends a copy to SGA Academics Committee for comment.
H. _____	_____	disapproved* approved	General Education Committee (for all General Education courses)
I. _____	_____	disapproved* approved	Graduate Council (for select graduate courses)
J. _____	_____	disapproved* approved	Graduate Dean (for all graduate courses sent to Graduate Council)
K. _____	_____	disapproved* approved	University Curriculum Committee (for all courses affecting students and/or programs in one or more colleges.)
L. _____	_____	disapproved* approved	Academic Vice President

M. Copies of signed original (curriculum change form, course outline, and routing sheet) sent by Academic Vice President to

Department Chair

Dean

N. Signed originals are sent by Academic Vice President to Assistant Registrar.

reviews
records

Assistant Registrar

O. Copies of signed originals (curriculum change form, course outline, and routing sheet) for all courses are sent by the Assistant Registrar to University Publications.

P. Copies of signed originals (curriculum change form, course outline, and routing sheet) for all courses are sent by the Assistant Registrar to University Publications and for all new and deleted courses to the library, Head of Collections Management.

*Q. _____ *All changes that are not approved are to be returned to the department chair and faculty with comment and with notification to the appropriate college dean(s).

R. Comments:

Wichita State University University Curriculum Change

The university curriculum change process reflects the University's traditional commitment to two concepts: (1) that the curriculum is a primary concern of the faculty from which changes are to be initiated; and (2) that department and college curriculum committees play an essential role, along with the various levels of academic administration, in curriculum development, approval, and implementation.

All changes for university courses listed in the WSU Undergraduate Catalog and WSU Graduate Bulletin must be submitted on the University Curriculum Change Form. The process typically originates with department faculty and proceeds through the college. Where college policy requires, additional steps may be added to the process. In cases where programs from more than one college are affected, the proposals will be sent to the University Curriculum Committee before approval in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. When appropriate other governing committees such as the General Education Committee or Graduate School will review proposed changes before routing the request for change to the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Faculty are required to note the effect of change on students and/or programs in other departments and/or colleges on the University Curriculum Change Form (20). In order to facilitate the discussion between departments and/or colleges, agendas for each College Curriculum Committee meeting will be forwarded to the deans of all colleges and to the Head of Collections Management of the library. Electronic posting is encouraged.

Cross Listed Changes

All courses which are cross listed must proceed through both departments and/or colleges before proceeding.

Steps in the Change Process

1. Perceive need for change.
2. Determine level and type of change(s).
3. Seek information required on form.
4. Fill out University Curriculum Change Form.
5. Department faculty and/or Department Curriculum Committee discuss, review, and if approved, forward to the Department Chair. The change then proceeds through the College Curriculum Committee, the College Dean, (the SGA for comment to the Vice President of Academic Affairs only), the General Education Committee (General Education Courses only), the Graduate Dean and/or Graduate School (for courses numbered 500 and above), the University Curriculum Committee (for courses affecting students and/or programs in more than one college), or goes directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

If, at any point, the change is not approved, the form will be returned to the Department Chair and faculty with comments.

If the Vice President finds that the curriculum change form has been inappropriately routed, the Vice President will forward the form to the appropriate place.

If the Vice President does not approve the change(s), the materials may be returned to any previous program or committee with notification to the appropriate faculty and college dean(s).

If the Vice President approves, the original is forwarded to Assistant Registrar to record and save. Copies are sent to the College Dean as notification and the Department Chair for implementation.

6. The Assistant Registrar deletes or records the course, files the original, and sends signed copies to University Communications for printing and Ablah Library, Head of Collections.

REVISIONS SUGGESTED - Deans' Council - 4/2/96

Chronic Low Performance

Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his/her professional duties as defined in the respective unit shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing university policies. Each department or unit shall develop a set of guidelines describing the acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty as well as procedures to handle such cases, subject to the approval of the appropriate dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. ~~It is expected that departmental faculty will have input into any decisions on individual cases, if requested by the faculty member.~~ When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the acceptable level, as indicated by the annual merit evaluation, the department or unit chair shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department chair will also indicate in writing a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. ***This action plan will be developed in consultation with the affected faculty member and it will follow departmental guidelines described above.*** It is expected that departmental faculty will have input into any decisions on individual cases, if approved or requested by the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members who fail to meet standards *in* the year following the department chair's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five year period in which standards are not met, ***despite all corrective efforts***, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean. **This policy does not change any right of appeal under normal university policies. -A faculty member may appeal under standard university procedures-**

(Additions in this revision are bold, italicized and underlined.)

**FACULTY SENATE
Wichita State University**

Minutes of the Meeting of April 22, 1996

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alagic, Badgett, Bair, Baxter, Benson, Berry-Bravo, Brooks, Burk, Byrum, Campbell, Carroll, Celestin, Chambers, Coats, DeSilva, Detjens, Deyoe, Dreifort, Eaglesfield, Erickson, Hawley, Hitchcock, Horn, Hoyer, Hundley, Kraft, Kukral, Lescoe-Long, Matson, Murphey, Paske, Patton, Riordan, Schommer, Sharp, Sutterlin, Swan, Terrell, Wahlbeck, Wang, Williamson, Yeager

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bajaj, Cavarozzi, Chaudhuri, Christensen, Fowler, Gythiel, Hamdeh, Houts, Leavitt, Leland, Mandt, Nagati, Parkhurst, Saalman, Talia

GUESTS: AVPAA Davis, AVPAA Zoller, Wilson Baldrige, L. Murphey

SUMMARY OF ACTION:

- 1. Adopted new university curriculum change form.**
- 2. Appointed Elmer Hoyer Chair of the Task Force investigating faculty salary reduction caused by bi-weekly pay implementation.**

I. CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER: President Campbell called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS:

President Campbell announced that Regents Nolan and Havner would be visiting WSU on April 23 and would meet with any interested faculty in the Board Room of Morrison Hall 1-2pm.

She also noted that there would be a General Faculty Meeting April 29, 3:30 in Hubbard Hall and the next senate meetings would be May 6 and May 13.

Senator Murphey admonished the Senate to note current problems of the student government. He was concerned particularly about the spending of money and about the low number of voters participating in student government elections. He suggested that there be a taskforce of some kind to investigate such problems and recommend solutions. Senator Benson added that the student control of the Supreme Court of the University seemed questionable.

President Campbell reported that the Senate Executive committee had appointed Elmer Hoyer to chair a Task Force to investigate the matter of faculty pay during the summer that had been brought before the Senate at the April 8 meeting.

Senator Hawley noted that statistics for her college for Spring, 1996, that had been prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and reported to the Board of Regents contained many inaccuracies. She encouraged Senators from other colleges to investigate these statistics. Senator Paske requested the Senate Executive Committee to obtain copies of the report and to investigate if there are inaccuracies in the data.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Senator Hoyer moved, Senator Murphey seconded the approval of the minutes of April 8. Approved as submitted.

IV. PRESIDENTS REPORT:

President Campbell reported on the Regents meeting of April 18. Ted Ayers, who is currently counsel to the Regents, will become counsel for WSU, filling a position that has been vacant for four years. She reported that the Regents approved a 3.5% increase in tuition and a \$1 per credit hour technology fee. Senator Byrum added that it was his understanding the technology fee would remain in the college that generated the credit hour.

President Campbell further reported that the Regents, because of their concerns for liability issues, appropriated \$300,000 for repairs to Cessna Stadium. Representative Helgeson requested that the legislature appropriate an additional \$500,000. The Board directed President Hughes to request bond funding for Cessna repairs as soon as possible. President Campbell reported that President Hughes noted his intention to pursue bond funding only AFTER support from the community had been secured. The Regents made the directive anyway.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Senator Byrum noted that there would be a report from the Planning and Budget Committee at a future Senate meeting and that the Committee is working on clarification of their role in the University and relationship to the University Budget Committee.

VI. OLD BUSINESS:

A. New University Curriculum Change form.

President Campbell stated that debate would be limited to 30 minutes and requested Senator Carroll lead the discussion. Senator Carroll explained the form and explanation that was attached to the agenda and pointed out the changes that had been passed at previous Senate meetings.

Senator Byrum noted that previous discussions on the course form seemed to him to focus on the issues of time, energy and efficiency of the faculty member who would originate the form, and suggested that the Senate also be mindful that another purpose of the form was to provide information for a committee's decision-making.

There followed discussion on whether or not a syllabus should be attached to the form, specifically line 26. Senator Swan suggested that line 26 be modified to read, "Attach a syllabus if appropriate." The relationship to teaching and grading was raised. Senator Carroll noted that the Curriculum Committee expected that grading and teaching were the prerogative of each faculty member and not relevant to the course form. Senator Williamson asked representatives of the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to state their concern on this issue. Wilson Baldrige, Chair of the CAPC of LAS, answered that a syllabus was deemed appropriate for major changes, and since the proposed course form no longer made the distinction between major and minor, having a syllabus attached to every course change form seemed unreasonable. Senator Carroll stated that the Committee had debated the issue of making the distinction between major and minor changes at great length and had reached the conclusion that it was a relative issue--what would be considered a minor change may indeed be viewed as a major change to somebody else.

Senator Murphey moved that "Attach a sample course syllabus if appropriate" be added to line 26 and to accept the revised form as attached to the agenda. Seconded by Senator Eaglesfield.

The motion passed.

The motion on the floor made by Senator Murphey and seconded by Senator Eaglesfield at the April 8 session was brought to a vote. The motion: To adopt the proposed course form, that it become effective August 1, 1996, that the Curriculum Committee review the form at the end of the first and second semesters of 1996/7 and report back to the Senate with changes as necessary; and that explanatory material be placed in the Faculty Handbook.

The motion passed.

B. Chronic Low Performance statement.

President Campbell introduced the discussion by summarizing that it was the sense of the Senate at the last meeting that the statement should read: "Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his/her professional duties as defined in the respective unit shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing university policies."

She stated that the question about past history had come up at the last discussion and she wanted to know if indeed any tenured faculty member had ever been so dismissed in the past. VPAA Patton stated that to his knowledge no one had been so dismissed. AVPA Zoller stated that the policy has never been seen through its conclusion, although there have been instances where informal committees had been convened. Others commented about experiences on such committees and noted that indeed no formal hearings had taken place.

Senator Murphey moved that the statement he submitted be passed. The motion was seconded by Senator Hoyer. Senator Murphey noted that faculty must state to the public that slackers would not be tolerated. On the other hand, it is in faculty's interest to defend the tenure system. There should be a definition of chronic low performance which would make it a quantum leap below the performance that was shown by the person winning of tenure.

Senator Paske spoke against having either the policy that was proposed at the last session or that was proposed by Senator Murphey. He stated that these policies were simply a reaction to the public's perception that faculty are lazy. He pointed out the danger of every faculty member becoming vulnerable to lose their job just for slipping below an average performance measure. Others agreed that this policy would be dangerous. Senator Kukral noted that there are many faculty who had achieved tenure 20 and 30 years ago and who were no longer active in research. Such people were doing more teaching and service to compensate for less research. Senator Hawley voiced distress that faculty would admit that after achieving tenure, they relax and are not able to perform in similar fashion as do pretenure faculty. Senator Murphey stated the importance of addressing both the issues of low performance and protection of the tenure system.

President Campbell reminded the Senate that this policy was being mandated by the Regents.

Senator Baxter stated that tenured faculty are valuable assets to the University. She stated that a policy on chronic low performance would be written and it would be her wish that this writing be done by faculty. She was not sure that the appropriate definition had yet been written but that Senators should not ignore the duty to craft such a policy.

The question was called. The motion passed.

The motion, to adopt the statement as written by Senator Murphey, was not passed.

Senator Terrell asked for clarification, was this policy to be applied just to faculty or to everyone who teaches. It was pointed out by Senator Byrum that it related specifically to tenured faculty and it was assumed that appropriate policies would be written for others such as unclassified professionals.

Senator Carroll moved that both Senator Murphey's and the Senate Executive Committee's statement be merged to read:

"The faculty and administration of Wichita State University place high value on the system of tenure that safeguards the freedom of inquiry and recognize that system will be imperilled if tenure is allowed to be abused, however infrequently the abuse may in fact occur, by some faculty who may perform their research, teaching and service work at a chronically low level. Each department or unit shall develop a set of guidelines describing the acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty as well as procedures to handle such cases, subject to the approval of the appropriate dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Chronic failure

of a tenured faculty member to perform his/her professional duties as defined in their respective unit shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing university policies.

The motion was seconded by Senator Swan.

Senator Baxter moved that this be discussed at a time when Senators could see this in writing. Senator Eaglesfield seconded the motion. Senator Murphey asked if this policy would leave individuals vulnerable to departmental politics. Senators Byrum and Horn voiced concern that individual units would take too long to write such policies.

President Campbell called for a vote on the Baxter motion, to consider and vote on the Carroll motion at time when it could be in writing for all Senators. The motion passed. Vote on the Carroll motion will be during the May 6, 1996, meeting.

C. University Evaluation Guidelines.

President Campbell clarified the confusion over the documents related to this issue. The peach-colored document attached to the April 8, Senate Agenda originated from the Senate office. It is the statement that was approved by the Senate in the Spring, 1995, and was transmitted to the Academic Vice President's office, also in the spring, 1995. The staff of both the President and AVP offices read and modified this document during this academic year, entering editorial changes and modifying the document for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook. The version that Senator Terrell brought to the Senate meeting of April 8 was made by Senator Terrell after the Senate vote in May, 1995. President Campbell stated that this version had not been seen by the Senate office until April 9, 1996, and it was not the version that the administration processed during this academic year. She went on to say that the Senate Executive Committee decided that, since the differences between the peach version and Senator Terrell's April 9 version were minor, the Senate would continue debate on the peach version and that Senator Terrell may add editorial changes to this version as debate continues.

She asked Senators to make note of the following problem spots that had been pointed out by the university administration and to be prepared to have a focused discussion on these at the next meeting:

C.2: The paragraph as originally written was deemed inappropriate the Faculty Handbook.

D.1. The original paragraph was crossed out because it was considered to be a university budget issue and not in the preview of the Faculty Handbook.

D.3. Deletions were made because there would not be the time for such an appeal process, if the university were to adopt a common calendar for tenure and non tenure review.

D.6 This paragraph was deemed inappropriate for a faculty handbook and was viewed as an administrative issue. President Campbell stated that the issue could be addressed by the faculty at a later time, perhaps by having an ad hoc task force study the issue and make recommendations.

E.2. Paragraphs a-k were lined out and viewed as inappropriate for the Handbook. President Campbell noted that the Senate Executive Committee thought that a task force or Senate Committee should be asked to address these issues next year.

She stated that on May 6, the Senate would discuss these items listed above and asked Senators to be prepared to vote on this policy.

She added that the Student Academic Integrity Policy would also be discussed on May 6.

Senator Swan moved that the Senate adjourn. Senator Williamson seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Jean Eaglesfield, Secretary