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I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
II. Informal Statements and Proposals
III. Approval of Minutes
IV. President’s Report

V. Committee Reports
   Annual Reports (green attachments)
   A. Academic Appeals
   B. Faculty Support
   C. Scholarship & Student Aid
   D. Tenure & Promotion
   E. University Curriculum
   F. University Curriculum report on Assessment of Student Achievement/Learning
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   A. Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (4/8/96 attachment)
   B. Chronic Low Performance statement (page 3-4 minutes 4/22/96)
   C. Faculty Response to State of University (gold attachment)

VII. New Business
   A. Student Academic Integrity Policy (4/8/96 attachment)

VIII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Jolynne Campbell, President
Joyce Cavarozzi, Past President
Helen Hundley, Vice President
Jean Eaglesfield, Secretary
Donna Hawley, President-Elect

ELECTED BY SENATE
   Keith Williamson
   Sue Bair

APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT
   Walter Horn
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3410 Box 44
THE ACADEMIC APPEALS COMMITTEE
Annual Report

The Academic Appeals Committee makes the final decision on cases appealed to it regarding students' requests for a change of grade, or other matters regarding academic requirements which the student can challenge.

The committee meets according to needs. The cases coming to the committee are those where the differences between the student and the instructor are not resolved either at the Chair-person's level or at the Dean's level.

Each meeting is well planned. When a case reaches the committee, chair of the committee writes a letter to the student and the instructor to give an opportunity to add more comments, if so desired, within a two week period. After the two week period or on the receipt of responses from the student and the instructor, hearing is scheduled in consultation with the student and the instructor.

After the hearing the student and the instructor are informed of the decision, generally, within a week.

Currently there are no pending cases where any action be needed.

The members of the committee are:

Faculty: Prem N. Bajaj (MATH) - chair
          Bert Smith (AE)
          Bertil H. VanBoer (MUSIC)

Students: Jack Niblack
          Larry Easley

Note: Dr. VanBoer has resigned. His replacement is to be appointed by the senate.

Respectfully submitted by

April 24, 1996.
Prem N. Bajaj

"Report"
Members of the Faculty Support Committee:
Dr. Anthony Gythiel, History (Chair)
Dr. Dharam Chopra, Mathematics
Dr. J.C. Combs, Music
Dr. Manoj Gupta, FREDS
Dr. Ruth Hitchcock, ACES
Dr. Robert Lawless, Anthropology
Dr. Michael Long, HSOP
Dr. Ravi Pendse, Electrical Engineering
Dr. Sam Yeager, HWS Urban & Public Affairs
Dr. Gerald Loper, Associate VP for Research*
Mr. Harry Williford, Research Administration*
Dr. Peter Zoller, Associate VP for Academic Affairs*

* ex-officio

The Faculty Support Committee (FSC) met 9 times between October 4, 1995, and April 17, 1996. Committee activity is summarized below. FSC members reviewed proposals for University Research/Creative Project Awards (URCAs) and Awards for Research/Creative Projects in Summer (ARCS), and forwarded their recommendations to the Vice President for Research for funding decisions. Also, the FSC evaluated sabbatical leave requests as well as nominations for the Young Faculty Scholar Award and President's Awards for Distinguished Service, and a subvention request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBMITTED</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED/AWARDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New faculty URCAs</td>
<td>7 for $28,756</td>
<td>7 for $28,756/ 7 for $28,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior faculty URCAs</td>
<td>7 for $29,700</td>
<td>7 for $29,700/ 7 for $29,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS</td>
<td>15 for $55,616</td>
<td>10 for $37,656/ 11 for $40,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21/ 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Faculty Scholar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Award</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book subvention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members recommend a revision to the Faculty Handbook section on Faculty Support Committee. In Chapter 2, page 22, the first charge should read "To review requests for institutional support of individual, departmental, and college research proposals, and forward recommendations to the Vice President for Research". This revision is consistent with the statement found in Chapter 6, page 4: "Awards are made by the Vice President for Research based on recommendations from the Faculty Support Committee..."
1. Committee members:

Thomas De Petro, Library, Chair
Pawan Kahol, Physics, Secretary
Richard Johnson, Mechanical Engineering
Sandra Houts, Sociology
Harold Popp, Music
Maureen Hoag, English, Acting Secretary
Chris Joseph, Student
Larry Rector, Financial Planning, Ex-officio

2. Meeting schedule:

Sept. 19, 1995; Oct. 3, 10, 17, 24, 1995;
Meetings are scheduled only as needed to fulfill the Charge.

3. Activities:

The Committee met in fulfillment of item number 3 of its Charge, which states in part that it "...acts as an appeals board for students whose scholarship have been terminated." The Committee heard three such cases this academic year, scheduling meetings of all parties concerned, making a recommendation to accept or reject the appeals, and notifying all parties concerned of the recommendations.

4. Pending issues:

The Committee needs to list the procedures for handling the appeals cases that were established during the academic year.

The Committee needs to review the "actions of the Financial Aids Office" per item number 1 of its Charge. This could be accomplished by reading that office's annual report and commenting on it.

The Committee may wish to involve itself in the annual Scholarship Invitational Competition administered by the Admissions Office each fall semester.

5. Recommendations:

The Senate Executive Board may wish to list guidelines for committees to use in making recommendations (not decisions!) and for dealing with the press.
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

April 23, 1996

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: A. J. Mandt, Chair, University Tenure and Promotion Committee
SUBJECT: Annual Committee Report

The committee's members this year were: Robert Alley (Education), Deborah Soles (LAS), Ward Jewell (Engineering), Francis Shelly (Fine Arts), Ken Pitetti (Health Professions), Manoj Gupta (Business), Mike Kelley (Library), Gary Greenberg (At-Large), Jay Mandt (At-Large), Bobby Patton (ex officio, non-voting), Michael Tilford (ex officio, non-voting), Paula niBride (student, non-voting). In the fall, the committee met for organizational purposes and reelected Ken Pitetti as Secretary and Jay Mandt as Chair. In early January, the committee spent most of a week reviewing cases, discussing them, and making recommendations. Final decisions were made in an Executive Session of the voting members. Two candidates appealed the committee's recommendations. Vice President Patton recommended acceptance of the committee's recommendations to President Hughes, who concurred.

Attached you will find a summary of tenure and promotion cases considered by the committee this year. Several points deserve some comment.

Role of the Vice President and President. As last year, Vice President Patton scrupulously avoided saying anything to influence the committee's deliberations. When it came time to make his own recommendations on cases that were closely decided, the Vice President deferred to faculty judgment. In making final determinations, President Hughes relied substantially on the Vice President's advice and faculty recommendations. The current University administration fully respects the faculty's traditional responsibility to determine who does and does not merit tenure and promotion.

Early Tenure and Promotion. This year, we had a number of cases for early tenure and early promotion. The committee spent a great deal of time discussing the issue and attempting to interpret the new tenure/promotion policy in this regard. The clear majority's conclusion was that candidates fully meeting expectations merited a favorable decision, rejecting the view that "early" candidates needed to have exceeded expectations. Consequently, several negative college recommendations decided on the basis of opposition to the principle of early tenure or promotion were reversed. Despite his stated concerns about this
issue, Vice President Patton concurred in these recommendations.

At the same time, two cases where highly accomplished faculty sought early decisions were denied on the grounds that in one respect or another clear and persuasive evidence was lacking. The committee held closely to the principle that candidates are responsible for making the case for a favorable decision. The absence of negative information does not in itself support a favorable decision. Candidates for early decisions needed to leave the committee in no doubt about their achievements and their significance.

Weighting Teaching and Research. The committee worked again this year on the principle that satisfactory teaching is a necessary condition for tenure or promotion. The committee took great pains to assure itself that all candidates met or exceeded the University's expectations with respect to teaching. This was also the particular concern of the committee's non-voting student member, who, like her predecessor last year, commended the committee's attention to this issue. In the absence of written position descriptions to the contrary, teaching and research received equal weighting.

With respect to research, the committee continued to differentiate expectations on the basis of disciplinary norms. This particularly applied to such issues as the relative weight assigned to traditional publication versus conference proceedings, applied versus non-applied research, multiple author publications, and quantitative expectations. The committee did not attempt to judge the value of any candidate's research or creative work, but asked instead whether adequate documentation had been offered concerning its value and significance, and whether departmental and college reviews had been consistent with the evidence offered.

Review Process. The committee expected departmental judgments to be consistent with earlier annual evaluations or specific expectations of candidates unless clear and documented reasons were offered for arriving at different conclusions. In two cases, department-level recommendations were reversed on this basis. We also had occasion to debate some cases in which department committees were predominantly made up of outside members. These committees did not receive the same deference given committees made up of faculty actually in the candidate's discipline.

The new tenure and promotion policy requires both committees and administrators at each level of review to provide written accounts of their conclusions to the next level. Compliance with this requirement remains somewhat mixed. The committee gave careful consideration to such statements, and substantially disregarded recommendations that were not supported by specific reasons and argumentation. For our part, we provided detailed explanations of our reasoning to candidates when we reversed college-level recommendations so that they could make fully informed appeals if they chose.
Consideration of A Case During Summer 1995. In accordance with the settlement of a grievance entered into by the University and a faculty member who would have been in the 1994-1995 tenure class, the available members of the committee met during the summer of 1995 to make recommendations concerning the candidate. Under the terms of the settlement, no department or college review occurred.

The committee objected to the administration's unilateral decision as to how the review process in this case should have been organized. Our view was that the faculty as a whole has rights with respect to the review of colleagues' credentials for tenure and promotion, and it is not appropriate for the administration to bargain these rights away without consultation, as was the case here.

The terms of the settlement also left the committee with a partly unsatisfactory personnel record for the candidate. Some sections of one annual review were physically cut out, without explanation. Although there were some indications of the issues that led to the candidate's grievance, the findings of the grievance panel were not included in the file, and we knew of the grievance itself only indirectly.

Our understanding was that the University, not the candidate, insisted on a level of secrecy far beyond the requirements of confidentiality and inconsistent with the needs of the review process. In part, the committee was able to act in this case only because it had independent knowledge of the facts through persons who were not party to the settlement. The committee made favorable recommendations based on the candidate's excellent credentials, and these recommendations were accepted.
### 1996 TENURE AND PROMOTION CASES
#### Summary of Actions

#### CASES FOR TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>#Cases</th>
<th>Dept. Approval</th>
<th>College Approval</th>
<th>Univ. Approval</th>
<th>Tenure Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 4 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 4 2 2 2 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 7 7 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A 4 4 3* 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Abstain

#### CASES FOR ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dept. Approval</th>
<th>College Approval</th>
<th>Univ. Approval</th>
<th>Tenure Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 3 4 4 4 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 2 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 8 8 7 7 7 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A - 1 1 1* 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Abstain

#### CASES FOR PROFESSOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dept. Approval</th>
<th>College Approval</th>
<th>Univ. Approval</th>
<th>Tenure Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2 1 2 2 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 1** 3 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 2* 3 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Abstain
The members of the committee during the 1995-6 academic year have been:

- Jharna Chauduri, Engineering
- Diana Cochran, Health Professions
- Jaunette Eaglesfield, Academic Services
- David Ericson, LAS Social Sciences
- Kirk Lancaster, LAS Math/Nat. Sci.
- Dwight Murphey, Chair, Business
- Paula niBride, Student Member
- Diane Quantic, LAS Humanities
- Marlene Schommer, Education
- Dorothy Crum, Fine Arts

Gayle Davis served ex officio, representing Administration.

The committee in its entirety met three or four times during the early fall, then broke into subcommittees until late January. Thereafter, the committee met four or five times on a weekly basis as an entire committee to finalize what the subcommittees had done. The subcommittees met frequently during the winter months.

During the spring semester of 1995, the Vice President for Academic Affairs' office asked the committee to look into revamping the university Curriculum Change Form, which had not been updated for several years. Jeri Carroll of Education, who had been chair of the committee during 1994-5, presided over the process of obtaining input from a number of people who are involved in the curriculum change process, and this resulted in a draft of a new form which was sent out to all department chairs, chairs of college curriculum committees, and some others early in the fall of 1995 for comment.

In September 1995, JoLynne Campbell, president of the Faculty Senate, referred the following items of business to the committee to handle: the continued development of the Curriculum Change Form; the Regents' request for an Academic Dishonesty document for Wichita State by the summer of 1996; and the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents' request for a review of two subjects: the assessment of student achievement, and the training in teaching of graduate teaching assistants. So that all of these could be addressed simultaneously, the committee broke into subcommittees, with the result that each issue was resolved as follows:

The new Curriculum Change Form. The subcommittee dealing with this was chaired by
Jaunette Eaglesfield and included Jharna Chaudhuri and Diana Cochran, who participated actively. Although she was no longer on the University Curriculum Committee, Jeri Carroll gave unstinting effort to this subcommittee's work throughout the winter, and presented the proposed new form in the Faculty Senate during three Senate meetings prior to its approval in the spring of 1996. Barbara Mason and Will Baldridge of the LAS CAPC also worked extensively with the subcommittee. This process, however extensive, did not produce consensus on behalf of the new form. At its April 8, 1996, meeting, the Faculty Senate approved the new form with some modifications, and provided that it would take effect in August 1996, the explanatory material would be included in the Faculty Handbook, and that the University Curriculum Committee is to review the experience with the new form at the end of both its first and second semesters of use.

The Academic Integrity document. The subcommittee dealing with this was chaired by Kirk Lancaster and included the active participation of David Ericson and Paula niBride. It has produced a proposed Academic Integrity policy statement that has been pending in the Faculty Senate since April 8. The subcommittee broadened the issue of "academic dishonesty" to more affirmative "academic integrity."

Report on Assessment of Student Achievement/ Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants. The subcommittee dealing with this was chaired by Diane Quantic, joined by Dorothy Crum and Marlene Schommer. It determined that the University has in the recent past made extensive reports on each of these issues. The subcommittee prepared a summary of the situation regarding each issue and submitted it to President Campbell in April 1996.

The University Curriculum Committee as a whole was called upon in March 1996 to review and approve the very extensive curricular changes being made by the Honors Program.

Pending business, to be taken up next year, will include the review of experience with the new Curriculum Change Form at the end of the fall and of the spring semesters, 1996-7, with a report in each case to the Faculty Senate. It would also be desirable for the committee to give further consideration to the list that this year's chair presented in September 1995 of questions that might apply to any new Associate Degree programs that may be proposed in the future, since it may be desirable to have criteria talked out in advance about such proposals.

Chair's comments. The committee's extremely productive work was due largely to the devotion, ability and hard work of several people, who gave of themselves far beyond what is usual for committee work. Special thanks go to Jaunette Eaglesfield, Kirk Lancaster and Diane Quantic for their diligence in leading the subcommittees. (Lancaster is, with only slight exceptions, the author of the proposed Academic Integrity document.) Jeri Carroll -- though no longer on the committee! -- gave many hours and extraordinary intelligence and leadership to the work regarding the Curriculum Change Form, for which she can't be thanked enough. And thanks go, too, to Barbara Mason and Will Baldridge, of the LAS CAPC, for their generous efforts. Although a conflict of scheduling prevented Dorothy Crum from attending the usual Friday afternoon sessions of the committee, the committee as a whole was one of the best committees with which the chair has had the pleasure of serving.

Recommendations. The committee's recommendations have been included in the various reports and drafts mentioned above.

Respectfully submitted,

Dwight Murphey, Chair
March 1996

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: University Curriculum Committee
SUBJECT: Report on Assessment of Student Achievement/Learning and Training Graduate Students to Teach

NOTE: The University Curriculum Committee asked Diane Quantic, Marlene Schommer and Dorothy Crum to form a sub-committee to investigate two of the Regents’ concerns that were assigned to our committee by the Faculty Senate. This report summarizes our findings and conclusions.

Assessment of Student Achievement/Learning.
The university provides students and faculty with a number of opportunities to assess student achievement and learning. These are summarized in the June, 1995 report, Wichita State University Departmental Assessment Report for Undergraduate Majors. This report traces the development of WSU’s assessment procedures from 1985 to 1995. It encompasses the university’s effort to assess basic skills, general education and the major fields of study. Pages eight and nine of the report summarize the work of these committees through the 1994-95 academic year. Appendix D provides a one-page summary of the assessment activities in each major field across the university.

For example, in the College Arts and Sciences:
--Nine departments have developed portfolio assessment procedures. Students collect a body of work, or representative samples of their work that is evaluated by faculty, or by an outside evaluator.
--Thirteen departments conduct alumni surveys to determine the lasting effects of students’ learning at WSU.
--Eight departments administer SAT field major exams or other exit-level exams that demonstrate students’ competency in the field.
--Several departments track graduate school admissions.

Other assessment procedures currently in place:
--Students in the English and math classes that are required of all WSU students must pass departmental exams to receive credit for these basic skills courses.
--Other colleges have similar assessment plans, and some colleges, such as the College of Education, have made extensive changes in their programs as a result of the development of an assessment process.
--Colleges across the university utilize portfolios, alumni surveys and field assessment tests as well as outside reviewers (often professionals in the field) or teams of professional evaluators who visit to accredit programs in the discipline. Students in a number of departments and colleges (education, for example) must pass professional accreditation exams.
--One of the university’s most successful programs is the Cooperative Education program. Students learn on the job, in the community, and are evaluated by employers as a part of their WSU learning experience. This is probably one of the most effective ways to demonstrate both student learning and achievement.

Summary/ Evaluation
What is being done:
These are examples of some of the assessment tools WSU colleges, departments and programs now have

1 Copies are available from the office of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs.
2 Most colleges have an assessment committee, although not all of them are active, and there is supposed to be one at the university level.
3 As a part of the upcoming North Central Accreditation visit, the university is assessing student academic achievement across the campus, including students’ proficiency in most of the skills and competencies addressed in this brief report.
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in place. Not all of the assessment procedures have been fully implemented. If they were being followed, we would have a number of accurate, varied and proven techniques for assessing both department and student achievement across the university. Nevertheless, the report demonstrates that, across the university, students are increasingly responsible for completion of a number of these assessment tasks, specifically portfolios, cooperative learning, student teaching, music juries, and passing professional exams.

What can be done now:
The assessment plan could be fully implemented. This would have to include some mechanisms at the college and university levels to oversee the collection of materials and administration of various evaluation procedures. Sufficient financial support from the university and college administrations would be necessary to realize the completion of the various assessment tasks, such as outside evaluators, the development and implementation of surveys, the administration of required exams, storage facilities for portfolios, test results, postage, etc.

What could be done:
1. The university administration and faculty could continue to encourage the development of student-centered assessment such as portfolios and cooperative learning.
2. The university and college administrations could provide the various colleges and departments with workshops and other support in the administration and evaluation of these various forms of assessment.
3. The University Curriculum Committee or other appropriate faculty constituencies could study means of assessment of student learning that are being developed at other universities such as cross-disciplinary courses, off-campus learning experiences in the community or abroad.
4. The university could hire a full time faculty development director to oversee this process and to assist colleges and departments in implementing the assessment tools departments and colleges have "implemented."

2. Training Graduate Students to Teach

At present, there are two "tiers" of Graduate Teaching Assistant training in place:

1. Teaching Assistant Orientation: For the past three years, the graduate school has held a two day orientation for new Graduate Teaching Assistants and lecturers in August. There are sessions on subjects such as university policies, graduate school regulations, and sessions on specific pedagogic concerns.

2. To address the more specific teaching skills needed by GTAs in various disciplines, most departments that employ large numbers of Graduate Teaching Assistants have formal training programs in place.

English:
New Teaching Assistants in English are required to attend the graduate school orientation and all G.T.A.s attend one day of orientation to the department before the start of the fall semester. Department services, policies and procedures, and the first week's class schedule are among items covered.
In addition, all English Teaching Assistants --are required to take English 581, Syllabus. Students attend weekly syllabus meetings with the supervising faculty member. There are syllabus groups for English 101, English 102, English 011 (basic or remedial English) and the three English as a Second Language courses. In these meetings, students review the following week's teaching schedule and cover any other classroom matters.
--must take English 780, Advanced Theory and Practice in Composition. This three hour course provides

4 Some of the assessment tools now in place, such as portfolio assessment, are difficult to administer within acceptable guidelines of validity and reliability.
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the theoretical background necessary for the effective teaching of composition and rhetoric.
---must submit SPTE evaluations for all courses they teach
---must turn in syllabi for each course they teach
---upon leaving the university, they must leave their grade books, student evaluations and other pertinent information on file.

The Writing Program Director handles complaints from students regarding teaching and classroom procedures on an individual basis.

In the Spring 1996 semester, the director initiated individual conferences with all Teaching Assistants to review student evaluations; discuss any specific concerns about teaching; offer assistance in developing effective or improving weak teaching techniques; discuss with students their willingness to act as mentors for first-year Teaching Assistants; solicit their participation in the development of new curricula in the composition program, and to help them plan teaching portfolios and job search strategies.

**Speech:**
All new Teaching Assistants must attend the graduate school's two day orientation as well as a two-week departmental workshop in August. They receive three hours of credit for this workshop which meets for six hours five days a week. The course covers administrative matters, theories of instruction, the course text, classroom assignments, etc.
Teaching Assistants also participate in these activities:
---weekly meetings: Teaching Assistants meet with the supervising faculty member to discuss classroom problems, questions, etc.
---SPTE or IDEA student evaluations
---classroom observation by a faculty member who then meets with them in a follow-up conference concerning their teaching effectiveness

**Math:**
All new Teaching Assistants must attend the graduate school's two-day orientation.
All Teaching Assistants are
---video taped in the classroom, followed by a conference and written evaluation.
---required to turn in syllabi and at least the first tests they administer in their classes to the supervising faculty member
---required to administer SPTE or IDEA to all of their classes

There are occasional meetings of all Teaching Assistants to discuss problems and to check on progress.
Because many Teaching Assistants in math are non-native speakers, there are stringent requirements in place to assure that these teachers are fluent in English.

All non-native speakers are required to
---take the test of spoken English
---give an oral presentation to a panel of faculty and students who evaluate their use of spoken English

If potential Teaching Assistants are deficient in spoken English, they must participate in more training set up by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. In addition, it is department policy to allow students to transfer freely in the first weeks of classes to and from classes taught by non-native speakers.

The director handles complaints concerning Teaching Assistants by visiting the classroom and, if necessary and appropriate, talking with students in the class to determine the seriousness of the complaint.
Biology:
All new Teaching Assistants must attend the graduate school's orientation.
All Teaching Assistants in biology must
- participate in a day-long orientation and training session in the fall semester, and a half-day session each spring semester
- follow weekly preparatory notes for the current topic, supplied by the course lecturer and/or the course laboratory coordinator
- attend weekly preparatory meetings for each lab they are teaching. During the meetings, Teaching Assistants are required to make a presentation, on a rotating basis, covering the current topic.

Ad Hoc Committee Report
In addition to this information gathered by informal phone conversations, Dean Tilford made available a copy of the 1992 Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Teaching Assistant Training. Once again, our work has already been done for us but with various changes in the administration, and the general tendency of inertia to set in once a task force's job is done, little has been done to initiate the recommendations in this report. A copy of the final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee is appended to this report. What follows is a selective summary of the report.

Subcommittee A conducted a survey, and based their conclusions on responses from 38 returned questionnaires. Less than half of the respondents indicated that their departments conducted GTA training. Most programs' training sessions were a day or less in duration. Ten had annual training and four conducted training twice yearly.

Subcommittee B gathered information from GTA focus groups. Their findings included these points: Orientation, teaching training, and continuing instructional support for Graduate Teaching Assistants differs greatly across colleges, departments, programs, and teaching assignments. Some programs, as this report has already outlined, provide thorough and on-going teacher training. In other areas, "GTAs reported being thrust into teaching with little or no orientation, preparation, or support." The GTAs had specific ideas about the need for, and the usefulness of, various kinds of teaching training. For example, GTAs supported the university's brief orientation; handbooks; sharing of course materials. They did not support long, general orientations or spending time on items not related directly to their jobs and their departments.

Out of the GTA focus groups came a number of specific recommendations. Among them:

- Share teaching techniques by experienced professors
- Provide additional orientation for newly-arrived non-native speaking GTAs.
- Present classroom techniques for working with WSU's often under-prepared students.

Training:
- GTAs need training in instruction, assessment, and problem solving.
- Departments should document their plans for GTA training.
- Departments should provide GTAs with exemplary course materials and instructional plans.
- Training should continue at least through the first year of teaching.
- GTAs should not be required to sit through orientation and training that they regard as redundant.

Evaluation:
- GTAs expect evaluation and welcome formative evaluation early in the semester.
- Evaluation criteria and procedures should be presented during orientation.

Summary/Evaluation

What is being done now.
The informal survey conducted in the fall of 1995 indicates that departments that employ the largest numbers of Teaching Assistants are very aware of their responsibility to support and assist new
teachers in the classroom. But the Ad Hoc Committee report has evidently been shelved. Probably there are units across the campus that still do little or nothing to prepare graduate students to become effective classroom teachers.

What can be done now.

First, we should again distribute across the campus the committee’s survey to see if any changes have occurred “spontaneously.” Then, we should consider the findings and recommendations made four years ago.

What could be done.

Once we ascertain the extent of training in place, the senate (or other appropriate body) may determine that we need a university level committee or a director to oversee graduate teacher training, implement workshops on specific teaching techniques, assist with individual mentoring, language training, etc.

In addition to the graduate school’s orientation, there should be required follow-up meetings for all GTAs on issues of general concern to beginning university-level teachers, and/or sessions on specialized techniques and/or pedagogical issues, such as writing in the disciplines, effective classroom presentations, collaborative learning, small group work, independent learning, etc.

NOTE: In a telephone conversation Steve Brady, a member of the original committee, mentioned his concern that there is no training in the teaching of handicapped students in the classroom. This an issue that should be addressed by a campus-wide teacher training orientation or an on-going program.

Conclusion:

This report reveals that, at least as far as these two issues are concerned, the university has addressed these concerns, but in both instances, the implementation of quality programs has been put in place, then shelved and, evidently, forgotten. Of course, this means that some good suggestions have been ignored, and some long hours, hard work, and careful consideration by faculty members have been ignored.
April 2, 1996

TO: Dwight Murphey

FROM: Diane Quantic

SUBJECT: Addendum to Sub-committee report

In light of the memo I received from Dean Tilford, which he copied to you, I suggest the following change in the sub-committee report on Training Graduate Students to Teach:

1. Teaching Assistant Orientation: For the past three years, the graduate school has held a two-day orientation for all new Graduate Teaching Assistants and lecturers in August. The program is evaluated and modified each year in response to participants’ evaluations. In 1995, there were sessions on university policies, graduate school regulations, discrimination, privacy and cultural awareness, and sessions on specific pedagogic concerns such as teaching techniques in laboratory and multimedia classrooms and syllabus organization. Workshop participants taped micro teaching lessons that were critiqued by experienced GTAs and lecturers.

2. Although this program introduces the new GTA to many of the issues and skills that they will need to address as university-level instructors, there is, as Dean Tilford has said in a memo to the sub-committee chair, "no question of the need for greater individual department involvement in improving the instructional effectiveness of GTAs." To address the more specific teaching skills needed by GTAs in various disciplines, most departments that employ large numbers of Graduate Teaching Assistants already have formal training programs in place.

[I might note, off the record, that my comments in the original document were based on the information I could get from Dean Tilford’s office last fall. At that time, he evidently did not regard this report as important enough to provide me with a complete schedule of the GTA orientation. If he had, I wouldn’t have been so cavalier in my comments on the program.]
REPORT
OF
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON
GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT TRAINING

COMMITTEE
Michael Tilford, Chairperson
Don Levi
Jim Carroll
Don Malzahn
Don Corbett
Stephen Gladhart
Mary Sherman
Janice Cole
Nancy Fisher
Stephen Brady
Mel Zandler
Greg Meissen
Jane Rhodes
Jennifer Volz
Brian Utesch

CHARGE
Early in the Spring, 1992 semester, an ad hoc committee was charged by the Provost to educate itself about what colleges, schools, and departments at WSU are currently doing formally and informally in the area of graduate teaching assistant training. Based on the information gathered, the committee was directed to submit a recommendation to the Provost concerning the desirability of implementing GTA training programs which recognize the diversity of responsibilities assigned to GTAs and differences which exist across disciplines and professional areas. Specifically, the recommendation would address (1) organization and shared responsibility among the graduate school and colleges, (2) timing of such training, (3) whether the training should be mandatory, (4) the desirability of having an orientation as part of the instructional training, (5) general guidelines for departments and colleges in developing programs that meet their special needs, and (6) a summary of estimated costs.

PROCESS
To meet the charge for the committee to educate itself about the current status of GTA training, two subcommittees were formed. One subcommittee, chaired by Professor Levi, developed a questionnaire and administered it to departments. The questionnaire was designed to elicit responses which would inform the committee about the specific charge to determine the present duties of graduate assistants and graduate teaching assistants; identify training programs currently available to improve instructional competencies of GTAs; learn how the teaching effectiveness of GTAs is evaluated and how the information is used; determine whether there is coordination among GTAs involved with teaching different sections of the same class; find out if GTAs have had their duties altered because of GTA evaluations or because of language competency; and whether there is a GTA coordinator and, if so, the responsibilities associated with the position. A summary of the responses to the questionnaire is attached.
The other subcommittee, chaired by Professor Carroll, sought and gained the services of Dr. Robert Ross and Ms. Esther Headley of the W. Frank Barton School of Business, to develop a focus group format to obtain information, as charged, about the perceptions of current GTAs and their evaluation of the instructional development they are receiving, if any; the instructional development they desire; topics that should be addressed in GTA training or GA/GTA orientation; and factors that would improve their instructional effectiveness. The results of this investigation are also attached.

RECOMMENDATION

The Ad Hoc Committee on GTA Training strongly and unanimously recommends the implementation of a university-wide program to train Graduate Teaching Assistants. Because of its interest in seeing that GTAs are properly trained, the Graduate School should have the overall responsibility, working with the colleges and departments, for developing an effective program. In its examination of current training programs the committee found that efforts run the gamut from excellent to virtually non-existent. Therefore, in creating a centralized training program, the diversity in current programs as well as differences across disciplines and professional areas must be recognized and respected.

Among the many tasks to be accomplished in creating a GTA training program of the magnitude proposed, is the appointment of a development/advisory committee. Because the members of the ad hoc committee have become better educated about the subject of GTA training, consideration should be given to their appointment as the nucleus of a development/advisory committee whose membership could be broadened as necessary (to include experienced GTAs for example). Based on information gained from departments and current GTAs during the committee's investigation, and responding to components of the provost's charge, the GTA training program should:

- occur prior to, and as close to the beginning of the Fall semester as feasible. It is critical that training be on-going through the academic year;
- be mandatory for beginning GTAs and optional for those beyond the first year. Consider awarding credit;
- include a general orientation to the University and common instructional methodology, followed by, or concurrent with, instructional training specific to departments and/or disciplines;
- provide general guidelines for departments and colleges in developing training programs that meet their special needs, as indicated above;
- include a GTA handbook to also be made available to faculty supervising GTAs;
include a special component to address the needs of foreign
GTA's; and

provide for evaluation of its effectiveness during the
program and after each semester.

In responding to the provost's charge to provide a summary of
estimated costs, the committee suggests start-up costs of about
$30,000, which would include the salary of a one-half time
coordinator, and secretarial and clerical assistance. Other
costs would be linked to the delivery system developed and would
include significant use of existing resources, both personnel and
materials.
THE STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY RESPONSE

THE FACULTY

1) Are committed to working collaboratively with the administration in the recruitment of qualified students,

2) Are committed to the retention of qualified students,

3) Are committed to working collaboratively to address the issues of credit hour activity, enrollment, program development and budget,

4) Reaffirm their continuing and long standing commitment to academic rigor and the maintenance of quality educational programs that meet academic and appropriate accreditation standards,

5) Reaffirm that quality teaching and scholarly activities are part of the same process and are responsibilities of the Faculty. As stated in the WSU Mission, all faculty are involved in research, scholarship and/or creative activities and service.

Faculty Senate Resolution 11
FACULTY SENATE
Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of May 6, 1996

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alagic, Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Berry-Bravo, Brooks, Burk, Byrum, Campbell, Cavarozzi, Christensen, Coats, DeSilva, Detjens, Dreifort, Eaglesfield, Erickson, Gythiel, Hawley, Hitchcock, Horn, Houts, Hoyer, Hundley, Kraft, Kukral, Leavitt, Lescoe-Long, Mandt, Matson, Paske, Patton, Riordan, Saalmann, Schommer, Sharp, Sutterlin, Swan, Terrell, Wahlbeck, Williamson, Yeager

MEMBERS ABSENT: Badgett, Baxter, Carroll, Celestin, Chaudhuri, Deyoe, Fowler, Hamdeh, Leland, Nagati, Parkhurst, Talia, Wang

GUESTS: AVPAA Davis, Kirk Lancaster,

SUMMARY OF ACTION:
1. Accepted annual reports of the following committees: Academic Appeals Committee, the Faculty Support Committee, the Scholarship and Student Aid Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, University Curriculum Committee.
2. Accepted recommendation of the Faculty Support Committee to revise the charge of the Committee as stated in the Faculty Handbook.
3. Accepted recommendations of the Scholarship and Student Aid Committee that the Senate Executive Committee issue guidelines for committees to use in making recommendations and for dealing with the press.
4. Referred report on Assessment of Student Achievement from Curriculum Committee back to committee to work with the Office of Academic Affairs in developing guidelines & recommendations on the training of Graduate Students who teach.
5. Accepted election of Larry Davis as Senator to represent LAS Humanities 1996/7.

I. CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER:
President Campbell called the meeting to order at 3:00.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS: President Campbell reminded Senators that the meeting of May 13 would begin at 3:00pm and that the new Senate for 1996/7 would meet at 4:30 that day for the purpose of electing officers for 1996/97.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
Minutes of the Meeting of April 22, 1996 were discussed. On page 4, the paragraph C. University Evaluation Guidelines, paragraph D.1 the word "preview" should be changed to "purview." Senator Bajaj moved and Senator Erickson seconded a motion to accept the minutes as corrected. The Motion passed.

IV. PRESIDENTS REPORT: There was none.
V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ANNUAL REPORTS:

A. Academic Appeals: Senator Cavarozzi moved and Senator Eaglesfield seconded a motion to accept the report. The motion passed.

B. Faculty Support. President Campbell noted that the intent of the committee in making the recommendation to revise the Faculty Handbook was to bring all statements on faculty support in the Handbook in agreement. Senator Cavarozzi moved and Senator Gythiel seconded a motion to accept the recommendation. The recommendation was to change the wording of the first charge of the Faculty Support Committee in the Handbook to read: "To review requests for institutional support of individual, departmental, and college research proposals, and forward recommendations to the Vice President for Research." The motion to accept this change was passed. Senator Yeager moved, seconded by Senator Eaglesfield, to accept the report. The motion passed.

C. Scholarship and Student Aid: Senator Schommer moved, Senator Bair seconded a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee that the Senate Executive Committee list guidelines for committees to use in making recommendations and for dealing with the press. The motion passed. Senator Horn asked if the Committee had such guidelines to recommend and President Campbell noted that indeed the Committee had drafted such ideas. Senator Bajaj moved, Senator Erickson seconded, the acceptance of the report. The motion passed.

D. Tenure and Promotion: Senator Erickson moved, Senator Eaglesfield seconded a motion to accept the report. Senator Mandt, Chair of the Committee, commented on the report. He noted that the Regents had this year delegated the authority to make tenure decisions to the Presidents, and in the case of WSU, effective this year, the primary responsibility of these decisions was with the faculty review process.

He also wanted to point out a second issue, that of early tenure and promotion. There were several this year. He stated that this is an open issue in that the new tenure and promotion policy does not state clear guidelines for making an early reward. Senator Mandt explained that on one side is the rationale that if an individual thinks he/she is qualified to meet tenure, the individual should request it. On the other hand, Mandt explained, there is the rationale that such cases should exceed the standards for tenure and promotion. Such issues are to be resolved in the years to come.

Another factor in the work of the committee, Senator Mandt explained, was that the committee was very careful to document teaching achievement this year.

Finally, Senator Mandt wanted to emphasize the importance of having written explanations of recommendations from all parties involved—deans, department chairs, committees. He noted that compliance of this policy was still mixed. He noted that when all such parties do furnish explanations, the individual case is helped.

Senator Hawley noted that this was the second consecutive year in which a tenure case was decided in the summer, out of sequence from all other tenure cases. The motion to accept the report was passed.

E. University Curriculum and F. University Curriculum report on Assessment of Student Achievement/Learning.

Senator Hoyer moved, Senator Cavarozzi seconded a motion to accept the report.

President Campbell asked for a motion to accept the report on the Assessment of Student Achievement, since it was a part of the annual report of the Curriculum Committee. Senator Matson asked if anyone knew the approximate number of graduate students who were teaching in any given
semester. No one knew.

President Campbell requested the Senate to recommend that the Curriculum Committee work with the Office of Academic Affairs in the next year on the issues addressed in the report. Senator Murphey moved, Senator Bair seconded a motion to return the report back to committee. The motion passed. The motion to accept the annual report of the Curriculum Committee passed.

G. Rules: Senator Hawley announced that Larry Davis has been recommended to serve as senator representing LAS Humanities. The recommendation was approved.

VI. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

President Campbell directed the Senate to take up the guidelines as attached to the April 8 agenda. She explained the change in paragraph A.4.b., as the last item to the list of issues that she stated at the close of the last session of April 22. Senator Terrell asked that the word "performance" be struck from the paragraph.

Senator Paske questioned the policy of goals being set by department chairs. He asked if chairs were asked to set goals. VPAA Patton and AVPAA Davis summarized previous discussions on this issue. VPAA Patton that there should be clarity of expectations communicated to faculty. Senator Byrum stated that this paragraph protects the faculty member. Senator Mandt pointed out the ambiguity of this issue, that in many cases it is the department chairs and deans who set goals and not the faculty member. It was his opinion that the goal setting should be done by the faculty member.

Senator Terrell stated that the purpose of paragraph 4 was record keeping, and that the third line should be changed to "shall be" and not be "should be." Senator Terrell recommended that everything in bold face in paragraphs A.4.b and A.4.c. be struck and that there be a decision on "each person" or "each faculty" in A.4.d. President Campbell agreed that there was a recommendation to make these strikes and that discussion would take place on A.4.d.

Senator Byrum asked for clarification of procedures of this discussion and suggested that each section be discussed and agreed upon before moving onto the next.

Senator Terrell moved and Senator Burk seconded a motion to discuss each numbered paragraph, one at a time. The motion passed and discussion moved to each numbered paragraph.

President Campbell next called for a discussion of paragraph A.1 and noted that at the April 8 discussion the "librarianship" was added to "Every person with teaching..." She called for a vote to agree to the change of A.1. The vote was taken; the motion passed.

Senator Terrell suggested a rewording of the preamble as he had suggested at the meeting of April 8 which was that the paragraph would read: "The following policy provisions are established from the perspective that variety in departmental evaluation procedures shall be preserved subject to providing a fair evaluation for each individual and subject to departmental mission." Vote was taken on the preamble. The motion carried.

Senator Terrell raised the issue of the title of the document, since he said the original was "university faculty evaluation policy," and asked for an explanation of the difference between the document at hand and his original title. Senator Cavarozzi stated that it was "university teaching evaluation guidelines." The question was called; the motion carried.

Vote was taken on "university teaching evaluation guidelines" to be the title of the document. The motion passed.

Discussion next moved to paragraph A.2. The vote to approve the revised A.2 as written was called. The vote to approved A.2 passed.

President Campbell called for discussion of paragraph A.3. Senator Hawley moved, Senator Lescoe-Long seconded, motion to put a period after "...review" and strike the rest of the paragraph.
Vote was taken and motion passed.

Discussion moved to paragraph A.4. President Campbell stated that it had been agreed to make the change from "should" to "shall," to strike the additions in paragraphs e and c and that the word "person" in c be changed.

President Campbell called for a vote to accept paragraph 4 as amended; the vote passed.

President Campbell moved onto paragraph A.5. Senator Terrell moved that the original wording be reinstated. Senator Swan seconded. President Campbell and Senator Horn spoke to the unclear nature of the original wording. Senator Terrell said that departmental instructions to faculty would be broad. Senator Horn offered a friendly amendment to put the statement in two different sentences. The friendly amendment was accepted. Senator Cavarozzi suggested that wording be changed so that information intended only for annual evaluation would be requested. The Cavarozzi suggestion was not accepted as a friendly amendment by Senator Terrell.

The vote on A.5. was taken and the vote passed: the original paragraph was reinstated and the statement was divided into two sentences. The bolded paragraph 5. was deleted.

It was then decided to change A.5. to read: "There shall be no information requested for annual evaluation that is not intended for that purpose."; to make A.6. to read: "The individual should be informed of any submitted information that was not reviewed by the evaluators."; to make A.7. "There shall be developed procedures for an open..."

Vote was taken on the changes and it was accepted.

Paragraph A.8, as proposed by Senator Hawley on April 8 that the majority of any departmental review committee should be tenured faculty. Vote was taken on the proposal and the proposal was accepted.

President Campbell moved discussion to Section B. There was debate about B.3. Senator Paske moved to accept the original wording. Senator Terrell seconded. Vice President Hundley explained why the Executive Committee intended to have a vote and to make it secret. Senator Paske withdrew his motion.

Vote was taken on accepting the new version of paragraph 3 and it passed.

Discussion moved to Section C. Senator Terrell stated that the original intent was to let faculty determine how the chair would communicate pay information to every person. Senator Mandt noted that last year there had been a contentious debate on the issue of sharing salary information with each person and that his recommendation to share all salaries with each person was defeated by the Senate. He added that the secret ballot concept was introduced last year in order to maintain the right of faculty to decide if and when they would want the salary information to be shared.

It was decided that in C.1. the parentheses would be removed. President Campbell suggested the paragraph to read: "Chairs shall transmit departmental pay recommendations for the entire department according to faculty-established policy as approved by secret ballot of the department, to each individual faculty as soon as these are developed and ready to be transmitted to the Dean. At that time, faculty should be invited to appeal their individual pay recommendations to the department chair."

Senator Mandt suggested that "for the entire department" be deleted. There was debate on the issue of how much information would be available for each individual faculty; in addition to salary information of the entire department, would it also include all evaluation documents of all members of the department. Senator Byrum added that last year that it was deemed important to learn the recommendation of the departmental chair.

There next came a digression as to the purpose of the debate. Senator Kukral asked what all this had to do with teaching. President Campbell stated that this began as evaluation guidelines which encompassed the entire job. Senator Kukral asked why research and service were not part of this document. VPAA Patton and AVPAA Davis clarified that Regents use the language "faculty evaluation guidelines" which mean teaching, research and service. Senator Cavarozzi suggested she could remove
her original suggestion and reword the title to "university evaluation guidelines."

Senator Mandt stated that since there was so much confusion on this document—i.e., is it an evaluation policy, or just a teaching policy—that the Senate was not ready to act on it.

President Campbell suggested that discussion move to Section D, that issues in C.1. and C.2 needed more discussion, that to move onto other sections and get those approved at this time.

There then came questions as to the title and purpose of the document and to which groups of the university it related to. Senator Paske suggested that since there was so much confusion the document should be referred back to the committee. Senator Terrell said that the Regents policy was that everyone in the classroom should be evaluated and this was the origin of this document. Senator Byrum suggested that this document should not be sent back to committee that these issues should be resolved at this time.

President Campbell explained the changes that had been made in Section D. Senator Paske suggested that D.5. be dropped. It was agreed to do this.

It was suggested to remove the parentheses in sections 2 and 3 and this was agreed upon. It was agreed to renumber the paragraphs.

Senator Hawley suggested that "chairs salary recommendation" be changed to "salary recommendations for the department." This was agreed upon.

President Campbell called for a vote to approve Section D as amended. The vote carried. Section D was accepted as amended.

Discussion moved to Section E. President Campbell explained all the strike-outs dealt with guidelines that a committee should take up at a later time, as recommended by the Senate Executive Committee.

Senator Terrell recommended that E.1.b. be changed so that the discussion of the policy statements and appendices would be removed and that mention should be made of the Regents policy statements and the 1984 faculty survey. This was agreed upon.

Senator Paske suggested that the word "effectively" be removed from the first sentence in Section E.

Senator Swan moved to strike from E3A "...do not have access to blank survey forms and they...". Senator Hawley seconded. Senator Terrell spoke in opposition to the motion. Senator Coats noted that her school did not have personnel to administer such forms. Senator Swan clarified that forms are sent to faculty and it gives the faculty member the flexibility to schedule the evaluation at a time appropriate for the class.

Senator Paske offered a friendly amendment that faculty may not administer and/or tally the evaluations. Senator Swan accepted the friendly amendment.

President Campbell noted that all of E2 would go to a committee for discussion and to look at tools presently in use.

Vote was taken on the motion as amended and it was approved.

Vote was taken on E1b and it was approved as amended.

Senator Horn moved to introduce to E.3.c: "faculty should have access to the raw scores of any survey used." Motion seconded by Senator Hoyer. Vote was taken on the motion. The motion passed.

VII. AS MAY ARISE

Parliamentarian Benson clarified a question that had been raised about discussion of the annual reports of the committees. He stated that after checking the Rules of the Senate, he found that annual reports are to be automatically accepted by the Senate unless a motion to the contrary arises from the Senate floor.

Senator Erickson moved to adjourn. Senator Cavanaugh seconded the motion. Vote was taken and the meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,