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WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 126 CH 3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, August 26, 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
   A. Rules

VI. Old Business
   A. Procedures for Dismissal for Cause -
      Sec.III,new #4 & Sec.VIII, #4
   B. Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment
      Formal Hearing for Faculty, #3.
      (see salmon attachment)

VII. New Business

VIII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Donna Hawley, President 3610 Box 41
JoLynne Campbell, Past President 3146 Box 43
Sue Bair, Vice President 3340 Box 16
Jean Eaglesfield, Secretary 3591 Box 68
Walter Horn, President-Elect 3410 Box 44

ELECTED BY SENATE

Sandra Houts 3280 Box 25
Elmer Hoyer 3415 Box 44

APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT

Donald Byrum 3551 Box 67
The following are the areas of each document which we will be discussing at the meeting. The full document can be found in your Faculty Handbook, or you may obtain a copy at the Faculty Senate Office.

DISMISSAL FOR CAUSE

Section III INFORMAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

(new number 4 old 4 becomes 5...)

4. If the alleged professional incompetence or dereliction of duty is one of chronic failure of a faculty member to perform the professional duties defined in this document and by the academic unit, the Informal Review Committee should be convinced that the performance of the faculty member was substantially below the normal standards of the academic profession. If the faculty member’s overall performance, as evaluated by peer faculty and their department chair, is judged to be substantially below an acceptable level of the normal standards of the profession for a total of three annual evaluations within a five year period the faculty member is subject to dismissal under the procedures discussed in this section. Criteria for judging faculty performance to be substantially below an acceptable level shall include, but is not limited to the following: (1) unreported extended absence from the classroom, (2) failure to submit grades for a course, (3) absence of an evaluation or testing process for students of a class, (4) failure to provide assigned advising services, (5) failure to be prepared to present course material, (6) failure to address corrections of identified gross impediments in conveying knowledge, (7) violations of accepted standards of scholarly activity (as discussed in Section 6.15 Misconduct in Research), (8) failure to fulfill the agreed upon responsibilities associated with university service, and (9) creating a hostile and destructive environment which disrupts the normal educational mission of the university.

Section VIII PROCEDURES AFTER HEARING

4. Although the President has the final legal authority from the Board of Regents in personnel matters, the interest of the University in faculty self-governance and the principle of peer evaluation suggest that the recommendations of the Formal Review Committee will generally be accepted. In cases where the recommendations of the Formal Review Committee are not accepted, the President will ..... the basis of his/her decision with the Internal Hearing Panel as well as the direct participants in the dismissal process.

POLICY PROHIBITING SEXUAL HARASSMENT

FORMAL HEARING FOR FACULTY

3. As provided for in the Grievance Procedure, the Findings of the hearing panel will be reviewed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President of the University. The President’s decision will be final in all matters. Although the President has final legal authority from the Board of Regents in personnel matters, the interest of the University in faculty self-governance and the principle of peer evaluation suggest that the recommendations of internal hearing panels will generally be accepted. In cases where the recommendations of an internal panel are not accepted, the President will ..... the basis of his/her decision with the internal hearing panel as well as the direct participants in the grievance process. If additional or new information or evidence is brought to the attention of the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the President of the University during their respective reviews, the internal hearing panel should be reconvened to hear said additional or new information or evidence to consider whether revisions of its original findings and recommendations are justified.
FACULTY SENATE

Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of August 26, 1996

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alagic, Armstrong, Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Burk, Byrum, Campbell, Celestin, Coats, DeSilva, Detjens, Deyoe, Dreifort, Hawley, Hemans, Horn, Houts, Hoyer, Hughes, Kukral, Leavitt, Mandt, Matson, Murphey, Palmiotto, Papanicolaou, Parker, Schommer, Sharp, Skinner, Stone, Sutterlin, Swan, Toops, Wahlbeck, York

MEMBERS ABSENT: Baxter, Berry-Bravo, Brooks, Chambers, Davis, Eaglesfield, Goldsteen, Kraft, Lescoe-Long, Nagati, Riordan, Saalmann, Talia, Terrell, Wang, Yenne

GUESTS: L. Murphey, B. Bowman

SUMMARY OF ACTION:
1. Accepted Rules Committee appointments to various Faculty Senate Committees.
2. Accepted the revisions for the Dismissal for Cause Policy
3. Accepted the revisions for the Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment.

I. CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER: President Hawley called the meeting to order at 3:30pm. She expressed hope that the Senate would have an exciting and productive year. She reviewed meeting protocol and noted that Roberts Rules of Order would be used. She introduced the Parliamentarian, Senator Benson.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS: Senator Swan expressed concern about two opposing trends affecting faculty. On one hand, credit hour production had been stated as important and in fact, Senator Swan noted that during the summer, lists of low producing faculty had been circulated. On the other hand, he stated, that there seemed to be a strong emphasis on offering as many classes as possible. He suggested that the Senate to look into these trends. He stated that he is a faculty member who agrees that faculty should be flexible, yet he was concerned that faculty were being pushed in opposite directions.

Senator Murphey requested a moment of silence for Professor Jimmy Skaggs who had passed away on August 25.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: President Hawley asked that the May 13 minutes of 1995/6 Senate and of the 1996/7 Senate meetings be approved. Senator Toops noted that he was present at the 1996/7 session. Senator Wahlbeck noted that he was absent at both Senate sessions. Both minutes were approved with the corrections noted above.
IV. PRESIDENTS REPORT:

New identification cards: Several faculty had brought to her attention the fact that the new cards were not designating faculty's status. After discussing the matter with Vice President Lowe, it was decided that henceforth new cards would designate "faculty" for such people and that cards would be reissued for those who had the first status-less version and who request it. President Hawley added that those who would make the request to do so after September 15 when the bulk of registration would be over.

Strategic Planning Committee: President Hughes has named this committee. It will be chaired by Tony Ross, Associate to the President. Faculty representatives are Jeri Carroll, Scott Miller and Ray Hull. Representing the Unclassified Professional Senate are Mike Wood and Linda Matson and representing the Classified Senate are Jane Eshelman and Ellen Horn. President Hawley noted that his committee would begin to meet soon and that she would invite Dr. Ross to meet with this Senate within the next few meetings.

Special Senate meeting: Sept. 11, 3:30 p.m., CH 126 -- Board of Regents representatives, Chair, Phyllis Nolan. 1995/96 Chair John Hiebert and Executive Director, Stephen Jordan will be on campus for the events in connection to the Newcomen Society award. They would also like to meet with the Faculty, therefore, we will have a special meeting. President Hawley urged all Senators to please be present and to invite members of their faculty areas. She stated that it is important that Faculty share their thoughts and ideas with the Regents.

President Hawley also noted that the regular meeting of the Board of Regents will be on this campus October 16 and 17.

Executive Committee reviewed and approved the Honors Program transfer and transition rules, as directed by the 1995/6 Senate.

The 1995/6 Senate had also directed the Executive Committee to review the academic integrity policy. The Committee worked with Professor Lancaster during the summer and revised the policy. This will be brought back to the Senate for discussion within the next few Senate sessions.

VPAA Patton has asked the Senate for a strategic plan for faculty development. The Executive Committee has requested the Faculty Support Committee to work with AVPAA Gayle Davis to develop this plan. The Board of Regents have required that a plan for faculty development be submitted to them by May, 1997.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Rules—Walter Horn, Chair submitted the following names for three year appointments to the following committees for approval:

- Academic Affairs -- Larry Blocher, Susan Huxman
- Court of Academic Appeals -- Mary McHugh
- Exceptions -- David Blatt
- Faculty Affairs -- Hyuck, Kwan
- Faculty Support -- Ruth Hitchcock, Paul Rillema, Eunice Myers
- General Education -- Asrat Teshome, Pamela Larsen
- Honors -- Jharna Chaudhuri
  Mary Anthes to replace Margaret Fast
- Library -- Denise Celestin, Richard Laptad, James Clark, Michael Vincent, David Koert
- Scholarship & Student Aid -- Roger Scudds, Philip Howze
- Tenure & Promotion -- Elmer Hoyer
- University Curriculum -- Dwight Murphey, Tiruvadi Ravigururajan

The appointments were approved as stated.

Senator Horn further noted that there remained several vacancies in committees and in the Senate itself: the General Education Committee has a vacancy in LAS Social Sciences, the University Curriculum Committee needs representatives from the Colleges of Health Professions and Education. In the Senate there are vacancies in the College of Business representing the Department of Accountancy in the College of Education.
VI. OLD BUSINESS:
A. Procedures for Dismissal for Cause - Sec. III, new #4 and Sec. VII, #4

Senator Hoyer moved that there be a change in procedure and that Dismissal for Cause, Section VIII.4, and Prohibiting Sexual Harassment Section 3 be discussed together since these were similar and that Section III.4, of Dismissal for Cause be discussed as a separate item. The motion was seconded by Senator Bair. The motion was approved.

President Hawley introduced the discussion of the first section by stating that both policies had been in draft form for two years, have been approved by the Senate but not by the President. The Senate Executive Committee met with the President and University Counsel Ayers over the summer and identified the one area of disagreement. She asked Senator Hoyer to explain the issue.

Senator Hoyer stated that in the Dismissal for Cause procedures, after the hearing there was difference in opinion on how the President would relate his/her decision to the hearing committee. Senator Hoyer read Paragraph 4 of Section VIII PROCEDURES as recommended by the Senate Executive Co: "... In cases where the recommendations of the Formal Review Committee are not accepted, the President will discuss said decision with the Formal Review Committee as well as the direct participants in the dismissal process." He moved adoption of that paragraph to Paragraph 4 of Section VIII of the DISMISSAL FOR CAUSE policy. The vote was taken and motion passed.

Senator Hoyer turned to the Sexual Harassment policy, FORMAL HEARING FOR FACULTY, Sec. 3, paragraph 2. He explained that this was the same language as in the Dismissal for Cause policy. He moved adoption of this paragraph with the change of the last sentence having the words "discuss said" added. Thus, the sentence would read "... In cases where the recommendations of an internal panel are not accepted, the President will discuss said decision with the internal hearing panel as well as the direct participants in the grievance process." The vote was taken and motion carried.

Senator Hoyer then returned discussion to the DISMISSAL FOR CAUSE policy, Section III, #4, which he stated was to be added to the Policy. This paragraph is about chronic low performance. The policy on chronic low performance that the Senate had passed in the Spring, 1996, had not been approved by the Regents. So, the Senate Executive Committee during the summer wrote a new paragraph for the Dismissal for Cause policy that would fulfill the requirement of the Regents to address the chronic low performance issue. He moved the adoption of this paragraph. Motion was seconded by Senator Horn.

Senator Murphey questioned the three to five years parameters for such behavior, that this would be too long a time for some of the behaviors listed in the paragraph. His second concern was that there seemed to be too little attention to performance related to research and asked if it were the were the intent to de-emphasize research activity.

Senator Byrum, as a member of the subcommittee who drafted the paragraph, explained that there was more explanation of research issues in other sections of the policy, namely Section 6, paragraph 15.

Senator Armstrong noted that there are currently non-tenure track faculty who do not have research expectations at this university and that deans have agreed to such a situation.

Senator Wahlbecker pointed out the inconsistency in the wording about standards of performance. He noted the two phrases used in the paragraph: "substantially below normal standards" and "substantially below an acceptable normal standard." He asked how one is to interpret a "normal standard." He moved that the words "acceptable level" be used. Motion was seconded by Senator Bair. Senator Mandt noted that standards change as the field changes. Senator Byrum stated it is the spirit of the policy to address someone who falls substantially below the standard benchmark of the field. Senator Leavitt stated that this policy applies to someone who is
really doing a bad job. Senator Wahlbeck did reply that we really do not codify normal standards. The vote was taken and the motion passed. Thus the term "normal standards" will be removed from the paragraph and substituted with "acceptable level."

Senator Kukral addressed concerns about #9.

Senator Murphey stated that this is an improvement over the document as approved in the spring, 1996. Senator Coats stated concern that #8 be further defined.

Senator Swan wondered if #6 were spelled out enough. In addition, he expressed concern about #1 asking if the University were to wait two years to dismiss someone who did not show up to teach classes. Senator Mandt answered that deans and chairs would actively address such behavior immediately but it would take more than one year before such a person would be dismissed from his/her job. Senator Mandt stated that it takes time to correct such behavior. He gave the example of an individual with mental illness who did not report to class; the immediate action was that he was not paid. Senator Hoyer noted that missing a whole semester would be categorized as gross incompetence, and this is already defined in the Handbook.

Senator Kukral stated that rather than finely defining each of the 9 items in the paragraph, the Senate should pass this document, see how it works over a period of time, and amend it at a later date. He stated that the Regents are worried about teaching and not so much concerned about research.

Senator Schommer asked if the policy related to overall performance—teaching, research and service—or to one specific area.

Senator Murphey suggested that there be some formal mechanism to review the policy in one or two months. He expressed concern that there be more emphasis placed on research.

Senator Hoyer moved the previous question. Motion was seconded by Senator Horn. Motion passed.

The motion to accept the new no. 4 as amended with the substitution of the term "acceptable level" for "normal standards" was brought to a vote. The motion passed.

Senator Murphey raised a procedural question. He suggested that when there is a motion to close debate, that the chair ask how many people would still have something to say. With a show of hands, members would thus have a way of making an informed vote in such procedural matters.

Senator Hoyer moved that anyone who had comments or further desired changes for the statement on Chronic Low Performance submit them to the Executive Committee. Second by Senator Swan. Motion passed.

VII. AS MAY ARISE: There were no other issues, concerns or statements. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jean Eaglesfield, Secretary