



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1996-1997

Volume X

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of November 25, 1996

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 126 CH

3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, November 25, 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. University Faculty Evaluation Policy,
(gold attachment) -- report from Executive Committee
 - B. Rules Committee
- VI. Old Business
 - A. First Year Experience -- Martha Shawver,
Associate Vice President, Student Affairs
- VII. New Business
 - A. Resignation of Walter Horn, President-Elect
 - B. University Club Board update - Tom DePetro
- VIII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Donna Hawley, President	5724	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

3.31 UNIVERSITY FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

The following policy provisions are established from the perspective that variety in academic schools/ departmental (*hereafter referred to as department*) evaluation procedures shall be preserved, subject to providing a fair evaluation for each individual and subject to departmental mission.

3.311 GENERAL POLICY

- A. Every person with teaching/librarianship responsibilities amounting to at least 50% of his/her workload is to be evaluated at least once a year whether or not they hold faculty rank and regardless of whether they are in the Academic Affairs division of the University.
- B. There shall be a common calendar for the evaluation of untenured faculty and for annual merit evaluation.
- C. Department evaluation procedures shall focus on the year in question while providing for at least two contiguous years in each review, in order to make appropriate adjustments in salaries based on previous years with limited or no salary allocation moneys and to determine patterns and continuity in academic accomplishments.
- D. The department shall be established as the primary site of evaluation. The following records shall be established and maintained in appropriate files kept in the departmental office:
 - 1. Departmental evaluation policy.
 - 2. Departmental instructions to persons being evaluated including the requirement to consult with the chair in setting performance goals for the coming year.
 - 3. Departmental evaluations for each person, including assessment of success in attainment of performance goals.
 - 4. The link between evaluation and departmental pay recommendation for each person.
 - 5. The rationale for changes in departmental evaluations and pay recommendations made by persons outside the department.
- E. There shall be no information requested for annual evaluation that is not intended for that purpose.
- F. Persons being evaluated should be informed of any submitted information that was not reviewed by the evaluators involved in the evaluation process.
- G. There shall be developed procedures for an open information flow between affected parties as per the procedure outlined below, and an opportunity for the person being evaluated to appeal at each stage of the process that will meet the prevailing budget time line requirements.
- H. The majority of any departmental review committee, if established according to the following procedure, must be tenured faculty.

3.312 PROCEDURES

3.3121. Departmental Faculty.

- A. The faculty of each department shall establish a written policy for annual evaluation of persons with teaching/librarianship responsibilities amounting to at least 50% of his/her workload.
- B. Chairs and deans shall review departmental policy and meet with the departmental faculty in the interest of any changes that should be made.
- C. The faculty of each department shall cast a secret ballot every third year on whether they desire to elect annually a faculty committee for the purpose of evaluation and merit pay recommendations. If such a committee is established, its chair will meet with the department chair to report on committee recommendations and establish departmental recommendations to the dean. If the departmental faculty elect not to name a committee, the department chair is responsible for making departmental recommendations to the dean.

3.3122. Department Chairs.

- A. Chairs shall transmit departmental pay recommendations for the entire department, according to 3.3121C above, to each person being evaluated as soon as these are developed and ready for transmittal to the dean. At that time, each person being evaluated may appeal their individual pay recommendations to the department chair.
- B. Chairs shall transmit departmental pay recommendations to their dean along with a prioritized list of individuals they recommend for any additional salary increases.

3.3123. Academic Vice President and Deans.

- A. Deans shall transmit their pay recommendations to the Academic Vice President for the entire department according to faculty-established policy. At the same time, the dean will explain to the chairs any changes recommended by the dean in the department's salary recommendations. The chairs are responsible for informing the person being evaluated immediately.
- B. The Academic Vice President shall transmit that office's departmental pay recommendations for the entire department according to the faculty-established policy to each dean who has the responsibility of informing the department chairs as soon as these are developed. The chair is responsible for informing the person being evaluated at that time.
- C. Administrators above the department level shall prepare a written explanation, attaching any relevant documents, of all changes they make in pay recommendations sent to their office. The

explanation shall be transmitted to the person being evaluated and to the department chair.

3.313 EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. Kansas Board of Regent's policy statements of April 1992 and December 1994 mandate that there be a formal evaluation of teaching as a part of the annual merit salary review. All university personnel with teaching/librarianship responsibilities amounting to at least 50% of his/her workload are subject to these policies. Portions of Kansas Board of Regents policy statements have direct implications for faculty action (*Faculty Performance Evaluation, 4/92 and Policy on Teaching Evaluation, 12/94, Kansas Board of Regents*):

1. Each department shall develop an explicit statement of the appropriate information to be used for teaching evaluation in that department and an explicit statement of the criteria used for the evaluation of that information.
2. Multiple sources or kinds of information shall be used. Examples are cited in Regent's policy statements and in the Faculty Evaluation Committee report to the Faculty Senate (5/95).
3. Student survey results must be included in the information sought.
4. The information presented must be evaluated by peers or knowledgeable colleagues.
5. To protect the broad faculty prerogatives explicit in Regent's policy, department faculty shall act immediately to implement those policies. Accordingly, these faculty shall:
 - a. Determine the kinds of information appropriate for their discipline or for the various sub-disciplines represented in their department.
 - b. Describe the peer evaluation process with respect to the requisite information.
 - c. Determine the appropriate criteria which is used to judge the information.
 - d. Write a departmental policy statement incorporating items a through c above.
 - e. As to oversight, ensure that the unit operates in accord with its own policy.

B. Since all persons with teaching/librarianship responsibilities amounting to at least 50% of his/her workload must be rated by students at least once a year, the department faculty shall determine the form or forms appropriate to its discipline among those which conform to the criteria stated in the policies of the Board of Regents (*Policy on Teaching Evaluation, Board of Regents, 12/94*).

C. Surveys intended for faculty evaluation must conform to certain administrative practices:

1. Persons being evaluated do not have access to blank survey forms and they have no responsibilities to administer the survey nor to tally survey results.
2. Personnel who distribute and collect the surveys will acknowledge by their signature that they conducted the survey for a particular class and they recorded the number of students present at the time the survey was taken.
3. Persons being evaluated shall have access to a copy of raw scores of any survey used for evaluation.

FACULTY SENATE

Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of November 25, 1996

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alagic, Armstrong, Bair, Bajaj, Baxter, Bennett, Benson, Burk, Byrum, Campbell, Celestin, Cheraghi, Coats, Coffman, G. Davis (*for Patton*), DeSilva, Deyoe, Dreifort, Eaglesfield, Goldsteen, Hawley, Hemans, Horn, Hoyer, Kraft, Kukral, Leavitt, Matson, Murphey, Palmiotto, Papanicolaou, Parker, Schommer, Skinner, Swan, Talia, Terrell, Toops, Wahlbeck, Wang, Yenne, York

MEMBERS ABSENT: Berry-Bravo, Brooks, Davis, Detjens, Gythiel, Houts, Lescoe-Long, Mandt, Miller, Riordan, Saalman, Sharp, Stone, Sutterlin

GUESTS: L. Murphy

SUMMARY OF ACTION:

1. Accepted revised University Faculty Evaluation Policy
2. Appointed Tina Bennett Senator representing LAS Humanities -2 yr. term
3. Appointed Hossein Cheraghi, Senator representing Industrial Engineering, to complete term vacated by Randall Chambers - 1 year
4. Accepted appointment of Charles Romig as Alternate to the Court of Academic Appeals - 3yr term

I. CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER: President Hawley called the meeting to order at 3:35pm.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS: There was a moment of silence in memory of Dean Michael Tilford.

Chris Comfort, chair of the Academics Committee of the Student Government Association, described a program whereby course syllabi of summer and fall classes were being gathered and placed in several locations, including Ablah Library and the off campus centers. In February, SGA will be sending memos to all faculty requesting their course information. He urged faculty to cooperate in this project. He also noted that he was investigating the possibility of putting this information on the Internet. When questioned about the legality of doing this, he stated that the committee would carefully investigate these issues. President Hawley added that all courses at Emporia State have syllabi on the Internet. Comfort added that syllabi for just General Education courses were being gathered at this time.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of October 28 were approved with the following corrections: Senator Yenne was absent, the President's report, on page 1, "selective admissions" should be changed to "qualified admissions", page 3 paragraph "Senator Swan noted... "away" should be changed to "a way."

IV. PRESIDENTS REPORT:

President Hawley reported on the November Board of Regents meeting. The Student Government Association Presidents suggested to COCOA that the results of student evaluations of faculty teaching be published. COFSP did not endorse this idea and suggested that students use syllabi as a way of evaluating courses. She noted that the impetus for this suggestion came from K-State and K U student groups and mentioned that the Senate Exec. Comm. will meet December 2 with SGA representatives to discuss faculty

evaluation.

The second issue COFSP addressed was distance education. She noted there is a task force on this issue and she advised faculty to be aware of this activity, that it is a complex issue faculty should watch.

Finally, the Board of Regents had asked COFSP to compile anecdotes of cases of faculty leaving the universities due to low salaries. This information would be forwarded to the Regents to assist them in working with the legislature. She noted that COFSP told the Regents that salary compression was another issue that should be addressed.

President Hawley summarized recent activity of the Executive Committee. 1. There is an Ad Hoc committee developing criteria for distinguished professorships. 2. The Executive Committee would soon meet with University Counsel, Ted Ayres, on the issue of commercialization. 3. The Executive Committee has asked the Committee on Academic Affairs to look at the process of initiation of new degrees and programs. There is no mechanism in the Faculty Handbook; perhaps a policy is needed in the Handbook, especially from the curriculum point of view. 4. The Executive Committee is working on the Dismissal for Cause policy and on the Student Academic Integrity Policy. She noted that perhaps the latter would be shown to the Counsel before bringing it to the Senate. Senator Leavitt voiced concern about this process, that it might be dangerous to have legal counsel review documents before the Senate makes decisions and policy. President Hawley answered that the Executive Committee would treat this process carefully.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Senate Executive Committee presented the University Faculty Evaluation Policy which was attached to the agenda. The policy had been passed by the Senate, May, 1996, and sent to the Executive Committee to prepare it for insertion into the Handbook. This document meets all the principles and guidelines wanted: faculty evaluation being located in the department, a peer review mechanism, the option for departmental committee or solely for departmental chair to conduct the evaluation, having a standard calendar, and the meeting of Regents requirements for faculty evaluation.

She then reviewed passages that were changed for clarification. Section 3.3123 B, the words "**according to the faculty-established policy**" should be deleted; these were redundant. It was agreed that the same phrase in 3.3123A should also be deleted.

Senator Toops asked that the word "immediately" in 3.3123A be moved so that the sentence would read, "**The chairs are responsible for immediately informing the person being evaluated.**"

Senator Terrell suggested that in Section 3.3122A, "**according to faculty established policy**" replace the referral to 3.3121C above.

The next point of clarification was to remove the words "librarianship" from Section 3.313A, since these criteria refer to teaching and not librarianship. Senator Wahlbeck asked for an explanation for the change. Senator Eaglesfield explained that no librarian teaches more than 50% of his/her time, that the librarians recommended to have the word "librarianship" in the introductory statement in 3.311 in order to continue the assurance of faculty status. She explained that librarians have the teaching/research/service designations of their time, along with other faculty; only that the "teaching" is interpreted as librarianship. She stated the librarians concern in applying section 3.313 to librarians, might be interpreted that students be called upon to evaluate "librarianship." Librarians do want to have the other aspects of this policy--peer review, common calendar, etc.--applied to their ranks and that is the reason why they would want to have the "librarianship" term as a general rubric in the introduction to this policy, even though technically no librarian teaches more than 50% of his/her time. AVPAA Davis noted that "librarianship" should be deleted from 3.313B. It was agreed to do this.

There was discussion on the "50% of his/her workload" in Section 3.313A. Senator Terrell stated the intent of the Regents' policy was that anyone who enter the classroom is subject to evaluation. Senator Campbell noted that the definition of "Faculty" is 5/10' FTE. Senator Swan noted that faculty who are "bought out" to do research, and teach much less than 50% for that period of time, are still evaluated according to these guidelines, and no others. AVPAA Davis clarified that the definition was necessary because of WSU's Unclassified Professionals in order to know who would be evaluated under this policy. There were questions about people in

other categories and if and how these people are evaluated. There were suggestions that the senate consult with the Unclassified Professional Senate to devise a policy. Senator Campbell noted that this becomes a difficult legal issue between the two groups.

The next point of clarification was to 3.313.5e "ensure" should be changed to "insure."

Senator Parker asked about the use of the terms "schools/department" and the use of the words "chair" in Section 3.3122. He noted that in his area, there is a "director" position. It was decided that after the word "chairs", "/directors" (*hereafter referred to as chairs.*) be added.

President Hawley pointed to a revision to 3.312C, which was suggested by the Executive Committee, in response a meeting of department chairs November 21, who suggested that a better description of the role of the faculty committee would add clarity to the process. The Executive Committee agreed. The words "at least" was also added to the paragraph. Senator Dreifort summarized the sense of the departmental chairs meeting of November 21, that the intent was that evaluation committees be advisory to the chairs. There was discussion on terms of committee service, whether staggered terms or not. It was agreed to make the change to the paragraph. Thus, 3.3121C would read: "The faculty of each department shall cast a secret ballot at least every third year on whether they desire to elect annually a faculty evaluation committee for the purpose of evaluating the department members with teaching responsibilities and providing merit pay recommendations to the department chair. If such a committee is established, its chair will meet with the department chair to report on the committee's recommendations for merit pay distribution within the department. If the departmental faculty elect not to established a committee, the department chair will have sole responsibility of evaluating the department's teaching personnel and generating the departmental recommendation for merit pay distribution within the department."

Senator Bennett asked for the word "is" in 3.313A5c to be changed to "are". It was so agreed.

Senator Bennett asked for the word "link" in 3.311D4 to be changed to "relationship." It was agreed to do this.

Senator Toops suggested that in the last sentence of 3.3122A "their" be changed to "his/hers." This was agreed to do.

Senator Coats asked when this policy would come into effect. President Hawley stated this would go into effect as soon as possible, to be applied to evaluations done in January, 1997. Senator Byrum clarified that the policy would next go to the Division of Academic Affairs, seeking the signature of the University President.

Senator Terrell spoke eloquently about the need to have such a policy.

Senator Campbell moved, and Senator Leavitt seconded, a motion to approve the document as changed. The vote was unanimous in approval.

B. Senator Horn presented the following appointments from the Rules Committee:

Tina Bennett-, fill the vacancy of LAS Humanities Senator (2 yr. term)

Hossein Cheraghi, complete the term vacated by Randall Chambers, Industrial Engineering Senator (1 yr. term)

Charles Romig -- 3 yr. appointment to Court of Academic Appeals as an Alternate

All of the appointments were accepted by the senate.

VI. OLD BUSINESS:

First Year Experience. President Hawley introduced Associate Vice President Martha Shawver who gave the Senate an update on this new program. AVP Shawver stated that in Spring, 1996, she made a presentation before the Senate on retention issues, and she noted the existence of such a course elsewhere in the country, and that she was investigating the possibility of bringing this to WSU. A committee was appointed and met over the summer. She explained that in discussing this with peers and doing a literature review, she found that a seminar type course would be very helpful. She then introduced two committee members, Nicholas Smith and Dianne Coleman.

Nicholas Smith discussed the survey of the peers. He noted that WSU has had a loss rate of freshmen

students of between 36-40% for the past ten years. He showed charts comparing retention rates of Kansas Regents universities; these showed WSU as the highest loss rate and lowest retention rate. He discussed research of two peers, Oakland University and Portland State which utilize such courses. He explained that in these peers, having the first year class has helped curve the loss rate.

Shawver then introduced Dianne Coleman who explained the prototype course being designed in the Barton School of Business for the spring, 1997 semester. Coleman emphasized that this should not be considered a freshman course, but rather a first year course, since a large variety of people--adults returning to school after many years, freshmen, remedial students who had failed, students who had not done well in previous semesters--would be taking this. She showed various charts listing characteristics of the course: advantages/outcomes (such as "anxiety levels reduced"). She explained that in business, there are certain characteristics they would want their students to gain; such as to becoming team players, being appreciative of diversity, how to dress for success, business etiquette and several other features unique to that area of study. She stated that the course would consist of many activities: discussion, skits, lectures, debates, field trips, library and computer research training.

Shawver explained that each college would develop their own courses. She stated that in this particular prototype course, students would be studied against a control group. She noted that in the faculty development series there would be a training program for faculty to learn how to prepare such courses.

Senator Baxter asked how many credits: Answer: 3; are there any peers who charge for credits in the same way as does WSU: Answer: it varies; do any other peers have open admission as does WSU: Answer: Kansas is the only state that has open admission; has the university requested grant money to develop this class: Answer: no.

Senator Matson asked if the prototype course would go through the General Education committee and how it related to the courses offered in University College. Answer: noted that University College is currently reviewing their curriculum and might reconsider some of their courses and that this would also go before the General Education Committee.

Senator Murphey, chair of the Curriculum Committee, asked for a time line and if the committee should report back to the Senate after their review of the course. Answer: the goal is to have 8 sections of the course in the fall, 1997. Senator York ask if this would be a required course. Answer: stated her vision was not to make this a requirement.

Senator Dreifort stated that although he favored this program, would this replace the hodgepodge of courses that now exist in the University College. He also warned about "shameful recruiting" that occurs in such courses.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Resignation of Walter Horn, President Elect. President Hawley announced that Walter Horn has resigned as President Elect and that nominations for, and election of, a new President Elect would take place at the next Faculty Senate meeting, December 9. She reminded Senators who nominate individuals, that they should gain permission from the individual, in advance.

B. University Club Board update-- Tom DePetro. President Hawley tabled this to the next meeting, December 9.

Senator Murphey moved, and Senator Celestin seconded a motion to adjourn. The vote was taken and the meeting adjourned at 5:00pm

Respectfully submitted,
Jean Eaglesfield, Secretary