



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1996-1997

Volume X

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of April 28, 1997

**WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
AGENDA**

~~Room 107 CH~~

3:30 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, April 28, 1997

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 (*pink attachments*)
 - A. Annual Reports from: Academic Affairs*
Faculty Affairs*
Faculty Support
General Education
Honors
Tenure & Promotion
- VI. Old Business
 - A. October Break (2nd reading) (*green attachment*)
 - A. Dismissal for Cause Policy (*2nd pink attachment*)
- VII. New Business
 - A. Issues related to Ablah Library-Capitol Campaign / Budget
Jasper Schad, Buma Fridman, Tom Borrego
 - B. College of Health Professions Proposal for Clinical Faculty
Track (*2nd green attachment*)
- 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
Bill Terrell, President Elect	3220	Box 78
ELECTED BY SENATE		
Christopher Brooks	6194	Box 14
Elmer Hoyer	3415	Box 44
APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT		
Donald Byrum	3551	Box 67

Academic Affairs Committee
1996-1997 Annual Report

(1) List of Committee Members

Tina Bennett-Kastor, LAS-Humanities; Douglas Sharp, Business (Chair); Jane Rhodes, Academic Services; Pawan Kahol, LAS-Math/Nat.Sci.; Larry Paarman, Engineering; Susan Huxman, LAS-Social Sciences; and Larry Bloucher, Fine Arts. Larry Paarman is Chair for 1997-1998.

(2) Meeting Schedule

We will have met at least four, perhaps five times, by the end of the year.

(3) Brief Description of Committee Activities

- (a) Request from Elliott School of Communication for the exemption of certain courses from the university's test-out policy.**

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends approval of this request. (See Attachment A)

- (b) Request from the Operations Council to not count a "W" grade as a "course attempted."**

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends against approval of this request. (See Attachment B)

- (c) Request from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to investigate the apparent lack of on-campus policies/procedures for initiating new majors, emphases, combined degrees, etc.**

Members of the Academic Affairs Committee came to the conclusion that there are, in fact, on-campus policies/procedures for initiating new majors, emphases, combined degrees, etc. The current Curriculum Change Form includes any curricular change – whether this change is a single course or an entire program. The required approval process ensures appropriate faculty consideration of new majors, emphases, combined degrees, etc.

- (d) Request from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to investigate the on-campus approval process for certificate programs.**

Apparently there is no campus wide approved process for approval of certificate programs. The Academic Affairs Committee has requested information from individual academic units on their internal review process for such programs. When received, we will conclude our deliberations of this issue.

- (e) Request from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to review the current policy/procedure on program discontinuance. The specific request was to determine if there is sufficient clarity in the language so that closure of any academic program requires faculty consideration regardless of personnel issues.**

The Academic Affairs Committee reviewed this policy. Although we concluded that faculty do have input into this process, regardless of personnel issues, we believe that notification of affected units and faculty occurs too late in the process. We therefore recommend that this step be moved earlier. (See Attachment C)

- (f) **Request from the 1995-1996 Faculty Senate Executive Committee to review course offerings in shortened formats.**

This request was prompted by advertisements suggesting that three credit hours could be earned in nine days. This item was carried over from last year. The Academic Affairs Committee is recommending a university policy concerning such offerings. (See Attachment D)

(4) Pending Issues

Item (d) above, the approval process for certificate programs, is still under consideration. This issue should be resolved by the end of the 1997 spring semester, or early fall, 1997.

(5) Recommendations for consideration by the Senate.

- (a) Consideration of Committee recommendation concerning exempting certain courses in the Elliott School of Communication from the university's test-out policy. (Attachment A)
- (b) Consideration of Committee recommendation concerning the elimination of a "W" grade as a "course attempt." (Attachment B)
- (c) Consideration of Committee recommendation concerning the proposed addition to the Program Discontinuance Policy. (Attachment C)
- (d) Consideration of Committee proposal on courses offered in shortened formats. (Attachment D)

Attachment A

Exemption from University Test-Out Policy
Selected Courses in the Elliott School of Communication

(1) Courses Affected

214:	Audio Production
221Q:	Oral Interpretation
222:	Improving Voice and Diction
240:	Introductory Photojournalism
290:	Listening Strategies
301:	Writing for the Mass Audience
304:	Studio Video Production
325:	Speaking in Business and the Professions
328:	Teamwork, Leadership and Group Communication
332:	Writing for Electronic Media
340:	Applied Photojournalism
401:	Beat Reporting
422:	Broadcast News
440:	Advanced Photojournalism
500:	Advanced Reporting
502:	Public Information Writing
510:	Editing for Print
522:	Advanced Broadcast News
525:	Advertising Copywriting
550:	Opinion Writing
570:	Magazine Production
571:	Feature Writing
604:	Field Video Production
609:	Interactive Media Production
622:	Studio B: Practicum in Broadcast Journalism
625:	Public Relations Campaigns
626:	Advertising Campaign Research
627:	Advertising Campaign Production
636:	Advanced Public Speaking
650:	Communication Training and Development

(2) Committee Recommendation

Approval

Attachment B

Elimination of "W" as a "Course Attempt"

(1) Request

Remove a "W" grade as an "attempted course."

(2) Reasons Advanced for Request

- (a) The current policy, if adhered to, means that any time a student withdraws from a class and then re-enrolls in that class the following semester, the second enrollment is considered a repeated course even though he never earned a grade in the first enrollment of the course. Students are allowed to enroll in a course only three times and the withdrawal would count as one enrollment.
- (b) The current policy unduly penalizes students on probation and dismissal. The policy reads: *students will be dismissed at the end of the semester in which they accumulate 12 attempted hours with a semester and WSU grade point average below the minimum required after being placed on probation.* When a "W" counts as attempted hours, the following scenario could happen – a student is placed on probation with a GPA of 1.89, the next semester he enrolls in 12 hours and earns grades of "C" in 6 hours, a "D" in 3 hours and withdraws from 3 hours. According to the current policy, he would be dismissed from the University. Or, let's say, he went to another school after his first semester and earned a 3.00 GPA and then returned to WSU to repeat the above scenario. Because the policy applies to earned WSU hours, he would be readmitted on probation. If he earned a "C" in one course, a "D" in another and withdrew from six hours, he would be dismissed in that semester.

(3) Committee Recommendation

We recommend against approval of this proposal.

(4) Reasons for Recommendation

- The current policy was part of a package of changes, adopted by the faculty, to enhance academic standards at Wichita State University. We enthusiastically endorse the direction indicated by these changes.
- We believe students should be encouraged to make serious choices of what they will attempt. Treating a "W" as an attempted course supports this objective.
- The change, if made, would tend to encourage students to "shop around" for the courses they can do the best in, then drop all the others. This has been a problem in the past, and is a reason for the current policy.
- Frankly, we believe the student described in the scenario cited should be dismissed.
- There may, of course, be extenuating circumstances in any specific case that warrant an exception to any policy of the university. Procedures and processes are in place to accommodate these situations.

Attachment C

Recommended Change in Program Discontinuance Policy
Paragraph 2.8

(1) Recommended Change

Paragraph 2.8 now reads:

Proposals for potential program discontinuance shall be made in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Such proposals will include identification of circumstances leading to the recommendation, a detailed rationale for the recommendation, a statement of the projected impact on the mission of the University and the academic unit, a statement of the projected impact on students and faculty of the academic unit, and a statement of the financial resources and faculty positions likely to be affected by the recommendation.

Suggested Paragraph 2.8:

Proposals for potential program discontinuance shall be made in writing. Such proposals will include identification of circumstances leading to the recommendation, a detailed rationale for the recommendation, a statement of the projected impact on the mission of the University and the academic unit, a statement of the projected impact on students and faculty of the academic unit, and a statement of the financial resources and faculty positions likely to be affected by the recommendation. Copies of the formal proposals will be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the head of the affected unit. The faculty of the affected unit may file a formal response with the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

(2) Reason for the Proposed Change

Under the current policy, faculty of the affected unit are notified after the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs have decided to proceed with consideration of the program discontinuance. They must respond within two weeks of this formal notification.

We believe this is late in the process.

The proposed change requires official notification at the point at which the proposed program discontinuance is made formal.

Attachment D

Recommended Policy Credit for Courses Offered in Shortened Formats

(1) Recommended Policy

For each unit of credit in courses of short duration,¹ there should be at least 15 hours of direct instruction required, together with the usual amount of out-of-class scholarly work.² Direct instruction should extend over a period of at least three days per credit, with no more than one credit earned per week. Course publicity must indicate the nature and amount of work required for a typical student, as well as a completion date for the work. The department in which the course is offered is responsible for insuring that the required out-of-class scholarly work, in terms of both level and quantity, is consistent with that offered in the typical semester-length format.

¹Courses offered in less than the typical semester length format.

²A standard "hour of instruction" implies fifty minutes of class and a ten-minute break.

(2) Reasons for Recommendation

- There is a policy concerning such offerings at the graduate level, but no such policy exists for course offerings at the undergraduate level. This recommended policy is patterned after that which exists for graduate level courses.
- We believe there is a time dimension to the learning process that may not be being adequately considered. When the question, "What's the minimum?", was posed, there was either no answer or one that suggested that as long as the 45 clock hour requirement was being met, we were OK. We believe this ignores necessary out-of-class time for reading, reflection, and other scholarly work.
- We currently have a number of courses being offered in 10-day formats, and even some have been advertised as "Three Credit Hours in Nine Days." We suspect there are more in the latter category. When we posed the question, "Why two weeks?", the response was typically "... that's the period of time between semesters." Those of us who have been around since they put water in the moat can remember when the minimum time was three weeks. Guess what the rationale was: "... that's the period of time between semesters." Heaven help us if we ever reduce that time to two days!
- We believe a limit of one credit hour per week is most reasonable. An average university level course should require between two and three hours of work outside of class for every hour inside class. This suggests that a three hour class should require a total time commitment of 135 - 180 hours. This suggests that students are spending from 11.25 - 15 hours per day on a class being offered in a two-week time frame. Anecdotal evidence would suggest that this is not the case.



WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of History

SENATE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT (1996-1997)

The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee consists of the following members:

Deborah Baxter
Will Klunder (chair)
Fred Kraft
Hyuk Kwon
Cathy Moore-Jansen
Diana Rogers-Adkinson
Rob Zettle

The committee was asked by Senate president Donna Hawley to draft policy recommendations pertaining to Unclassified Professionals who teach as their primary responsibility. During the fall semester, we met approximately every two or three weeks, gathering information relating to our charge. More recently, we met nearly every week in an effort to draft the recommendations. A majority of the committee (one member dissenting) agreed upon the final version printed below. At this time, no further issues are pending before the committee.

POLICY RECOMMENDATION REGARDING UNCLASSIFIED PROFESSIONALS WHO TEACH (50% OR MORE).

1. All future hires should be in tenure-track positions. We do not wish to see Wichita State University develop a dual-track faculty. Only tenure guarantees the faculty member academic freedom, professional security, and full participation in university affairs and governance.
2. Searches should be conducted for all positions, seeking qualified applicants with appropriate degrees and experience. Most searches should be formal, national searches; qualified candidates should hold terminal degrees in their field. The committee recognizes that, in both cases, exceptions may be necessary.
3. The faculty member and department chair should jointly determine the emphasis placed on teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities at the time of hire and during the annual probationary reviews. It may not be in the best interests of the department and faculty member to adhere to the traditional "40-40-20" division of professional responsibilities, and the allocation may change during the probationary period. During the tenure and promotion process, the faculty member should be evaluated consistent with the agreed upon responsibilities.



WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Administration, Counseling, Educational and School Psychology

To: Faculty Senate

From: Faculty Support Committee
Ruth Hitchcock, Chair
Michael Long, Vice-Chair
Ravi Pendse
Eunice Myers
Sam Yeager
J.C. Combs
Robert Lawless
Paul Rillema

The Faculty Support Committee reviewed applications for and made recommendations to the Vice President for Research for the following

University Research and Creative Activity Awards
Awards for Research and Creative Activity in Summer
Young Faculty Scholars Award
Wichita State Excellence in Research Award

The Committee also reviewed applications for sabbatical leaves and submitted recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Committee reviewed the faculty nominations for the President's Distinguished Service Awards and made recommendations to the President.

The Committee has also recommended changes in the criteria for the Excellence in Research and Young Faculty Scholar Awards, as well as the time frame and means of collecting information for the President's Distinguished Service Award.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth Hitchcock

To the University Faculty Senate
General Education Committee
Report for 1996-1997

Committee: Voting members: Phillip G. Wahlbeck (Chair, LAS Math/Nat Sci), Wilma Detjens (LAS Humanities), W. James Jones (Fine Arts), Dharma DeSilva (Business), Linda Bakken (Education), Pam Larsen (Health Professions), Asrat Teshome (Engineering), Delores Craig-Moreland (LAS Soc Sci)

Non-voting members: Bob Rozelle (University College), Maralyn Schad (Library), Stephen Brady (Director of College Algebra), Diane Quantic (Director of English Composition), Keith Williamson (Director of Speech Communication), Paul Ackerman (Ad hoc General Education Committee), Martha Shawver (Administration)

Voting Student members: Curtis Baxter, Tom Hickok

General Education Coordinator: Peter G. Sutterlin (non-voting)

The General Education Committee of the University Faculty Senate has met regularly at approximately three week intervals during the Fall and Spring Semesters. The following items were considered during those meetings.

1. Preparations for Review of General Education Program during Fall 1997

The current General Education Program was approved by the WSU Faculty on November 21, 1991, and it went into effect for students admitted to the University in the Fall semester 1994. Detailed information regarding the General Education Program is available for students and faculty in "General Education Handbook," 9th edition, 1996-98. It was mandated that there be a review of the program in Fall 1997. In order to accomplish this review the following activities have been planned: (1) Focus groups are designed to allow free, interactive discussion among participants on exploratory topics. Focus groups, two student groups and two faculty groups, will meet on May 7 and 8, 1997. The facilitator for the focus groups will be Esther Headley, an instructor in the College of Business. She professionally operates a facility to do studies using focus groups. Topics germane to the review have been given to Professor Headley, and she will generate a script to be used as a discussion guide with the groups. (2) A questionnaire will be circulated to faculty teaching general education courses to explore the faculty views of general education in their courses. (3) Portfolio assessment on a few portfolios will be done.

2. Basic Skills courses in mathematics

There are three basic skill areas required in the General Education Program: English (English composition), Communications (public speaking), and Mathematics (algebra). The Mathematics requirement could be satisfied by taking or having the equivalent of Math 111 (College Algebra) or 112 (Precalculus Mathematics). A new mathematics course was developed by the Mathematics Department as a general education basic skills course. This course was designated Math 131, Contemporary Mathematics. The new course was approved by the Mathematics Department and by the LAS CAPC.

The General Education Committee was in favor of including Math 131 with Math 111 and 112 as a course choice that would fulfill the Basic Skills requirements. The University Faculty Senate at a meeting on January 27, 1997 agreed that the General Education Committee had the authority to add the course as an option for students.

3. New Courses or Changes in General Education Courses

During the academic year 1996-1997, the General Education Committee approved the following:

Biology 370Q – course title change – to “Introductory Environmental Science”
from “Population, Resources, and the Environment”

Econ 280 – I and P course – Economics of Social Issues – a proposed new general education course from Economics was approved by the General Education Committee.

WomS 580N - Gender, Race, and Knowledge – a proposed new general education course from Women’s Studies was approved by the General Education Committee. This course had been taught previously as a non-General Education course.

4. Agreement with WATC

The General Education Committee has functioned to have only a limited, selected number of courses allowed as general education courses. The committee wants to avoid having an open door for all courses to be considered as general education courses. The committee believes that it is important that any exceptions to counting other courses as general education courses be passed through the committee.

Wichita Area Technical College (WATC) has had discussions with the University regarding WSU faculty teaching students at WATC courses currently offered on the WSU campus. The WATC selects our courses that they feel would be important for the general education of their students. The General Education Committee has approved the following statement:

“Wichita State University (WSU) will provide general education for Wichita Area Technical College (WATC) students who are seeking the Associate of Applied Science degree. Wichita State University will provide a listing of general education courses, as well as general education course syllabi and expected learning outcomes, from which the WATC coordinators and faculty will select courses appropriate for their programs. Courses that are foundational to WATC curricula that are not approved for WSU general education credit may be approved on an exceptional basis by the WSU General Education Committee.

“Wichita State University will also transfer all credit courses taken for AAS degrees. Whenever possible those courses will be considered as partial fulfillment for bachelor’s degrees at WSU. We encourage WATC and WSU departments to work cooperatively in planning articulated programs which will facilitate timely degree completion.”

5. Search for a General Education Coordinator

Peter Sutterlin has been General Education Coordinator since the inception of the new General Education Program in 1991; he is completing his second three-year term. Professor Sutterlin is going to complete the review of the general education program mandated for Fall 1997 during the summer and fall, 1997. A search will be conducted during the conclusion of this semester for a successor for Sutterlin; announcements of this search have been or will be circulated soon. The new Coordinator will be available during the Fall semester to learn from Sutterlin and will become Coordinator in January 1998.

Respectfully submitted,

Phillip G. Wahlbeck

8 April 1997

1996-97 SENATE HONORS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT
April 14, 1997

Members of Honors Committee: Mary Anthes, Jharna Chaudhuri, Sandra Houts (chair), Mira Merriman, William Terrell, Joan Wagner (student), and Jim Erickson (Fall semester only), and Jay Mandt, Director of Honors (ex officio).

Charged with serving as counsel to the Director and reviewing his activities, recommending changes in program rules, and considering student applications for independent studies leading to a degree with departmental honors, the Committee met approximately once monthly (8 meetings) while fulfilling its responsibilities.

The major activity of the year was implementation of the restructured Honors Program. Fall and Spring seminars were organized, faculty identified, courses approved by the Committee and, when appropriate, by the General Education Committee. Concurrently, mechanisms were being created to ensure continuity of course offerings and departmental commitments to the Honors Program.

Policy decision: To allow satisfaction of seminar requirements of honors students by their taking any three seminars in the stipulated time period of one seminar per every 15 credit hours. Because there are no means by which to assess the levels at which seminars are taught (many are at the introductory level to a discipline), students cannot be expected to enroll in seminars at increasing levels of difficulty.

One major pending issue the Committee wishes to see addressed in the next year is that of Program staffing. The Honors Program, to be effective, responsive to student needs, innovative, etc. requires more than one faculty person on staff. The Director has worked alone for two years, shepherding a new program into existence and implementing the new structure. He has built a viable program that engenders enthusiasm among student and teaching faculty. The consensus of the committee is that he should not be expected to continue at the present pace without promise of assistance.

Submitted by Sandra Houts, Chair

April 10, 1997

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: University tenure and Promotion Committee

SUBJECT: Annual report of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee

At its December 9, 1996 organizational meeting, the committee elected Kenneth Pitetti chair and Michael Kelly secretary. Because of the death of Michael Tilford, the issue of a Graduate School representative was discussed. Deborah Soles was asked to notify the Graduate Council for a representative.

At the first meeting to discuss the tenure and promotion cases, Deborah Soles informed the committee that she would be representing the Graduate School. At this first meeting there was no representative from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The committee requested the chair to consult with President Hughes before the next meeting.

After individually reviewing files, the committee met for three days in January to deliberate and make its recommendations. The results are summarized in the attached tables. Martha Shawver represented the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Submitted by:

Voting Members:

Robert Alley (Education)
John Belt (Business)
Dorothy Crum (Fine Arts)
Gary Greenberg (At-large)
Mahesh Greywall (Engineering)
Elmer Hoyer (At-large)
Michael Kelly (Library), Secretary
Kenneth Pitetti (Health Professions), Chair
Deborah Soles (Liberal Arts)

Non-voting members:

Martha Shavyer (Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs)
Richard Harris (Student representative)

Candidates for Promotion to Professor

College	Cases Considered	Recommended by Department	Recommended by Chair	Recommended by College	Recommended by Dean	Recommended by University	Recommended by President
BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ED	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
EN	3	2	2	3	3	1	3
FA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
HP	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
LA	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
LIB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	12	10	11	10	11	8	11

Candidates for Promotion to Associate Professor

College	Cases Considered	Recommended by Department	Recommended by Chair	Recommended by College	Recommended by Dean	Recommended by University	Recommended by President
BA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
ED	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
EN	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
FA	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
HP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LA	10	9	7*	8	8	9	9
LIB	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	20	19	16	18	18	19	19

Candidates for Tenure

College	Cases Considered	Recommended by Department	Recommended by Chair	Recommended by College	Recommended by Dean	Recommended by University	Recommended by President
BA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
ED	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
EN	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
FA	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
HP	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
LA	9	9	7*	8	7	8	7
LIB	1	**	1	1	1	1	1
Total	21	21	19	20	19	20	19

* Two candidates from departments without chair.

** Library has only one committee.

October Break Proposal

Submitted to the Faculty Senate of Wichita State University, April 28, 1997.

Given that the requirement of 75 days of classes and five days of final exams is to be observed as a Regents guideline, and given that faculty and students at a Regents school may begin service as early as the 17th of August, this proposal is being submitted as follows.

By beginning the fall semester at WSU on a Thursday, the university community would be able to schedule a two-day break by returning that Thursday and subsequent Friday as off days later in the term. Given that the stretch of consecutive days demanding the presence of the university community can run from August 20 until Thanksgiving, this proposal requests that the two-day vacation be slated at the end of the second week of October which, when combined with the weekend, comprises an "October Break" of four days.

In this model, then, the WSU community would start all fall semesters on a Thursday, end on a Thursday in December, use the following Friday as "Study Day," begin finals on the subsequent Saturday and continue with finals on the traditional Monday-Friday schedule. 75 days will be maintained, and six days of finals (necessary for our Saturday classes) will also be maintained.

The impact on the university community will concern starting and ending dates. We will now see the first day of the term fall as early as August 18th and as late as August 24th. In the current system, we start between August 20 and August 26. The last day of final exams will fall from December 16 to December 22--both dates two days later than we now employ. The December 22 date will occur once every seven years and effect Friday exams. WSU does not schedule a final exam after 12:00 Noon on the last day of finals.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Brooks
LAS Senator-at-large

1
2 4/21/97 revision
3

4 **3.29 POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR DISMISSAL FOR CAUSE**
5

6 **3.291 STANDARD FOR DISMISSAL**
7

8 To warrant dismissal for cause a charge or charges must amount to grave misconduct or be a
9 serious and continuing dereliction of duty. Conviction of a felony by a trial court will also
10 warrant dismissal. However, in being convicted of a felony, the faculty member will be
11 suspended without pay until there has been final disposition of any legal proceedings.
12
13

14 **3.292 STATEMENT OF POLICY**
15

16 It is of the essence of a university that its faculty have committed themselves to a life of the
17 mind. On a personal level, their choice of that life frequently involves a decision to forego
18 careers that are more lucrative. More broadly, history shows that a vigorous life of the mind
19 often exposes the scholar to dangers that could have an inhibiting effect on the pursuit of truth,
20 an inhibition that is highly destructive of an essential pillar of civilization. For these reasons, it
21 is incumbent upon institutions of higher learning jealously to guard their faculty from arbitrary
22 dismissal. Wichita State University sees dismissal for cause of a faculty member, especially one
23 who has earned tenure, as a matter of utmost gravity. It is essential that the proceedings be
24 conducted both in letter and in spirit in a way that recognizes the seriousness of the penalty and
25 that protects the accused from arbitrary action, both for his or her sake and for that of the
26 University community's continuing intellectual freedom. At the same time, there are many
27 other interests that a university must serve and protect, and it is the policy of the University not
28 to shield professional incompetence, dereliction of duty, or abusive behaviors by a faculty
29 member (hereafter referred to as "misconduct"). The intent of the procedure must always be a
30 fair hearing of the evidence and a judicious weighing of the competing interests involved. In
31 making this assessment, care must be given not to overvalue other interests, regardless of the
32 temper of the time.
33

34 **3.293 GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE**
35

- 36 1. These procedures have been developed and agreed to by the University and the Faculty
37 Senate.
38
39 2. The Faculty Senate President is responsible for selecting an Informal Review Committee
40 for informal hearings.
41
42 3. If the Informal Review Committee recommends a formal hearing, the Faculty Senate Rules
43 Committee will select the Formal Review Committee.
44

- 1 4. The Formal Review Committee is responsible for conducting formal hearings and is
2 required to function within the procedures described in this document.
3
- 4 5. The Convener of the Formal Review Committee is responsible for ensuring that fair and
5 proper procedures are followed and for submitting the final report to the President of the
6 University.
7
- 8 6. The role of the Formal Review Committee is not to serve as a court of law, but to use its
9 professional judgment in determining the appropriate disposition of a case within the limits
10 set out in this document.
11
- 12 7. The time limits in this policy may be extended by mutual agreement among the parties and
13 the Formal Review Committee.
14
- 15 8. Settlement between the parties may occur at any time.
16

17 3.294 INFORMAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

18

- 19 1. The Dismissal for Cause procedure begins with the filing of a written complaint with the
20 President of the Faculty Senate against a faculty member by the Vice President for
21 Academic Affairs. The complaint must contain charges, alleging specific misconduct,
22 against the faculty member. Upon receipt of a complaint, the Faculty Senate President will
23 convene an Informal Review Committee of three faculty members to review the complaint.
24 These informal reviews are conducted to mediate a resolution of the problem, or to
25 recommend a formal hearing if no mutually-agreed resolution can be effected and if the
26 alleged improper conduct appears to the Committee to be sufficiently serious to warrant
27 dismissal from the University.
28
- 29 2. If the Informal Review Committee makes a preliminary finding that the charges, if
30 substantiated, might be sufficient in its opinion to warrant dismissal, it will recommend
31 that the matter proceed to a formal hearing. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will
32 prepare a complaint based on the charges for which the Informal Review Committee
33 believes there is evidence. It is the expectation of these procedures that the matter will
34 proceed based upon the specific charges recommended by the Informal Review Committee;
35 provided however, that the University will have the authority to initiate a complaint even
36 though not recommended by the Informal Review Committee. It is upon the specific
37 charges contained in the complaint, as it may come to be amended, that the matter will
38 proceed. Any additional charges must be discussed with the Informal Review Committee if
39 they are to be heard in formal hearings.
40
- 41 3. If a charge is made concerning a single action, the charge must be filed within one year of
42 the action. This time limit does not apply to cases of plagiarism, theft, or scientific
43 misconduct. If a charge is based upon a pattern of misconduct, actions from the past may
44 be used, provided the most recent act is within one year of the filing of the charge. The

1 Informal Review Committee will determine whether the charge of a pattern of misconduct
2 is sufficiently substantiated to warrant a formal hearing.
3

- 4 4. If the alleged professional incompetence or dereliction of duty is one of chronic failure of a
5 faculty member to perform the professional duties defined by university policy and by the
6 academic unit, the Informal Review Committee should be convinced that the performance
7 of the faculty member was substantially below the acceptable level of the academic
8 profession. If the faculty member's overall performance, as evaluated by peer faculty and
9 his/her department chair, is judged to be substantially below an acceptable level of the
10 profession for a total of three annual evaluations within a five year period, the faculty
11 member is subject to dismissal under the procedures discussed in this section. Criteria for
12 judging faculty performance to be substantially below an acceptable level shall include, but
13 is not limited to the following: (1) unreported extended absence from the classroom, (2)
14 failure to submit grades for a course, (3) absence of an evaluation or testing process for
15 students of a class, (4) failure to provide assigned advising services, (5) failure to be
16 prepared to present course material, (6) failure to address corrections of identified gross
17 impediments in conveying knowledge, (7) violations of accepted standards of scholarly
18 activity (as discussed in Section 6.15 of the *Faculty Handbook*, Misconduct in Research),
19 (8) failure to fulfill the agreed upon responsibilities associated with University service, and
20 (9) creating a hostile and destructive environment which disrupts the normal educational
21 mission of the University.
22
- 23 5. No substantive amendment may later be made to the complaint unless the faculty member
24 is given adequate time, as judged by the Formal Review Committee, to prepare a defense.
25
- 26 6. The complaint will list by name the witnesses that the University may call as to each
27 charge. The University may add witnesses later if the Formal Review Committee agrees.
28
- 29 7. If the University suspends the faculty member before final action is taken by the President,
30 the suspension will be without prejudice to the continuation or outcome of the procedure
31 stated here. These procedures do not themselves speak to the issue of whether the
32 University has a right to suspend faculty prior to the President's final action.
33

34 3.295 SELECTING THE FORMAL REVIEW COMMITTEE 35

- 36 1. The Faculty Senate Rules Committee, with technical assistance supplied by the University
37 Affirmative Action Officer, will establish a pool of thirty tenured faculty members selected
38 from the existing grievance pool as potential members of Formal Review Committees. The
39 pool will be representative of the University faculty to the extent possible: It will include
40 tenured faculty from the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor
41 and an effort will be made to include members of federally protected classes.
42
- 43 2. No member of the pool selected for service in a given case shall be from the same
44 department as the faculty member. Persons selected for service on the Formal Review
45 Committee who allege conflict of interest or who cannot be impartial may petition the Vice

1 President of Academic Affairs to be excused from serving in the particular case.
2

- 3 3. After the Informal Review Committee has directed that a matter proceed to formal hearing,
4 the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee in consultation with the members of the
5 Rules Committee will select a Convener and will then select five members from the pool to
6 constitute the Formal Review Committee. No person who served on the Informal Review
7 Committee relative to the given case shall then serve on the Formal Review Committee.
8
- 9 4. The Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee will notify both parties of the names of
10 the Formal Review Committee members and the Convener. Thereupon, the University and
11 the faculty member may exercise in rotation four challenges to remove prospective
12 Committee members. These four challenges can be used without giving a reason. It is not
13 required, however, that a party exercise them. There will be unlimited challenges for
14 cause, for which the party making the challenge will, at the time it is made, submit a written
15 statement of justification. Challenges for cause can also be made against the Convener.
16 The Faculty Senate Rules Committee will decide the merit of challenges for cause. If a
17 prospective hearing Committee member is removed by challenge, the Chair of the Faculty
18 Senate Rules Committee will immediately make a new selection and notify both parties. If
19 the pool is exhausted by the challenges, the Faculty Senate Rules Committee will add
20 temporary members to the pool for the hearing of the one case. If this occurs, each party
21 will have one additional challenge.
22
- 23 5. If, once the panel has been established and prior to the start of the hearing, any member of
24 the Formal Review Committee is unable to continue because of good and sufficient reason
25 as judged by a majority of the remainder of the Committee, a replacement agreeable to
26 both the faculty member and the University shall be appointed by the Chair of the Faculty
27 Senate Rules Committee.
28
- 29 6. Faculty who serve on an Informal Review Committee or on a Formal Review Committee
30 are exempt from service on either type of Committee for the two years immediately
31 following that service.
32

33 **3.296 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FORMAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**
34

- 35 1. The Convener of the Formal Review Committee is responsible for ensuring fair and
36 expeditious procedures, for setting the schedule of the hearing, and for chairing the
37 meetings. The Convener is responsible for submitting the final report of the Formal
38 Review Committee to the President of the University and to the parties.
39
- 40 2. Members of the Formal Review Committee are responsible for attending the meetings, for
41 considering all evidence and testimony, and deciding, by using their best professional
42 judgment, and recommending whether dismissal is warranted by the evidence, whether
43 some other sanction is warranted by the evidence, or whether no sanction or penalty is
44 warranted by the evidence.
45

- 1 3. The hearing itself, unless it is an open hearing, and the deliberations following the hearing
2 of evidence and argument will be in executive session. Unless ordered by a court to the
3 contrary, all members of the University community have a duty to maintain the
4 confidentiality of the proceedings. The Convener and members of the Formal Review
5 Committee will sign the final report, although one or more concurring or dissenting reports
6 may be attached by panel members.
7

8 **3.297 PROCEDURES PRIOR TO THE HEARING**

9

- 10 1. The faculty member may, at any time but no later than ten working days before the
11 beginning of the formal hearing, file with the Chair of the Faculty Senate Rules Committee
12 a written response to the charges.
13
- 14 2. Unless the faculty member and the Convener of the Formal Review Committee agree to an
15 earlier hearing, a minimum of twenty-one (21) working days must elapse between the
16 final formalization of the charges and the first hearing by the Formal Review Committee.
17
- 18 3. The Convener shall call the Formal Review Committee to its first meeting not less than
19 one week before the scheduled date of the hearing so that the Formal Review Committee
20 may review its procedures and responsibilities and receive the formal charges. Thereafter,
21 the Formal Review Committee will meet at the call of its Convener.
22

23 **3.298 HEARING PROCEDURES**

24

- 25 1. The Convener of the Formal Review Committee will establish the schedule for the
26 hearings and shall conduct and control the hearings. Every effort will be made to complete
27 the hearings in a timely manner as well as to accommodate the needs of the parties.
28
- 29 2. The Formal Review Committee may make arrangements for written testimony with the
30 consent of both parties.
31
- 32 3. Neither the University nor any person employed by it shall retaliate for testimony or
33 information given.
34
- 35 4. At the hearing, each party may be accompanied by (1) a representative, who is not an
36 attorney, to serve as an advocate and/or assist in the presentation, and/or (2) an attorney,
37 who may advise, but not participate in the proceedings.
38
- 39 5. If the Formal Review Committee request legal counsel that is independent of the
40 University's counsel, the University has the obligation of finding such counsel for the
41 Committee.
42
- 43 6. All hearing of evidence and argument by the Formal Review Committee will be
44 electronically recorded, and the recording will be retained by the University Archives for a
45 period of five years. If, however, the rules of the Board of Regents require a stenographic

1 or other form of record, such a record shall be made in place of a recording, and so
2 retained for five years.

- 3
- 4 7. The hearings will be closed unless the faculty member informs the Convener prior to the
5 hearings of his or her desire for the hearings to be open. If the hearings are open, members
6 of the media may attend. However, the hearings may not be televised, broadcast, or
7 electronically recorded (other than the official recording referred to in the preceding
8 paragraph), except with the consent of all parties and the Committee.
- 9
- 10 8. The University shall go first in regard to the presentation of the evidence and has the
11 obligation to establish facts which prove and support the charges made in the complaint.
- 12
- 13 9. All parties may call witnesses and introduce evidence. The parties will have access to all
14 written and oral evidence that is introduced and considered. The Formal Review
15 Committee and the parties may question each witness. Each party may offer rebuttal
16 witnesses or statements to any evidence or testimony after it is presented. The Formal
17 Review Committee shall consider the evidence and testimony presented by each side.
- 18
- 19 10. Because of the wide variety of circumstances, it is impossible to formulate clearly a rule
20 restricting the admission of evidence of past conduct that will draw the precise line for
21 inclusion and exclusion. Accordingly, it will be within the discretion of the Formal Review
22 Committee to allow or disallow such evidence.
- 23
- 24 11. The Formal Review Committee is not limited by the rules of evidence as applied in a court
25 of law, and may admit such evidence as it considers desirable and relevant to hear.
- 26
- 27 12. When each party has presented its evidence and made a final summary of its case, the
28 Formal Review Committee will retire to deliberate in executive session. The Formal
29 Review Committee will use its best professional judgment in determining whether the
30 charges have been proven and what action should be taken by the University. The
31 deliberations will not be recorded, and voting will be by secret ballot on each of the
32 Committee's findings and recommendations. The Convener does not have a vote.
- 33
- 34 13. The private notes of a Formal Review Committee member are the committee member's
35 work product and are not part of the official record.
- 36
- 37 14. Members of the Formal Review Committee will scrupulously avoid discussing the case
38 with any person who is not on the Committee, or with other committee members apart
39 from the meeting of the group. The Convener of the Committee may discuss procedural
40 and evidentiary issues with the parties or their representatives and may keep the University
41 President and the President of the Faculty Senate apprised of the progress, though not of
42 the content, of the hearings.
- 43
- 44 15. After the hearing has commenced, all members of the Committee must be present, with the
45 exception that if one member of the Committee becomes unable, after the hearings have

1 begun, to attend, the remainder of the Committee, consisting then of four members, shall
2 constitute the panel for all further activity. If two or more members of the Committee
3 become unable to serve, the hearings shall be suspended and the Faculty Senate Rules
4 Committee will initiate the process again with the selection of a new Formal Review
5 Committee. To avoid dropping a member or causing the creation of a new committee, the
6 Convener of the Committee may postpone sessions of the Committee, for a period not to
7 exceed twenty(20) working days, during the period of a committee member's temporary
8 inability to attend.
9

10 3.299 PROCEDURES AFTER THE HEARING

- 11
12 1. The Convener of the Formal Review Committee will submit the signed final report of the
13 Committee, together with any written concurring and dissenting opinions, to the parties
14 and to the President of the University within ten (10) working days of the conclusion of the
15 hearing. The final report shall:
 - 16
17 a. State, as to each charge, whether the evidence presented supported the charge(s).
 - 18
19 b. State the recommendation(s) of the Committee, which may be for dismissal, or for a
20 lesser penalty or penalties, or for vindication; and shall state the justification for the
21 recommendation(s).
22
 - 23
24 c. With regard to each recommendation, the vote shall be recorded.
 - 25
26 d. Be signed by all members of the Formal Review Committee, although the signature of
27 any member shall not necessarily signify that member's agreement with the result.
- 28 2. Within five (5) working days of receipt of the Formal Review Committee's final report, any
29 party may submit a written statement to the President of the University.
30
- 31 3. The Formal Review Committee will file a separate report, relating to the
32 dismissal-for-cause procedures, with the President of the Faculty Senate and with the Vice
33 President of Academic Affairs. This report should address the effectiveness of the
34 procedures and make recommendations for whatever changes the Committee deems
35 appropriate in the procedures or in other matters. This report should be filed within twenty
36 (20) working days of the completion of the work of the Committee.
37
- 38 4. The President of the University will notify the direct participants in the dismissal process of
39 the President's decision.
40
- 41 5. Although the President has the final legal authority from the Board of Regents in personnel
42 matters, the interest of the University in faculty self-governance and the principle of peer
43 evaluation suggest that the recommendations of the Formal Review Committee will
44 generally be accepted. In cases where the recommendations of the Formal Review

1 Committee are not accepted, the President will discuss said recommendations with the
2 Formal Review Committee as well as the direct participants in the dismissal process.

3
4 6. The faculty member will not be subject to retaliation because of the use of this procedure.

5
6 7. Once the University President has informed the faculty member of the decision, the
7 Convener of the Formal Review Committee shall deliver all files and records of the
8 proceedings to the University Archives, which shall hold them for at least five years. Such
9 material will be considered confidential as a personnel matter.

10
11

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS

PROPOSAL FOR CLINICAL FACULTY TRACK



The College of Health Professions, Wichita State University, proposes the establishment of a Clinical Faculty Track which will be non-tenure earning, but which will allow advancement of those faculty meeting specified, rigorous criteria including teaching, scholarship, and service. Scholarship will primarily be inherent in teaching and clinical expertise and not in traditional research-based activities. Teaching and clinical expertise will be the primary focus of the role.

Promotion in rank for clinical track faculty will follow the university promotion structure using the standards for clinical faculty (see attached). Clinical track faculty may remain in the position as long as annual evaluations are satisfactory and the needs of the college are met.

Rationale and background:

1. As the health professions evolve as academic and clinical disciplines, both research-based and clinical faculty are essential. The health professions rely heavily on the clinical expertise of faculty and close supervision of students in laboratory/clinical settings. As such, many faculty spend the majority of their time (20+ hours per week) working directly with students who are providing care to patients in actual clinical settings.
2. Currently, these teaching faculty are placed in the inappropriate category of unclassified professionals; and under this category they are not part of the university faculty. These faculty are not represented on university faculty committees nor in the Faculty Senate. They have no input in university academic matters. In addition to the disenfranchisement of this faculty group, the situation weakens the power base of all WSU faculty. In the past, it has lead to inappropriate and misleading calculation of credit hour production for faculty. Budget appropriations to this group have been different than to the faculty as a whole.
3. This category for faculty is not new. Academic health science centers with medical schools have had this type of faculty appointment for a number of years. Nursing and allied health schools, including the University of Kansas, have developed a non-tenure clinical track. Other examples include Vanderbilt, University of Pittsburgh, State University of New York at Buffalo, St. Louis University, Johns Hopkins University, and University of Maryland. A two-track system is very common in universities with clinical programs. Typically, when two tracks are present, one is the traditional research, tenure track and the other a clinical, non-tenure track.

4. Impacting faculty in health professions education is the changing health-care system.
5. This non-tenure track is proposed for faculty with clinical expertise whose primary responsibilities reflect clinical and related classroom teaching. Faculty seeking appointment, reappointment, and promotion in the clinical track would be reviewed in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Scholarship within these ranks is evidenced in teaching within the clinical, classroom, and community settings.

CLINICAL TRACK: NON-TENURE
STANDARDS FOR CLINICAL FACULTY ACCORDING TO RANK

Recommendations for advancement in rank will be made according to the standards below. In addition to standards for each rank, the candidate for promotion will demonstrate potential for continuing growth in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to assure future contributions to the school, college, and university. Scholarship within these ranks is evidenced by teaching in clinical, classroom, and community settings.

1. Clinical Instructor

The faculty member shall demonstrate evidence of ability to teach and provide service to the university and community. The faculty member at this rank will have a minimum of a master's degree in an appropriate area.

2. Assistant Clinical Professor

The faculty member shall have demonstrated evidence of clinical instructor rank qualifications; shall have demonstrated adequacy in teaching; and shall show evidence of clinical expertise, potential for clinical scholarship or creative activity, and some university service appropriate to the mission of the school or college. A minimum of a master's degree in an appropriate area is required.

3. Associate Clinical Professor

The faculty member shall have demonstrated evidence of assistant clinical professor rank qualifications and shall have documented evidence of effective teaching, clinical scholarship, or creative activity which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level. Professional or school/college service is normally expected. The faculty member at this rank will have a minimum of a master's degree in an appropriate area. A doctoral degree in an appropriate area is normally expected.

4. Clinical Professor

The faculty member shall have demonstrated evidence of associate clinical rank standards; shall have documented evidence of sustained effective teaching, a record of substantial accomplishment in clinical scholarship, or creative activity which has led to recognition in professional circles at the national level; and shall have demonstrated leadership in the form of service to the university and the profession. The faculty member at this rank will have a doctoral degree in an appropriate field.



WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate

APRIL 28, 1997

To: Faculty Senate
From: Buma Fridman, chair of the library committee

Faculty Senate Library Committee report (1996-97 Academic year).

1. List of committee members.

(voting) faculty: Denise Celestin, James Clark, Buma Fridman (chair), David Koert, Richard Laptad, Janice Riordan, Samuel Yeager.

Student Representatives: Daniel Gilligan (undergrad), Stanley Samuel (grad).

(ex officio, non-voting) Library Administration: Kathy Downs, Jean Eaglesfield, James Eller, Philip Howze, Jasper Schad.

2. The committee met several times in the Fall semester and once a month in the Spring 1997 semester.

3. Major issues considered by the committee: budget cuts and its impact on collections, report on the NCA survey, the millionth volume campaign, electronic delivery systems, possible budget strategies.

4. In my opinion the major pending issue is still the library budget strategy to provide necessary library materials to support teaching and research of our faculty and students.

5. In our last meeting a letter to the President concerning library support has been unanimously approved (attached). I am asking the Faculty Senate to endorse this letter, and the Senate President to write a separate letter to the University President conveying the endorsement.

6. In 1996 year the library has agreed to produce a budget report at the beginning of every fiscal year and make it available to the Senate Library committee, and to every interested WSU faculty or student. This year's budget report is attached.



WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate

APRIL 28, 1997

President Eugene M. Hughes
Wichita State University
Campus Box #1

Dear President Hughes:

Library work being an integral part of students education and faculty teaching and research, the Senate Library Committee is concerned about anything that may threaten the students' and faculty's ability to pursue knowledge. The Library's budget problems pose such a threat. Once again, the library must plan further cuts in book purchases and journal subscriptions for the coming year. In an effort to reduce the impact of these cuts, the library introduced a document delivery service that will enable the faculty to receive copies of articles in journals that have been canceled or were never owned by the library. This new service offers promise, but it is in its infancy and not yet fully evolved. Furthermore, the faculty need time to learn how to use this system. Now is not the time for further cuts in library acquisitions. Fortunately, some of the inflationary loss in the library's buying power is offset by state increases in base budgets, the Campaign for the Library for the 21st Century, and Mill Levy funds. The library and Senate Library Committee are together looking at ways to make the best use of available funds. Despite these efforts, the library's base budget needs to be increased. The Senate Library Committee, therefore, asks that funds be found to enable WSU to maintain book and periodical acquisitions. We ask you to give this matter serious consideration. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Buma Fridman
Chair, Faculty Senate Library Committee

LIBRARY EXPENDITURES FY 97 projected

	BOOKS AND JOURNALS	DOCUMENT DELIVERY	EQUIPMENT	PERSONNEL	OTHER OOE	TOTAL
BUDGET FY 97	\$1,466,758		\$0	\$2,198,468	\$378,395	\$4,043,621
APPROPRIATIONS						
EXPENDITURES FY 97 &&&	\$1,466,758		\$30,520	\$2,076,329	\$378,395	\$3,912,002
STSA*		\$8,000	\$60,000		\$16,000	\$84,000
RESEARCH/MILL LEVY&	\$30,000					\$0
ENDOWMENT-GEN**	\$120,000					\$120,000
ENDOWMENT-SPEC***	\$95,000		\$48,500			\$143,500
21ST CENTURY CAMPAIGN&&	\$36,235					\$10,000
CARRY OVER FROM FY 96****		\$60,000				\$60,000
TOTALS	\$1,747,993	\$8,000	\$139,020	\$2,076,329	\$394,395	\$4,269,502
PERCENT	40.9%	0.2%	3.3%	48.6%	9.2%	\$1
FY 96 EXPEND	\$1,749,586	\$60,000	\$123,162	\$2,058,354	\$380,545	\$4,371,707
CHANGE	(\$1,653)	(\$52,000)	\$15,858	\$17,975	\$13,850	(\$4,317)
EST. CARRY OVER TO FY 98	\$80,000	\$40,000				\$120,000

*STSA-SPECIAL TARGETED STATE APPROPRIATION

**ENDOWMENT-GEN-FUNDS CAN BE USED FOR ALL TYPES OF LIBRARY MATERIALS

***ENDOWMENT-SPEC-CAN ONLY BE USED FOR SPECIFIC SUBJECTS AND TYPES OF MATERIALS

**** PAID TO EBSCODoc FROM FY 96 BUDGET TO MAKE DOCUMENT DELIVERY AVAILABLE FOR FY 97 & FY 98

&DEPOSITED INTO EBSCO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

&& PARTIALLY CARRIED FORWARD INTO FY 98

&&& \$30,000 LIKELY TO BE DEPOSITED INTO BLACKWELL ACCOUNT

BUDGET INCREASE

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Library (2800 & 2801 Grants, etc)</u>	<u>% Increase</u>	<u>University Educational & General</u>	<u>% Library</u>
1966	\$ 479,233		\$ 6,484,407	7.39%
1967	531,788	11.0%	8,003,110	6.64%
1968	655,486	23.3%	9,403,337	6.97%
1969	691,060	5.4%	10,576,598	6.53%
1970	844,368	22.2%	12,683,666	6.66%
1971	914,687	8.3%	14,840,823	6.16%
1972	924,359	1.1%	15,639,636	5.91%
1973	1,047,595	13.3%	17,696,896	5.92%
1974	1,069,510	2.1%	19,584,058	5.46%
1975	1,135,451	6.2%	24,415,755	4.65%
1976	1,363,782	20.1%	27,785,524	4.91%
1977	1,519,779	11.4%	30,208,460	5.03%
1978	1,591,569	4.7%	32,528,068	4.49%
1979	1,785,180	12.2%	35,417,588	5.04%
1980	1,872,033	4.8%	38,212,405	4.90%
1981	2,007,425	7.2%	43,573,780	4.61%
1982	2,173,676	8.3%	47,074,183	4.62%
1983	2,270,918	4.5%	46,693,053	4.57%
1984	2,360,034	3.9%	55,723,304	4.24%
1985	2,707,189	4.7%	61,930,896	4.37%
1986	2,840,382	4.9%	66,607,282	4.26%
1987	2,917,105	2.7%	67,764,744	4.30%
1988	3,015,644	3.4%	72,225,278	4.18%
1989	3,346,149	11.0%	78,855,697	4.24%
1990	3,464,172	3.5%	84,600,460	4.09%
1991*	3,945,349	13.9%	90,482,718	4.36%
1992	3,640,714	(7.7)%	96,301,088	3.78%
1993	3,853,781	5.9%	100,168,560	3.85%
1994	3,909,835	1.5%	103,963,037	3.76%
1995	4,045,109	3.5%	110,729,197	3.65%
1996	4,125,011	2.0%	114,224,243	3.61%

*Includes Patent Trademark & Depository Library Grant from FY91

Source: WSU Annual Financial Report

FACULTY SENATE

Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of April 28, 1997

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alagic, Armstrong, Bair, Bajaj, Baxter, Bennett, Benson, Brooks, Burk, Byrum, Campbell, Coats, Coffman, Davis, DeSilva, Dreifort, Hawley, Hemans, Houts, Hoyer, Hughes, Kukral, Leavitt, McKellar, Mandt, Matson, Murphey, Palmiotto, Papanicolaou, Riordan, Sharp, Skinner, Stone, Swan, Talia, Terrell, Toops, Wahlbeck, Wang, York

MEMBERS ABSENT: Berry-Bravo, Celestin, Cheraghi, Detjens, Deyoe, Goldsteen, Kraft, Lescoe-Long, Miller, Parker, Sutterlin, Yenne

GUESTS:

SUMMARY OF ACTION:

- 1. Accepted annual reports of the Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Faculty Support, General Education, Honors, and Tenure and Promotion Committees*
- 2. Approved recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committee on test out policy, on program discontinuance on shortened formats of courses and referred proposed changes in the Withdrawal policy to the Curriculum Committee for further study.*
- 3. Established an ad hoc committee to review the Regents' proposed policy on intellectual property rights.*
- 4. Endorsed Senate Library Committee's request to the President to increase the Library's base budget.*
- 5. Returned proposal for clinical faculty track to the College of Health Professions to develop rationale.*

I. CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER:

President Hawley called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS

President Hawley asked for a change in agenda in order to have time to discuss pressing matters with Kenneth Pitetti, Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, who had class at 4:00. Pitetti began by committing on the College of Health Professions proposal for a Clinical Track Faculty stating that the changing of designation of unclassified professionals who teach more than 50% of their time to ranked faculty positions may start a precedent. He asked if other universities have done this. A faculty title would lead people to assume the person is a faculty member when in effect many may no longer be, unless the term "clinical" were added to the title descriptions. (This statement was in reference to the process whereby unclassified professionals who teach more than 50% of their time are being designated with rank and evaluated by faculty in his college.)

Regarding the Tenure and Promotion Committee's annual report, two senators pointed out that the numbers were inaccurate. Pitetti stated he would check with the Secretary and correct the numbers. Pitetti explained that there were disagreements over 6 candidates. In three of the cases, the committee's decision was

made with the assumption that the candidates were in an early application. Had the committee realized that these were not early, their decision would have been in agreement with that of the Vice President. He further noted that the Tenure and Promotion Committee plays an advisory, although very important role, and that disagreements would naturally occur from time to time. He stated that this is a very professional committee, it is unpolitical, no hearsay was acted upon, and that the committee plays a vital role in the tenure & promotion process.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of April 14, 1997, were approved with the correction on page 2 where the name of the state senator should be "Edmonds" and not "Hammond."

IV. PRESIDENTS REPORT:

President Hawley noted that nomination forms for Senate officer positions and for Planning and Budget Committee seats were due April 29.

She explained that the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents had been requested to comment on the Regents proposed policy on intellectual property rights. After some discussion, Senator Murphey moved that an ad hoc committee be formed to review, explain and comment upon the policy. Senator Swan seconded. The vote was taken and motion passed. Senator Murphey agreed to chair the Committee. Senators Swan, Riordan, Skinner and Coats volunteered to serve on the Committee.

President Hawley noted that the North Central Accreditation Association visiting team had presented their findings on April 16, that the final report would come to WSU at the end of May and that the final report, after reading, would be sent to the NCA in September. She noted that there may be an article in the May 9 issue of Inside WSU about the verbal report that had been given on April 16. She stated that the team had recommended a 10 year approval but that there would be a focus visit during the year 2000-01 on the issue of clarification of goals.

Finally, she noted that Gary Greenberg would discuss the report of the Ad hoc Task Force on Programmatic Review at the May 12 meeting and that Tony Ross was at that point unable to meet with the senate this year.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

The annual reports of the Faculty Support, General Education, Honors and Tenure and Promotion Committees were accepted.

The reports from the Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs contained action items, and were next discussed.

Senator Sharp, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, presented the recommendations of that committee. First, item A, a request from the Elliott School of Communication concerning exempting certain courses from the university's test out policy. Sharp moved acceptance of the recommendation. Senator Byrum seconded. The motion passed. Next, Sharp moved that the item C of the Committee's report that paragraph 2.8 of the Program Discontinuance Policy be changed to read "*Proposals for potential program discontinuance shall be made in writing. Such proposals will include identification of circumstances leading to the recommendation, a detailed rationale for the recommendation, a statement of the projected impact on the mission of the University and the academic unit, a statement of the projected impact on students and faculty of the academic unit and a statement of the financial resources and faculty positions likely to be affected by the recommendation. Copies of the formal proposals will be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the head of the affected unit. The faculty of the affected unit may file a formal response with the Vice President for Academic.*" Senator Murphey seconded the motion. Vote was taken and the motion carried. Third, Senator Sharp moved acceptance of item D, a proposal on courses offered in shortened formats be accepted. The recommendation was for at least 15 hours of class time. Senator Murphey seconded. The vote

was taken and the motion carried.

Recommendation B of the committee having to do with the "W" grade was discussed. Senators Murphey and Eaglesfield noted that the Curriculum Committee had already sent a recommendation accepting the changes in the W grade and this had been accepted by the Senate earlier in the semester. After discussion, Senator Murphey, second by Senator Wahlbeck, moved to refer this issue back to the Curriculum Committee for further review of what the Academic Affairs committee had recommended. Senator Baxter, a former Chair of the Exemptions Committee, noted that timeliness of the withdraw should be watched.

At this time, President Hawley suspended rules and moved to New Business for consideration of Item A. After Item A (Library issues) was discussed, the meeting returned to the report of the Committee on Faculty Affairs. President Hawley asked if the Senate were willing to take action on the recommendation of the committee. There was no action taken.

All committee reports were accepted.

VI. OLD BUSINESS:

A. October Break--2nd reading -- Senator Brooks.

Senator Brooks explained that the Student Government Association had endorsed his proposal. Senator Bajaj moved that the proposal be adopted. Senator Bair seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued. Senator Dreifort objected to disrupting the summer season by adopting this change and stated that the fall break was essentially Thanksgiving. Senator Bajaj stated that the October break would give students an opportunity to catch up with their work. Senator Dreifort noted that students would not use such breaks to catch up anyway.

The vote was taken; there were 17 in favor and 16 opposed with one abstention. The motion passed.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Library issues -- Dean Schad, Tom Borrego, Buma Fridman.

President Hawley introduced Jasper Schad, Dean of the Libraries. Dean Schad began by introducing Tom Borrego, Director of Development for the Libraries, to summarize the Campaign for the 21st Century. Borrego explained that the Campaign had raised nearly \$1 million to date. He noted that in relation to the current situation of having to cancel journal subscriptions while at the same time fund raising was going on, he is trying to develop a strategy whereby faculty in the affected areas of the journal cuts would be asked for names of people in the community who might help in those subjects. Borrego noted that campaigns for subscriptions are generally not successful; rather, that successful library campaigns have usually been brick and mortar campaigns. He also noted that this is the first library campaign of this University.

Next, Dean Schad addressed the issue of the journal cancellations. He summarized the reasons for the high inflation of library materials and that there does not seem to be relief from this situation soon. He said that to solve the problem, \$125,000 would have to be added to the base budget every year to meet inflation. This would imply that \$2.5 million would have to be raised each year in endowment. Although the Campaign had been a help, he noted that most of the endowed funds would not be seen until 1998. He noted how document delivery helped in the areas of high cost low use journals.

He stated that the Library has achieved substantial economies that will reduce the level of next year's cuts and that he will continue to look for additional funds in order to postpone entirely any cuts next year. The results of these efforts will not be known until early July. In the meantime, the Library must continue to draw up lists of titles that will be canceled if enough money is not found.

Dean Schad concluded that the bottom line was either to change the process of scholarly communication or to add more funds to the base budget of the library. He stated that Library was grateful for the advice and counsel for the Senate Library Committee who have talked these issues through with the library administration. He then turned to Buma Fridman, Chair of the Senate Library Committee.

Fridman presented the annual report of the Senate Library Committee. He called attention to the attached letter to President Hughes requesting additional funds for the Library. He asked that the Senate endorse this letter and that the Senate President send a letter conveying this endorsement to the President.

Questions to Dean Schad about budget and the proportion of the University budget spent on library followed. Fridman noted that if the library's material budget were increased 2% next year, the projected journal cut would be reduced by half. President Hawley asked if the decreasing buying power of the library had affected the buying of books; Dean Schad answered that it had. Senator Matson noted that one of the charts attached to the Library Committee report showed that the Library's budget over the past 30 years had increased, but that the library's share of the University budget had decreased. He asked Dean Schad how this compared with peer institutions. Dean Schad noted that current levels of funding are comparable to other schools but WSU is a small university, with low enrollment, therefore it is difficult to properly fund programs. He gave the University of Nevada at Las Vegas as an example.

Senator Bennett moved that the Senate endorse the letter and that President Hawley send a letter conveying the endorsement. Senator Riordan seconded the motion. Vote was taken and the motion carried.

B. College of Health Professions Proposal for Clinical Faculty Track.

President Hawley stated that this was a request from VPAA Patton for Senate reaction to a proposal for a non-tenurable promotable track requested by the College of Health Professions. She turned to Senator Riordan to present the proposal. Senator Riordan stated that there is a need for this because of the clinical nature of the work. These are very skilled people and the College does not want to lose them, it is not a new idea and several other universities have such clinical faculty.

Senator Davis asked who would rank these people. Senator Swan stated that it would be the tenure and promotion committee who would do the ranking. Senator Bennett noted that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs had just recommended that there not be two tracks of faculty and that this proposal looked just like such a system would be developed. Senator Baxter asked why tenure could not be given to such people. Senator Campbell noted that this would actually establish a third track of teachers in the College--the faculty, the unclassified professionals who teach who were currently being designated into ranks and put into the tenure track, and this, the third track of non-tenurable faculty. Senator Mandt stated that there is no rationale for non-tenurable faculty in the proposal. Senator Terrell asked if the college already had guidelines for tenure and promotion. Senator Campbell noted that the revised guidelines had yet to be written.

Senator Swan moved that this proposal be returned to the College to develop a rationale as to why a separate clinical track is needed and to be returned back to the Senate at a later date. Senator Eaglesfield seconded the motion. Senator Terrell suggested that the college also state why they are not providing tenure to these people. Senator Swan suspected that the college would not probably want to give tenure to these people. Senator Mandt offered an amendment that the Faculty Affairs committee be consulted by the College in the development of this rationale. This would give them the benefit of the larger university-wide perspective on the issue. This was accepted as a friendly amendment by Senator Swan. Vote was taken, motion passed with one vote in opposition. The proposal would be returned to the College to consult with the Committee on Faculty Affairs to develop a rationale.

VIII. AS MAY ARISE:

President Hawley stated that the Dismissal for Cause issue would be on the agenda of the May 5 meeting and that Senators were to read the proposal from Senator Mandt to amend section E. 294, section 2.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jean Eaglesfield, Secretary