



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1997-1998

Volume XI

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of April 27, 1998

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

MEETING NOTICE: Monday, April 27, 1998
Room 107 CH 3:30 p.m.

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

- I. Call of the Meeting to Order
- II. Informal Statements and Proposals
- III. Approval of the Minutes
- IV. President's Report
- V. Committee Reports
 - A. Rules
 - B. Annual Reports from: (*green attachments*) Academic Affairs
Honors
Library
- VI. Old Business
 - A. Honors Committee proposal - 2nd reading (*peach attachment*)
 - B. General Education report (*2nd green attachment*)
- VII. New Business
 - A. University Tenure & Promotion report (*2nd peach attachment*)
- VIII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

William Terrell	President	3220	Box 78
Jean Eaglesfield	Vice President	5073	Box 68
Christopher Brooks	Secretary	6194	Box 14
Elmer Hoyer	President Elect	6314	Box 44
Donna Hawley	Past President	5724	Box 41
ELECTED BY THE SENATE			
Deborah Baxter		3103	Box 53
Tina Bennett		6694	Box 14
APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT			
Donald Byrum		3551	Box 67

FACULTY SENATE ANNUAL REPORT

Academic Affairs Committee

April 8, 1998

Annual Report for the 1997/98 Academic Year.

Academic Affairs Committee members:

Mara Alagic,	Mathematics and Statistics
Tina Bennett,	English
Larry Blocher,	Music
Jeri Carroll,	Curriculum and Instruction (Education)
Sue Enns,	Physician Assistant (Health Sciences)
Susan Huxman,	Elliott School of Communication
Larry Paarmann,	Electrical & Computer Engineering

Committee Chairman: Larry D. Paarmann

The Committee was concerned with only two items this academic year, one completed and one pending: preparing a response to the Draft Strategic Plan, and preparing a response to the Interim Report on Tenure and Promotion.

Draft Strategic Plan

The Committee received the Faculty Senate charge (attached) to the Academic Affairs Committee, to identify concerns and questions on the Draft Strategic Plan relevant to the Academic Affairs Committee, and prepare a response to the Faculty Senate, on November 6.

Members of the Academic Affairs Committee met on November 11, November 18, and November 25, to discuss the charge and prepare a report for the Faculty Senate. The report (attached) was sent to the Faculty Senate on November 25.

Interim Report on Tenure and Promotion

The Committee received a copy of the Interim Report on Tenure and Promotion (attached) in March (dated March 9). To date no action has been taken. Plans are for the Committee to meet and discuss the Report, and forward comments to the Faculty Senate before the end of this semester.

Respectfully submitted, Larry D. Paarmann

LDP

Honors Committee Report

Honors Committee Membership

Dr. Nancy Brooks
Dr. Jharna Chaudhuri
Dr. Sylvia Coats, Chair
Dr. Tony Gythiel
Dr. Buddy Johns
Mary Anthes (fall semester only)
Heather Muller, student member
Dr. A.J. Mandt, Honors Program Director, ex officio
Dr. Andrew Craig, Professor Emeritus, ex officio

Meeting Dates:

Oct. 17	Feb. 13
Oct. 31	March 13
Dec. 5	April 10
	April 17

The Honors Committee moved, seconded, and passed a proposal by Dr. Jay Mandt, Honors Program Director, for changes recommended in honors requirements. The change deals with upper division Honors courses in the college or department of the student's major. The proposal was forwarded to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

The Honors Program continues to grow with enrollment increases of 44% and credit hour increases of 65% compared to three years ago. The committee reviewed the Fall 98 schedule. Twelve seminars will be offered, a significant increase from past years.

Beginning in Fall, 1998 Brennan Hall will house honors students. A presentation about the Honors residence hall will be made at the Quick Start Orientation program in April. An Honors Center in Neff Hall (formerly the Conferences office) will provide office space, a spacious student lounge, a computer lab, and seminar room. Renovation of Neff Hall should be complete by Spring 99.

In response to the need for more staff, Professor Emeritus Andrew Craig was hired as a part-time Associate Director.

The Honors Committee conducted the 3 year review of Dr. Mandt and will forward the results to Dr. Bobby Patton, Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Committee members attended receptions for the Quick Start Orientation and the Distinguished Scholarship Invitational.

Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

Senate Library Committee for 1997-1998

Sam Yeager, Chair

April 10, 1998

This is the list of members on the Faculty Senate Library Committee for FY98:

Celestin, Denise, Fine Arts
Clark, Jim, Business
Cochran, Diana, Health Professions
Conard, Rebecca, Liberal Arts
Fridman, Buma, Liberal Arts
Laptad, Richard, Education
Yeager, Samuel, Liberal Arts
Phommachanh, Thip SGA (undergraduate)

Ex-Officio members of the committee from the Library include

Downes, Kathy
Eaglesfield, Jean
Howze, Phil
Eller, Jim
Schad, Jasper

To date, the Library Committee meet 5 times during the year and has one more meeting scheduled. These meetings occurred on October 21, November 18, December 16, 1997, and on February 17, and March 17, 1998. Our last meeting of the year is scheduled on April 21st.

Significant matters examined this year included the following: revisions to the library circulation policy, review of the Library for the 21st Century Campaign, review of the library annual report, meeting with Academic Vice President Bobby Patton to discuss future funding and building needs, review of library space needs and expansion options, and a review of plans for the 24-hour study facilities to be added to the library. The most significant of these items are reviewed here.

The Library for the 21st Century Campaign

As of October 31st, The Library for the 21st Century Campaign had received over \$891,000. Forty-five percent of this amount was cash. The goal for this campaign was three million dollars. Efforts were in process to make appeals to potential large donors, and a broad appeal through public service announcements. The intent was to finish the campaign by June 30, 1998.

Funding Needs of the Library

In recent years funding needs of the Wichita State University Library have received considerable attention. The cost of books and periodicals continues to rise faster than the inflation rate and faster than the rate of increase in the library budget. This has resulted in purchase of fewer books, and repeated efforts to reduce the number of periodicals purchased. This has had a qualitative impact on library support of teaching and research. The repeated periodical cuts have been disturbing to a number of faculty.

Funding needs have been partially met by the Academic Vice President finding additional monies at the end of budget years and by the recent fund raising campaign for the library. Although these efforts are worthy and effective they are temporary stopgaps not permanent solutions to the ongoing library funding problem. Continued cost increases will require further cuts in library book and periodical purchases to balance the budget in the year 2000.

Library Annual Report

The library annual report indicates significant increases in library use. Major improvements have been made in provision of electronic media.

The current library circulation system and the new university UNIX computer system are incompatible. New software will have to be purchased and installed.

Other highlights of the library annual report include the following points:

1. Use per FTE student has increased from 51.1 items in 1989 to 79.8 items in 1997. Attendance dropped 16% during this same period. These figures reflect the increasing impact of electronic products and their use by students outside the library.
2. From the time it was introduced until the end of the fiscal year, the use of articles in EBSCOhost increased to the point where it was three times that of print journals. As EBSCOhost had little effect on the use of the print collection, most of this was new use.
3. The success of the Library for the 21st Century Campaign was a major factor in staving off book and journal cuts for 1998.
4. Automation is increasingly becoming part of every function in the library. Downes added that in electronic reserves, one page was visited 800 times.
5. Eaglesfield is a member of a state-wide committee that is developing an electronic databases consortium. She also implemented an electronic document delivery services for WSU.
6. The Reference Department reduced its collection to make room for networked work stations for students.
7. Special Collections developed a home page to enhance access to its collection.

Meeting with Vice President Patton

Vice President Patton addressed issues related to the need for additional library space. It is time, he stated, to create a preliminary plan and get the program on the university's list of projects. Also considered were the implications of digitization on space needs.

Other topics discussed included:

1. Political support. The attention that WSU's library campaign and David Shullenburgers's convocation speech at KU are drawing, is building a case for libraries. The atmosphere for cooperation with the legislature is improving at this time.
2. Equipment needs. Through the efforts of Regents University academic officers, the Governor's budget has earmarked an additional $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1% for library acquisitions next year. Additionally, if there is year-end money, Patton will give the library high priority.

Schad expects that additional money and funds raised in the Campaign will postpone journal cuts for another year. Next year's budget recommendations also includes a technology fee for the Regents universities.

3. Cooperation. The Regents university libraries and the State Library have formed a state-wide consortium for the cooperative purchase of electronic databases in order to reduce their cost. Unfortunately, the special allocation the State Library is using for database purchasing was not included in the Governor's budget.
4. Journals published electronically are not less expensive than print journals.

Space Needs of the Library

Space needs of the library are a pressing issue. Two options for additional library space exist.

1. Adding a fourth floor. This is the more desirable, but more expensive, option.
2. Installing high density compact shelving in the basement. This would be a closed stack area, with books and journals retrieved by library staff.

Dean Schad cited the North Central Association Report, which states that ". . . the Library is rapidly running out of space and its space needs will need to be addressed if the collection is to continue to be accessible." He noted the difficulty associated with persuading funding authorities of the need for an addition. A commonly held, but inaccurate, perception is that digitization will eliminate the need for additional space.

The 24-hour study room will be a useful addition to the library and will help meet student demand for study space after hours. However, it will do virtually nothing to alleviate library space needs. Schad reviewed architectural plans for the area and reported that support for this project comes from a donor to the Library Campaign and from WSU discretionary funds. The

plans include space for vending machines, computer carrels, study tables and lockers. Security concerns are being addressed by glass-wall construction, allowing access only with a Shocker card when the library is closed, installation of surveillance cameras and telephone call boxes.

More library space for books and other materials will be needed in eight years or less. Given the work that is necessary to gain support for a new library addition, the Library Committee feels that strong action is needed now to gain support for that project. To that end, a copy of a letter to Vice President Patton is attached. **We ask that the Faculty Senate put this issue on their agenda for next year.**

10 April, 1998

Vice President Bobby Patton
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas 67260

Dear Vice President Patton:

I write to you as Chair of the Senate Library Committee to thank you for meeting with the us and sharing your views of library issues, especially funding and space issues.

The committee has subsequently examined the issue of library space needs in detail. Space is already tight and will soon become a critical issue for the library.

Simply put we are rapidly running out of space. The library needs additional space. There are two options.

1. Adding a fourth floor. This is the more desirable, but more expensive option.
2. Installing high density compact shelving in the basement. This would be a closed stack area, with books and journals retrieved by library staff. There are service and technical problems with this option.

The recent North Central Association Accreditation Report states that the WSU "Library is rapidly running out of space and its space needs will need to be addressed if the collection is to continue to be accessible."

The last addition to the library met desperate space needs, but did not provide sufficient room for growth. When construction on the current addition began the library was 120 percent above national standards for book density in the stacks. This means that **the library will effectively be out of space for books and periodicals in about 8 years.**

The library can expand stack areas only at the expense of seating for patrons. The library is already well below national standards for seating.

Vice President Bobby Patton

Page 2

It is difficult to gain state support for any new building. A commonly held, but inaccurate, perception is that digitization (availability of materials on the Internet and CD-ROMs) will eliminate the need for additional space. On a per item basis this alternative is more expensive than hard copy media. User acceptance of digitized materials is a problem since most readers still want hard copy. Nationwide a comprehensive effort to digitize will cost trillions of dollars and consequently it will not happen soon.

This is a critical issue. Consequently, we believe that **an effort to build an addition to the library must receive a high priority and begin now** if an addition is to be begun at the point in time that Wichita State University will need it. **It is the hope of the committee that you will continue to give these issues a very high priority as you seek resolution of this problem.** Your role in this regard is especially important as a new university president comes onboard,

Sincerely,

Samuel J. Yeager
Chair, Senate Library Committee

Revised Honors Curriculum Proposal

The proposed changes in Honors requirements attached to the Senate agenda for April 13, 1998 have been rewritten to clarify the relationships between Honors, General Education, and college or departmental requirements. The substance of the recommendations has not been changed.

The intent of the recommended changes in requirements is to permit colleges and departments to develop upper division Honors tracks within their own curricula. Where these are developed, students would be able to meet upper division Honors requirements either by taking courses in the Honors track in General Education (i.e., Honors sections of courses in the General Education Program) or by taking courses in the Honors track in their college or department (i.e., Honors sections of courses in their major).

As currently, no course in a department major could also satisfy general education requirements. Courses would satisfy either honors and general education requirements or honors and major requirements.

Draft Catalog copy, to follow current paragraph outlining the Honors freshman/sophomore seminar requirement:

A. Honors Upper Division Courses

Honors students must also complete at least six hours of course work in an approved upper division Honors track. Students may elect either the Honors Track in General Education or an Honors track offered in a specific college or department.

The Honors track in General Education offers Honors sections of "Further Studies" and "Issues and Perspectives" courses from the University's General Education program. Therefore, courses in this track satisfy both Honors and General Education requirements.

Honors tracks are also offered in some colleges and departments. Typically, these courses are part of the core requirements for college or department majors. Therefore, courses in these tracks satisfy both Honors and college or department major requirements.

The following language would be included among policies governing operation of the Honors program:

B. Policy and Administration:

Any college or department may propose an upper division Honors track. The track should provide for at least six hours of Honors course work. A track may be designed to incorporate all or part of the separate six hour Honors Senior Project requirement.

All upper division Honors tracks must be compatible with the Honors Freshman/Sophomore Seminar requirement, and should either incorporate or be compatible with the Honors Senior Project requirement.

In order to be included in the Honors program, an upper division track (and any changes in it) must be approved by the Faculty Senate Honors Committee.

Students in departmental or college Honors tracks are members of the university honors program.

Report to the Faculty Senate
University General Education Committee
At Wichita State University
For 1997-1998

4-20-98

From: Phillip G. Wahlbeck, Chair
Russell Widener, General Education Coordinator

<u>Committee Membership</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Term Ends</u>
Linda Bakken	Education	1998
Delores Craig-Moreland	LAS Social Sciences	1999
Helen Hundley	LAS Humanities	2000
Phillip Wahlbeck	LAS Math/Science	1998
Pamela Larsen	Health Professions	1999
Dharma DeSilva	Business	1998
James Jones	Fine Arts	1998
Asrat Teshome	Engineering	1999
Russell Widener	Coordinator	2000
Richard Comfort	Student	
Liz Gawlik	Student	
Paul Ackerman	Ad hoc Committee, <i>non-voting</i>	
Stephen Brady	College Algebra, <i>non-voting</i>	
Diane Quantic	Writing, <i>non-voting</i>	
Keith Williamson	Communication, <i>non-voting</i>	
Robert Rozelle	University College, <i>non-voting</i>	
Maralyn Schad	Library, <i>non-voting</i>	
Martha Shawver	Administration, <i>non-voting</i>	
Peter Sutterlin	Previous General Ed. Coordinator, <i>non-voting</i>	

The General Education Committee met twice each month. Frequent meetings were necessary because of the review of the General Education program that was carried out during this year. The report of that review follows.

Report to the Faculty
General Education Program
At Wichita State University

General Remarks

The General Education program at Wichita State University was approved by the University Faculty in 1991. The first students to enter the new program enrolled at the University in the Fall semester, 1994. When the program was adopted, a program review was mandated for the Fall semester, 1997. This report is an outgrowth of that review.

The General Education program has four components. They are: (1) basic skills courses (writing and library research, communication, and mathematics); (2) introduction to the discipline courses; (3) further studies courses; and (4) issues and perspectives courses. These four components will be discussed separately. Detailed descriptions of these requirements can be found in the University Undergraduate Catalog and the Schedule of Courses for each semester.

The review process utilized five focus group sessions. Of these five groups, two were made up of faculty members, two were made up of students, and one consisted of advisors. The first four sessions were professionally facilitated by *Research Partnership*, Esther Headley, President, with observations by some members of the University General Education Committee. The focus group discussions provided a rich source of information about the General Education program. The reliability of that information is based on the frequency of occurrence of the same or similar remarks by different groups on the same subject.

In addition, the review process included an across the curriculum audit of general education courses. All faculty teaching general education courses in LAS and in Fine Arts were given a questionnaire which asked about their teaching of their general education courses.

This report consists of remarks about each of the four areas. At the end of the report are recommendations for action. The University Committee on General Education has approved the following report.

THE BASIC SKILLS COURSES

Based on the Focus Group sessions, both students and faculty agree that, of all the General Education requirements, the Basic Skills courses have the most value in helping students achieve success in their other academic courses, in their major courses, and in their professions and careers. As a result, efforts to re-enforce the writing, speaking, mathematical, and library research skills are considered very important. Although, according to the across-the-curriculum audit, writing is applied in many of the General Education courses, the skills of speaking, mathematics, and especially library research are not, to any great degree, being applied in subsequent General Education courses.

THE INTRODUCTION TO THE DISCIPLINES COURSES

The primary objective of these courses is to expose students to a variety of disciplines, and they are consequently very discipline-focused. This was a recurring theme voiced by both students and faculty focus group participants. Although ideally students should have completed an Introductory course prior to taking a Further Studies or Issues and Perspectives course, this should be left to Departments—i.e., more than one course can be considered as an introduction to a discipline. Faculty teaching Introductory courses should be mindful of the facts that (a) most students in their class will be non-majors, and (b) majors within their discipline cannot count the course for General Education credit.

FURTHER STUDIES COURSES

There are too many Further Studies courses. There are now 243 Further Studies courses listed in the Undergraduate Catalog, which is approximately 60 more courses than the combined number of "G" and "Q" courses included in the former Program. This has done nothing to address the criticism that the former program was not coherent, and that it lacked structure.

Theoretically, Further Studies courses should have the same objectives as the Introductory courses and should be designed primarily for non-majors who have completed an Introductory course in the same discipline. However, of the 243 courses in this category, 109 are courses numbered from 500 to 799 - courses for which only students not majoring in the discipline can receive General Education credit. These courses do not seem designed for the General Education Program.

ISSUES AND PERSPECTIVES (I&P) COURSES

The I&P courses are not functioning as conceived. Despite the fact that there has been no suggestion to eliminate the I&P courses, it was commented that: there are not enough I&P courses; they are not taught in all semesters (few are taught at night); most are "warmed over 'G' courses" and are therefore little different than Further Studies courses. There is a need to increase the incentive for faculty to develop new I&P courses, courses that are innovative and pertinent, especially team-taught I&P courses.

The committee considers that:

- (a) the concept of the I&P courses continues to be regarded as valid, and
- (b) the I&P courses, given the proper incentives for their development and implementation, could become the highlights of the entire General Education program - courses in which both faculty and students would be eager to participate.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

If the General Education program is to achieve its goals, faculty must be convinced of its value. Instructors must therefore be encouraged to:

1. Incorporate the across-the-curriculum components in General Education courses.
2. Make more effort to relate their subject matter to the students' experiences and encouraged to "cross" disciplinary boundaries.
3. Attend presentations and workshops which offer insights into effective methods of presentation of disciplinary material in the general education classroom.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Basic Skills

1. The Basic Skills courses should be retained, and continue to be emphasized and strengthened.
2. The number of required Basic Skills courses should not be increased.
3. Much more effort must be made to help students improve their writing, speaking, mathematics, and (especially) library research skills by including these as components in subsequent General Education (and other) courses whenever practicable.

Introduction to the Disciplines

1. There should not be any increase in the number of Introductory course offerings.
2. Introductory courses should be taught by full time faculty.
3. More Introductory courses should be taught outside the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. in order to alleviate scheduling problems.
4. If a General Education Introductory course has a prerequisite other than a Basic Skills course, there should be an analogous course which does not have a prerequisite to accommodate non-majors.
5. Instructors must emphasize the General Education overview.
6. More attention must be given to incorporating speaking, mathematics, and library research.

Further Studies

1. Further Studies courses must address one or more of the broadly defined goals of General Education.
2. Departments should re-evaluate their Further Studies courses, and eliminate those not appropriate for undergraduate non- majors.
3. To avoid students being "dead-ended" in choosing Further Studies courses, all Further Studies courses in each discipline must be available to students in at least two out of three semesters in any calendar year.
4. As a guide to students and advisors, if a Further Studies course does not have prerequisites, there must be some indication of the intellectual level and/or the student background for which the course is targeted.
5. A three-year tentative schedule should be available.

Issues and Perspectives

1. List I&P courses in the University Catalog and Schedule of Classes simply as General Education I&P courses from which students could select up to two courses to fulfill the General Education requirements.
2. Accept proposals for I&P courses from the Colleges of Business, Education, Engineering, and Health Professions as well as from LAS and Fine Arts.
3. Provide sufficient resources (analogous to those provided for the Honors Program) so that on a course-by-course basis both active and emeritus faculty who wish to participate in the development and teaching of I&P courses can be compensated.
4. Ensure that at least a minimum number of I&P courses are offered every Semester, including the Summer Semester.
5. Upgrade the position of Coordinator of General Education to a more substantial position of Director of General Education with the authority and budgetary resources to administer the I&P course offerings in addition to the present responsibilities of the Coordinator.
6. A three-year tentative schedule should be available.

COMMUNICATING THE OBJECTIVES OF GENERAL EDUCATION

Communication of the objectives of General Education by the Committee to the faculty, and particularly by the faculty to students is, according to the focus groups sessions, something that is not occurring. Students still regard General Education courses as "things to get out of the way so I can concentrate on my major courses".

It is therefore recommended that:

1. At the beginning of each semester, all faculty teaching General Education courses should be sent a note by the Committee to remind them of the objectives of the program, and its guidelines, both of which should be shared with students at the beginning of the course.
2. The President, Vice-presidents, Deans, and Chairs should become directly involved in a very visible campaign which stresses the values and benefits of WSU's General Education program, aimed at the students, the parents (of traditional students), the faculty, the Board of Regents, the Legislature, and our urban neighbors, all of whom are stakeholders in the enterprise.

April 13, 1998

To: Faculty Senate

From: University Tenure and Promotion Committee

Subject: Committee Report

The members of the 1997-1998 University Tenure and Promotion Committee are:

Voting members:

David Alexander, At Large
Janet Brown, Library
Jeri Carroll, Education (Secretary)
Mary Conrad, Health Professions
Mahesh Greywall, Engineering
Elmer Hoyer, At Large
Jean Lansing, Fine Arts
Phillip May, Business
Deborah Soles, LAS (Chair)

Non-voting members:

Dawn Moore, Student
Bobby Patton, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Michael Vincent, Graduate Dean

At its organizational meeting in the fall, Deborah Soles was elected chair, and Jeri Carroll was elected secretary. After members individually reviewed the files, the committee met for three days in January to deliberate and make its recommendations. In the majority of cases, the committee simply confirmed that departmental and college committees had followed college and university guidelines and had reached reasonable conclusions. The committee paid particular attention to those cases in which there had been split votes at previous levels, and to cases which had been appealed to it (there were 7 of these). The results are summarized in Attachment A.

The committee spent a considerable amount of time discussing the issue of "early" tenure and interpreting the university's policy in this regard, with the majority of the committee concluding that candidates *fully* meeting expectations for tenure and/or promotion should receive a positive recommendation, even if they had not "exceeded" expectations. This conclusion is consistent with conclusions reached by the committee in past years.

Unless departments and/or colleges indicated otherwise, teaching and research/creative activities were viewed as counting equally for the award of tenure or promotion, with service being expected but not accorded as major a role. As it has in the past, the committee viewed a record of teaching effectiveness as a necessary condition for the award of tenure or promotion, and examined dossiers carefully with an eye to this. In compliance with Board of Regents' directives, all colleges are now using normed instruments as part of the effort to substantiate

instructional effectiveness. These results, together with other teaching materials submitted, were taken seriously by the committee.

The committee also expected that successful candidates for tenure and/or promotion should have an appropriately established record of research and/or creative activity. As it has in the past, the committee again recognized that expectations will vary depending on discipline and faculty assignment, and that differential weighting may be given to various modes of dissemination of research or creative activities. Consequently, the committee focused on the question of whether adequate documentation had been provided to justify recommendations made at previous levels, and found it especially helpful when departments and colleges provided detailed guidance on expectations within particular disciplines.

All candidates were notified of the recommendation being made by the University Committee, and any candidates receiving a negative recommendation from the University Committee were provided with a written statement of the committee's reasoning in the case.

This year, there seemed to be a large number of misunderstandings and procedural glitches in the process, ranging from unsigned signature sheets, a lack of clarity of what should or could be included in the primary dossier, to aspects of the external review process. As a result, the committee met two more times to discuss ways of making the process run more smoothly. As a result of these discussions, Vice President Patton sent a memo to all deans and chairs which summarized the results of these discussions. Also a result of these discussions, the committee identified a number of changes to the Tenure and Promotion policy that it recommends the Senate consider (see Attachment B).

Some of these recommendations (Items I. 5-6, and II. 1) deserve special discussion. Two years ago, the Board of Regents ceased its practice of approving recommendations for tenure and promotion made by the President; rather, the President's decision is now final, and the Board of Regents is notified of his decisions. The effect of this change is that the role of the Vice President for Academic Affairs has changed in the past two years. Instead of the Vice President and the President discussing cases and together making a recommendation to the Board of Regents, the Vice President has been making independent recommendations to the President, and notifying candidates of his recommendation, and their rights of rebuttal in early February. Candidates are then notified by President of his decision no later than the first Friday in April. Attachment B (Items I.5 and I.6, and II.1) contains recommendations, which if adopted, would modify the tenure and promotion policy and calendar to reflect these changes and codify the practice of the past two years. The committee believes these to be substantive changes which, in effect, would introduce an additional stage in the review process. As such, they need full consideration by the Senate.

The final activity of the committee has been to initiate the 3 year review process of college tenure and promotion guidelines, with the review of documents from two colleges. The reviews are to ensure that college guidelines are consistent with university guidelines. In addition, the committee has made some suggestions to clarify the documents. The committee has reviewed the College of Health Professions' guidelines, and it is in the process of reviewing those of the Barton School of Business.

Respectfully submitted,
Deborah Soles

Attachment A

1997-98 Cases Considered by the University Tenure and Promotion Committee

Tenure

		Department		College		University		
		Committee	Chair	Committee	Dean	Committee	VPAA	President
Education	2	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y
Engineering	3	3Y	1Y, 2N	3Y	1Y, 2N	1Y, 2N	1Y, 2N	1Y, 2N
Fine Arts	2	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y	2Y
Health Prof.	1	1Y	1Y	1N	1Y	1N	1Y	1Y
LAS	7	6Y, 1N	7Y	6Y, 1N	6Y, 1N	6Y, 1N	6Y, 1N	6Y, 1N
Library	1	---*	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y

--
16 (includes 1 appeal to university committee)

Promotion to Associate Professor

Education	3	3Y	3Y	3Y	3Y	3Y	3Y	3Y
Engineering	3	3Y	1Y, 2N	3Y	1Y, 2N	1Y, 2N	1Y, 2N	1Y, 2N
Fine Arts	3	3Y	3Y	3Y	3Y	3Y	3Y	3Y
Health Prof.	2	2Y	2Y	1Y, 1N	2Y	1Y, 1N	1Y, 1N	1Y, 1N
LAS	8	7Y, 1N	8Y	5Y, 3N	7Y, 1N	7Y, 1N	7Y, 1N	7Y, 1N
Library	4	---*	3Y, 1Y/1N**	4Y	3Y, 1N	4Y	3Y, 1N	3Y, 1N

--
23 (includes 1 appeal to university committee)

Promotion to Professor

Business	1	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y
Education	1	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y
Engineering	3	3Y	3Y	3N	3N	3N	3N	3N
Fine Arts	1	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y	1Y
Health Prof.	2	2Y	---***	1Y, 1N				
LAS	5	5Y	5Y	4Y, 1N	4Y, 1N	4Y, 1N	4Y, 1N	5Y

--
13 (includes 5 appeals to university committee)

* Library has only one committee

** A candidate works in 2 departments with 2 chairs

*** Chair abstaining for conflict of interest

Note: These figures are for cases the university committee considered. Any cases which were heard at the departmental or college level but which were not forwarded to the university committee would not be included in these figures.

Attachment B:

Recommended Changes

I. Tenure and Promotion Calendar:

1. **Change** the 4th Friday in September for inclusion of letters from external reviewers to the 4th Friday in October.

Rationale: Consistency. The document states at 3.176 that "6. Reviews can be added to the candidate's secondary dossier up until the time that the college committee begins its deliberations on the candidate."

2. **Add** 2nd Friday in October — Deadline for candidates to sign departmental cover sheet in the Dean's office indicating that they have reviewed all documents being forwarded by the department.

Rationale: This will ensure that candidates are aware of the decisions, have seen all materials added, that the cover sheet is signed, and that the dean is the one notifying the candidate of the departmental decision.

3. **Change** the 2nd Friday of November deadline for college committee to transmit recommendations to the dean to the 3rd Friday in November. This change would require that one week be added to all other deadlines through the last "2nd Friday in December" deadline.

[In the following recommendation #4, I have indicated the adjustment this would require in italics].

Rationale: The time from the 4th Friday in October to the 2nd Friday in November (usually 2 weeks) is not time for adequate review of all materials in all colleges.

4. **Add** 1st [2nd] Friday of December — Deadline for candidates to sign college cover sheet in the dean's office indicating that they have reviewed all documents being forwarded by the college.

Rationale: This will ensure that candidates are aware of the decisions, have seen all materials, and that the cover sheet is signed.

5. **Change** 2nd Friday of February to read — Deadline for notification of candidates of recommendations to be made by the Vice President of Academic Affairs to the President.

Rationale: The Board of Regents no longer gives final approval to tenure and/or promotion cases. The President makes the final decision.

6. **Change** 1st Friday in April to read — Final transmittal of Wichita State University decisions to the candidates and to the Kansas Board of Regents.

Rationale: By this time, candidates have had adequate time for appeals, rebuttals, and/or petitions. In addition, final decisions are no longer made by the Kansas Board of Regents.

II. Changes to Descriptive Statements of Policies:

1. In Section 3.175, references to the role of the Board of Regents need to be deleted or revised, and revised in 3.1435, and in 3.161. If calendar items 5 and 6 above are adopted, then appropriate changes in reference to the roles of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and the Kansas Board of Regents need to be made to the last three paragraphs of Section 3.175.
2. Currently, the calendar states that the chair of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee should notify candidates of the Committee's recommendations, but Section 3.175 says only that the chair shall provide a written statement if the Committee's recommendation differs from that of the college. These need to be made consistent.

III. Addition of Phrase to 3.176:

Add to the first sentence of Section 3.176 — The Use of External Evaluations, the phrase "and can be helpful", so that the sentence would read "The use of external peer reviews is optional **and can be helpful.**"

Rationale: The committee has found that external peer evaluations, conducted according to the university's policy, can be very helpful in their deliberations. Addition of the phrase would make this very clear.

University General Education Committee
At Wichita State University

From: Phillip G. Wahlbeck, Chair
Russell Widener, General Education Coordinator

Date: 23 April 1998

Issues and Perspective Courses

It is desired that the General Education Program be strengthened by improving the "Issues and Perspectives" (I & P) courses. The University General Education proposes the following motions:

1. I & P courses will be listed under a separate category in the University Catalog and Schedule of Classes from which students would select up to two courses (no area designations given) to fulfill the General Education requirements.
2. Proposals for I & P courses may be submitted to the General Education Committee by the Colleges of Business, Education, Engineering, and Health professions as well as from LAS and Fine Arts.
3. Interested faculty will be recruited by the Coordinator (or Director) of General Education to teach the I & P courses. An appropriate number and breadth of I & P courses will be offered each semester (including the summer).

Note

The General Education committee and the Coordinator of General Education will develop steps to implement the recommendations successfully. Discussions with the administration have occurred to find ways to entice faculty to participate in the I & P courses.

Criminal Justice

The Department of Criminal Justice in the Hugo Wall School has requested that they be allowed to teach General Education courses. The Department has changed in the past few years to have a broader social science base.

The University General Education Committee has voted its approval of Criminal Justice offering General Education courses. It recommends that this recommendation be placed on the agenda of the next University Faculty meeting.

OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

TO: Senators

FROM: Rules Committee

The Rules Committee would like the Senate to confirm the following appointments:

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: Larry Paarman

ACADEMIC APPEALS: Ray Hull (full member)

EXCEPTIONS: Full members: JoLynne Campbell & Kamran Rokhsaz
Alternate: John Carter

FACULTY AFFAIRS: Cathy Moore-Jansen, Will Klunder, Dharam Chopra, & Robert Zettle

FACULTY SUPPORT: Dwight Murphey, Michael Long, & Paul York
Brian Hancock (2 yrs, replace Naylor)

GENERAL EDUCATION: Lisa Rosenthal, Melva Owens, Peer Moore-Jansen, & Larry Blocher

HONORS: Buddy Johns

LIBRARY: Buma Fridman

SCHOLARSHIP AND STUDENT AID: Pawan Kahol, Teresa McWilliams

CURRICULUM: Syed Taher, Johnnie Thompson

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE: Minutes, April 27, 1998

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alagic, Baxter, Bennett, Brooks, Byrum, Campbell, Celestin, Coffman, DeSilva, Eaglesfield, Hawley, Hodson, Hoyer, Huntley, Kraft, Lancaster, Larson, Mandt, Murphey, Myers, Papanicolaou, Patton, Pfannenstiel, Rogers, Rokosz, Skinner, Stone, Swan, Terrell, Toops, Techak, Zettle

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bahr, Bajaj, Benson, Born, Burns, Chandler, Cheraghi, Davis, DeLillo, Gythiel, Hemans, Hill, Leavitt, McHugh, Miller, Palmiotto, Pickard, Schommer, Sharp, Stevenson, Sutterlin, Yenne, York

SUMMARY OF ACTION:

1. See Committee Reports
2. Accepted Honors Committee Proposals
3. Postponed decision on General Education Committee Proposals
4. Accepted University Tenure & Promotion Committee Proposals

I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENT & PROPOSALS: Senator Eaglesfield announced her resignation from the university and thanked her senate colleagues for the happy experiences given her while being part of the Senate and Executive Committee. Murphey moved a show of appreciation and the senate applauded their departing colleague.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: Approved as distributed.

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT: President Terrell reported that the Intellectual Property Policy draft, which has been greatly revised, has been returned for faculty comments. He asked for feedback, even if small so that reports could be made to the Kansas Board of Regents during their May meeting.

He also announced that he and Hoyer attended the state chapter meeting of the AAUP. The President of the Kansas chapter of the AAUP, Delores Furtado, will be in Wichita on May 21 and 22 during the Regents meeting.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Hoyer announced the following recommendations from the Rules Committee for Committee appointments are requested Senate confirmation:

- Academic Affairs - Larry Paarman
- Academic Appeals - Ray Hull, full member
- Exceptions - JoLynne Campbell & Kamran Rokhsaz, full members
John Carter, alternate member
- Faculty Affairs - Cathy Moore-Jansen, Will Klunder, Dharam Chopra &
Robert Zettle
- Faculty Support - Dwight Murphey, Michael Long, & Paul York
Brian Hancock (2 yr. term to replace T. Naylor)
- General Education - Melva Owens, Peer Moore-Jansen & Larry Blocher
- Honors - Buddy Johns

Library - Buma Fridman
Scholarship & Student Aid - Pawan Kahol & Teresa McWilliams
University Curriculum - Syed Taher & Johnnie Thompson

All committee appointments were accepted

The annual reports of Academic Affairs, Honors and Library committees were accepted.

VI. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Honors Committee proposal: Jay Mandt, Director of Honors, opened by presenting a revised version of the Honors proposal and his summation of the policy as one "that permits departments to offer new upper-division Honors courses within the major." Mandt asserted that these new courses do not replace Gen. Ed. courses but rather gives a student working within an Honors track the opportunity to take an Honors course either within the Gen. Ed. offerings or those of the department. The proposal carried two actions, one to change wording in the catalogue of courses and the other to create new courses for Honors credit within individual majors. Both motions carried unanimously. The Senate also showed appreciation to Sylvia Coats, Chair, and to the committee work for all their work.

B. General Education Committee Proposals: Phil Wahlbeck, Chair, presented a series of recommendations and three motions offered by the General Education committee. Wahlbeck re-asserted what his previous reports had indicated, that I & P (Issues and Perspectives) courses have "flopped." The Gen. Ed. committee seeks to renovate the I & P offerings with interdisciplinary courses. Among the motions were requests to provide separate I & P listings in the course catalogue; to allow colleges beyond LAS and Fine Arts to offer I & P courses; and to allow the coordinator of the program to aggressively recruit teachers for that program, including the summer offerings in I & P.

MUCH discussion followed. Byrum asked about potential abuses, Murphey about allowing the Administration of Justice program to offer such courses, and Rogers about the lack of specific language and rigorous assertions concerning the need for interdisciplinary courses. Rogers asked for a written statement of intent to prioritize interdisciplinary, to clarify where the funding would come from, and to distribute credit hours equitably. DeSilva responded that funding and academic policy must be handled separately. Swan asked if the teacher of an I & P course would keep the credits generated, and Wahlbeck assured him of this but pointed out that the faculty needs more incentives than merely keeping the credit hours. Rogers asked for a clear definition of interdisciplinary and asserted that any faculty member can use an interdisciplinary perspective but that such approaches are not truly interdisciplinary courses and further asserted that the agenda for the meeting indicated nothing about motions being made on changes in Gen. Ed. course offerings and further noted that his constituents did not feel that they had been given time to respond to the report, the recommendations, or the proposed motions. Wahlbeck responded that the reports have been out for some time and that the Gen. Ed. committee has sought but gotten little feedback.

Byrum asserted that the debate had reached an impasse. Rogers moved to postpone discussion until the next meeting. Terrell asked Rogers to respond in writing, with counter-proposals, to the Gen. Ed. report. Lancaster suggested that a general faculty meeting be called to discuss Gen. Ed. courses. Some senators did not want to postpone because the Gen. Ed. committee has been reporting to the Senate regularly; others wanted more time to consider the matter and to meet with their departments. The motion to postpone carried by a 12-11 vote.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

A. University Tenure & Promotion Committee proposals: The report was presented by Deborah Soles, Chair, who reported the findings and proposals coming from the University Tenure and Promotion Committee. Section I, Tenure & Promotion Calendar -- logical changes concerning the

calendar comprised items 1-4, passed unanimously. Item 5 concerned the change in the decision-making process, now that the Board of Regents do not make the final decisions, passed unanimously. Item 6 which changed the date of the final report passed unanimously.

Section II, Changes in Descriptive Statement of Policies, which clarifies the new role of the Board of Regents, passed unanimously.

Section III, Addition of Phrase to 3.176, suggested a parenthetical phrase be added about external review--adding "and can be helpful" concerning the voluntary submission of external evaluations. Debate followed about whether it asserted the need for something that was otherwise voluntary. Some schools use outside reviews, others don't. A vote was taken and the motion to add the extra line was defeated by a 12-11 margin.

The hour being late, the meeting adjourned at 4:59.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Brooks, Secretary