



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 2002-2003

Volume XVI

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of April 14, 2003

**WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
AGENDA**

MEETING NOTICE	Monday, April 14, 2003
	Room 126 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 -- Monday, March 31, 2003 --**
<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/M4-7-03.htm>
- IV. **President's Report**
- V. **Committee Reports**
 - A. Faculty Senate Committee Annual Reports from:
 - Faculty Affairs -- <http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/FArpt-03.htm>
 - Faculty Support -- <http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/FSrpt03.htm>
 - Honors -- <http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Hrpt-03.htm>
 - Scholarship & Student Aid -- <http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/SSArpt-03.htm>
 - Undergraduate Research -- <http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/URrpt-03.htm>
 - University Curriculum -- <http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/UCrpt-03.htm>
- VI. **Old Business**
 - A. Proposal to Revise the General Education Program --
<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/ExC-GenEd%20Prop.htm>
- VII. **New Business**
 - A. Ablah Library update -- Kathy Downes, Interim Dean
- VIII. **As May Arise**

2002 - 2003 FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

1. Committee Members:

Joyce Cavarozzi, Fine Arts, Chair
Mary Conrad, Health Professions
Phil Hersch, Business
Tina Bennett, LAS Humanities
Sha Li Zhang, Library
Don Malzahn, Engineering
Mel Kahn, LAS Social Sciences
Frank Rokosz, Education
Hussein Hamdeh, LAS Math/Natural Sciences

2. The committee met five times during the year, and conducted some business via e-mail.

3. The committee, as charged by the Senate, reviewed a motion on mandatory external reviews and a resolution from the Library committee about the Patriot Act.

4. There are no pending issues

Joyce Cavarozzi, Chair

Report: Faculty Support Committee AY2002-2003

1. Members:

Sam Yeager (LAS - Social Sciences) (Chair)
David Duncan (Library) (Vice-Chair)
Larry Blocher (Fine Arts)
JoLynne Campbell (Health Professions)
Dharam Chopra (LAS - Math and Natural Sciences)
Tony Gythiel (LAS - Humanities)
Ruth Hitchcock (Education)
Hyuck Kwon (Engineering)
Dwight Murphey (Business)

Dr. Gerald Loper (ex-officio)
Emily McReynolds (support staff)
Carole Robarchek (support staff)

2. Meeting Schedule:

The committee met nine times from November 8, 2002 to March 28, 2003. Also, the committee drafted procedures and guidelines for the new Regents' awards for the outstanding faculty of the year awards. These were presented to the Faculty Senate, discussed there and revised. Senate approval occurred on March 31st.

3. Description of Committee Activities:

The committee critiqued, judged and made recommendations on the following competitions:

Competition	Submitted	Recommended	Awarded
New Faculty URCA's	5/\$15,317	5/\$11,817	5/\$11,817
Senior Faculty URCA's	9/\$37,631	7/\$29,533	7/\$29,533
ARCS	5/\$18,000	5/\$18,000	5/\$18,000
MURPA's	3/\$15,000	2/\$10,000	2/\$10,000
Sabbaticals	13	12	12
Young Faculty Scholar	5	1	1
Excellence in Research	12	1	1
Excellence in Creativity	5	1	1
Community Research	5	1	1

University Research/Creative Projects Award (URCA)
Award for Research/Creative Projects in Summer (ARCS)
Multidisciplinary Research Project Award (MURPA)

Wichita State University

TO: Kirk Lancaster
President, Faculty Senate

FROM: Kay Gibson
Chair, Honors Committee
Box 28

DATE: March 28, 2003

SUBJECT: 2002-2003 Senate Honors Committee Report

1.

Jay Mandt	Director of Honors Program
Andrew Acker	Fairmount College of Liberal Art and Sciences
Elizabeth Behrman	Associate Director of Honors Program and LAS
Joseph Combs	College of Fine Arts
Kay Gibson	College of Education
Anthony Gythiel	Fairmount College of Liberal Art and Sciences
Diane Huntley	College of Health Professions
Susan Huxman	Fairmount College of Liberal Art and Sciences
Scott Miller	College of Engineering
Dwight Murphey	Barton School of Business
Brian Williams	Library
2. The committee meets two to three times a semester.
3. The two main issues that the committee has been considering are
 - a. the 2003 Regents Academy that will be held at WSU this summer for four weeks in June; and
 - b. Departmental Honors and upper division Honors requirements (a proposal is currently being considered by the Senate)
4. All aspects of The Regents Academy will be finalized this Spring for June 2003. The implementation of Departmental Honors will certainly carry over to Fall 2003 if/when it is passed by the Senate.

2002-2003 Scholarship and Student Aid Committee Annual Report

Committee Members:

- Les Anderson, LAS Communication
- Linda Bakken, Education
- Deb Byers, Financial Aid
- Tisha Cannizzo, Admissions
- Connie Dalrymple, Library
- Jacquelyn Dillon, Fine Arts
- Kathy Gill-Hopple, Health Professions
- Gawad Nagati, Engineering
- Diane Scott, **CHAIR**
- Sheelu Surender, Financial Aid
- Syed Taher, LAS Math/Natural Science
- Benson Tong, LAS Humanities

Meeting Schedule:

The committee meets two to three times per semester.

Committee Activities and Issues:

During the 2002-2003 academic year, the committee's primary focus has been on the Distinguished Scholarship Invitational. Specific issues examined include questions posed for the Small Group Interviews, leadership criteria, and scoring methods.

A number of committee members, as well as faculty members outside the committee, expressed concern with the questions used for the Small Group Interviews. Primary concerns related to the general nature of the questions and the weak, short answers the questions elicited. Recommendations have been made to the DSI planning committee to direct a panel of faculty to revise the questions. The DSI planning committee is in the process of implementing this recommendation.

Committee members have also expressed concern relating to the criteria used to determine leadership. Questions have been raised as to the validity of the criteria and possible discriminatory impact of the criteria. The Scholarship and Student Aid Committee has plans to systematically evaluate the current criteria and make recommendations for change.

Scoring methods used in the DSI have also been scrutinized. Under current procedures, a top-two ranking from a DSI observer that has only seen six candidates carries the same weight as a top-two ranking from a DSI observer that has seen 26 candidates, leaving many candidates at an obvious disadvantage. Recommendations have been made to the DSI planning committee to revise these procedures, thereby granting all candidates equality of opportunity in ranking.

It must be noted that, even though many concerns have been discussed and addressed by the Scholarship and Student Aid Committee, there is general consensus among committee members that the DSI has undergone significant improvements from the 2001-2002 academic year.

Pending Issues:

<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/SSArpt-03.htm>

4/10/2003

The Faculty Senate has established, in response to previous concerns identified by the Scholarship and Student Aid Committee, an *ad hoc* Committee on Scholarships. This *ad hoc* committee will be submitting a report addressing these issues and has made several recommendations. The Scholarship and Student Aid Committee will be focusing on implementing these recommendations during final meetings of the 2002-2003 academic year and throughout the 2003-2004 academic year. Specific emphasis will be placed on the increased importance of academic criteria for general scholarships, the establishment of a scholarship month (November), and the DSI criteria and processes.

2002 -- 2003 Undergraduate Research Committee Annual Report

The following is a brief report outlining the activities of the Undergraduate Research Committee for the academic year 2002-2003

Membership list:

Jeffrey Hershfield, chair
William Hendry
Janet Twomey
Jay Mandt
Jim Swan
Michael Palmiotto
Pamela Beehler
Gerald Loper
Ted Naylor
Tim Pett

The committee met for the first time this academic year on February 20. Another meeting is scheduled for May. The reason for the rather late timing of the first meeting is this. After last year's forum, the chair at the time (Ken Petiti) resigned. No meeting was ever called to elect a new chair, and consequently for most of this year the committee was dormant, existing largely on paper. In the meantime, Bill Hendry, because of commitments stemming from a grant, was interested in ensuring that a forum ran this year. Because the committee was in limbo, he took it upon himself to organize a forum that will take place April 25 at the Hughes Metroplex. Because of these unusual circumstances, the forum, though open to all undergraduates who meet the criteria, will largely consist of students working under Bill's supervision as part of his grant. The committee has resolved to make sure that for next year the forum will have a much broader profile in the university, including students from across the university. In our first and only meeting so far, those present discussed various ways to improve the forum to ensure its success and long-term viability on this campus. The meeting in May will further this discussion, and we intend to get a much earlier start next fall. I think it is safe to say that there was consensus amongst those present at the meeting that the key to success is to figure out ways to increase student participation.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffrey Hershfield, Chair

2002 - 2003 UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

Members:

Charles Koeber, Chair (LAS Social Sciences)
 Gary Toops (LAS Humanities)
 John Carter (Health Professions)
 Bryant Fillion (Education)
 Silvia Herzog (Fine Arts)
 To be Assigned (Science)
 To be Assigned (Engineering)
 To be Assigned (Business)
 Elizabeth Smith (Academic Services)
 Student Representative (?)

Martha Shawver (ex officio, Office of Academic Affairs)

The University Curriculum Committee met five times since I submitted the 2001-2002 Senate Committee Annual Report.

The main task of the University Curriculum Committee over the past year has been to write, seek approval of, and apply a set of guidelines by which to evaluate undergraduate certificate program proposals. At the end of April, 2002 the Curriculum Committee approved a draft of the guidelines. In October of 2003, the guidelines were presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. After making revisions to the Guidelines recommended by the Senate Executive Committee, then approved by the Curriculum Committee, the guidelines were brought to a vote and approved by the Faculty Senate.

The Curriculum Committee recently met and approved the Emergency Medical Technician certificate program, the first program proposed under the new guidelines. The proposal was well-written and organized according to the specifications of the Guidelines and the program was approved without confusion or incident. Currently, the Curriculum Committee has sent letters informing University Colleges about the new guidelines and will evaluate proposals as they are received. All new certificate programs must be evaluated and all existing programs must be re-evaluated every three years. I anticipate that this charge will constitute a substantial portion of the duties of the University Curriculum Committee.

In an October meeting I announced that the Curriculum Committee was informed by the Faculty Senate that it no longer needed to consider proposals for cross-listed courses that have already been reviewed by a curriculum committee at the college level.

In another October meeting the Committee addressed an issue regarding changes to course numberings approved by the Curriculum Committee and subsequently altered by the Registrar. The Committee had sent a letter to the Faculty Senate, the Registrar and other involved parties regarding the matter. The Registrar supplied the Committee with a copy of course numbering guidelines and stated that in the future he would inform the Committee of any changes in course numbering approved by the Curriculum Committee.

As of this writing, I am completing my three-year term in the University Curriculum Committee and my term as its Chair. The Curriculum Committee will need to meet before the end of the spring semester to elect a new Chair. The Curriculum Committee also had three members resign during the past year because of their promotion to Dean of a College or Graduate School. The Faculty Senate Office has been informed and it is my understanding that they are in the process of finding replacements for these members. Additionally, at their request I did provide the Student Government Association with information about the Curriculum Committee and was told that we would be receiving a new student representative. However, the SGA did not subsequently inform me of who that student is.

Respectfully Submitted,
 Charles Koeber, Chair
 University Curriculum Committee

Rationale for a required basic skills course at WSU **Comm 111, Public Speaking**

How is the required speech course, Comm 111, central to the academic mission of the University?

Tied directly to the mission of WSU

"[T]he University seeks to equip both students and the larger community with the educational and cultural tools they need to thrive in a complex world, and to achieve both individual responsibility in their own lives and effective citizenship in the local, national, and global community" (WSU mission statement, adopted 1991).

Tied directly to the goals of General Education

"The goals of the Wichita State University General Education Program are to educate students who: 1) are able to apply principles of written and oral communication appropriately to various contexts" (<http://www.wichita.edu/online>).

Tied directly to the K-12 Kansas state mandates for communication proficiency

"Standard #1: The educator uses the modes of effective communication including listening, viewing, and speaking to promote active inquiry, collaboration, and interaction" (General Education Teacher Education Requirements, 2002).

The above directives are reflected in the governing principles in the Comm 111 course objectives

"Students will demonstrate basic oral communication skills necessary for functioning effectively in the classroom in vocational pursuits, and in participation in society as an enlightened, articulate citizen

Students will gain a greater appreciation for the complexities of the oral communication process by recognizing the important variables in the speaker-audience situation and by learning basic strategies for tailoring messages to overcome obstacles in the speaking situation.

Students will develop critical thinking skills by learning to reason, organize, and articulate their ideas, by learning to recognize the rhetorical techniques used by others to influence them, and by learning active listening skills.

Students will groom leadership skills that emerge in formal speaking situations by overcoming speech anxiety, projecting expertise, trustworthiness, and dynamism, and showing genuine regard for the audience" (Comm 111 Handbook, 2002).

What other colleges & universities require a speech course as part of General Education?

National Trends

Comprehensive studies are difficult to track, but in the last published systematic study of its kind (NCA 1995), of 384 randomly selected colleges and universities, 79% reported that they offer one or more communication courses among the institutions' general education requirements.

Kansas Regents Universities

Of the six state schools (WSU, KSU, KU, ESU, PSU, FHSU), all but one (KU) require a speech course at the university level for fulfilling general education. At KU, there are no university basic skills requirements; they are all college-dependent requirements. In many colleges at KU, speech is required; In LAS there is a choice between speech and logic.

Why are the academic trends so strong for requiring speech competency?

Intellectual Reasons

Instruction in speech is central to understanding who we are as symbol users; appreciating the diverse ways in which speech forms communities; sharpening our moral sensibilities regarding the power of speech in affecting societal values. These intellectual roots run deep. The ability to speak clearly, eloquently, and effectively has been recognized as the hallmark of an educated person since the beginning of recorded history. Under the label "rhetoric," the study of the theory and practice of communication was a central concern of Greek, Roman, medieval, Renaissance, and early modern education. (NCA, 2003) Isocrates, for instance, noted: "To become eloquent is to activate one's humanity, to apply the imagination, and to solve the practical problems of human living" (Hart, '93).

Citizenship Reasons

Aristotle first argued that humans were the only animal to live in a city-state and that the art of speaking was as much a survival skill as the mark of an educated person. Cicero in his call for "citizen-orators" cemented the relationship between civic-mindedness and speech competency. Preparation for life in the modern world requires communication with a cross section of diverse people who often have conflicting needs and interests. Effective speech helps maintain a sense of community and an ability to craft consensus in an increasingly diverse and complex world. An oral communication course brings together students from across the institution and provides direct experience in communication within a diverse speech community. In the basic communication course, we wish to mold citizen-orators for our times. (Huxman & Campbell, 2003); (NCA, 1996).

Workplace Reasons

Studies abound pointing to the centrality of speech competency in the job market. *The Wall Street Journal* (1998) reported the findings of a survey of 480 companies that found that employers ranked communication skills (speaking, listening, and writing) as the skills most valued in any job. In a report on fastest growing careers, the U. S. Department of Labor (1995) stated that communication skills would be in demand across occupations well into the next century. When 1000 faculty members from a cross section of disciplines were asked to identify basic competencies for every college graduate, skills in communicating topped the list. (Winsor, Curtis, & Stephens, 1997). An economics professor states: "we are living in a communications revolution comparable to the invention of printing...Communication studies might well be central to colleges and universities in the 21st century"(McCloskey, 1993).

Public Policy Reasons

In 1978, Congress added "effective oral communication" to the basic skills of reading, writing and mathematics for all elementary and secondary schools in the Title II Education Act of 1965. (Witkin, Lovern, & Lundsteen, 1996). Institutions of higher learning have been generally receptive to capitalizing on these federal mandates through General Education requirements.

How do you ensure rigor in the speech course?

In what we teach

The Classical Canons of Rhetoric:

Invention, Arrangement, Memory, Style, Delivery.

Social Scientific & Humanistic Theories of Communication:

Credibility; Audience Reception & Resistance; Cognitive Dissonance; Inoculation; Intercultural; Media influences, etc.

The Building Blocks of Effective Speechmaking:

Audience Analysis; Critical Listening; Researching a Speech; Reasoning Patterns; Argument Types & Fallacies; Outlining; Organization; Gathering, Citing, Evaluating Evidence; Language Strategies; Verbal & Nonverbal Delivery; Genres of Public Speaking; Visual Communication; The Ethics of Public Speaking; Speaking in a Multi-Cultural World.

All of these subjects are the contents of the course text: Steven Lucas, *The Art of Public Speaking*, now in its 8th ed and recognized as the dominant public speaking text nationally, in part, due to the scholarly reputation of its author from the University of Wisconsin

In How we teach

All sections of the course use a common syllabus

Students learn by doing—and doing a lot. Eight extemporaneous and impromptu speeches are required; two exams; weekly assignments.

Manageable, class sizes (26 per class) that foster interaction

In Who teaches

Five full-time faculty and two part-time faculty in the ESC who specialize in oral communication teaching and research are regular instructors for the course.

All other lecturers must have the M.A., and, along with GTAs must complete a 2 week, 7 hour a day workshop—Comm750. Additionally, GTAs are recruited nationally; meet weekly in a pedagogy class; are evaluated twice a semester with in-class visits, and use SPTE.

In Tracking GPA

Spring 2002	2.59	(26 sections)
Fall 2001	2.55	(35 sections)
Spring 2001	2.41	(31 sections)
Fall 2000	2.32	(38 sections)
Spring 2000	2.41	(33 sections)
Fall 1999	2.39	(41 sections)
Spring 1999	2.41	(32 sections)
Fall 1998	2.45	(39 sections)

In Requiring Course Evaluations

SPTes required of each instructor of record

What are some measures of evaluating the effectiveness of basic skills?

North Central Accreditation

Internal WSU General Education Review ('97) commissioned by the General Education Committee. See the findings of the last systematic examination of basic skills conducted on this campus—including focus groups and telephone surveys administered by Esther Headley.

SPTes

GPA consistency with other basic skills courses

Common final exam across all sections

“Shocker Speak-Out.” Each semester, a required policy speech contest is conducted on campus involving one representative from each section of Comm 111. Semi-final rounds and a final round compose the tournament. Judged by WSU faculty and administrators from all disciplines and community persons. Taped by MRC.

What are some misconceptions about basic skills?

“They’re just skills courses.”

In the case of speech, speaking skills are tied directly to critical thinking, communication theories, historical and political contexts, and speech analysis.

“They’re too easy.”

In the case of speech, see GPA trends and course requirements above.

“Anyone can teach them.”

In the case of speech, see above “what we teach.” Clearly, public speaking is not public reading.

“They’re not necessary for superior students”

Like the other basic skills, we have “test out” measures in place for students. In speech, students who come to WSU with considerable forensic and debate experience may elect to test out.

We offer an Honors Section of Public Speaking for 4 credits that combines public speaking, speech criticism, and American public address history.

Selected Sources:

Campbell, K.K. & Huxman, S. S. (2003). The rhetorical act: Thinking, speaking and writing critically. 3rd ed. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth.

Diamond, R. (August 1997). Curriculum reform needed if students are to master core skills. The Chronicle of Higher Education, B7.

Hart, R. P. (1993). Why communication? Why education? Toward a politics of teaching. Communication Education, 42, 97-105.

Huxman, S. S. (1992) Public speaking: A repertoire of resources. New York: McGraw-Hill Custom Pub.

McCloskey, D. (1994). The neglected economics of talk. Planning for Higher Education, 22, 11-16.

Morreale, S. P., Osborn, M. M., & Pearson, J. C. (January, 2000). Why communication is important: A rationale for the centrality of the study of communication. Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 29 (1), 1-25.

National Communication Association (1995). Results of speech communication association survey of communication as a component of general education requirements. Annandale, VA: NCA.

National Communication Association (1996). Speech communication association policy platform statement on the role of communication courses in general education. Annandale, VA: NCA.

National Communication Association (2003). Pathways to careers in communication. Washington, D.C.: NCA.

Report of the National Association of Colleges and Employers. (December 29, 1998). Wall Street Journal, Work Week, p. A1.

U. S. Department of Labor Report (1995). Career projections to 2005: Fastest growing careers.

Williamson, L.K. & Morris, C. (2002). Communication 111 Handbook. New York: McGraw-Hill, Custom Publication.

Witkin, B. R., Lovern, M. L., & Lundsteen, S. W. (1996). Oral communication in the English language arts curriculum: A national perspective. Communication Education, 45, 40-47.

TRANSFER AGREEMENT AND ARTICULATION GUIDE KANSAS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES - KANSAS PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

We, the undersigned representatives of public institutions of higher education in the State of Kansas, adopt the following transfer agreement.

*A student who completes an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree based on a baccalaureate oriented sequence at a state and regionally accredited Kansas public community college, and whose program of study has met the requirements of the Kansas Public Community College-Kansas Public University Transfer Agreement and Articulation Guide, will be accepted with junior standing and will have satisfied the general education requirements of all Kansas public universities. Students transferring to Kansas Public Universities who have not completed an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree will be given general education credit for any articulated general education course completed at the community college.**

This voluntary commitment reaffirms the intent to cooperate with sister colleges and universities in matters of student transfer and articulation for the ultimate benefit of all transfer students in the State of Kansas.

*See the nine points of clarification below.

December 2002

POINTS OF CLARIFICATION

1. This Agreement applies only to Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degree transfers from state and regionally accredited public community colleges in Kansas. The agreement does not include transfers from nonaccredited community colleges or any other colleges.
2. Transfer students accepted for admission at Kansas public universities with the Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree will automatically be given junior standing with the understanding that:
 - a) Each receiving institution has the right to determine admission standards to the various majors in their institutions.
 - b) Transfer students are subject to the same institutional assessment policies and procedures as resident students of the receiving institution.
3. General education is defined as follows:

General education provides students with facility in the use of the English language and a broad intellectual experience in the major fields of knowledge. It insures that each graduate will have experienced some of the content, method and system of values of the various disciplines which enable humanity to understand itself and its environment at a level of abstraction beyond that found in secondary school studies.

Although the following distribution of courses does not correspond to the General Education requirements at any Kansas public university, it will be accepted as having satisfied the general education requirements of all Kansas public universities.

A minimum of 45 credit hours of general education with distribution in the following fields will be required. General education hours totaling less than 45 will be accepted, but transfer students must complete the remainder of this requirement before graduation from the receiving institution, which may require an additional semester(s).

12 hours of Basic Skills courses, including:

6 hours of English Composition
3 hours of Public Speaking
3 hours of college level Mathematics (college algebra or above); statistics will be required of transfer students where University curriculum requires it

12 hours of Humanities courses from at least three of the following disciplines:
*Performance courses are excluded.

Art*	Theater*	Philosophy
Music*	History	Literature

12 hours of Social and Behavioral Science courses from at least three of the following disciplines:

Sociology	Psychology	Political Science
Economics	Geography	Anthropology

9 hours of Natural and Physical Science courses from at least two disciplines (lecture with lab).

Transcripts of students fulfilling the requirement of this agreement will be appropriately coded by the sending institution.

4. Because each institution retains its right to define the requirements of a baccalaureate degree, additional courses, not in the transfer agreement, may be required.
5. Other associate degrees and certificates may be awarded for programs which have requirements different from baccalaureate-oriented sequences or a primary objective other than transfer. Students in such programs wishing to transfer to Kansas public universities are to be considered outside of the terms of this agreement.

be determined by the receiving institution on the basis of application of the courses to the baccalaureate program in the major field of the student.
Credit for equivalent technical courses may be granted by departmental examination.

6. Transfer students preparing for teacher certification must meet the general education requirements as outlined by the State Board of Education. Teacher certification requirements have been incorporated into the degree requirements of Kansas public universities.
7. Foreign Language requirements are viewed as graduation requirements and not as general education requirements for purposes of this agreement.
8. A transfer student may be required to take freshman or sophomore courses to meet particular requirements or course prerequisites of a given major or minor.
9. The spirit of the Agreement indicates that transfer students are to be judged academically in the same way as non-transfer students.

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES:

Date: _____

Robert Hemenway, Chancellor
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Jon Wefald, President
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Donald L. Beggs, President
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Kay Schallenkamp, President
EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Tom W. Bryant, President
PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

Edward Hammond, President
FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY

Jerry Farley, President
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

CC Presidents to follow.

TRANSFER AGREEMENT AND ARTICULATION GUIDE
KANSAS PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES,
TECHNICAL COLLEGES & TECHNICAL SCHOOLS
FOR THE ASSOCIATE IN APPLIED SCIENCE DEGREE AND
ASSOCIATE IN GENERAL STUDIES DEGREE

In accord with K.S.A. 72-4453 and 72-4454 this agreement is made among Kansas' public universities, community colleges, technical colleges and technical schools. This agreement is effective upon approval of the Kansas Board of Regents.

With the acceptance of this agreement, Kansas students of postsecondary education will be able to bridge their educational experiences at technical schools, technical colleges, community colleges and universities by completing the Associate in Applied Science degree, the Associate in General Studies degree, or appropriate baccalaureate degree (e.g. an applied or general studies baccalaureate degree). Public universities are encouraged to explore opportunities to provide appropriate pathways for graduates of technical programs to complete an appropriate baccalaureate degree and to develop specific program-to-program articulation agreements.

POINTS OF CLARIFICATION

The purpose of this agreement is to facilitate student transfer of technical education courses and programs.

1. All Kansas technical schools and colleges will record on a student's transcript the completed courses or programs approved by the Kansas Board of Regents. *may*

2. Credit hours from technical programs *will* be transferred on a credit to credit basis up to a maximum of 45 credit hours. Clock hours from technical programs *will* be transferred according to the following guidelines: *may*

900 to 1300 clock hours -- 30 credit hours
1301 to 1800 clock hours -- 36 credit hours
over 1800 clock hours -- 45 credit hours

3. Transfer of completed technical programs will follow one of three options (a, b, or c below).

a. The Associate in General Studies degree may be earned by the student transferring the completed technical program and by completing the graduation requirements for the A.G.S., including general education.

b. The Associate in Applied Science degree may be earned by the student transferring the completed technical program to a community college and by completing the graduation requirements for the A.A.S.

c. An appropriate (e.g. an applied or general studies) baccalaureate degree may be earned by the student transferring the completed technical program to a public university and by completing the graduation requirements for the baccalaureate degree.

4. The institution to which a student is transferring may require students to successfully complete at least 12 credit hours at the institution before technical hours will be recorded on a student's transcript.

5. Assuming that the Associate in Applied Science degree requires a minimum of 60 credit hours, and that a baccalaureate degree requires a minimum of 124 credit hours, no more than 45 credit hours of the Associate in Applied Science degree or the appropriate baccalaureate degree shall be in the technical area. At least 15 credit hours of the associate degree shall be in general education and must be from not less than three of the following areas: (1) communication (2) mathematics and science (3) social science (4) arts and humanities.

6. General education is defined as follows:

General education provides students with facility in the use of the English language and a broad intellectual experience in the major fields of knowledge. It insures that each graduate will have experienced some of the content, method and system of values of the various disciplines which enable humanity to understand itself and its environment at a level of abstraction beyond that found in secondary school studies.

7. Students transferring to a public university should be advised that, although the following distribution of courses does not correspond to the General Education requirements at any Kansas public university, it will be accepted as having satisfied the general education requirements of all Kansas public universities.

A minimum of 45 credit hours of general education with distribution in the following fields will be required. General education hours totaling less than 45 will be accepted, but transfer students must complete the remainder of this requirement before graduation from the receiving institution, which may require an additional semester(s).

12 hours of Basic Skills courses, including:

6 hours of English Composition
3 hours of Public Speaking
3 hours of college level Mathematics (college algebra or above); statistics will be required of transfer students where University curriculum requires it

12 hours of Humanities courses from at least three of the following disciplines:
*Performance courses are excluded.

Art* Theater* Philosophy
Music* History Literature

12 hours of Social and Behavioral Science courses from at least three of the following disciplines:

Sociology Psychology Political Science
Economics Geography Anthropology

9 hours of Natural and Physical Science courses from at least two disciplines (lecture with lab).

Transcripts of students fulfilling the requirement of this agreement will be appropriately coded by the sending institution.

8. Students must, in addition, meet the appropriate graduation and residency requirements of the institution awarding the degree.

Signatures to follow

**WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES – Monday,
April 14, 2003**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Behrman, Brooks, Celestin, Chopra, Dawe, Decker deSilva, Edwards, Eichhorn, Enns, Hemans, Hershfield, Herzog, Hill, Hiltner, Hodson, Johnson, Kear, Klunder, Lancaster, McDonald, Miller, Moore-Jansen, Muma, Murphey, Parker, Quantic, Ravigururajan, Riordan, Rokosz, Roussel, Russell, Teshome, Williamson, Wimalesena, Yeager, Zhang

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bakken, Bees, Carroll, DeLillo, Forlaw, Hemans, Lause, Matson, Mau, May, Sheikh-Ahmad

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Celestin, Goldy, Markovich, Ross, Withrow

Ex-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: AVPAAR Shawver

SUMMARY OF ACTION:

1. The Senate unanimously approved a motion that Senate President Lancaster communicates to University President Beggs the Senate's continued support for a permanent 1% allocation of any tuition increase (i.e., 1% out of the 19%, say) to the Library.

2. Senate accepted the annual reports from the following committees:

Faculty Affairs
Faculty Support
Honors
Scholarship & Student Aid
Undergraduate Research
University Curriculum

I. CALL TO ORDER: President Lancaster called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS & PROPOSALS:

Senator Murphey expressed dismay and outrage over the pillaging of the Iraq National Museum and the United States government's failure to give the museum the protection that was promised by the State Department for it. He called for an international board of inquiry to determine responsibility.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: Minutes of April 7, 2003, accepted as corrected (a sentence-fragment in the New Business paragraph & Senator Muma, excused.).

VII. NEW BUSINESS (*taken out of order*):

Ablah Library update: Kathy Downes, Interim Dean of University Libraries, spoke about (a) recent Library enhancements; (b) budget constraints upon the Library, and the ways in which the Library is seeking to enhance revenues and cut costs; and (c) the proposed calendar for the periodic "serials review," which is being conducted with an eye toward cutting approximately

20% of the periodicals budget, with other cuts in the book and electronic areas. She requested that faculty participate in an online survey available at:
<http://library.wichita.edu/colldev/electfacsurvey.htm>

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT:

A. President Lancaster said that University President Beggs is expected to make his decision this Friday about any tuition increase for the University. He reminded the Senate of its prior support for an allocation of 1% out of any increase of, say, 19% to the Library. This would come to some \$240,000. A motion made by Senator Moore-Jansen, (Senator Behrman, 2nd) was unanimously approved to call upon President Lancaster to communicate to President Beggs the Senate's continued support for this Library allocation.

B. President Lancaster said the next Board of Regents meeting will be this Wednesday and Thursday. The Council of Faculty Senate Presidents (COFSP) will consider potential means for collaboration among faculty of the Regents' universities. He said COFSP needs to present a document about this at the May meeting of the Board of Regents.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

The Senate accepted the annual reports from the following Senate Committees:

- Faculty Affairs
- Faculty Support
- Honors
- Scholarship & Student Aid
- Undergraduate Research
- University Curriculum

VI. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Proposal to Revise the General Education Program: The Senate continued its discussion President Lancaster made the point that some of the revisions relate to graduation requirements and other matters that are not themselves General Education Program changes.

He said that Senators should send their suggestions for any modifications of the proposed revisions to any member of the Executive Committee before Wednesday, so that the Senate Executive Committee can consider them at a session this Friday that will incorporate what it understands to be the will of the Senate.

The Senate moved to a consideration of numbered paragraph 6 of the proposal, which relates to the Basic Skills oral communication requirement. Senator Keith Williamson spoke extensively to this issue, pointing out that he was the Director of Oral Communications for twelve years. He made four principal points:

1. That the process that has produced the pending proposal has ignored the constitutional role of the Senate's General Education Committee, which has a membership that is broadly representative and which is charged with the responsibility of recommending changes to the program when necessary.

2. That the process excluded oral communications from representation on any of the taskforces that were appointed last August and whose recommendations became the underpinning for the pending proposal. He objected that oral communications representatives appear to have been excluded by design, while representatives of other Basic Skills areas did serve on some task forces. In response, President Lancaster said he had deliberately left all Basic Skills representatives off the taskforce dealing directly with that subject, and that any omission of oral communications people from the other taskforces was unintentional.

3. That the process was not a systematic examination of all three basic skills, unfairly singling out oral communication for different treatment than math or English. Williamson said that all three basic skills should be reviewed systematically, openly and fairly, as affirmed by the LAS College Council this past December. In addition, he pointed to the delays in communicating the proposed changes, and to the continual alteration of the proposal.

4. That the proposed change relative to oral communications is not based on any credible evidence. He said there have been no complaints about the program, and that the burden of proof for a change lies with those who advocate one. There is no rationale, he said, for making oral communications a college- or LAS-division-based option. He cited several contra-indications: that the December 2002 Transfer Agreement includes three hours of Public Speaking; that the new teacher licensure document does the same; that LAS bodies have indicated their support for the current WSU Speech requirement; and that the academic literature supports it.

By consent, Professor Susan Huxman of the Elliott School of Communication addressed the Senate, presenting in detail the rationale for a Public Speaking component of Basic Skills. She was critical of the proposed college- and division-option, saying that it may result in a complex system of assessment.

Senator Quantic questioned why the University needs more assessment, pointing out that students are already tested in class and otherwise.

Senator Enns said she was not sure what the purposes of the proposed revision are. She pointed to a national trend toward the use of assessment for program improvement.

In the final ten minutes of the meeting, the discussion moved on to paragraph 7 of the proposal, relating to the use of introductory and further-study courses.

VII. NEW BUSINESS: none

VIII. AS MAY ARISE:

Respectfully Submitted,
Dwight Murphey, Secretary