ORDER OF BUSINESS:

I. Call of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Statements and Proposals

III. Approval of the Minutes -- Monday, February 26, 2007 -
    - http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/M2-26-07.htm

IV. President's Report

V. Committee Reports

   A. Library Committee -- Senator P. Moore-Jansen, committee member

   1. The Library Committee wishes to remind the Senate, and inform new
      senators, about its proposal for enhanced funding of the University
      Libraries. This was unanimously passed by the LC and forwarded to the
      Senate in the fall of 2004. (See attachments.)

   2. We also wish to communicate to you our unanimous support that, in
      addition to the current funding rate, the WSU administration allocate at
least 1% of all new WSU student tuition increases to the University Libraries for acquisitions.

3. We further note that just for the FY 2008 materials budget, an increase of $206,790 will be needed merely to maintain the present level of access and an increase of $350,000 is needed to help fund additional electronic resources desperately needed by faculty and students. 

http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Library%20Proposal--March%202007.htm

B. Faculty Affairs -- Terrence Decker, Chair -
- http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/FacAffairs-3-07.htm

VI Old Business

VII New Business

A. Proposed X/F Grade policy discussion -- http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/XF-XW%20grade.htm

B. Proposed policy on Chronic Low Performance -- 1st reading -
- http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/CLPproposal3-07.html

Background and Rationale -- President Roussel, Q & A -- Senator Spurgeon

VIII As May Arise
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<td>Secretary - Robert Ross</td>
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<td>Box 84</td>
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<td>6268</td>
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<td>Past President - Chris Brooks</td>
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<td>Box 14</td>
</tr>
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Library Proposal – March, 2007

Here is the total text with corrections, additions and deletions:

1. The Library Committee wishes to remind the Senate, and inform new senators, about its proposal for enhanced funding of the University Libraries. This was unanimously passed by the LC and forwarded to the Senate in the fall of 2004. (See attachments.)

2. We also wish to communicate to you our unanimous support that, in addition to the current funding rate, the WSU administration allocate at least 1% of all new WSU student tuition increases to the University Libraries for acquisitions.

3. We further note that just for the FY 2007 materials budget, an increase of $95,000 will be needed merely to maintain the present level of access; and an increase of $125,000 is needed to will help fund some enhancements and an increase of $181,000 will fully fund additional electronic resources desperately needed by faculty and students.

The following is the clarification and update with the "new" or current numbers appropriately describing the Library’s needs. This is want we want to pass:

1. The Library Committee wishes to remind the Senate, and inform new senators, about its proposal for enhanced funding of the University Libraries. This was unanimously passed by the LC and forwarded to the Senate in the fall of 2004. (See attachments.)

2. We also wish to communicate to you our unanimous support that, in addition to the current funding rate, the WSU administration allocate at least 1% of all new WSU student tuition increases to the University Libraries for acquisitions.

3. We further note that just for the FY 2008 materials budget, an increase of $206,790 will be needed merely to maintain the present level of access and an increase of $350,000 is needed to help fund additional electronic resources desperately needed by faculty and students.
The Faculty Affairs committee passed on March 8, 2007:

All accepted by the Faculty Senate 4-9-07
1. Publish in the Tenure and Promotion Calendar, section 4.16 of Policies & Procedures:

   **January**

   2nd Week        Regular meeting of the University Tenure and Promotion committee

2. Publish in the Tenure and Promotion and Professor Incentive Review (PIR) Calendar, section 3.8 of Handbook for Faculty:

   **January**

   2nd Week        Regular meeting of the University Tenure and Promotion committee

3. Insert in the definition of terms, section 4.18 of Policies & Procedures:

   Refereed – A refereed article is a manuscript that has been carefully reviewed and evaluated by scholars or experts in the research topic of the manuscript. Typically, the manuscript has been subjected to a blind review process by one or more readers.

4. Insert in the definition of terms, section 3.84 of Handbook for Faculty:

   Refereed – A refereed article is a manuscript that has been carefully reviewed and evaluated by scholars or experts in the research topic of the manuscript. Typically, the manuscript has been subjected to a blind review process by one or more readers.
5. Change “The use of external peer reviews is optional. In deciding whether or not to seek external peer reviews, candidates should assess how they can best make an effective case that they have met college and University criteria for tenure and/or promotion. For those candidates who elect to employ external review, a standard procedure should be followed” in section 4.18 of Policies & Procedures to:

Members of a review committee typically expect to find external review in the files of all candidates. When external reviews are not employed, therefore, a brief explanation should be provided in the candidate's statement. The use of external peer reviews is optional. In deciding whether or not to seek external peer reviews, candidates should assess how they can best make an effective case that they have met college and University criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The importance of external peer reviews varies among disciplines. For those candidates who elect to employ external review, a standard procedure should be followed.

6. Change “The use of external peer reviews is optional. In deciding whether or not to seek external peer reviews, candidates should assess how they can best make an effective case that they have met college/school/University Libraries and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. For those candidates who elect to employ external review, a standard procedure should be followed” in section 3.85 of Handbook for Faculty to:

Members of a review committee typically expect to find external review in the files of all candidates. When external reviews are not employed, therefore, a brief explanation should be provided in the candidate's statement. The use of external peer reviews is optional. In deciding whether or not to seek external peer reviews, candidates should assess how they can best make an effective case that they have met college/school/University Libraries and university criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The importance of external peer reviews varies among disciplines. For those candidates who elect to employ external review, a standard procedure should be followed.
XF/XW Grade Policy

The grade of XF, submitted by the faculty, is intended to denote a failure to accept and exhibit the fundamental value of academic integrity. The XF grade shall be recorded on the student's transcript with the notation "failure due to academic dishonesty." The XF grade shall be treated in the same manner as "F" for purposes of computing a grade point average, course repeatability and determination of academic standing.

1. If the student believes that the grade of XF was unjustly assigned, the student may appeal the assignment of such a grade immediately to the Student Court of Academic Appeals in accordance with the policies in the Student Handbook, the Faculty Handbook and the Policies and Procedures Manual.

2. No student with an XF grade on their transcript shall be permitted to run for or hold any office in any student organization or serve as a member of any campus committee.

3. If the student does not wish to challenge the justice of the XF assignment but wishes to have that grade (the X from the F) expunged from the transcript, the student may file an appeal with the Student Court of Academic Appeals in accordance with the policies in the documents referenced in number 1 above. Decisions will consider the following factors:

   a. At the time the petition is received, at least one complete semester should have elapsed since the XF grade was imposed, whether or not the student is currently enrolled at WSU.
   b. An essay submitted by the student with the petition adequately explains why the grade should be changed: and
   c. The student has not been found responsible of any act of academic dishonesty of similar disciplinary offense.

4. A student who withdraws from a class before the end of the semester, because the student was deemed academically dishonest by the instructor, will receive an XW on their transcript. All aspects of the XF grade apply to XW.

5. A student may petition only one time for the removal of an X from the XF or XW grade.

6. If a student is academically dishonest more than once, and the appeals process has been exhausted, the student faces dismissal.

Accepted by the Faculty Senate 4-11-05
PROPOSED CLP INSERT for SECTION 4.22 – Revised March 8, 2007

CHRONIC LOW PERFORMANCE

Each University department/unit shall develop, with input from its faculty, a set of guidelines describing the minimum acceptable level of performance, for all applicable areas of responsibility for its faculty, as well as procedures to handle alleged cases of chronic low performance. Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform the faculty member’s duties as defined in the Guidelines shall constitute evidence of “chronic low performance” and may warrant consideration for “dismissal for cause” under existing University policies. This Chronic Low Performance Policy (CLP Policy) is intended to establish a specific and clear procedure for identifying and addressing instances of failing to meet the minimum level of performance, and to provide a remediation program where appropriate, as further described below.

If a standing committee of the tenured faculty determines that the overall performance of a faculty member in their department/unit falls below the minimum level of performance, this finding shall be indicated in the annual evaluation form sent to the dean and the Chair or Head of the department/unit. The Chair shall discuss with the faculty member a suggested course of action to improve performance and document that course of action.

If within four years a faculty member receives a second annual evaluation which reflects a finding by the standing committee of tenured faculty in that department/unit that the faculty member has failed to meet the minimum level of performance, the Chair and/or the dean shall meet with the faculty member and discuss the faculty member’s performance and types of remediation that are available and appropriate. If the faculty member requests a review of that determination, three tenured faculty members from outside that department/unit but within the same college shall review the faculty member’s annual evaluations and other relevant documents. The faculty member and the Chair shall each select one reviewer, and they shall jointly select the third person. The reviewers shall submit a written report to the faculty member and the Chair stating that by majority vote they have concluded either that (a) there is clear and convincing evidence of Chronic Low Performance and that remediation is necessary; or (b) there is not clear and convincing evidence of Chronic Low Performance.

If remediation is necessary, the Chair will discuss the faculty member’s performance with the faculty member and suggest types of remediation that are available and
appropriate. The remediation may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, or other appropriate interventions, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. Other remediation steps may be offered, subject to review by the Faculty Affairs committee of the Faculty Senate and the VPAAR. Remediation should begin as soon as possible and will be funded by the University. The faculty member’s annual review document for the subsequent year should reflect the method of remediation and document its level of success.

If within a period of five years a tenured faculty member receives a third annual evaluation which reflects a failure to meet the minimum level of performance, the Chair, in conjunction with the dean, may recommend to the VPAAR that the dismissal for cause policy under Section 4.23 of the University’s Policies and Procedures be invoked, in which event the burden of proof will be on the University administration to make the case for dismissal.
Wichita State University Faculty Senate meeting Monday, March 12, 2007

MEMBERS PRESENT: Acker, Billings, Brooks, Byrum, Campbell, Carruthers, Celestin, Close, Coufal, Decker, deSilva, Elder, Forlaw, Hamdeh, Jarnagin, Lancaster, Liera-Schwichtenberg, C. Moore-Jansen, P. Moore-Jansen, Myers, Owens, Proctor, Rillema, Riordan, Rogers, Rokosz, Ross, Roussel, Schneegurt, Shelly, Spurgeon, Taher, Turk, Uhing, Vanderburgh, Yeager

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dooley, Gordon, Monroe, Siginer, Weheba

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Hathaway, Hershfield, Lewis, Manske, Myose

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS: VPAAR Miller

Summary of Action:

1. Accepted the proposed Resolution from the Library Committee for additional funding for the University Libraries
2. Accepted the report from the Faculty Affairs Committee proposing revisions from the Tenure and Promotion Policy
3. Discussion about the proposed policy on Chronic Low Performance

I. Call of the Meeting to Order:
   President Roussel called the meeting to order at 3:30 P.M.

II. Informal Statements and Proposals: None

III. Approval of the Minutes -- Minutes of February 26, 2007, accepted as presented

III. President’s Report -- None

IV. Committee Reports
   A. Library Committee -- Peer Moore-Jansen gave the report for the committee. Parts of the proposal were approved by the Faculty Senate previously. The numbers have been updated in an attempt to secure additional funding. In addition to current funding, the Library Committee is asking for an additional 1% permanent funding from all new WSU student tuition increases, to be used for acquisitions. This would apply to tuition increases starting in the fall semester of 2007. A motion was made by Sylvia Carruthers (Byrum, 2nd) to attach a subpart to Item #1 in the proposal to incorporate the “Budget Recommendation” from October 2004. The motion passed unanimously. A motion was made by Sylvia Carruthers (Lancaster, 2nd) to approve the Library Committee’s report including the subpart. The motion passed unanimously. The Resolution is available at: http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Library%20Comm%20resolution%202007.htm

   B. Executive Committee -- President Roussel explained the procedure for discussing proposed policies for first reading. The proposals would be presented and there
would be an orderly discussion. She said that VPAAR Gary Miller would then provide his comments to each proposal. Finally, she would ask senators to think about the proposals over spring break.

President Roussel said that she talked to President Beggs on Friday and he said he believed it is important for faculty to meet sometimes without administrators present. She proposed that when VPAAR Gary Miller could not be present that he not send a representative so that the senate could have an opportunity to have discussions without administration representatives present. The senate discussed the issue, with some senators noting the importance of such meetings, and others expressing concern that the administration not be discouraged from attending. President Roussel then said it appeared that a majority of the senate did prefer to have an administration representative present at all the meetings.

C. Faculty Affairs Committee -- Terrence Decker, Chair, gave the report for the committee. The committee met on March 8 and passed six proposals. He summarized the proposals and then asked for comments. 1. There was brief discussion about the scheduling of the tenure calendar. 2. Several senators commented on the definition of a “refereed” publication, noting that the approach for the review of publications varies among the disciplines. 3. There was discussion about the committee’s suggested language for the use of external peer reviews. The committee’s proposal states that the “use of external peer reviews is optional.” Sylvia Carruthers said that the Tenure & Promotion Committee had proposed that the statement be that such reviews are “typically expected.” There was discussion by senators about the meaning of “typically expected” and the methods currently used in certain colleges.

VPAAR Gary Miller was asked for his comments. He said that he did not think the tenure calendar requires a policy change. His suggestion about defining refereed was intended to save time. As for external reviews, he said that he does expect external reviews to be used and that he would consider it unusual for there not to be external reviews in the tenure file. Kirk Lancaster moved (Byrum, 2nd) to accept the report. The motion passed unanimously. The definition of "Refereed" and "External Reviews" will be discussed at the next meeting. The report is available at: http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/FacAffairs-3-07.htm

V. Old Business - None

VI. New Business

A. Proposed X/F Policy – The X/F grade policy was made available to senators. It was originally approved by the senate in Spring 2005 but was never acted upon by administration. There was discussion about the origin of the policy, from the SGA, and whether the SGA was still supportive of the policy. President Roussel explained that VPAAR Gary Miller had expressed concerns with the specific provisions of the policy. VPAAR Gary Miller said he has met with the SGA Academic Affairs committee and discussed the issue with Ted Ayres and Cheryl Adams. They will be working on a draft over the summer and will submit it to the
various constituent groups. He said that there are two issues, one being a grade, which is an academic matter, and the other is behavior, cheating. Grading does not involve due process except for the appeal to the student court of academic appeals. Using an X involves behavior and that requires due process. Proposed X/F policy is available at: http://webs.wichita.edu senate/XF-XW%20grade.htm

B. Proposed Chronic Low Performance Policy – President Roussel presented the revised draft of the proposed CLP Policy. The senate approved a proposed CLP draft last year, but it was not approved by the administration. She explained the changes and the rationale for the changes. There was some discussion about what happens if the outside review members conclude that the faculty member did not perform below expected standards and the role of the department chair in the process. In some departments the chair makes the determination of performance, and in others the chair signs off but is not directly involved. VPAAR Gary Miller said the new draft was a vast improvement, but that he does have some minor concerns. He believes the policy should refer to a system of college approval of department guidelines. This draft takes out the reference to chair involvement and leaves it entirely to the committee. He also expressed some concern about the reference to a review by three persons outside the department. He wants to take out the reference to medical leave in the discussion of remediation steps. He thinks the last sentence about burden of proof is redundant. Upon suggestion by a senator, the Executive committee will meet with VPAAR Miller and University Counsel Ayers to iron out the minor details. This proposed policy is available at: http://webs.wichita.edu senate/CLPproposal3-07.html

VII. As May Arise --

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm
Respectfully Submitted
Robert Ross, Secretary