



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 2007-2008

Volume XXI

Agenda and Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting of May 13, 2008

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:
<http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/6646>

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

GENERAL FACULTY MEETING

AGENDA

MEETING NOTICE Tuesday, May 13, 2007
3:30pm R S C Ballroom

Please plan to attend the Faculty Awards Ceremony prior to the General Faculty Meeting. It will begin with a reception at 2:30 and the Awards Ceremony at 3:00

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

- I. Call of the Meeting to Order -- Vice President, Jolynne Campbell
- II. Selection of a Secretary & Parliamentarian
- III. Approval of the Minutes -- May 8, 2008 --<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/GF5-8-07.htm>
- IV. Moment of Silence for Deceased Faculty
- V. State of the Senate -- Silvia Carruthers, President
- VI. State of the University -- Donald L. Beggs, President
- VII. State of Academic Affairs -- Gary L. Miller, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Research
- VIII. Old Business -- none
- IX. New Business
 - A. Proposed Policy on Plus/. minus grading:

. Motion from Executive Committee: accepted by the Faculty Senate 4-28-08

WHEREAS 173 faculty from all colleges responded to the survey about plus/minus grading, and

WHEREAS a majority of the respondents are in favor of plus/minus grading, The Faculty Senate Executive Committee moves that the following be the official policy of WSU, and that the following language be inserted in the WSU Undergraduate Catalog,

Graduate Bulletin, and all other relevant documents, subject to ratification at the next meeting of the General Faculty:

The grading system at WSU is

grade	points per credit hour	
A	4.0	The A range denotes <u>excellent</u> performance.
A-	3.7	
B+	3.3	
B	3.0	The B range denotes <u>good</u> performance.
B-	2.7	
C+	2.3	
C	2.0	The C range denotes <u>satisfactory</u> performance.
C-	1.7	
D+	1.3	
D	1.0	The D range denotes <u>unsatisfactory</u> performance.
D-	0.7	
F	0.0	F denotes <u>failing</u> performance.

{Definitions for the grades below to remain the same as p. 34f of the Undergraduate Catalog}

Au	Audit
Cr	Credit
NCr	No credit
S	Satisfactory
U	Unsatisfactory
I	Incomplete
W	Withdrawn
CrE	Credit by examination

<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-MinusSurvey.htm>

<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-MinusSurveyComments.htm>

<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-Minusgrade.htm>

<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-Minusgrade-EC%20discussions.htm>

<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-Minusgrade-opposing.htm>

<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-Minusgradeby%20univer.htm>

X As May Arise

**** University Faculty Awards'' will be presented prior to the General Faculty Meeting. A reception will begin at 2:30 pm followed by Regent Jill Docking presenting the Faculty Awards on the RSC Ballroom.**

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY MEETING

MAY 8, 2007

I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:30pm by Vice President Peer Moore-Jansen

II. Selection of a Secretary and Parliamentarian:

Nan Myers was elected Secretary and Larry Spurgeon, Parliamentarian.

III. Approval of the Minutes: The Minutes of the May 9, 2006, General Faculty meeting were accepted as presented.

IV. Moment of Silence for Deceased members of the WSU Faculty.

V. State of the Senate -- Brigitte Roussel, President

President Roussel reported on several topics that had been discussed in the Faculty Senate including College Tenure & Promotion and PIR Guidelines, defined "Refereed", worked on the Chronic Low Performance proposed policy and Grievance Pool training. She mentioned that the 2007 - 08 Senate would need to work on the proposed X/F policy, the proposed +/- grade system, continue revisions for the Grievance Policy, creating a Tuition Assistance fund for Faculty and Dependents, and review the Election process.

VI. State of the University -- President Donald Beggs

President Beggs congratulated the Faculty Awards winners. He then commented on the Higher Learning Commission study and said that because of the work done he expected full accreditation and this reflected the working together of faculty in the classroom and in governance. He noted that the WIN project is completed. The "We R WSU Campaign" is ending with results of 19 funded faculty positions and 60+ additional scholarships so it has been a success. Regarding buildings, he said the first phase of Engineering and Woodman are completed. He ended by stating that he takes great pride in the work the faculty is doing, there are more student in the classrooms because the faculty and he encouraged continued cooperation between the Faculty Senate and the Provost.

VII. State of Academic Affairs -- Gary L. Miller, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and Research

Provost Miller also congratulated the Faculty Award winners. He said he enjoyed this year working with President Roussel, that she was a strong advocate for

the faculty. He sees WSU as an Urban Serving Research Institution and wants to enhance resources for research without diminishing other areas. He wants to enhance the diversity on campus as been suggested by the HLC. He is going to work with VP Kopita to expand enrollment and recruitment of students. He encouraged continued work between the College of Education and USD 259. He mentioned two goals, 1. the have more interaction between the deans and faculty, more dialogue and 2. study ways to measure student learning. He thanked the faculty for the opportunity to speak and answered questions regarding Library Resolutions for additional funding and delay in naming a new General Education Coordinator.

VIII. Old Business --- none

IX. New Business

A. Proposed Policy on Chronic Low Performance -
- <http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/CLPproposal4-9-07clean.html>

Don Bryum moved (Denise Celestin 2nd) acceptance of the propose policy. The Faculty accepted it with an unanimously.

X. As May Arise -- none

The meeting was adjourned
Respectfully submitted
Nan Myers
Secretary

PROPOSED POLICY ON CHRONIC LOW PERFORMANCE

Each University department/unit shall develop, with input from its faculty, a set of guidelines approved by the Dean, 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 meet the minimum acceptable level of performance as defined by the department/unit guidelines shall constitute evidence of “chronic low performance” and may warrant consideration for “dismissal for cause” under existing university policies. This statement is intended to establish a specific and clear procedure for identifying and addressing instances of a faculty member failing to meet the minimum level of performance, and to provide a remediation program where appropriate, as further described below.

If the Chair and/or the FAR Review Committee determines that the overall performance of a faculty member in their department falls below the minimum level of performance, this finding shall be indicated in the annual evaluation form. The Chair shall discuss with the faculty member a suggested course of action to improve performance and document that discussion.

If during any four-year period a faculty member receives a second annual evaluation which reflects a finding in that department/unit that he or she has failed to meet the minimum level of performance, the Chair shall meet with the faculty member and discuss his or her 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, the Chair, and the Dean stating that by majority vote they have verified that departmental guidelines were followed and concluded either that (a) there is evidence of Chronic Low Performance and that remediation is necessary; or (b) there is not evidence of Chronic Low Performance. The Dean will then make the final decisions regarding chronic low performance after meeting with the faculty member and the Chair.

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, such as counseling, leave of absence, 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 Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Research. 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 any period of five years from the first evaluation of low performance, 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 Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Research that the dismissal for cause policy under Section 4.23 of the University's Policies and Procedures be invoked.

Chronic Low Performance – a rationale for the current draft

As part of developing a procedure for annual evaluations of tenured faculty in the early 1990s, the Kansas Board of Regents mandated that each institution within the Regents' system develop a Chronic Low Performance policy that will provide a definition of CLP and use it as an indicator of incompetence, despite all assistance provided for faculty renewal and development.

The WSU faculty senate worked for over twelve years to write such a policy. One two-page version was passed in the senate in the spring 2006 by a narrow margin, but was not signed by the VPAAR's office. A new draft was written this year, discussed multiple times in the senate and also at the general faculty meeting in November 2006. Upon suggestion by the faculty senate and at the request of the VPAAR's office to be consulted on developing policies at the onset, the executive committee was charged with negotiating a version acceptable by the senate and the administration directly with the VPAAR's office.

The present policy proposal is the result of that negotiation. The policy is simplified in its intent and clearer in its procedure. It provides a clause for due process and outlines the steps for remediation. It provides a clear time frame as well. The proposed policy was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on April 9, 2007.

Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting, May 13, 2008

Meeting called to order at 3:47pm by Faculty Senate Vice President JoLynn Campbell

Bill Vanderburgh was elected Secretary.

_____ was elected Parliamentarian.

Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting of May 8, 2007: Moved, Lancaster; second, Julian; Approved.

Moment of Silence for Deceased Faculty

State of the Senate—Faculty Senate President Sylvia Carruthers

President Carruthers reported on various items considered by the Faculty Senate during 2007 - 08, including accepting proposed revisions to the Subvention Policy, and accepting the proposed Bio-engineering and Dental Hygiene degrees. She noted that most of the business concerned working on the proposed +/- grading system. KBOR visited the WSU campus on April 15; Faculty Senate Executive met with Gary Shearer. What challenges, activities? Spent a lot of time talking about e-learning. Every KBOR meeting includes discussion of the five guiding principles: Is K-12 aligned with admissions expectations at colleges? Participation rates? Retention rates? Aligned with workforce development needs? Documenting learner outcomes in general and specific terms? How to do Regents-wide assessment while retaining the individuality of specific institutions.

She then presented information that the standing committees had been working on:

Rules committee discussed ways to increase participation and representation; new grievance policies; no grievances filed this year.

Academic Affairs committee (Krishnan, chair) worked hard on the plus/minus grading proposal, approved new programs.

Faculty Support Committee expressed concern about the 4% limit on the number of sabbaticals allowed—more sabbaticals have been recommended than can be accommodated.

General Education Committee developed new online exit survey of graduating surveys.

T&P Committee—recommend that external reviews be required in all promotion and tenure reviews (not required in PIR). Expect to have a General Faculty meeting early fall to discuss this topic before formulating Senate action.

It has been a privilege to work with Senate, Executive, Committees, and Senators. She thanked to this year's Executive Committee. Larry Spurgeon, Brigitte Roussel, JoLynn Campbell, Roy Myose, Cathy Moore-Jansen, Lori Miller, and William Vanderburgh. She introduced the Executive Committee for 2008 - 09, Larry Spurgeon, Deborah Soles, Steven Skinner, Brien Bolin, William Vanderburgh, Cathy Moore-Jansen and Frederick Hemans.

State of the University—President Don L. Beggs

President Beggs began by noting that the attendance for Faculty Awards was outstanding, thanked everyone for supporting your colleagues.

He said he has spent a lot of time and effort getting the 5 of 9 KBOR members who are new up to speed. There were a lot of changes. Omnibus bill in legislature included 2.5% salary

increase, OOE increase. WSU based our tuition and fee requests on that. BUT...legislature did not support the governor's recommendations. The 2.5% salary increase for 60% of staff; the other 40% must be made up internally. He noted that his priorities: salaries first; the utilities contract needs to be changed (additional \$300K); \$380K permanent adjustment for library resources. Technology; distributed via eLearning (we have a weak eLearning presence, need to increase faculty support \$350K). Advising, ERP, \$350K. Grad Student stipends are \$9200 for half time; would have been increased in the governor's budget, but now in flux. We had proposed 4.9% tuition increase; operating budget for Regents halved to \$10 Million. Are the expectations for tuition increases changing? If we are not allowed to increase tuition more, we will hold the line on top three priorities. We need to be aware that there are 21 other institutions offering degree courses.

He mentioned that the \$860 one-time bonus last year will become permanent. PIR needs would be taken off the top of the salary increase if needed, but current budget proposal doesn't require that.

He also stated that in a May 5 letter, Reggie Robinson, Chair, KBOR, announced there will be a legislative audit of post-secondary education looking to increase efficiencies; increased teaching loads, lower degree requirements, etc. This is a national trend.

He plans to work closely with all constituencies to resolve the current budget problems, and wanted all to remain encouraged, WSU is doing good things, Planning involves building on strengths. We need to show that our students achieve at the right levels. Economic conditions have changed; there is a historical trend that enrollment increases in tough times. But higher ed in that sense is mostly technical ed; our university is pursuing those issues. We will continue to do well next year, but the projections for 2010 are less positive given the national economy. He said he wanted Faculty to feel good about who you are and what you are doing, because you are good.

State of Academic Affairs—Provost Gary L. Miller

Provost Miller began by saying that President Beggs painted a clear picture of the economic future. That the Budget and post-audit will take most of our time next year. He also said that Sylvia Carruthers has been excellent representation for the faculty this year: Thanks to her and thanks, too, to the Senate; it has been a productive year.

He listed of some of administrative focal points next year -- Refined the mission of the university: urban-serving research university (community and Regents now using that language), Positioning ourselves with Regents so as to have advantages in competition for resources, the national movement regarding USRU is closely aligned with KBORs goals, Biosciences initiative: we are one of two or three major funding targets for the BSI. We will be making an excellent proposal this summer, The student experience, Shared governance, Provost has been charged to look into how we do and should do shared governance—more important than ever because of post-audit, economic downtown.

He noted that teaching is very important. Miller's address to the Academy for Effective Teaching is on the Provost's webpage. He talked about teaching as we wrestle with national movement regarding assessment of student outcomes.

Retention is a KBOR priority; strategic enrollment and retention needs to be in place. Academic division needs to focus on advising. Student centered, student success-based approach. Data shows that the first couple of experiences in a university are highly correlated

with retention and success. First year experience for various types of students. We can overcome economic troubles with higher enrollment.

He announced that Susan Huxman will facilitate a group of thought leaders to dream about a new sort of Honors program for WSU that enriches the intellectual lives of students and faculty.

He noted E-Learning was an HLC concern. We have a huge opportunity, need to invest in it. NIAR will have space at the new Jabara center, will be conducting research and training there. Need to work quickly to develop this; it is new tuition and an economic driver for the region. Although we are not a technical college, we have a responsibility to help educate the regional workforce.

He concluded his remarks by saying it is an honor to be part of this excellent faculty.

Old Business—none

New Business:

1. Motion from Faculty Senate Executive approved by Senate 4-28-08.

WHEREAS 173 faculty from all colleges responded to the survey about plus/minus grading, and
WHEREAS a majority of the respondents are in favor of plus/minus grading,
The Faculty Senate Executive Committee moves that the following be the official policy of WSU, and that the following language be inserted in the WSU Undergraduate Catalog, Graduate Bulletin, and all other relevant documents, subject to ratification at the next meeting of the General Faculty:

The grading system at WSU is

grade	points per credit hour	
A	4.0	The A range denotes excellent performance.
A-	3.7	
B+	3.3	
B	3.0	The B range denotes good performance.
B-	2.7	
C+	2.3	
C	2.0	The C range denotes satisfactory performance.
C-	1.7	
D+	1.3	
D	1.0	The D range denotes unsatisfactory performance.
D-	0.7	
F	0.0	F denotes failing performance.

{Definitions for the grades below to remain the same as p. 34f of the Undergraduate Catalog}

Au Audit

Cr	Credit
NCr	No credit
S	Satisfactory
U	Unsatisfactory
I	Incomplete
W	Withdrawn
CrE	Credit by examination

<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-MinusSurvey.htm>
<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-MinusSurveyComments.htm>
<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-Minusgrade.htm>
<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-Minusgrade-EC%20discussions.htm>
<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-Minusgrade-opposing.htm>
<http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Plus-Minusgradeby%20univer.htm>

Discussion:

Berman, member of Academic Affairs Committee, thinks the motion is a mistake. If we look at grading as evaluative, it is pretending that we have a larger degree of precision than can be justified. If we look at grading as motivational, there is an inconsistency—preventing grade inflation, motivating students, xxx. Grades are actually depressed, Myose, member Executive committee: Likely to increase grade appeals. Students are against it. It is mandatory, which is bad. Peer Moore-Jansen: concerned with grading large intro classes, worried that subjectivity in grading means he will be unable to defend his grades. Chris Brooks, English. Letters of recommendation for students with low A and high A are different. In humanities, we use +/- all the time. Let's make our grades line up with our real practice. Passed Exec, Senate, survey. Please think about those of us who need this to Schneegurt, Chemistry. The survey conducted was non-scientific. There is no strong undercurrent in faculty who want this. Was at an institution with +/-, and there were many more appeals. Going from 3 to 4 borderlines to Hershfield, Philosophy. Fully in support. In 20 years of teaching, fully confident he can distinguish +/- . Nothing dictates where you set the numerical lines. This is a tool to make more accurate representations of student performance. Hughes, Anthropology. Against the motion.

Motion to Call the Question. Moved, Roussel; seconded, Hershfield: passed.

Secret ballot. 59 in favor of motion, 57 against. Motion passes.

As May Arise - None.

Motion to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned

William Vanderburgh, Secretary