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Agenda and Minutes
of the Meeting of April 26, 2010

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at: https://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/6683
ORDER OF BUSINESS:

I. Call of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Statements and Proposals

III. Approval of the Minutes: Minutes of the April 12, 2010 meeting -
    - http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/m4-12-10.htm

IV. President's Report

V. Committee Reports
   A. Standing Committee Annual Reports:
      1. Court of Academic Appeals -
         - http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/CAArpt03.htm
      2. Executive Committee -
         - http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/EXrpt05.htm
      3. Faculty Support -- http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/FSrpt.htm
      4. Honors -- http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Hrpt-05.htm
         Proposal from the Honors Committee -
         - http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Honors%20proposal.htm
      5. Planning and Budget -
         - http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/P&Brpt05.htm
   B. Rules Committee -- Fritz Hemans, chair -- standing committee
      appointments -- http://webs.wichita.edu/senate/Rules%20-%202006.htm

VI. Old Business: none
VII. New Business

A. Keith Pickus, Associate Provost, Academic Affairs & Research - Foundations of Excellence statement

The following statement is the proposed language that has been recommended for approval by the FOE task force. The intent is to have all three Senates “approve” the statement before forwarding to the President for his final decision. Once this is complete, the plan is for the statement to be included in an appropriate place within the catalog, utilized in admission’s materials for new students and serve as a central feature of the Office for Faculty Development and Student Success’ mission.

“Wichita State University is strongly committed to providing a quality experience for all students in their first year of enrollment. This commitment includes continual improvement of policies, programs, and services to facilitate academic success and personal growth; providing foundational educational experiences and creating a culture that supports first-year enrollees' aspirations; encouraging students to actively engage in campus life; and helping first-year enrollees at WSU to participate in a multicultural global community.”

VIII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Campus Phone</th>
<th>Campus Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President: Deborah Soles</td>
<td>3125 / 7886</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President: Steven Skinner</td>
<td>3415</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary: Johnnie Thompson</td>
<td>6881</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Elect: Frederick Hemans</td>
<td>3555 / 7715</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President - Larry Spurgeon</td>
<td>6260</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elected by the Senate

Rhonda Lewis-Moss  
rhonda.lewis@wichita.edu  
3695 34

Julie Scherz  
julie.scherz@wichita.edu  
5344 75

Appointed by the Faculty Senate President

Daniel Russell  
daniel.russell@wichita.edu  
3125 74

Office of Faculty Senate

Bobbi Dreiling, Administrative Assistant  
bobbi.dreiling@wichita.edu  
3504 111
WSU Court of Academic Appeals
Annual Report for Year 2009-10

Members:
1. Rajiv Bagai, College of Engineering, Chair
2. Ray Hull, College of Health Professions, Member
3. vacant, Member
4. Kimberly Grimes, SGA Graduate Representative
5. Zach Gearhart, SGA Undergraduate Representative
6. Candace Wells, College of Education, Alternate Member
7. Orren Dale, LAS (School of Social Work), Alternate Member
8. vacant, Alternate Member
9. Julinda Taylor, SGA Graduate Representative Alternate Member
10. vacant, SGA Undergraduate Representative Alternate Member

Meeting Schedule and Committee Activities:
The Court meets whenever cases are presented to be heard. Hearings are conducted following careful review of the documentation presented. The year 2009-10 hearings known so far are:
• August 17, 2009 (involving HIST 308)
• March 26, 2010 (involving FIN 340)
• April 9, 2010 (involving SCWK 822 and termination from Master of Social Work program)
• April 23, 2010 (involving DS 350)

Pending Issues:
None.

Recommendations:
None.

Respectfully Submitted,
Rajiv Bagai
April 13, 2010
Executive Committee – Report to the Faculty Senate
April 26, 2010

Committee Members:
Deborah Soles, President of the Faculty Senate, Chair
Frederick Hemans, President-Elect of the Faculty Senate
Larry Spurgeon, Past President of the Faculty Senate
Steven Skinner, Vice President
Johnnie Thompson, Secretary
Rhonda Lewis Moss
Daniel Russell
Julie Scherz

Meeting Schedule for 2009-2010:
The Executive Committee generally meets on the first and third Mondays of the month.

Committee Activities:
The Executive Committee’s primary activity is to review proposals from the Faculty Senate Committees and to prepare the agenda for the Faculty Senate meetings. The meetings are held from 3:30 – 5:00 pm. Provost Miller frequently meets with the committee at the beginning of the meeting to give us updates on budget and university matters. The remainder of the meeting consists of discussion of senate agenda items and committee activities.
This year our work was focused on the university’s reshaping and rebuilding initiative, initially as it concerned the University Libraries, but more generally as the year progressed; ongoing reports from various Senate committees; reorganization of Faculty Senate Committees; policies for academic dishonesty; determination of faculty status. Proposals were or are being forwarded to appropriate Senate committees on the last three items. Additionally, a new Senate webpage is being constructed, and an additional entry about the budgetary situation was made to the existing webpage.
Report: Faculty Support Committee  
AY 2009-2010

1. Members:  
• Rick LeCompte (Business) (Chair)  
• Jay Price (LAS-Humanities) (Vice Chair)  
• Sai Deng (Library)  
• Walter Horn (Engineering)  
• Robert Lawless (LAS/Anthropology)  
• Rhonda Lewis-Moss (LAS-Humanities)  
• Linda Mitchell (Education)  
• Paul Rillema (Chemistry)  
• Maria Torres-Pillot (Health Professions/Medical Technology)  
• Tom Wine (Fine Arts – Performing Arts)

2. Meeting Schedule:  
The committee met four times from November 3, 2009 – March 2, 2010.

3. Description of Committee Activities:  
The committee critiqued, judged, and made recommendations on the following competitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty URCAs</td>
<td>4 / $17,783</td>
<td>2 / $9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Faculty URCAs</td>
<td>5 / $22,290</td>
<td>1 / $4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCS</td>
<td>8 / $31,715</td>
<td>3 / $11,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURPAs</td>
<td>Was not offered in AY 2009-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Faculty Scholar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Research</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Creativity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Available research funds were limited due to budgetary constraints.

4. Pending Issues:  
None
HONORS COMMITTEE, 2009-2010—Report to the Faculty Senate

Members:

Trisha Self, Health Professions
Hyuck Kwon, Engineering
Dharam Chopra, LAS Math/Natural Sciences
Clyde Stoltenberg (Chair), Business
Betty Monroe, Fine Arts (On sabbatical, Spring 2010)
Liorah Golomb, University Libraries (left WSU mid-year)
Chinyere Okafor, LAS Humanities
Ken Ciboski, LAS Social Sciences
Johnnie Thompson, Education
William Vanderburgh, Interim Director, Honors Program
_________________, SGA Representative

Charges:

1. Counsel the Director and review the Director’s activities.
2. Reviews and recommend changes as needed to the Honors Program.
3. Recommend changes in the rules and policies under which the program functions.
4. Consult with the Director regarding students who want to undertake independent study leading to a degree with departmental honors.
5. Annual reports to the Senate shall include recommendations made to and actions taken by the Honors Director.

Actions and Recommendations:

The Committee began the year by reviewing with the Interim Director its activities during 2008-2009. Then, we reviewed with the Interim Director the Fall 2008 Honors Steering Committee Final Report, Shaping the Future of Honors Education, and all relevant 2009-2010 catalog copy and Senate Meeting minutes. Also reviewed were Continuation and Graduation Rates for First Time Full Term Freshmen for the period 1996-2005, broken down for those Honors Program Registered, Honors Program Eligible Non-Registered, and Honors Program Not Eligible. Continuation and Graduation Rates appeared to be best for those in the category of Honors Program Registered, then for those in the category of Honors Program Eligible Non-Registered, and weakest for Honors Program Not Eligible. We also reviewed the list of students
who graduated with Departmental Honors from Fall 2006 to Summer 2009. There were 26 such students, categorized as follows: Political Science: 7; Engineering: 4; Music: 4, Communication Sciences and Disorders: 2; Criminal Justice: 2; Psychology: 2 and 1 each from Chemistry, English, Physics, History, Spanish and International Area Studies. (One student double majored in History and Criminal Justice.) Current Honors Program enrollment and graduation figures were also reviewed: 200+ were admitted to the Honors Program for the current year, and 17 completed the Honors Program last year.

Based on this data and other considerations, the focus of the Committee’s activity for the year was on the Upper Level Honors Program. While it appeared that there is sufficient curricular content to keep Honors Students engaged and involved with the Program during the first two years, the real gap seemed to lie in the Upper Level Honors Experience. These considerations produced a Feb. 11, 2009 Proposal for Revision of Honors Requirements. A copy is supplied with this Report. The Proposal contained recommendations for Increasing Admission and Progression Requirements, Enhancing the Lower Division, and Redesigning the Upper Division. Specifically, the Proposal recommended the following:

1. Increasing Admission Requirements:
   Incoming students with fewer than 24 college credit hours: a minimum high school GPA of 3.7, or a minimum composite ACT score of 27.
   Incoming students with more than 24 college credit hours: a minimum college GPA of 3.6.
   Students who do not meet these requirements may petition the Director of Honors for special admission.

2. Progression Requirements:
   Being in good standing in the Honors Program requires maintaining an overall WSU GPA of 3.0. Students who fall below these standards for one semester will be put on probationary status. Students who fall below these standards for two semesters will be dropped from the program. [Consideration was given to increasing the overall WSU GPA requirement to 3.5 and no less than 3.25 in any Honors class. Ultimately, we did not make this recommendation, preferring to have a progression requirement that would encourage Honors Students to take chances and stretch themselves.]

3. Increase the number of hours in the lower division of the program to 12.

4. Increase the number of hours in the upper division of the program to 12, with HNRS Advanced Composition and HNRS Research Seminar as required classes.

On April 13, 2010, the University Curriculum Committee approved the Proposal, and the Provost’s Office concurred. The changes were announced via WSU Today on April 22, 2010.

The Honors Committee recommends that attention be given during the coming year to the implementation of these changes and to monitoring and assessing their impact.

Respectfully Submitted,
Preliminary Proposal — February 11, 2009

REVISION OF HONORS REQUIREMENTS

Preamble
In 2008, the Provost’s Taskforce on the Honors Program made a series of recommendations about changes to the structure of the Honors program. The proposal below constitutes an early step toward implementing some of those changes in the current budgetary situation.

Background
Currently, the Emory Lindquist Honors Program has the following structure.

(1) Lower Division
   1. 3 Freshman/Sophomore Seminars

(2) Upper Division
   2. Departmental Honors Track (12 hours minimum)
      OR
   3. as an alternative to the Departmental Honors Track
   4. 2 upper division courses (either general education, Honors, in the major, or other approved upper division courses)
   5. Senior Project [Independent Study] in the major

Only ten departments (three from the College of Engineering) have defined Departmental Honors Tracks. Still fewer actively promote their Departmental Honors Tracks.

About 230 students are admitted to the Honors Program annually. In recent years, 0-17 students have graduated with the Emory Lindquist Honors Program notation on their transcripts each year (there have been no Program graduates since 2007). Since 2006, only 28 students have graduated with Departmental Honors. (Students can complete Departmental Honors without taking the lower division of the Honors Program, and in some cases even without being a member of the Honors Program.)

Students who enter the Honors Program have a significantly higher 6-year graduation rate and lower average-time-to-completion as compared to WSU students generally. (These rates are similar for Honors-eligible students who do not enroll in Honors.) This is to say that the dismal completion rate for the Honors Program is not due to Honors-admitted students not completing their degrees.

New recruits and students who take the Honors Freshman/Sophomore seminars are generally very enthusiastic about Honors. The question, then, is why these students stop participating in Honors and decide not to graduate with the ELHP designation on their transcripts. Possible reasons include lack of departmental commitment to Honors (especially visible in the fact that so few departments have defined Honors Tracks). Departmental and college academic advisors need better information and training about Honors and should make it a priority when advising their best students. Departments may not be able to offer the right rotation of courses to
support Departmental Honors Tracks, and faculty may be reluctant to devote significant time to blue card courses. Also, students who enjoy the close collaboration with faculty and fellow students and the unusual, interdisciplinary topics of the seminars probably feel at a loss when faced with the prospect of putting together their own upper division Honors program and have little to gain but extra work by adding the H designation to their major classes. Although independent study and one-on-one collaboration with faculty are sometimes appropriate, many students need more structure and interaction than a solo trip through the upper division of Honors can provide.

**Proposal**

The current Honors program is not successful. With the goal of significantly increasing the completion rate for the Emory Lindquist Honors Program while maintaining and extending the good parts of the current program (namely, the lower division seminars), the following new model is proposed.

*Increase admission and progression requirements*

Increase the minimum admission requirements to a GPA of 3.7 or an ACT of 27. Students who meet the minimum admission requirements will be invited to submit an application including a personal statement. Students who do not meet the admission requirements can petition the Director of the Honors Program for special consideration.

Increase the progression requirements from 3.25 GPA overall to 3.5 GPA overall, and 3.25 in any Honors class. Students who fall below these standards for one semester will be put on probationary status. Students who fall below these standards for two semesters will be dropped from the program.

*Enhance the lower division*

Increase the requirement from 9 hours to 12 hours of HNRS or H courses.

Offer a menu of courses across the colleges and divisions of LAS and establish a rotation of courses. Courses in the rotation should be interdisciplinary, involve active learning, and for the most part satisfy general education requirements. Offer one course each semester from each of Fine Arts, Business, Engineering, Education, Health Professions, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Natural Sciences and Mathematics. In addition, offer Comm 111H and the Honors Calculus sequence each year. *(19 lower division courses per year required, and departments can offer as many H sections as they want in addition.)*

The Honors Floor in Fairmount Towers will be converted to a living-learning community. As a condition of living on the floor, the 60 students on the floor will be required to take two courses each semester from the menu of HNRS and selected H
courses. They will also participate in a year-long service project. (60 student’s x 3 cr.hr. x 2 = 360 cr. hr. each semester, x $177.50 = $63,900 tuition income each semester.)

Redesign the upper division

Students will EITHER complete a Departmental Honors Track OR the following.

Increase the upper division requirement from 9 to 12 hours.

Required: HNRS 3XX Advanced Writing [Design new course, or convert existing English course: team taught?]

Required: HNRS 4XX Research Seminar. (Must be taken after Advanced Writing; can be repeated once for credit provided a different research topic is pursued). Groups of 6-12 students meet together one hour per week, report to each other what they are doing, offer each other advice, etc., then spend the rest of the week working on independent projects with a professor (rarely the seminar leader).

Each semester, offer HNRS Advanced Writing and HNRS Research Seminar. Each year, offer upper division HNRS courses similar to the lower division seminars each year in each college and division of LAS and the two HNRS leadership development courses. Encourage departments to offer concurrent H sections of I&P courses. Encourage emphases in global studies (including study abroad), responsible citizenship (including environmental issues and service learning) [DESIGN NEW COURSES: HNRS 3YY Issues of the Day, team taught; HNRS 3ZZ Serving to Learn] (10 HNRS courses each year)

[30 sections x $4000 = $120,000 annually; $90,000 @ $3000. Or equivalent in teaching, including free overloads, including Honors courses in regular loads, cross-listing regular sections with Honors sections, etc.]

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Vote on increasing admission requirements as follows:
   Incoming students with fewer than 24 college credit hours: a minimum high school GPA of 3.7, or a minimum composite ACT score of 27.
   Incoming students with more than 24 college credit hours: a minimum college GPA of 3.6.
   Students who do not meet these standards may petition the Director of Honors for special admission.

2. Vote on increasing the progression requirements as follows:
   Being in good standing in the Honors Program requires maintaining an overall WSU GPA of 3.5, and no less than 3.25 in any Honors class. Students who fall below these
standards for one semester will be put on probationary status. Students who fall below these standards for two semesters will be dropped from the program.

3. Vote on increasing the number of hours in the lower division of the program to 12.

4. Vote on increasing the number of hours in upper division of the program to 12, with HNRS Advanced Composition and HNRS Research Seminar as required classes.
Committee Members:
Deborah Soles, President of Faculty Senate, Chair
Frederick Hemans, President-Elect of the Faculty Senate
Larry Spurgeon, Past President of the Faculty Senate
Jo Bennett, Education
Terence Decker, Business
Will Klunder, Humanities
Annette LeZotte, Fine Arts
Ken Miller, Math/Natural Sciences
Peer Moore-Jansen, Social Sciences
Nan Myers, Library
Julie Scherz, Health Professions
Mehmet Yildirim, Engineering

Meeting Schedule for 2009-2010:
The Planning and Budget Committee met approximately twelve times during the fall semester, and approximately twelve times during the spring semester (Friday afternoons from 2:00 - 3:30 or 4:00 pm).

Committee Activities:
The Planning and Budget Committee is charged with a number of tasks, including:
- Identifying and defining the most appropriate avenues for faculty participation in the planning and budget processes
- Advising the President of the Faculty Senate and the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and Research on faculty concerns and priorities to budget policies
- Reviewing all matters pertaining to university planning and budgets, and expenditures, including budget policies and assumptions
- Developing the faculty perspective on strategic issues and the direction of the University, through direct participation with the Provost and other constituencies
- Review the revision/reallocation process that occurs after the legislature determines the actual budget allocations to the University.

This year, the committee continued its role as an advisory group to the Provost with respect to budgeting and planning issues. It concentrated on the University’s Reshaping and Rebuilding initiative. Since this initiative has impact on more than just faculty, the committee invited the presidents of the Unclassified Senate and the Classified Senate to attend our meetings, which they did. Activities during the fall semester centered on the approximately one hundred suggestions submitted in response to the Reshaping document. Some, such as increasing on-line courses, were already under consideration or implementation. Other suggestions, beyond the purview of Academic Affairs, were forwarded to the appropriate university division. Additionally, we met with all the Deans of the Colleges, the Library, and the Graduate School. We received an enormous amount of information about the ways in which college budgets work, the impact of the budget cuts, and the colleges’ responses. The Deans were
extremely open and generous with information. During the spring, we continued with our examination of suggestions and the concerns that prompted them. We met with a number of other individuals, including Eric Sexton, Director of Athletics, David McDonald in his capacity as Associate Provost for Research, Andrew Schlapp, Executive Director of Government Relations, and Keith Pickus, Associate Provost. We had frank, open and lengthy discussions about advising, retention, the Office of Research Administration, the Foundations of Excellence report, and general education.

As a result of these meetings, the committee:

- Endorsed the proposal that an Office for Faculty Development and Student Success be created.
- Endorsed the Adult Learning Program which is now being instituted at the West Campus. It also recommended that this program be reviewed after a year of operations.
- Asked the Social Science Research Lab to conduct a survey about perceptions of the operations of ORA. Results of this survey will be available via the Faculty Senate webpage.

In addition, the committee:

- Recommends that faculty-driven discussions be held between the Elliott School of Communications (LAS) and the School of Art and Design (FA) to consider whether some sort of merger might be a good idea.
- Recommends that colleges make efforts to increase meaningful faculty participation in students’ academic planning and to foster retention.
- Recommends that students be required to declare a major (or pre-major) as part of their admissions application process.
- Recommends, as a way of encouraging academic progress, that students after the first few weeks be required to have faculty approval before dropping a course.
- Recommends that the Faculty Senate appoint an ad hoc committee to examine the University’s general education requirements and to make appropriate recommendations to the Senate.
Status Update on Foundations of Excellence Action Items Presentation to the Faculty Senate April 26, 2010

Keith Pickus, Associate Provost
PROGRESS REPORT ON ACTION ITEMS

• APPROVE AND DISSEMINATE A POLICY STATEMENT ABOUT THE FIRST YEAR OF ENROLLMENT AT WSU
  – Completion Target: Spring 2010
  – Presented to the Faculty, UCP and Classified Senates and also to the Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee

• CREATE AN OFFICE FOR STUDENTS IN THEIR FIRST YEAR OF ENROLLMENT AT WSU, AND CHARGE AN INDIVIDUAL TO COORDINATE INITIATIVES
  – Completion Target: FY 2011
  – Created February 2010 and Executive Director hired
Progress Report on Action Items

• Improve communication with students in their first year of enrollment as a means to enhance engagement with the university and increase participation in events that will help broaden their understanding of other cultures
  – Completion Target: AY 2009–10
  – Recommendation under review by the Executive Director of the Office for Faculty Development and Student Success
Progress Report on Action Items

• Increase required advising for students in their first year of enrollment
  – Completion Target: Fall 2010
  – Discussed and approved by the advisor council and the recommendation will take effect Fall 2010

• Require all transfer students to participate in an orientation program
  – Completion Target: AY 2010–11
  – Recommendation to take effect for incoming transfer students in Fall 2010
PROGRESS REPORT ON ACTION ITEMS

• Expand student and faculty participation in student transition courses and programs
  - Completion Target: AY 2011–12
  - Initiative discussed with new Executive Director for the Office of Faculty Development and Student Success and initial plans are being developed

• Develop intervention strategies that lead to reduced rates of “D,” “F,” “W,” and “I” (DFWI) grades assigned in any course
  - Completion Target: AY 2009–10
  - Bi-weekly meetings with a faculty workgroup are underway with a goal being that the group will issue a series of recommendations to move forward on this issue
PROGRESS REPORT ON ACTION ITEMS

• Establish a verifiable and personal connection between all students in their first year of enrollment and a student, faculty member or staff person
  – Completion Target: AY 2010–11
  – Recommendation under review by the Executive Director of the Office for Faculty Development and Student Success

• Continue to assess transfer students' needs and develop appropriate interventions
  – Completion Target: AY 2009–10
  – No coordinated effort has begun, but the issue has been discussed with the new Executive Director
PROGRESS REPORT ON ACTION ITEMS

- **Develop a coordinated outcomes-based assessment plan for initiatives included in this review**
  - Completion Target: AY 2009–10
  - Initial discussions beginning with Institutional Research
Wichita State University
Foundations of Excellence—Final Report
Executive Summary

Co-Liaisons:
Keith H. Pickus, Associate Provost
Christine Schneikart-Luebbe, Dean of Enrollment Services

Steering Committee Members:
Cheryl Adams, Dean of Students
Rick Armstrong, Associate Professor, Elliott School of Communication, General Education Coordinator
John Bello-Ogunu, Associate Dean of Students, Director, Office of Multicultural Affairs
Deltha Colvin, Assistant Vice President for Campus Life and University Relations, Director of TRIO Programs
Gina Crabtree, Director of Budgets and Personnel, Campus Life and University Relations
Maureen Dasey-Morales, Director of Counseling and Testing Center
Jean Elliott, Assistant Director and Academic Advisor, Liberal Arts Advising Center
Charlie Fox, Associate Dean, College of Health Professions
Bobby Gandu, Director, Undergraduate Admissions
Linnea Glenmaye, Director and Associate Professor, School of Social Work
Dotty Harpool, Director, Student and Community Initiatives, W. Frank Barton School of Business
Donna Hawley, Assistant Vice President and Director of Institutional Research
Ron Matson, Chair and Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
Laura Manning, Assistant to the Provost
Jill Pletcher, Director, Office of Career Services
Jane Rhoads, Director of Undergraduate Success Programs
Vanessa Rodriguez, Director, Housing and Residence Life
David Soles, Chair and Professor, Department of Philosophy
Sheelu Surender, Associate Director for Scholarships, Office of Financial Aid
Background Information:

In spring 2008, the Enrollment Management Work Group, established by Provost Miller and Vice-President Kopita, recommended that Wichita State University participate in the Foundations of Excellence® (FoE) Self-Study. This recommendation was predicated on the group’s desire to develop a comprehensive plan to enhance student success at Wichita State University (WSU) and followed lengthy discussions with John Gardner, Executive Director of the Policy Center on the First Year of College. Associate Provost Keith Pickus and Dean of Enrollment Services Christine Schneikart-Luebbe were designated to oversee the FoE process, and in turn, they appointed a Steering Committee to lead the self-study. The Steering Committee was comprised of a broad cross section of university personnel that included faculty and staff from both the divisions of Academic Affairs and Research (AAR) and Campus Life and University Relations (CLUR) as well as students. All told, more than 120 people participated directly in the Foundations of Excellence-guided self-study at Wichita State University.

The FoE-guided self-study focuses on an “aspirational model” of institutional excellence that can be used to measure levels of student achievement and initiate data-driven planning processes. The model consists of nine standards of excellence termed “Foundational Dimensions,” which are built on the following four assumptions developed by the Policy Center:

1. The academic mission of an institution is preeminent.
2. The first year of enrollment is central to the achievement of an institution’s mission, and it lays the foundation on which undergraduate education is built.
3. Systematic evidence provides validation of the dimensions.
4. Collectively, the dimensions constitute an ideal for improving not only the first year of enrollment but also the entire undergraduate experience.

For purposes of this self-study, and in consultation with the Policy Center, students in their first year of enrollment included all freshmen and transfer students new to WSU during the 2007–08 academic year. This cohort of 3,595 students was comprised of both traditional and nontraditional students, regardless of whether they were enrolled full or part time.

During the self-study process, a subcommittee, co-chaired by a representative from both the divisions of AAR and CLUR, assessed Wichita State University’s “performance” relative to each “Foundational Dimension” and drafted a series of recommendations to improve interactions with students in their first year of enrollment at WSU. The self-study process was structured in such a way that each of the nine subcommittees drew upon a wide cross section of data to carry out its charge. This included all institutional data and two surveys, one administered to all WSU faculty and staff, the other administered to the first-year student cohort. The nine subcommittees worked at assigned times throughout the 2008–09 academic year, and all dimension reports were delivered by May, 2009. Each subcommittee consisted of 8 to 12 members, which included faculty, staff, and students.
From the dimension reports, the following “Action Items” emerged as the most pressing issues necessary to enhance student success for first-year enrollees at WSU, and collectively, they constitute a plan of action to improve student retention and persistence at Wichita State University in the years to come. The complete Foundations of Excellence Final Report that includes the nine dimension reports and survey results can be found on the Provost’s webpage.

**Recommended Action Items:**

I. **Approve and disseminate a policy statement about the first year of enrollment at WSU.**
   
   **Completion Target:** Spring 2010
   
   A. A working draft statement follows:

   "Wichita State University is strongly committed to providing a quality experience for all students in their first year of enrollment. This commitment includes continual improvement of policies, programs, and services to facilitate academic success and personal growth; providing foundational educational experiences and creating a culture that supports first-year enrollees' aspirations; encouraging students to actively engage in campus life; and helping first-year enrollees at WSU to participate in a multicultural global community."

   B. This statement should be seen as a contract of engagement between students and the university.

   C. Once drafted, it should be endorsed by the university administration and approved by all constituencies (faculty, unclassified professional staff, and classified staff).

   **Oversight Responsibility: Offices of AAR and CLUR**

II. **Create an office for students in their first year of enrollment at WSU, and charge an individual to coordinate initiatives.**

   **Completion Target:** FY 2011

   A. Given the cross-divisional work necessary to enhance student success, this new enterprise must have close working relationships with both AAR and CLUR.

   B. The creation of such an office will likely result from re-tasking an existing entity, such as “Undergraduate Success Programs.”

   C. Some programs that this new office will be involved in will include, but are not limited to, the following:

   1. Establishment of an early-alert program.
   2. Increased/enhanced communication with students in their first year of enrollment at WSU.
3. Enhanced participation in student success courses.
4. Increased advising requirements.
5. Mandatory orientation programs for all students new to the university.
6. Coordination of activities to support new students.

**Oversight Responsibility: Offices of AAR and CLUR**

**III. Improve communication with students in their first year of enrollment as a means to enhance engagement with the university and increase participation in events that will help broaden their understanding of other cultures.**

**Completion Target: AY 2009–10**

A. Create a website that specifically targets students in their first year of enrollment.
B. Send regular emails to students in their first year of enrollment to keep them informed about pertinent campus activities, events, and other pertinent administrative information.
C. Enhance partnerships between the Office of Multicultural Affairs and academic units.

**Oversight Responsibility: Office of AAR and CLUR**

**IV. Increase required advising for students in their first year of enrollment.**

**Completion Target: Fall 2010**

A. Current practice requires all new degree-bound freshmen and transfer students with less than 24 credit hours to meet with an academic advisor before registering for classes.
B. In addition, students in some colleges and programs (e.g. Engineering and Business) must meet regularly with advisors before enrolling.
C. This recommendation is twofold:
   1. All freshmen must meet with an academic advisor before they can register for both their first and second semesters of enrollment at WSU.
   2. All degree-bound transfer students, regardless of the number of credit hours that they have completed, must meet with an academic advisor before enrolling for their first semester.

**Oversight Responsibility: Office of AAR**
V.

**Require all transfer students to participate in an orientation program.**

*Completion Target: AY 2010–11*

A. This will require expanding and, perhaps, redesigning the orientation programs for students in their first year of enrollment at WSU.
B. Such programs should also be carried out at the department and/or college levels.

**Oversight Responsibility:** Offices of AAR and CLUR

VI.

**Expand student and faculty participation in student transition courses and programs.**

*Completion Target: AY 2011–12*

A. Create a revised format of the student success course for students in their first year of enrollment, and engage a broader range of faculty to teach such a course.
   1. Rather than requiring all students to take an existing “Introduction to the University” course, establish a committee to develop a “Transitioning to WSU” course that addresses the following areas:
      a. Goals and purposes of a university education.
      b. Role of general education within a university curriculum.
      c. Development of critical thinking and writing skills.
   2. One possibility for such a course is to deliver it in a larger lecture format that would have a range of recitation sections to cover the following areas:
      a. Study skills.
      b. Time management.
      c. University navigation.
      d. Student and faculty roles and responsibilities.
      e. Career advising and professional development.
B. Part of the revision process needs to develop differentiated programs that are based on students' appropriate academic and motivational levels.

**Oversight Responsibility:** Office of AAR

VII.

**Develop intervention strategies that lead to reduced rates of “D,” “F,” “W,” and “I” (DFWI) grades assigned in any given course.**

*Completion Target: AY 2009–10*

A. Establish a task force, chaired by Associate Provost Pickus, to continue analysis of DFWI rates initiated within the Foundations of Excellence self-study.
B. Determine an appropriate/acceptable DFWI rate for WSU courses.
C. Create and implement interventions, in consultation with university faculty, which will reduce DFWI rates.

**Oversight Responsibility: Office of AAR**

VIII. Establish a verifiable and personal connection between all students in their first year of enrollment and a student, faculty member, or staff person.

**Completion Target: AY 2010–11**

A. Establish a mentoring system for new students with other students.
   1. Such an initiative may work within the Residence Halls or within academic departments, if they are not already in place.
   2. The College of Engineering Wallace Scholars may be seen as a model.
B. Establish a mentoring program between interested faculty/staff and students in their first year of enrollment.
C. Structure early experiences of students to increase interaction between students in their first year of enrollment and other students, faculty, and staff.
   1. This could include specific programs for students in their first year of enrollment at WSU.
   2. It may also include orientations that are offered in partnership with other entities on campus such as colleges, departments, and the Office of Multicultural Affairs.

**Oversight Responsibility: Offices of AAR and CLUR**

IX. Continue to assess transfer students' needs and develop appropriate interventions.

**Completion Target: AY 2009–10**

**Oversight responsibility: Offices of AAR and CLUR**

X. Develop a coordinated outcomes-based assessment plan for initiatives included in this review.

**Completion Target: AY 2009–10**

A. Create assessment plans to measure desired outcomes, particularly as they relate to student retention and persistence where appropriate.
B. Develop an orientation assessment plan in coordination with the academic colleges and university libraries.
C. Develop academic advising assessment plans that include a standardized instrument to be used by all colleges.

D. Draft a plan that collectively assesses the multiplicity of tutoring programs and examines benefits, costs, and equity in students served.

E. Create assessment plans for the various transition courses that include long-term outcomes.

F. Develop outcomes-based assessment plans for student life programs.

G. Develop long-term outcome studies to supplement current assessments for the mill levy scholarship monies, such as Sedgwick County Scholars and Dean’s Scholars programs.

**Explanatory Note on Assessment:** A review of the selected ongoing initiatives/programs found that although many programs do assessments, the most common assessments are student-perception surveys. While a vital component of all assessment plans, student surveys by themselves are not sufficient. Outcomes-based assessments must be incorporated in the assessments of these various programs. WSU should move toward outcomes-based assessments (e.g., retention, GPA, graduation rates) using appropriate comparison groups.

**Oversight Responsibility: Offices of AAR and CLUR**

MEMBERS ABSENT: Baker, Baldridge, Craft, Klunder, Lezotte, Moore-Jansen,

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Bryant, Carruthers, Monroe

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS: Assoc. Provost Pickus

Summary of Action:
1. Reviewed Faculty Senate Standing Committee Annual reports from Court of Academic Appeals, Executive Committee, Faculty Support Committee, Honors Committee & the Planning & Budget Committee
2. Accepted Faculty Senate Standing Committee appointments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Prakash Ramanan, Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Will Klunder, LAS Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Bill Henry, LAS Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Barbara Hodson, Health Professions, Daniel Bergman, Education, Julie Bees, Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Student Aid</td>
<td>Jodi Pelkawski, Business, Suzanne Tirk, Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Research</td>
<td>Larry Whitman, Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Call of the Meeting to Order: President Soles called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. Informal Statements and Proposals:
VP Skinner reminded the Senate that nominations for Officers and for members of the Planning & Budget Committee will be accepted until May 3, 2010.

III. Approval of the Minutes: Minutes of March 22, 2010, meeting were accepted as presented

IV. President's Report:
President Soles presented the following statement:
As many of you know, two programs in LAS have been recommended for discontinuance. As part of the discontinuance process, there is an opportunity for the Senate to discuss and vote on the recommendations. This is to be done after the college has voted on the discontinuance proposals. May 12 is the date for the college vote.

Policies and Procedures 2.10 specifies:

"At the next meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Senate President will report the proposed program discontinuance and the action of the college faculty on that matter. No Senate action is required but the Senate may, by majority vote, choose to record a position of agreement or disagreement with the proposed program discontinuance which shall be forwarded to the University President.

The President of Wichita State University will evaluate the initial recommendation, the actions of the review bodies, the recommendation of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research and will, within four academic weeks, render a final decision regarding the recommendation for program discontinuance."

Until Wednesday of last week, the executive committee believed that 1. The President would not make a decision until after the Senate had voted, 2. that the “four academic weeks” referred to in P & P meant four weeks in the regular academic year (Aug – May) (P & P 2.10 says “The term "academic weeks" will be used to specify those periods of time, according to the University calendar, during which the University is officially in session (excluding Summer Session)” ) and that consequently, 3. the first Senate meeting in the fall would be the meeting at which the Senate would discuss the discontinuances.

We learned at midday on Wednesday that the President wants to make a decision soon after the LAS vote. Consequently, the executive committee has decided to call a special Senate meeting for the first Monday after the LAS vote, May 17.

President Soles announced that there will be a meeting of the Senate on May 17, to address this issue and posed the question about which senate should convene, the 2009-10 or the 2010-11. It was noted that the 10-11 Senate only meets on May 10 for the purpose of election of officers and members to the Planning & Budget Committee, but as stated in the Faculty Senate Constitution it does not begin their business duties until June 1. The Senate concluded that the 2009 - 10 Senate should address the issue but that the new senators would be invited as well as any faculty who wish to attend. President Soles asked that anyone, other than Senators, wishing to speak, notify the Office of the Faculty Senate.

V. Committee Reports:

A. Faculty Senate Standing Committee annual reports

Court of Academic Appeals -- accepted with two abstentions (Bolin, Dale)

Executive Committee, Faculty Support Committee, the Planning & Budget Committee --- accepted

Honors Committee -- Clyde Stoltenberg presented the Honors Committee report. He reported that the committee has worked closely with Bill Vanderberg, Interim Director of Honors. He said the first two years of the program are running well with more than 200 students being offered honors status. But he noted that a problem comes with upper division offerings. The Committee proposed changes with the goals of better retention rates and higher numbers of those receiving Honors status with graduation. The proposals include a discussion
of: 1. increasing the admission requirements, 2. increasing progression requirements, 3. increasing the number of hours in lower division of the program portion to 12 and, 4. increasing the number of hours in the upper division of the program to 12 with a HNRS Advanced Composition and a HNRS Research Seminar required. There was also some discussion about increasing the GPA requirements. The Committee will continue to work on the suggestions made by the Honors Taskforce.

The report was accepted

B. Rules -- Fritz Hemans, Chair presented nominees for standing committee appointments (see summary of action). All were accepted.

VI. Old Business: none

VII. New Business:
   A. Foundations of Excellence update, Keith Pickus, Associate Provost, Academic Affairs and Research -- Dr. Pickus asked the Senate to approve the following statement:

   “Wichita State University is strongly committed to providing a quality experience for all students in their first year of enrollment. This commitment includes continual improvement of policies, programs, and services to facilitate academic success and personal growth; providing foundational educational experiences and creating a culture that supports first-year enrollees' aspirations; encouraging students to actively engage in campus life; and helping first-year enrollees at WSU to participate in a multicultural global community.”

   He said that the intent is to have all three Senates “endorse” the statement before forwarding it to the President for his approval. Once this is complete, the statement will be included in an appropriate place within the catalog and utilized in admission’s materials for new students. It will serve as a central feature of the Office for Faculty Development and Student Success’ mission.

   Assoc. Provost Pickus presented an update of the FOE taskforce report and noted that several of the goals have been accomplished with the formation of the Office of Faculty Development and Student Success. Additional goals are increased student-faculty interaction, and increased graduation rates.

   Senator Miller moved (T. Bennett, 2nd) that the senate forgo a 2nd reading, and that the statement be amended to read "...provide a positive experience..." instead of "...quality experience". Dr Pickus had no objection to this change. The motion carried, and the Senate vote was unanimous to accept.

VIII: As May Arise: none

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm
Respectfully submitted:
Johnnie Thompson