



# Faculty Senate Archives

---

Faculty Senate

Academic year 2017-2018

---

## Volume XXXI

### Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of November 13, 2017

---

**Additional information:** Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:  
<https://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/15224>

# Agenda for Faculty Senate

13 November 2017

3:30 - 5:00

- Calling the Meeting to Order
- Informal Statements and Proposals
- Approval of the Minutes - [Oct 23](#)
- President's Report
  - Ability Ally training - needs to be completed by end of the year. In person classes available through MyTraining portal on MyWSU; [Online sessions available through Bb.](#)
  - KBOR meeting @ WSU on Nov 15.
- Committee Reports
  - Rules committee
- New Business
  - Non-Tenure Track promotion policy (1st Reading )
    - [Summary document with implementation details](#)
    - [FAQs](#)
    - [Full policy text](#)
- Old Business
  - [Revised FAR form with Uniscope](#) (2nd reading)
  - [Coaching and Corrective Action](#) (2nd reading)
  - [Investigative Leave](#) (2nd reading)
  - Separation of Employment (Pending)
- Guest: Molly Gordon - Accessibility committee
- As May Arise

## Promotion for Non-Tenure track Faculty<sup>1</sup>

### Expansion of Faculty

While advancement options for non-tenure track faculty have been discussed for a number of years on campus, this issue finally got some traction in 2016-17. President Yildirim charged the Rules committee to look into formally establishing these teaching professionals as Faculty members with eligibility to vote and serve in the Faculty Senate. With a recommendation from the Rules committee, the Senate passed a motion in November 2016, which was then adopted by a special general faculty meeting in January 2017. This action established all temporary faculty and unclassified professionals with primary teaching responsibilities as faculty members.

Revised definition of Faculty: All employees who have teaching/research/library responsibilities of 50% or more and .5 FTE or greater will be eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate, including: temporary faculty, probationary faculty, tenured faculty, contingent unclassified professionals, provisional unclassified professionals, and regular unclassified professionals. These employees all have the e-class designation of FA or F2.

### New Levels and Criteria for Advancement

Following this first step, President Yildirim appointed an Ad hoc committee<sup>2</sup> to work on creating Guidelines and Criteria for Advancement for non-tenure track faculty. These were presented to and approved by the Senate in April 2017. These guidelines were designed to mirror existing policy 4.15 “Tenure and Promotion- Guidelines and Criteria”. A summary comparison is below.

Tenure track Faculty	Non-Tenure track Faculty
Ranks:  Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor	Levels: <sup>3</sup> <i>With terminal degree:</i> Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor; and, Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical Professor. <i>With non-terminal degree:</i> Assistant Educator, Associate Educator, and Senior Educator.
Six years in rank before advancement <sup>4</sup>	Six years in level before advancement

<sup>1</sup> This term includes temporary faculty (those on annual contract), and contingent, provisional and regular Unclassified Professionals who are .5 FTE or more with 50% or more teaching responsibilities. It does not refer to ‘tenure-track’ faculty.

<sup>2</sup> Committee membership: Bayram Yildirim (Chair), Betty Smith-Campbell, Pina Mozzani, Jim Schwartz, Jan Wolcott, Scott Miller, and Carolyn Shaw.

<sup>3</sup> “Rank” is a term that refers specifically to tenure track faculty. The equivalent term for non-tenure track faculty is “level”.

<sup>4</sup> Candidates are eligible to go up for promotion after five years of service. Their promotion files are considered during their sixth year of service. If approved, they achieve their new rank/level at the end of the sixth year.

Tenure track Faculty	Non-Tenure track Faculty
Assistant Professor: (1) demonstrated adequacy in teaching/librarianship; (2) potential for achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activity; and (3) some appropriate University service	Assistant Teaching Professor/ Assistant Clinical Professor/Assistant Educator: (1) demonstrated adequacy in teaching/librarianship; and (2) some appropriate University service, as defined in the role statement
Associate Professor: Evidence is normally expected of the following: (1) documented effectiveness of teaching/librarianship; (2) a record of research, scholarship, or creative activities which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level; and (3) some professional or University service	Associate Teaching Professor/ Associate Clinical Professor/Associate Educator: Evidence is normally expected of the following: (1) documented effectiveness of teaching/librarianship; and (2) some professional or University service, as defined in the role statement.
Professor: (1) sustained effectiveness in teaching/librarianship; (2) a record of substantial accomplishment in research, scholarship, or creative activities which has led to recognition in professional circles at the national level; and (3) demonstrated academic leadership in the form of service to the University and the profession.	Teaching Professor/Clinical Professor/Senior Educator: (1) sustained effectiveness in teaching/librarianship; and (2) demonstrated academic leadership in the form of service, as defined in the role statement, to the University and the profession.

### New Policies and Procedures for Advancements

The Ad Hoc committee has continued to meet this Fall, working on the specific promotion policy and procedures, again mirroring existing policy for tenured faculty. The following policies have parallels for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty:

Policy	Existing Content	New Content
4.16	Promotion Calendar	This will be the same for both groups of faculty, although some of the deadlines will not be applicable for non-tenure track faculty (i.e. submission of external review letters)
4.17	Tenure and Promotion - Outline of Process Review	<i>Promotion for Non-Tenure track Faculty: Outline of Process Review</i>
4.18	Review for Tenure and Promotion: Procedures	<i>Review for Non-Tenure track Faculty Promotion: Procedures</i>
4.19	Tenure and Promotion Committee (university level)	Modified to include additional at-large membership of non-tenure track committee members to review non-tenure track faculty cases.
4.20	Cover Sheet for Tenure and Promotion Dossiers	Modified to be able to accommodate both groups rather than creating two separate sheets.
5.13	Full Professor Incentive Review Program	<i>PIR for Non-Tenure track Faculty</i>

## Summary Comparisons of the promotion policies for Tenure track and Non-Tenure track Faculty.

*Note: Throughout the document, language has been modified to be consistent for the target group of faculty with regard to titles, ranks/levels, role expectations, etc.*

Policy	Existing Content	New Content
4.17 Outline of Process Review	Faculty member or chair can nominate faculty for promotion after 5 years of service	Same process for non-tenure track faculty – simple policy title change.
4.18 Procedures	<p>Primary dossier: 25 pg limit, and includes letters of external review.</p> <p>Secondary dossier: may include...copies of publications or other evidence of scholarship, copies of student evaluations or course materials, etc.</p> <p>Dept Committee: a meeting of the tenured faculty of the department or a committee of tenured faculty chosen by these faculty members. In departments with fewer than three voting tenured faculty members, the college faculty will develop appropriate procedures for the review, subject to the approval of the dean.</p> <p>All Tenured dept faculty vote</p> <p>Separate evaluation done by the Chair</p> <p>Right to rebut or appeal</p> <p>College Committee: Will consist of all tenured, full-time faculty with the rank of assistant professor or higher. The total membership is an odd number, with a minimum of five members. The majority of the committee is elected by the faculty, according to a representational formula adopted by the college.</p> <p>A positive recommendation by the committee will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention vote to recommend promotion.</p> <p>Separate evaluation done by the Dean</p>	<p>Primary dossier: 15 pg limit, no external letters required.</p> <p>Secondary dossier: may include...evidence of teaching, copies of student evaluations or course materials, evidence of service contributions, etc.</p> <p>Dept Committee: at least three members and will consist of at least one voting non-tenure track faculty member, and at least one voting tenured faculty member of the department. In departments with fewer than the requisite members, the college faculty will develop appropriate procedures for the review subject to the approval of the dean.</p> <p>All tenured and non-tenure track faculty at Associate or above vote.</p> <p>Separate evaluation done by the Chair</p> <p>Right to rebut or appeal</p> <p>College Committee: will consist of at least one voting non-tenure track faculty member and at least one voting tenured faculty member from the college. The total membership is an odd number, with a minimum of five members. The majority of the committee are elected by the faculty, according to a representational formula adopted by the college</p> <p>A positive recommendation by the committee will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention vote to recommend promotion.</p> <p>Separate evaluation done by the Dean</p>

<p>4.19 Univ Promotion committee</p>	<p>7 college committee chairpersons + 2 at large tenured faculty appointed by Senate President ex officio: Grad Dean, and 1 non-voting student rep.</p> <p>Separate evaluation done by the Provost</p> <p>President makes final decision</p>	<p>7 college committee chairpersons + <b>4 at large non-tenure track faculty at Associate or Full level and 2 at-large tenured faculty appointed by Senate President</b>, ex officio: Grad Dean, and 1 non voting student rep.</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>7 college committee chairpersons + <b>2 at large non-tenure track faculty at Associate or Full level and 2 at-large tenured faculty appointed by Senate President</b>, ex officio: Grad Dean, and 1 non voting student rep.</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>7 college committee chairpersons + <b>2 at large non-tenure track faculty at Associate or Full level</b>, ex officio: Grad Dean, and 1 non voting student rep.</p> <p>Separate evaluation done by the Provost</p> <p>President makes final decision</p>
<p>5.13 PIR<sup>5</sup></p>	<p>Available to all tenured faculty members who have held the rank of Full Professor at Wichita State University for a minimum of six (6) years (whose appointment is 1.0 EFT)</p> <p>Process for review is the same as for promotion to Full Professor, and will progress through the stages of the promotion review process.</p> <p>The requirements for a successful incentive review merit award require that</p> <p>a) The candidate must have established and maintained a sustained, successful program in research, publication, or creative activity that has led to national visibility as judged by the standards of the discipline.</p> <p>b) The candidate must be able to demonstrate sustained, successful teaching at the undergraduate and/or graduate level as determined by the mission of the department.</p> <p>c) The candidate must be able to demonstrate sustained, successful service to the University and to the profession commensurate with the rank of professor.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the candidate to supply clear and convincing evidence in these areas.</p>	<p>Available to all faculty members who have held the level of Full Teaching Professor, Full Clinical Professor and Senior Educator at Wichita State University for a minimum of six (6) years (whose appointment is 1.0 EFT)</p> <p>Process for review is the same as for promotion to Full Teaching Professor, Full Clinical Professor and Senior Educator, and will progress through the stages of the promotion review process.</p> <p>The requirements for a successful incentive review merit award require that a candidate demonstrate sustained, successful performance in the areas of responsibility as defined in their role statement. This might include teaching at the undergraduate and/or graduate level, as well as service to the University and to the profession commensurate with the level of Teaching Professor.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the candidate to supply clear and convincing evidence in each area.</p>

<sup>5</sup> Candidates are eligible to go up for PIR after five years of service. Their files are considered during their sixth year of service. If approved, they achieve their PIR raise after the end of the sixth year.

## Implementation Framework

This initial implementation policy applies to all non-tenure track faculty employed at WSU prior to AY 2018-19.

1. Timeline for implementation:

After approval by President's Executive Team (with a goal of Jan 1):

All non-tenure track faculty will be automatically assigned to level of Assistant Teaching Professor, Assistant Clinical Professor, or Assistant Educator. Candidates may choose to apply for Associate or Full if they believe they meet criteria and have met the required years of service. This will reflect current practices for hiring with tenure and/or rank.

A special review process will be initiated three months after the President's approval to review all applications for candidates who want to apply for promotion to Associate or Full. These candidates must submit a primary dossier that includes details of their teaching activities and any additional service as stated in their role statements (maximum 15 pages). Candidates should also prepare a secondary dossier with supporting documents (recognizing that some materials may not be available).

Any non-tenure track faculty member who does not apply during this initial implementation period to be reviewed by the special committee will be able to apply during the regular annual cycle of promotion review beginning in the Fall following policy ##.

2. Departments/academic units should make sure the role statements for non-tenure track faculty are accurate and up to date to serve as the basis for promotion evaluation.

Departments/Colleges should identify mentors within their units to help those faculty going through this process for the first time.

3. Meeting criteria for promotion

Candidates are eligible to apply for promotion to Associate with a minimum of 5 years of service; promotion to Full requires a minimum of 11 years of service. Regardless of years of service, candidates must meet performance criteria in order to be awarded promotion to Associate or Full. Years of service alone do not automatically qualify candidates for promotion to Associate or Full.

4. Years in Service

If a candidate has been in service for 5 or more years, they can be considered for Associate. If they do not meet Associate promotion criteria, they will remain at the Assistant level. As long as they have served 5 or more years, they can apply again in subsequent promotion cycles for Associate if they believe they meet the criteria.

With the implementation of this policy, if a candidate has been in service for 11 or more years, they will be considered for Full. If they do not meet Full criteria, they will automatically be considered for Associate. If a candidate is promoted to Associate, then the faculty member can negotiate with the Chair and Dean about how many years of service they can count toward promotion before they are eligible to go up for Full. *Note:* This is similar to the process of hiring a tenured faculty member who negotiates years toward service when they are hired.

5. Special Review Process.

There will be an expedited process for reviewing cases that are submitted during the roll out period (3 months following the President's approval). Applications submitted during the initial implementation period will be reviewed by the following:

- a) Department/academic unit committee, and the Chair of the department/academic unit.
- b) The Dean
- c) The Provost/Senior Vice President.

In such cases where additional consultation is deemed desirable, the Dean or Provost/Senior Vice President may convene the college/school/University Libraries or University-level committee to effect an *ad hoc* promotion review panel. The Provost/Senior Vice President shall convey the recommendations to the President who shall review the recommendations and make the final decision and notify the individual in writing of the final decision.

6. Special Department Committees

Departments/academic units will determine the composition of these committees. Candidates for Associate Teaching Professor/ Associate Clinical Professor/Associate Educator should be evaluated by faculty with rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor; candidates for Teaching Professor/Clinical Professor/Senior Educator should be evaluated by faculty with rank of Full Professor.

In subsequent years, candidates' files will be reviewed through the standard promotion policy (##).

7. Candidates whose applications are approved in this special review process (3 months after President's approval) will *immediately* gain the title/level for which they have been approved *as long as* they have completed the requisite years in service (6 for Associate and 12 for Full).

Promotion Raises

The committee has been asked by the Provost to draft a separate recommendation regarding raise recommendations for both tenured and non-tenure track faculty with the understanding that a raise comes with promotion.

## FAQ's Regarding Proposal for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

- Will a candidate be allowed to go up for Associate in the Special Review period and get a pay bump, then go up for Full in the Fall and get another pay bump the next year?
  - If a candidate has served enough years to be eligible to go up for Full, they will be considered for Full. If they are not determined to be qualified for Full, they will be considered for Associate.
  
- If a candidate does not receive a promotion to Full, can they go up again the next year?
  - As with the tenure track policy, as long as a candidate has the requisite number of years in service, they can choose to go up as often as they want to reach the level of Full.
  
- Will there be pay raises with the promotions?
  - President Bardo says yes. He and the Provost will work out the financing. Amounts are still TBD.
  - It is anticipated that the pay for Full will be more than Associate, but the differential has yet to be determined.
  
- How long will it take to implement?
  - Pending approval by the Faculty Senate at the end of November, it will then go to PET. President Bardo says the administration has been looking forward to this policy proposal for some time. He expects one meeting of the PET will be needed. This would allow for the Special Review period to take place in the Spring 2018. Tentative timeline:
    - Submission of files due by: March 23 (Last Fri of Spring break)
    - Dept review deadline: April 20
    - College Review deadline: May 18
    - Provost's Review deadline: June 15
    - Final notification with new appointment: July 1
  
- What will the composition of the special review committees be?
  - The only required committee for the special review is at the department level. Candidates for Associate should be evaluated by tenured faculty with rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor; candidates for Teaching Professor/Clinical Professor/Senior Educator should be evaluated by tenured faculty with rank of Full Professor. The Chair will also review the applications and make recommendations.
  - This will be followed by the Dean's review and recommendation, and a review by the Provost/Senior Vice President. In such cases where additional consultation is deemed desirable, the Dean or Provost/Senior Vice President may convene the college/school/University Libraries or University-level committee to effect an *ad hoc* promotion review panel.

- The Provost/Senior Vice President shall convey the recommendations to the President who shall review the recommendations and make the final decision and notify the individual in writing of the final decision.
- What will the composition of the non-tenure track promotion committees be during the normal cycle that follows the special review period?
  - Department level must have committee of at least 3 members with 1 non-tenure track, and 1 tenure track. This committee may consist of the same members as for a tenure-track review, with the addition of a non-tenure track member.
  - College level must have committee with at least 1 non-tenure track and 1 tenure track member. This committee may consist of the same members as for a tenure-track review, with the addition of a non-tenure track member.
  - University level will be the same membership as for the tenure-track review with the addition of at large members (TBD).
  - Feedback from town hall meetings:
    - LAS prefers 2 non-tenure track at-large
    - Education had no strong feelings one way or the other,
    - Health Professions prefers 4 non-tenure track at-large
    - Business prefers 2 non-tenure track at large (but open to other options)
    - Fine Arts - no consensus on the issue
    - Engineering - issue not discussed
    - Library prefers 2 *tenure track* at large
- What guidelines will be used to determine if criteria are met for promotion?
  - Decisions will be based on role statement/contract responsibilities.
- What is a role statement?
  - This is a description of role responsibilities established by the Chair and faculty member.
- What will the primary dossier template look like?
  - It will be the same as the current one for tenure-track faculty except that the research section will note: [Not Required for Non-Tenure Track Faculty]. If there are research items to be included, these are allowed, but not required (unless included in role description/contract responsibilities).
- Will supporting material (secondary dossier) be required in the special review process?
  - Yes (with recognition that some materials may not be available)
- During the regular cycle of review?
  - Yes
- What counts for employment for 5 or 11 years?
  - Continual annual contracts, or previous semester contracts with a full time load as long as the employee is now on an annual contract.

- If you come in with some years of professional service, does that count toward your years to promotion?
  - It can. It will be considered as an exception with “careful documentation based upon an adequate rationale.” This would need to be negotiated with the Chair and/or Dean. This is equivalent to the negotiations that take place for tenure-track faculty when they are hired, except that this option was not available to negotiate upon the time of their hire for the non-tenure track faculty.
  
- What if I like my title as it is?
  - The university system allows for employees to have ‘vanity titles’, so if you prefer to keep the title of instructor or lecturer instead of educator, you could still do this. Your “level” (same as “rank” for tenured faculty) is determined by the promotion policy, but not your title label.
  
- How is the terminal degree determined for any given field?
  - This is a department / program level determination.
  
- How does UNISCOPE language, with reference to “Scholarship”, impact this proposal?
  - Uniscope refers to “scholarship” of teaching, research and service uniformly, with the explanation that activities in all three of these areas should be considered scholarship. This is not a traditional understanding that equates scholarship with research, but a broader understanding recognizing that teaching has both education and application functions that are valued in the model.
  - The annual FAR forms will maintain the traditional language, but include new boxes for each section (teaching, research, service) that allow faculty members to highlight the uniscope elements of their work.
  
- Will the current template for the primary dossier follow the Uniscope model?
  - There are steps being taken to align the dossier with the new model, but all candidates should be free to use Uniscope language in describing their work as it fits with the promotion guidelines of their departments/colleges. Education and Engineering have completed their Uniscope revisions, LAS and Fine Arts will be done by the end of the year, and Business and Health Professions will finish at the end of 2019.

#### **4.20 /Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Guidelines and Criteria [Already approved by Faculty Senate 4/24/17]**

Non-Tenure Track faculty are significant members of the university who are critical department members broadly engaged in an academic program's curriculum, evolution, and impact. Non-Tenure Track faculty need to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching/librarianship and service, as defined in the role statement. Although there is no research expectation for non-tenure track faculty, the faculty member's appropriate mix and extent of responsibilities is defined within their department by a role statement

1. A terminal degree in a field appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate teaches is normally required for appointment or promotion for the following advancement levels: Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor; and, Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical Professor. Candidates may be hired to the following levels in the absence of a terminal degree: Assistant Educator, Associate Educator, and Senior Educator. Exceptions to this guideline will require careful documentation based upon an adequate rationale.
2. Under normal circumstances, a faculty member should not expect to be considered for promotion with less than six years in advancement levels. For each level of promotion, successively higher levels of achievement are expected.
3. The standards for teaching/librarianship and service, as defined in the role statement, for each level are indicated below. The relative significance of teaching/librarianship, and service, as defined in the role statement, may vary from case to case. Consideration, in context of the candidate's entire career, will be given to teaching/librarianship, and service, as defined in the role statement, conducted while the candidate has been employed at the University.

Assistant Teaching Professor/ Assistant Clinical Professor/Assistant Educator: Evidence is normally expected of the following: (1) demonstrated adequacy in teaching/librarianship; and (2) some University service, as defined in the role statement, appropriate to the mission of the department and college/school/University Libraries

Associate Teaching Professor/ Associate Clinical Professor/Associate Educator: Evidence is normally expected of the following: (1) documented effectiveness of teaching/librarianship; and (2) some professional or University service, as defined in the role statement.

Teaching Professor/Clinical Professor/Senior Educator: Evidence is normally expected of the following: (1) sustained effectiveness in teaching/librarianship; and (2) demonstrated academic leadership in the form of service, as defined in the role statement, to the University and the profession.

#### **4.21 / Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty - Outline of Process of Review [New Proposal]**

Any faculty member may nominate himself or herself for review for promotion or incentive review after five years of service in the current level. The review takes place during the sixth year. Nominations may also be made by the chairperson.

The process of review for promotion or incentive involves these steps:

1. Nomination for review.
2. Departmental review of nominees by the departmental committee and by the chair.
3. In favorable or appealed cases, college/school/University Libraries review of department nominations by the college/school/University Libraries Promotion Committee, and by the college/school/University Libraries dean.
4. In favorable or appealed cases, University review of college/school/University Libraries nominations by the Promotion Committee and by the Provost and Senior Vice President.
5. In favorable or appealed cases, review of recommendations by the University President for final decision.

Procedures have been established for appeal in the case of an adverse promotion recommendation at the department and at the college level.

#### **4.22 Review for Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Procedures**

##### **Nomination for Review for Promotion:**

1. The department chair will write to all full-time faculty members of the department to tell them that nominations of persons to be reviewed that year for promotion must be given to the chair by a specified date. All others may be nominated by the chair or by the faculty member himself or herself.
2. The department chair will send copies of the list resulting from step 1 to all full-time departmental faculty and specify a second date by which any additional nominations must be provided in writing to the chair.
3. The department chair will confer individually with all nominated faculty members and provide information about departmental, college/school/University Libraries, and University criteria for promotion.
4. Faculty who have been nominated must inform the department chair in writing by a date specified by the department chair (which will be no sooner than two days after their conference) of the faculty member's decision to remain in nomination or to withdraw.
5. The final, typed list of those nominated will be sent to the dean and to all members of the department electorate. Each person on the list will be notified in writing by the dean that he or she is officially a candidate for promotion. In addition, the dean will inform the candidate of the criteria for promotion and will instruct the candidate to give his/her supporting materials to the department chair by a specified date.

**Preparation of the Primary and Secondary Dossier:**

The candidate will present a primary dossier and may prepare a secondary dossier. Only material contained in the primary and secondary dossiers and additional materials appropriately obtained and added to the dossiers may be used by the Promotion Committee at each level.

The candidate is responsible for assembling the materials and reviewing the entire dossier to determine that it is complete and accurate. Non-tenure track candidates are *not* required to have any external letters of review as part of their primary dossier. Adherence to established deadlines should ensure that the final dossier is complete at the time of submission. The candidate then submits the copy of the primary dossier and supplemental materials to the chair of her/his department. Once they have been submitted to the chair, these original materials cannot be changed or rewritten.

As the review proceeds through the various levels, the primary dossier and the secondary dossier will be in the custody of the administrator at each level. Items are added as attachments to the primary dossier by the administrator as called for in these procedures, but the administrator must give the candidate a copy of the additions and provide the candidate an opportunity to write a rebuttal that will also be added to the primary dossier.

**Primary Dossier:** The primary dossier consists of the basic document, the required cover sheet which records each step of the review process, copies of the annual reviews (and rebuttals if filed) for non-tenure track faculty, the chair's nonevaluative role statement, statements of evaluation by the committee and administrator at each level of review (and rebuttals if filed), and items added during the review process. The basic document will follow the standard format recommended by the University Promotion Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate. Deviations from the established format should be clearly explained. The basic document may be no more than 15 pages. The chair will provide a statement of the role of the candidate in the department which is purely descriptive and not evaluative. If the candidate's role involves a weighted distribution of responsibility among the categories of professional activity, that should be indicated in the role statement. The chair will make copies of the primary dossier available for all voting faculty.

**Secondary Dossier:** A secondary dossier may be submitted to the chair by the candidate. It consists of such additional materials as the candidate wishes to submit. Examples might include, but are not required or limited to evidence of teaching, copies of student evaluations or course materials, evidence of service contributions, etc. The candidate may add items to the secondary dossier during the review process (see calendar in [Section 4.16](#) of this manual). Should documentation significant to the candidate's case arrive after the deadline for adding materials to the secondary dossier, the candidate should notify the dean and the chair of his/her college/school/University Libraries committee who will add the material to the dossier. The chair of the committee will bring it to the attention of the next higher committee. The secondary dossier will not be duplicated but will be available to committee members.

**Department Review for Promotion:** <sup>1</sup>

The complete files of all faculty members under review in the department must be available for a reasonable time (at least five working days) to all voting faculty.

**Department Committee** - The Non-tenure track Faculty Promotion Committee at the departmental level should have at least three members and will consist of at least one voting non-tenure track faculty member, and at least one voting tenured faculty member of the department. Promotion cases will be reviewed at a meeting of the departmental faculty who hold level equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered or of a committee of those with appropriate level chosen by these faculty members. (The limitation of voting to persons of equal or higher level need not apply to votes at the college/school/University Libraries or University level. )In departments with fewer than the requisite members, the college/school/University Libraries faculty will develop appropriate procedures for the review subject to the approval of the college/school/University Libraries dean.

Each eligible person, excluding the department chair, will vote on each case under consideration and will sign the tally. The tally will not identify individual voters with their votes but must account for all eligible votes. Straw ballots may precede the final ballot. Abstentions may occur only in cases involving declared conflict of interest. A positive recommendation will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots (i.e., other than abstentions) have voted to recommend promotion. Copies of the tally sheets will be kept in the departmental office for three years.

Chairs do not participate in their own evaluation or in evaluations of faculty when the chair has a conflict of interest. Such cases automatically go forward without prejudice for review at the next level.

The results of the departmental deliberations and the chair's separate recommendation will be sent to the dean by the department chair. When the committee's discussion of a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee's evaluation of the candidate. The department chair will also provide a written evaluation to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In cases where the chair's recommendation differs from that of the voting faculty, the case will go forward to the next higher level without prejudice, and that transmittal will not constitute an appeal. The chair will also send forward the copies of the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

The dean will inform each candidate in writing of the department's recommendations, the chair's recommendation, the right to appeal, and the procedures for appeal. The dean will also notify the candidate that he/she may request meetings with the department chair and/or the

chair of the departmental promotion committee, at the candidate's option, to discuss the decision.

**College/School/University Libraries Review of Nominees for Promotion:**

The dean will give a copy of the primary dossier of each faculty member favorably recommended for promotion and of all appealed cases to each member of the college/school/University Libraries committee and will indicate the location of the secondary dossiers. These materials must be available to the committee for at least five working days prior to deliberation.

**College Promotion Committee for Non-tenure track Faculty.** This committee will consist of at least one voting non-tenure track faculty member and at least one voting tenured faculty member from the college. The total membership of the committee is an odd number, with a minimum of five members.

The majority of the committee are elected by the faculty, according to a representational formula adopted by the college/school/University Libraries. Members are elected or appointed for either two- or three-year terms (depending upon the college/school/University Libraries policies), staggered to maintain continuity. If a replacement is required due to a resignation, the replacement is selected only for the duration of the unexpired term. The committee chair is elected by the committee. No person can serve on the committee in a year in which he or she is considered for promotion or for more than two consecutive terms.

The committee will meet with the dean to receive information about the schedule of meetings and about administrative matters related to the cases to be reviewed. The dean may also request other meetings with the committee. Each college/school/University Libraries shall adopt procedures regarding the role of the dean in these other meetings. If the committee discovers that information is lacking in a dossier, it can ask the dean to acquire the information. Consistent with the department procedures, the dean must provide the candidate a copy of the material and allow the candidate to write a rebuttal. The college/school/University Libraries committee may, at its option, adopt a policy which prohibits a committee member from the same department as a candidate for promotion from speaking about the case during the committee's deliberations. If such a rule is adopted, it must apply to all cases before the committee. If additional information about the departmental committee's deliberations is desired, the committee may request explanatory information to be submitted in writing from the chair of the departmental committee. This statement will be added to the primary dossier, and the candidate will be provided an opportunity to place a rebuttal in the primary dossier. The committee will then consider the cases before it, whether regular or appealed. Straw ballots may be taken, but these are neither binding nor recorded. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member on a committee declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning the case. At a meeting without the dean each case will be discussed and the committee will conduct its final vote. A positive recommendation by the committee will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention vote to recommend promotion.

The committee must notify the dean in writing of its final ballot on each case. (Note: The college/school/University Libraries committee may meet with the dean as it sees fit but it must hold a discussion on each case and take its final vote in the absence of the dean.)

The results of the college/school/University Libraries deliberations and the dean's separate recommendations will be sent by the dean to the Provost and Senior Vice President. When the committee's discussion of a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee's evaluation of the candidate. The dean will also provide a written evaluation to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In cases where the college/school/University Libraries committee's recommendation differs from that of the dean, the case will go forward to the next higher level without prejudice and the transmittal will not constitute an appeal. A positive recommendation requires the affirmative vote of more than 50 percent of those voting. The dean will also send forward the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

The dean will notify each candidate in writing of the college/school/University Libraries committee's recommendation, the dean's recommendation, the right to appeal, if any, and the procedures for appeal. The dean will also notify the candidate that he/she may request in writing meetings with the dean and/or the chair of the college/school/University Libraries committee, at the candidate's option, to discuss the recommendation.

#### **University Review of Nominees for Promotion:**

The Provost and Senior Vice President will give a copy of the primary dossier of each faculty member favorably recommended for promotion and of each appealed case to each member of the University committee. In addition, the Provost and Senior Vice President will indicate the location of the secondary dossiers. The materials must be available to the committee for at least five working days prior to deliberations.

The review committee at the University level is composed of the same members as the Faculty Senate Tenure and Promotion Committee, with the exception that the **two at-large tenured members will be replaced by two at-large non-tenure track faculty.** No person may serve on the University-level review committee in a year in which he or she is considered for tenure or promotion.

If the committee discovers that information is lacking in a primary dossier, it can ask the Provost and Senior Vice President to acquire the information, which will be placed in the primary dossier. Consistent with college/school/University Libraries procedures the Provost and Senior Vice President must provide the candidate a copy of the material and allow the candidate to write a rebuttal, which will also be placed in the primary dossier.

The committee will then consider the cases before it, whether regular or appealed. The committee may request a written response from the dean on matters of interpretation of evidence, the academic needs of the unit, or its current resources, but the committee will not

invite the dean or other outside persons to meet with the committee. Consistent with college/school/University Libraries procedures, the candidate shall be provided a copy of any additional written material provided to the committee and shall be provided an opportunity to write a rebuttal. Both the statement and the rebuttal will be placed in the primary dossier. Straw ballots may be taken, but these are neither binding nor recorded. Abstentions will not be registered except when a faculty member on a committee declares he/she has a conflict of interest concerning a case. At a meeting without either the Provost and Senior Vice President or the Dean of the Graduate School present, each case will be discussed and the committee will conduct its final vote. A positive recommendation will result when more than 50 percent of those casting ballots other than abstention vote to recommend promotion.

The committee must notify the Provost and Senior Vice President in writing of its final ballot on each case. Any person not recommended by the University committee may request meetings with the Provost and Senior Vice President and/or the chair of the University committee, at the candidate's option, to discuss the recommendations. The candidate may invite a faculty colleague to accompany him/her.

The results of University committee deliberations and the Provost and Senior Vice President's separate recommendations will be sent by the Provost and Senior Vice President to the President. When the committee's decision on a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee's evaluation of the candidate. The Provost and Senior Vice President will also provide a written evaluation to accompany his/her recommendation for each case. These statements will be included in the primary dossier. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review these statements and to file a written rebuttal in the primary dossier. In any case where the proposed vice presidential recommendation differs from that of the University committee, the Provost and Senior Vice President will meet with the committee to discuss the reasons for his/her position.

The President will notify the candidate, the candidate's dean, and the chair, in writing, of his/her decision by the calendar date. Any person not recommended by the President may request a meeting with the Provost and Senior Vice President and the President to discuss the recommendations. The candidate may invite a faculty colleague to accompany him/her, in either case.

**Appeal of Decisions Related to Promotion:**

A candidate may make only one appeal during the entire review process. The appeal is made to the next higher level. No hearing is provided, and the appeal must be written. Some typical reasons for appeal are violation of academic freedom, failure to follow procedures concerning time periods or committee operations, inadequate consideration, discrimination, etc.

The committee to which the appeal is made will give full consideration without prejudice to the case in that the committee will review it in the same manner as favorably recommended cases and will apply similar standards.

If the candidate's one appeal results in an unfavorable recommendation, the candidate's dossier will be forwarded directly to the President. The President will make the final decision regarding the candidate as provided in Regents policy without further recommendations.

**No Publication of Names:**

Names of faculty being considered for promotion will not be published. The right of privacy of such faculty members was affirmed by vote of the faculty on March 6, 1978.

**Confidentiality of Proceedings:**

All deliberations are confidential. However, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed if the case goes to litigation.

**Disposition of Dossiers:**

The Provost and Senior Vice President in each case will keep a copy of the primary dossier for three years and return to the candidate the remaining copies of the primary dossier and the secondary dossier.

**Precedence of University Procedures:**

If department and college/school/University Libraries promotion procedures differ from those of the University, University procedures take precedent.

**Student Members:**

Students will not cast a vote regarding the award of promotion to individual faculty members.

Administrator - The administrator at the departmental level is the department chair. The dean is the administrator at the college/school/University Libraries level, and the Provost and Senior Vice President is the administrator at the University level.

Calendar - A Promotion Calendar will follow the same schedule as the Tenure and Promotion Calendar, developed and published each year by the Provost and Senior Vice President or their designee.

Documents - The basic document consists of the 15-page statement prepared by the candidate in accordance with the standard format. The primary dossier consists of this basic document, the required cover sheet, copies of annual reviews (and rebuttals if filed) for faculty, the chair's nonevaluative role statement, statements of evaluation by the committee and administrator at each level of review (and rebuttals if filed), and items added during the review process.

Candidates must be notified of any items added to the primary dossier and be provided an opportunity to submit a written rebuttal to such items, which will be included in the primary dossier. At each level of review, each committee member has a copy of the primary dossier. The secondary dossier consists of such additional materials as the candidate wishes to submit. Examples might include, but are not required or limited to evidence of teaching, copies of student evaluations or course materials, evidence of service contributions, etc. Only one copy of the secondary dossier is maintained.

Straw Ballot - A non-binding vote taken for the purpose of monitoring progress toward a final decision is a straw ballot.

Favorable Case - A favorable case occurs at any level of review if either the faculty committee or the administrator makes a positive recommendation concerning the case. Such cases automatically move forward for review at the next level.

#### **4.23 / Teaching Professor Incentive Review Program**

##### **Purpose:**

Establish a voluntary incentive review program for non-tenure track faculty holding the level of Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator.

##### **Preamble:**

The voluntary incentive review program is intended to provide an opportunity for a (1.0 EFT) non-tenure track faculty member holding the level of Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator at Wichita State University for six (6) years to be eligible for salary supplements based on the faculty member's continuing professional work. Any Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator, including those holding administrative positions, may apply for the merit award if they feel that they meet the criteria provided in paragraph five below.

##### **Policy Statement:**

1. The voluntary incentive review program is available to all faculty members who have held the level of Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor and Senior Educator at Wichita State University for a minimum of six (6) years (whose appointment is 1.0 EFT) and who have not received an incentive supplement under this policy in the last six years.
2. Eligible faculty members interested in participating in the voluntary incentive review program shall submit their names to the Chair of the department by the appropriate Spring deadline of their fifth (5th) year as a Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor and Senior Educator at WSU, at the same time as faculty seeking promotion to Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor and Senior Educator as noted in the [Tenure and Promotion Calendar](#). The candidate for the voluntary incentive review will present a primary dossier comparable to a promotion dossier to the department, highlighting work completed since the last review; the candidate may prepare a secondary dossier.
3. Chairs interested in participating in the voluntary incentive review submit their dossiers to the Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor and Senior Educator of the department for review. Chairs who are candidates for the Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor and Senior Educator Incentive Review Program do not participate in their own evaluation or in evaluations of candidates in the Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor and Senior Educator Incentive Review Program, or when the Chair has a conflict of interest. Such cases automatically go forward without prejudice for review at the next level.

4. Salary supplements under this policy are part of the merit pay system, not the promotion process. The criteria for award of a salary supplement are the same as the criteria for promotion to Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor and Senior Educator (in effect at the time the candidate files an application for full professor incentive review). In the interests of fairness and to assure comparable standards across campus, the process for review is the same as for promotion to Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator, and will progress through the stages of the promotion review process.

The process of review involves these steps:

- (A) Nomination for review.
- (B) Departmental review of nominees by the departmental committee\* and by the Chair.
- (C) In favorable or appealed\*\* cases, college/school/University Libraries review of departmental nominations by the college/school/University Libraries tenure and promotion committee and by the college/schools/University Libraries dean.
- (D) In favorable or appealed\*\* cases, University review of college/school/University Libraries nominations by the promotion committee and by the Provost and Senior Vice President.
- (E) In favorable or appealed\*\* cases, approval by the president of the University.

\*In departments having fewer than three faculty members with appropriate level, the college/school/University Libraries faculty will develop appropriate review procedures subject to the approval of the college/school/University Libraries dean.

\*\*Procedures have been established for appeal in the case of an adverse promotion recommendation at the department, college/school/University Libraries and University levels.

Note: The applicable policies and procedures may be found in the [WSU Policies and Procedures Manual, Chapter 4](#);

5. The requirements for a successful Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator incentive review merit award require that a candidate demonstrate sustained, successful performance in the areas of responsibility as defined in their role statement. This might include teaching at the undergraduate and/or graduate level, as well as service to the University and to the profession commensurate with the level of Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator. It is the responsibility of the candidate to supply clear and convincing evidence in each area.

6. Satisfactory completion of the voluntary incentive review program will result in payment of a salary supplement to the participating faculty member that equals the salary supplement paid to a person promoted to Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor or Senior Educator at the same time.

**Implementation:**

This policy shall be included in the *WSU Policies and Procedures Manual* and shared with appropriate constituencies of the University.

The Provost and Senior Vice President shall have primary responsibility for publication and implementation of this University Policy.

**Evaluation and Signature Form for  
Tenure Track Faculty and Non-Tenure Track Faculty for Calendar Year 2017**

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Rank/Level \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_  
 Type of Appointment \_\_\_\_\_ Years in Current Status \_\_\_\_\_ Months \_\_\_\_\_ Hire Date \_\_\_\_\_

1. Tenure Track/Non-Tenure Track Faculty Evaluation Committee: *Attach an evaluative statement.*

Based on performance record, reappointment is: \_\_\_\_\_ Recommended (Vote Count) \_\_\_\_\_ Not Recommended (Vote Count)

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
                     Committee Chair

2. Department Chair: *Attach an evaluative statement with specific reference to performance and check appropriate spaces below.*

Probationary Faculty        \_\_\_\_\_ Reappointment recommended                      \_\_\_\_\_ Reappointment not recommended

Temporary Faculty        \_\_\_\_\_ Reappointment recommended, contingent upon funding

   \_\_\_\_\_ Reappointment not recommended

   \_\_\_\_\_ Position terminates \_\_\_\_\_ (date)

Unclassified Professionals    \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewed

Tenured Faculty                \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewed

	Teaching/Librarianship	Research/Creative Activity	Service	Overall
Meets expectations				
Does not meet expectations				
N/A				

**Signature Form**

Faculty Member: (Check items that apply below.)

\_\_\_\_\_ I have discussed goals for the coming year with the chair, as attached to this evaluation.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have read this evaluation and had the chance to discuss it with the department chair.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have read this evaluation, had the opportunity to discuss it with the department chair, and I have ATTACHED A WRITTEN RESPONSE.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
                     Faculty member

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
                     Chair

Dean: \_\_\_\_\_ I concur with this evaluation. \_\_\_\_\_ I have attached comments.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
                     Dean

Provost and Senior Vice President: \_\_\_\_\_ I concur with this evaluation. \_\_\_\_\_ I have attached comments.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
                     Provost and Senior Vice President

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

TENURE TRACK AND NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY ACTIVITY RECORD for Calendar Year 2017.  
*(Instructions for Completion are included in this document)*

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Rank/Level \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

**I. TEACHING/LIBRARIANSHIP:**

A. Courses taught (indicate courses taught for first time by an asterisk; list Independent Study and Blue Card Courses and identify by IS or BC).

<u>Credit Hours</u>	<u>Course No. &amp; Title</u>	<u>Term</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>

B. Students advised:        Bachelors \_\_\_\_; Masters \_\_\_\_; Doctoral \_\_\_\_; Other (explain) \_\_\_\_\_.

C. Degree Committees:

Masters -Committee	(member)_____	(chair)_____	(director)_____
Thesis/report/terminal Project	(member)_____	(chair)_____	(director)_____
MFA -Thesis/Terminal Project	(member)_____	(chair)_____	(director)_____
Doctoral - Examination Committee	(member)_____	(chair)_____	
Dissertation Committee	(member)_____	(chair)_____	

Support for students' work through grants and/or publications:

Curriculum Improvement (new courses developed, significant course revisions, etc.) explain:

Faculty development activities (participation in workshops, conferences, being/having a mentor, etc.):

Special awards, honors, or other recognition of excellence in teaching:

For activities listed above in subsections A, through C, classify any (or all, as the case may be) TEACHING/LIBRARIANSHIP activities into UniScope classification of (add rows as needed):

Topics (e.g. specific courses, advising, theses, etc.)	UniScope dimensions			
	Discovery	Integration	Application	Education
Comments, remarks, etc.				

II. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY:

A. Books, articles, compositions, etc., that were published and or accepted for publication. List significant performances, exhibitions, productions directed, etc. If multiple authors or creators, list in order of the magnitude of their contributions.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Publisher</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Refereed, Reviewed or Juried?</u>

B. Research/creative project in progress (intended for dissemination/publication) and items submitted. (Use NA under publisher/place if work not yet submitted or deadline established):

<u>Title</u>	<u>Publisher</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Refereed, Reviewed or Juried?</u>

C. Applications submitted for grants, contracts, fellowships and leaves (indicate by P under Funded if decision pending):

<u>Title</u>	<u>Publisher</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Fund Y/N; \$ Amount</u>

D. Consultancies, professional presentations/meetings. Paper/grant refereeing activity, contracted publication reviews, accreditation evaluator, adjudication etc.:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Publisher</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Remuneration Y/N</u>

E. Professional awards, honors, editorships (list teaching awards/honors in Section I):

<u>Title</u>	<u>Publisher</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Remuneration Y/N</u>

For activities listed above in subsections A through E, classify any (or all, as the case may be) RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES into UniScope classification of (add rows as needed):

Topics (e.g. details of books, projects, grants, consultancies, presentations, etc.)	UniScope dimensions			
	Discovery	Integration	Application	Education
Comments, remarks, etc.				

III. SERVICE:

A. Administrative (including graduate assistant supervision, etc.), committee activity, or other service within the University (organize by levels and designate; D for School/Dept.; C for College; U for University).

<u>Committee of Activity</u>	<u>Role</u>	<u>Date or ongoing</u>	<u>Rel time or Remuneration</u> <u>Y/N</u>

B. Community service, non-credit course taught, and special services to WSU:

<u>Committee of Activity</u>	<u>Role</u>	<u>Date or ongoing</u>	<u>Rel time or Remuneration</u> <u>Y/N</u>

C. Service to professional organizations, etc., if not cited in Category II:

<u>Committee of Activity</u>	<u>Role</u>	<u>Date or ongoing</u>	<u>Rel time or Remuneration</u> <u>Y/N</u>

For activities listed above in subsections A through C, classify any (or all, as the case may be) SERVICE activities into UniScope classification of (add rows as needed):

Topics (e.g. details of administrative, committee, community service, professional service activities, etc.)	UniScope dimensions			
	Discovery	Integration	Application	Education
Comments, remarks, etc.				

#### IV. POSITIVE RISK-TAKING [Optional]:

If some of the activities noted above in teaching/librarianship, research/creative activity, and service involved some element of risk-taking, acting experimentally outside the normal parameters, provide a brief narrative description of the risk(s) taken.

**Describe the experimentation, outcome, and learning that took place. Explain how this activity involved risk-taking and what parties were affected by the activity. Include the beginning and ending dates of the experimentation and if there was compensation for the activity.**

A. Developing unique applied learning or research experiences for students:

B. Pioneering interdisciplinary curricula with others ~~outside of the faculty member's college~~: [suggestion that some colleges have very diverse departments and interdisciplinarity might take place within the college, but between departments]

C. Capitalizing on relevant trends that increase quality educational opportunities in a distinctive way:

D. Accelerating the discovery, creation, or transfer of new knowledge via inventions, innovations, or technologies that are market driven:

E. Empowering students to create a campus culture and experience that meets their changing needs:

F. Enhancing learning via the creation of a campus that reflects – in staff, faculty and students – the evolving diversity of society:

## **Faculty Activity Record Instructions**

*This format for the Faculty Activity Record has been provided to allow for adjustment of the form for the space needed in each category. Please refer to and complete all items listed on the outline and GIVE ONE COPY TO YOUR CHAIR.*

### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE FACULTY ACTIVITY RECORD**

#### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

The Faculty Activity record is prepared by the faculty member and submitted for use with the Faculty Evaluation Form at the department level.

The Faculty Activity Record is an annual update of professional activity during a single calendar year. Those employed at WSU for less than a calendar year should indicate the months employed at the top of the first page. Please enter complete name, official rank/title, and department at the top of the first page.

#### **I. TEACHING/LIBRARIANSHIP:**

List sequentially all course taught (including independent study [IS] and blue card [BC]) during the Spring, Summer and Fall terms of the calendar year, and indicate credit hours, course number and title, term and official 20<sup>th</sup> day enrollment. Denote by an asterisk at left if the course was taught for the first time. Librarians should use this space to list activities and accomplishments.

Identify the number of students advised by level.

Identify the number of graduate committees by function: member, chair, or director.

List students with whom you have worked on grants and/or publications and identify the projects.

Outline contributions to curriculum improvement (new course development, course restructuring, internationalizing the curriculum, integrating computers in course content or teaching methodology etc.).

List any involvement as a teacher or participant in WSU or off-campus faculty development activities.

List special recognitions.

Provide details of activities aligned with UniScope classifications and add comments/remarks as applicable.

#### **II. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY [Optional for Non-Tenure Track faculty]:**

Indicate whether you are the sole author or, in the case of collaborations, list the authors in order of the importance of their contributions. List all works published or accepted for publication during the calendar year showing full title, publisher/publication, and date. Clearly indicate expected date for unpublished materials as well as whether refereed or not. Include only those publications/performances, which are considered scholarly contributions to your disciplinary area.

For creative activities (art exhibitions, musical performances, theatre productions). Indicate whether you are the sole creator, or in the case of collaborations, list the creators and the role each played, the place and date exhibited/performed, and indicate whether the activity was refereed/juried and your rating.

Indicate work in progress, including items submitted, If still in the research/preparation stage, write NA under the publisher/place to indicate work has not been submitted.

Indicate applications for grants, contracts, fellowships and leaves by title, sponsoring agency/organization, and date submitted. The amount under \$ funded should be the amount awarded. If the application was not funded, enter NF under \$ Funded.

Indicate consulting, professional presentations, meetings attended, and refereeing of papers/grants or creative activities during the year. Describe the activity, your role, the date the activity occurred and the amount, if any, or remuneration received for services.

List awards, memberships in professional associations and editorships of journals; include election to a leadership role in regional or national professional organizations.

Provide details of activities aligned with UniScope classifications and add comments/remarks as applicable.

#### **III. SERVICE:**

List all university administrative and committee assignments, noting department (D), college (C) or university (U) level. If released time and/or compensation was provided, indicate the number of released hours and/or amount of stipend associated with the activity.

List service or community activities or special services to WSU (e.g. Assistance at alumni meetings or student recruiting.). Provide details of activities aligned with Unicode classifications and add comments/remarks as applicable.

*Remember: the Faculty Activity Record is an account of your professional academic discipline-related activity during the calendar year. The Record should include only those activities related to your faculty assignment (for tenured faculty), to your performance in those areas reviewed for the award of tenure and promotion (for probationary faculty), or to fulfillment of role description/assignment (for unclassified professional and temporary faculty).*

#### **IV. POSTIVE RISK-TAKING [Optional]:**

If some of the activities noted above in teaching/librarianship, research/creative activity, and service involved some element of risk-taking, acting experimentally outside the normal parameters, provide a brief narrative description of the risk(s) taken.

Describe the experimentation, outcome, and learning that took place. Explain how this activity involved risk-taking and what parties were affected by the activity. Include the beginning and ending dates of the experimentation and if there was compensation for the activity.



# *Policies and Procedures*

## **3.48/ Coaching and Corrective Action**

### **PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this policy is to establish a consistent process for incidents of unmet Employment Expectations, unacceptable performance, behavior and/or misconduct. The processes for incidents involving sexual misconduct, sexual harassment, relationship violence, stalking, and/or discrimination are addressed in separate policies.

### **SCOPE:**

This policy applies to all Wichita State University (“University”) employees with the exception of faculty. Faculty with operational positions are included for their administrative duties but not for their teaching positions.

### **POLICY STATEMENT:**

The University is committed to providing an environment that encourages and assists employees in meeting Employment Expectations. Failure to meet Employment Expectations may result in Coaching and Corrective Action. All decisions made regarding Coaching and Corrective Action should be unbiased, non-retaliatory, and non-discriminatory.

### **DEFINITIONS:**

**Coaching and Corrective Action:** A progressive process by which employees who fail to meet Employment Expectations are counseled in levels or stages. Leadership uses discretion to determine the level of Coaching and Corrective Action necessary to address the unmet Employment Expectation(s), based on consideration of previous actions taken, severity of the situation, and number of interactions. The original signed documents of each progressive step will be sent to Human Resources (“HR”) to be included in the employee’s personnel file. Coaching and Corrective Action can include, but is not limited to:

**Employee Coaching Plan (Attachment A):** A documented verbal discussion between Leadership and the employee to address minor violations or incidents. The employee will complete the Employee Coaching Plan form with Leadership and signifies the employee’s commitment to resolve the unmet Employment Expectation(s).

**Written Coaching and Corrective Action (Attachment B):** A written document used to address repeated failures of an employee to meet Employment Expectation(s), or for an initial violation or incident of a more serious nature.

**Final Coaching and Corrective Action (Attachment B):** A written document requiring approval by an appropriate HR professional, used to address more serious violations or incidents, allowing an employee a last opportunity to meet employment expectation(s).

**Employee Assistance Program (“EAP”) Leadership Referral:** A meeting mandated by Leadership that requires an employee to meet with an EAP consultant. The referral is intended for situations in which there is a reasonable belief that internal or external circumstances are influencing an employee’s performance that may be corrected through the assistance of consulting services conducted by an outside party.

**Employment Expectations:** The competent performance of duties and functions of the job while exhibiting professional behaviors consistent with the University’s mission and values.

**Employment at Will:** An employment relationship that continues at the discretion of both the University and the employee. The University can separate an employee for any reason at any time, and likewise, an employee can voluntarily separate employment for any reason at any time. Employment at Will does not preclude compliance with any state or federal law or other University policies.

**Investigative Leave:** A mandated leave in response to situations that require removing an employee from the workplace while conducting internal fact-finding investigation of alleged behaviors and/or actions that may violate University policy, rules, and/or Employment Expectations. See [Policy #3.XX] Investigative Leave policy for more information. Human Resources should be consulted if an Investigative Leave is considered, and prior to implementation.

**Involuntary Separation (Attachment C):** Occurs when Leadership makes a decision to end the employment relationship. Involuntary Separation requires approval by Human Resources and the appropriate Leadership. Any employee, including tenured faculty, who is charged with and/or convicted of a criminal offense may be immediately separated from University employment at the discretion of Leadership and Human Resources.

**Leadership:** For purposes of this policy, Leadership includes individuals at the University who have employees reporting to them, or Department Chairs/Directors.

## **PROCEDURE:**

When an unmet Employment Expectation(s) is identified, Leadership reviews the concerns with the employee in a timely manner, documents the concern, and applies the appropriate Coaching and Corrective Action. The level of corrective action depends on the nature and severity of the incident(s), previous performance, and other relevant factors. Each situation is considered on a case-by-case basis.

- (1) Leadership engages in a face-to-face conversation with the employee regarding any concern of unmet Employee Expectations. If the employee works virtually, a phone conversation with the employee if needed in place of a face-to-face conversation may take place.
- (2) Leadership obtains the appropriate level(s) of approval before administering Coaching and Corrective Action.
- (3) Leadership completes the Coaching and Corrective Action documentation and reviews the expectations with the employee. Leadership seeks commitment for the specific expectations(s) from the employee.
- (4) After reviewing the documentation with the employee, Leadership provides the employee the opportunity to add comments. The employee must provide comments within three (3) University business days of receipt of the Coaching and Corrective Action.
- (5) The Coaching and Corrective Action document is signed by both the employee and Leadership.
- (6) In instances in which the employee requests additional time (up to three (3) University business days of receipt of document), the document is signed without comments added.
- (7) In instances in which the employee refuses to sign, Leadership documents "Employee Refused to Sign" on employee signature line. Refusal to sign does not void the corrective action.
- (8) Leadership sends the original signed document to HR. A copy is maintained by Leadership, and a copy is provided to the employee.
- (9) Leadership is encouraged to schedule periodic review sessions with the employee to assess progress and assist the employee with meeting Employment Expectation(s).
- (10) Leadership works with EAP, as appropriate, to assist the employee in resolving issues and meeting Employment Expectation(s).
- (11) If Employment Expectation(s) are not met, Leadership continues Coaching and Corrective Action up to, and including, Involuntary Separation.
- (12) Responsibilities:

### **Leadership**

- (1) Leadership will be knowledgeable of the policy and procedures.
- (2) Assists employee in meeting Employment Expectation(s) by clearly defining goals and objectives.
- (3) Engages in face-to-face conversation with the employee regarding any concern of unmet Employee Expectations.
- (4) Obtains the appropriate level(s) of approval before administering Coaching and Corrective Action.
- (5) Reviews expectations and Coaching and Corrective Action documentation. Seeks commitment for the specific expectation(s) of the Coaching and Corrective Action from the employee.
- (6) After reviewing the documentation with the employee, Leadership sends the original signed document to HR. A copy is maintained by Leadership, and a copy is provided to the employee.
- (7) In instances in which employee refuses to sign, Leadership documents “Employee Refused to Sign” on employee signature line. Refusal to sign does not void the corrective action.

#### **Employee**

- (1) Actively participates in and commits to correcting the unmet Employment Expectation(s).
- (2) Seeks direction and assistance from Leadership as necessary to ensure Employment Expectation(s) are met.
- (3) Discusses all performance related concerns with Leadership in an effort to resolve issues, and discusses with Leadership in the chain of command if needed. Eligible employees may use Policy 3.XX Internal Grievance Process, should the concern remain unresolved.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment A – Employee Coaching Plan  
Attachment B – Coaching and Corrective Action Memo  
Attachment C – Separation of Employment Notice

#### **Revision Date:**

November 2, 2016  
May 8, 2017



# *Policies and Procedures*

## **3.XX Investigative Leave**

### **PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance for situations that require removing an employee from the workplace while conducting internal fact-finding investigations of alleged behaviors and/or actions that may violate Wichita State University (“University”) policy, rules and/or employment expectations. The processes involving allegations of sexual misconduct, sexual harassment, relationship violence, stalking, and/or discrimination are addressed in separate policies.

### **SCOPE:**

This policy applies to all University employees except those who are covered by a collective bargaining agreement.

### **POLICY STATEMENT:**

The University strives to provide a professional work and learning environment free from behaviors and/or actions that violate University policy, rules and/or employment expectations.

### **DEFINITIONS:**

**Investigative Leave:** A mandated leave that removes an employee from the University pending the outcome of an internal investigation of alleged behaviors and/or actions that may violate University policy, rules and/or employment expectations. The length of Investigative Leave will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

**Investigator:** For purposes of this policy, Investigator is the individual(s) conducting the internal investigation.

**Leadership:** For purposes of this policy, Leadership includes individuals at the University who have employees reporting to them, or Department Chairs/Directors.

### **PROCEDURE:**

1. Leadership or Investigator consults with HR regarding the potential need for Investigative Leave prior to implementation, if at all possible, unless it is not feasible due to the nature of the incidents.

2. Leadership or Investigator communicates the decision to the employee upon placement on Investigative Leave using the Investigative Leave Memo.
3. Leadership or Investigator collects the employee's WSU ID, keys, and other University property or information as deemed appropriate.
4. Leadership, Investigator, or HR notifies appropriate departments to disable access including, but not limited to, computer, network, and badge/door access.
5. Appropriate employee(s) are engaged to conduct an internal investigation.
6. Based upon the investigative findings, Leadership, Investigator, and/or HR determine any action to be implemented and obtain appropriate levels of approval.
7. Leadership, Investigator, and/or HR prepares documentation to provide to the employee with details of the determined action, using Coaching and Corrective Action forms if applicable.
8. Leadership, Investigator, and/or HR meets with the employee to communicate the investigative findings and determined actions. The communication is delivered prior to an employee returning to work from Investigative Leave.
9. Leadership ensures timekeeping rules are applied accurately. Investigative Leave may be paid with benefits, except in rare circumstances identified by Leadership the Investigator, and/or HR. Leadership coordinates with HR to make any adjustments to timekeeping and compensation as appropriate.
10. Responsibilities
  - a. Leadership, Investigator, and HR
    - (1) Knowledgeable of the policy and procedures.
    - (2) Conducts all investigations promptly, thoroughly, and impartially without bias.
    - (3) Maintains confidentiality regarding internal investigations.
  - b. Employee:
    - (1) Cooperates with internal investigation by sharing knowledge, information, evidence, and documentation.
    - (2) Maintains confidentiality regarding the investigation when informed that it is required.
    - (3) Complies with the conditions of the implemented Investigative Leave Memo.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: Investigative Leave Memo

# Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Monday November 13, 2017

3:30 - 5:00 CH 126

## Summary of Action

- Voted to choose “option 3” as outlined in the proposal that describes the make-up of the University Committee so that it includes the 7 college committee chairpersons + 2 at large, non-tenure track faculty at Associate or Full level, ex officio: Grad Dean, and 1 non-voting student representative. The vote passed with 4-opposed.
- The revised FAR form that includes Uniscope was approved by majority vote with 2 abstentions.

### I. Call to Order

### II. Informal Statements and Proposals

None

### III. Approval of the Minutes

Minutes approved

Mention made from floor to watch spelling of names and avoid abbreviations of names.

### IV. President's Report

- a. Ability Ally training - needs to be completed by end of the year. In person classes available through MyTraining portal on MyWSU; Online sessions available through Bb – use self-enroll option, see link on senate page.
- b. KBOR meeting @ WSU on Nov 15. Thoughts from senate floor were requested for issues to share with KBOR – none were offered.
- c. Joint UP/USS meeting held last week, another is planned for spring. Issues discussed included non-salary based incentives in lieu of raises. It was stated that a cross campus survey would be conducted. Discussed ongoing development of service standards. Discussed game-day parking challenges. Campus police are part of this meeting and police shared details about handling these changes. You can register to get text messages about game day parking restrictions. Discontent regarding health quest – send complaints to [benefits@kdheks.gov](mailto:benefits@kdheks.gov).

### IV. Committee Reports

- a. Gen. Ed. Committee – considering requests regarding 120 hour exceptions and whether it is time to open a dialogue about revising general education guidelines.
- b. Rules committee – Still have two openings.

### V. New Business

a. Non-Tenure Track promotion policy (1st Reading )

- i. Summary document with implementation details
- ii. FAQs
- iii. Full policy text

Dr. Bardo and PET are eager to take a look at these policies. Submission due by March 23. There will be an opportunity for non-tenure track faculty to go up for promotion in the spring. Department review deadline April 20. College review deadline May 18. Q- Is the administration expecting an up or down vote from the senate? A Yes. Q – Has this policy been shown to the non-tenure track faculty who this affects? A – Yes, they sit in this senate and had members on the committee that put this policy together. Q – What is the proportion on non-tenure members on the proposed University Committee? A- Trying to establish the fairest arrangement.

Discussed which option of the proposed compositions of the University Promotion Committee was favored by senate.

**Voted to choose “option 3” as outlined in the proposal, which includes 7 college committee chairpersons + 2 at large, non-tenure track faculty at Associate or Full level, ex officio: Grad Dean, and 1 non-voting student representative. The vote passed with 4-opposed.**

**VI. Old Business**

- a. Revised FAR form with Uniscope (2nd reading) – Discussion focused on section IV “positive risk taking.” A motion was forwarded to approve, motion was seconded and the **senate voted in favor with 2 abstentions.** The new FAR form is anticipated to come into effect for calendar year 18.
- b. Coaching and Corrective Action (2nd reading) - Discussion focused on the scope of this policy and how it pertained to faculty with operational positions and how “Leadership” is defined as it is used in the policy. Q – How is “at-will” defined with respect to faculty? A- “At will” applies to faculty in their non-faculty roles, such as administrative roles. Concerns were raised from senators regarding wording under “Involuntary Separation” which stated that “Any employee, including tenured faculty, who is charged with and/or convicted of a criminal offense may be immediately separated from University employment....” The objection was the inclusion of “tenured faculty” in this statement. **It was decided to have another reading of this policy before voting.**
- c. Investigative Leave (2nd reading) A **motion was made to close debate and the move was seconded.** Concerns were then raised about the section describing the procedure to be followed. Specific concerns included issues of barring a faculty member’s access to office, e-mail and other resources during an investigation. Further discussion regarding the invoking of confidentiality on employees being investigated took place. In response, it was stated by general counsel’s office that this does not apply to legal advice. Concerns persisted on the senate floor about language regarding confidentiality being imposed on an employee under investigation. **The prior motion was voted on and the failed to pass.**

**VII. Meeting Adjourned 4:58.**