



# University Senate Archives

---

University Senate

Academic year 1975-1976

---

## Volume XII

### Minutes of the Meeting of May 12, 1976

---

**Additional information:** Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:  
<http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/15271>

UNIVERSITY SENATE

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the meeting of May 12, 1976.

Approved as written  
See minutes of Sept. 13, 1976  
Meeting.

Members Present: Ahlberg, Benningfield, Breazeale, Brewer, Burgess, Chaffee, Chopra, Davis, Duell, Gosman, Gray, Greenberg, Hays, Henderson, Holmes, Houston, Humphrey, Kasten, Kraft, May, McFarland, Millett, Paske, Petree, Rhatigan, Rogers, Sharp, TenElshof, Walters, Weaver, Zandler.

Members Absent: Brady, Camin, Driefort, Fisher, Goudie, Graham, Hay, Haynes, Hughes, Jakowatz, Kane, Kannan, Koppenhaver, Magelli, Mathis, McBride, McKibbin, Needles, Nierenberger, Perel, Rodenberg, Shanmugam, B. Smith, Snyder, Taravella, Terwilliger, Webb, Welsbacher, Whitehead.

Guests: Brown, Bugg, Crockett, Durand, Platt, Schad.

- I. The meeting was called to order by President Paske at 3:40 p.m.
- II. Dr. Paske made an informal statement to the Senate concerning the Rank and Due Process document.

"It has been called to my attention that when the Agenda Committee scheduled the document now under discussion, it overlooked the fact that the document was being presented by a subcommittee of the Ad Hoc Committee on Due Process for Non-Teaching faculty.

As a chairman of the Agenda Committee, I assume full responsibility for this unfortunate oversight, and I regret very much that the oversight is an extremely serious one.

The Ad Hoc Committee consists of Annette TenElshof, Roger Lowe, James Merriman, John O'Loughlin, and Alvin Sarochek. The committee described in your document is a subcommittee of this committee. The charge to the subcommittee is (see Senate Attach. A)

Because the subcommittee did not report to the Ad Hoc committee, I rule that the current document is not legitimately before the Senate. The lack of reporting is due to a misunderstanding.

The effect of the oversight is that the representatives of the teaching faculty have had no opportunity at the committee level to review and/or respond to the document.

This is incompatible with the intent of the inclusion of representatives of the teaching faculty."

- III. President Ahlberg spoke to the situation. (see Attachment B) Dr. Ahlberg offered a solution in the form of a institutional action. Senator Rogers moved to support the President's comment. The motion carried.
- IV. Senator Burgess moved for adjournment, with a second from Senator Millett. The motion carried, and adjournment was at 3:50 p.m.

## INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To TenElshof, O'Loughlin, Platt, Taggart,  
Crawford, Gosman, Crockett

Date 4/8/75

From Kay Camin, President, University Senate

Subject Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Due Process for Administrators with Faculty Rank

The Ad Hoc Committee on Due Process for Non-Teaching Faculty (Annette TenElshof, Roger Lowe, James Merriman, John O'Loughlin, and Al Sarachek) has requested that a subcommittee be appointed to draft a document for the initial appointment, promotion, administrative tenure, and due process procedures and policies for unclassified administrative personnel.

This document should incorporate the principles already agreed upon by the Ad Hoc Committee. A copy of these principles will be provided to you in a few days.

The "due process" document will be presented to the Ad Hoc Committee which in turn will present recommendations to the University Senate.

The following administrative persons with faculty rank are appointed to the subcommittee:

George Platt  
Thoburn Taggart  
Rusty Crawford  
Al Gosman  
Helen Crockett

Planning  
Library  
University College  
Associate Dean, Academic College  
Continuing Education

Annette TenElshof  
John O'Loughlin

Chair of Ad Hoc Committee  
Computer Center, Member  
of Ad Hoc Committee

Annette TenElshof will chair the subcommittee.

This is an extremely important job. I appreciate the time and effort which all of you are asked to give to this assignment.

mb

cc Dr. John Breazeale

Re: "Rank and Due Process for Administrators/Professionals at Wichita State University"

The Library/Media Resources faculty have long held status as <sup>teaching</sup> faculty at Wichita State University and, in view of the AAUP Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians, would consider that application of this document to them is a step backwards in the integration of the Library with the learning function of the University.

The Library/Media Resources faculty carefully considered the document and voted to recommend that its application in the Library/Media Resources Center be limited to the administrative officers, that is, the Director and two Associate Directors.

To modify the document the following changes are proposed:

<u>page</u>	<u>section</u>	<u>recommended change</u>
2	II,6. Sector II, e	add the words "and the Office of the Director, Library/Media Resources Center"
3	II,6. Sector IV	strike the entire Sector
12	IV,B, 2	strike "Library--Library Media Resources Center-- Media Resources"
13	IV,B, 2	add to "Deans' Offices of the Teaching Colleges..." the words "and the Office of the Director, Library/Media Resources Center"

It is apparent that no further action can take place this year on the Report on Rank and Due Process for Administrators. Nevertheless, the University is faced with the following realities:

1. That the University has made a number of administrative appointments for next year and that there are several more to be made in the next few weeks. In those appointments already made, the past practice of awarding academic rank without departmental designation has been followed. It is the Institutional intent to follow that same practice in the appointments yet to be made until such time as action on the ad hoc Committee report on Rank and Due Process for Administrators has been completed.
2. Several persons holding administrative appointments and academic rank without departmental designation, and with no teaching assignments, will complete six years of probationary service during the coming year. The following options exist relative to their review:
  - a. They may <sup>elect or instructed</sup> be directed to the standard tenure review process and tenure awarded if they pass that review.
  - b. They may <sup>review</sup> be reviewed under an ad hoc process patterned on that proposed in the Report on Rank and Due Process for Administrators and awarded a "continuing appointment" if they pass that review.

It is the Institutional intent to follow option <sup>"a" or</sup> "b" until such time as there is approval, approval with modifications, or disapproval of the Rank and Due Process for Administrators document by the Senate and the faculty.

I believe it is appropriate that the Senate know of the intended Institutional behavior during the interval which will exist until some action can be taken on the Rank and Due Process for Administrators document, and that it have the opportunity, if it should wish to do so, to express its sense of the appropriateness of these actions.

I therefore request that the President of the Senate inquire as to whether there is any wish on the part of the members of the Senate to express their sense of the appropriateness of the proposed Institutional action on the two items mentioned above.

One of the responsibilities of any University program is that of self-evaluation, specifically the evaluation of its practices and their effects on participating members. In an effort to meet that responsibility in as a sophisticated manner as possible, the Executive Council of the WSU Honors Program directed that such an evaluation be made. Therefore, in March, 1976, Alayne Marker, under the supervision of Mario Dennis the Honors Counselor, developed a set of questions designed to measure: (1) whether or not the Program was meeting the expectations of its members, (2) strong points of the Program, (3) weak points of the Program, and (4) to provide an opportunity for honors students to offer meaningful feedback to the Honors Coordinator and Counselor, as well as the Executive Committee.

The instrument employed contained 36 multiple and forced choice questions plus nine open-ended and essay questions. The format rendered 39 questions capable of computer processing. The six remaining questions are not amenable to simple analysis, and their answers will be used primarily by the Coordinator.

Each of the 438 students in the Program received a questionnaire and cover letter in the mail. Although individual responses were and are confidentially maintained, each questionnaire had a code number which was checked against a master roster. Those students who had not returned their questionnaire within 7 days received a follow-up postcard urging them to mail it (postage paid) as soon as possible. The final return rate was 46.80%, somewhat below expectations, but still sufficiently high to assume some degree of validity.

After receipt of all questionnaires, the results were coded, key-punched and verified. Mr. Dennis handled all aspects of computer programming and statistical analysis of the data.

## RESULTS

The first item of interest to be examined was the return pattern. More specifically, did the questionnaires returned accurately reflect the demographic make-up of the Program? Table 1 below demonstrates the starting similarity of class break-downs for the returns and the actual Program membership.

Table 1

### Class Breakdowns for Returns and Actual Membership.

	RETURN	ACTUAL
Freshman	27.9 %	27.5 %
Sophomore	27.9 %	27.7 %
Junior	16.7 %	17.9 %
Senior	25.5 %	25.5 %
Other	2.0 %	1.4 %
Total	100.0 %	100.0 %