



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1992-1993

Volume VI

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of September 14, 1992

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
The Wichita State University

ROOM 126 CH

PLEASE NOTE TIME! 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, September 14, 1992

Order of Business:

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
- II Informal Statements and Proposals
- III. President's Report
- IV. Approval of Minutes
- V. New Business
 - 1. Library/MRC and Ad Hoc Committee report (2nd reading)
 (3:00 - 3:45) Canary Attachment on August 31 Agenda
- VI. New Business
 - 1. Program Review (3:45 - 4:30) (Provost Cottle's
 recommendations are due September 11). Report from members of
 the University Advisory Committee. If printed report is
 available, we will try to deliver it prior to the meeting.
 - 2. Report of Task force on Perception of Administrators
 Effectiveness (4:30 - 5:00)
- VII. As May Arise.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Kathryn Griffith, President	3165	Box 17
Keith Williamson, Vice President	3185	Box 31
Joyce Cavarozzi, Secretary	3541	Box 53
James Clark, President-Elect	3220	Box 78
Albert Gosman, Elected by Senate	3402	Box 35
John Dreifort, Elected by Senate	3150	Box 45
Elmer Hoyer, Apptd by Sen. Pres.	3415	Box 44
A. J. Mandt, Past President	3125	Box 74



The
Wichita
State University

6a

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans, Directors, & Chairpersons
FROM: Academic Advisory Committee
SUBJECT: Program Review Appeals
DATE: September 11, 1992

The timeline for the academic program review process stipulates that colleges, departments, or other academic units which report to the provost may file an appeal to the provost's first draft recommendations which are being released today. Those appeals are due by September 25, with the provost's final recommendations to be released on October 9.

The academic advisory committee will serve as the hearing committee for all appeals, with the full participation of the provost in all hearings. We have developed the appeals process described below to help ensure that all participants are given a full and fair opportunity to appeal any aspect of the provost's draft recommendations.

Appeals Process for Program Review

Written appeals -- All appeals must be made in a written statement which identifies the recommendation which is being appealed, the rationale for the appeal, and the alternative action which is desired. Please deliver 13 copies of the appeal to the provost's office by 4:00 pm on September 25 for immediate distribution to the academic advisory committee.

Oral appeals -- If you wish to make an oral appeal to the committee, those sessions will be scheduled on Tuesday, September 29 (and Wednesday, September 30, if necessary). Appellants will be given approximately 5 minutes for a summary statement and 10 minutes to respond to questions from the committee. Longer time allocations can be made for especially complex appeals, or if the committee determines that more time is required for a full discussion of the issues involved. Please indicate your desire to make an oral statement when you submit your written appeal. Appellants will be notified of their appeal time on Monday, September 28. Because of the very tight time schedule on which we must work, we will not be able to schedule appeal hearings around other commitments.

Committee recommendations -- After all oral appeals have been presented, the academic advisory committee will meet without the provost to determine its recommendations to the provost. The committee may take straw votes on individual appeals, but not until all appeals have been heard and discussed. The recommendations of the committee will be conveyed to the provost in writing, and will be discussed with him at a separate meeting of the committee.

Provost's final recommendations -- The plan of action contained in the provost's final recommendations will be determined solely by the provost. While it is expected that he will listen carefully to the appeals and the recommendations of the advisory committee, he is in no way bound to accept any of those appeals or recommendations.

The academic advisory committee consists of the chairs of each of the college or divisional advisory committees, two faculty elected by the Faculty Senate, and one faculty appointed by the provost. David Alexander has been elected by the committee to serve as its chair. Questions about the appeal process may be directed to him (x3988, box 32) or to the other committee members.

Committee members:

David Alexander	Physics	Charles Burdsal	Psychology
Joyce Cavarozzi	Performing Arts	Albert Gosman	Mech. Eng.
Elmer Hoyer	Electrical Eng.	Dennis Kear	Curr. & Instr.
David Kemme	Economics	Susan Kruger	Nursing
Jack McCormick	Chemistry	Charles Romig	Couns., Educ.
David Soles	Philosophy		& School Psych.

FACULTY SENATE
The Wichita State University

The Minutes of the Meeting of September 14, 1992

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alexander, Allen, R. Armstrong, Bajaj, Behrman, Benson, Billings, Brady, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Chopra, Clark, Daugherty, Davis, Dreifort, Duell, Erickson, Farnsworth, Fisher, Gosman, Griffith, Gythiel, Hawley, Horn, Hoyer, Hundley, Jeffers, Kahn, Koppenhaver, Mandt, Masud, May, Merriman, Murphey, Parkhurst, Pitetti, Romig, Shanahan, Sheffield, Teshome, Thomson, Wherritt, Williamson, Yeager
MEMBERS ABSENT: Bair, Bereman, Berger, Martin, Moore, Murdock, Widener, Zytow
GUESTS: Kelly, Schad, Vincent

Summary of Action Taken:

1. Motion passed to send the Senate Library/MRC report to the Rules Committee with instructions to consider the impact on MRC, and to consider the size and representation of the committee.
 2. Motion passed to approve the Ad Hoc Library Committee report, and endorse the strategies outlined, but to note that special recommendations as to budget and personnel will have to be considered in light of the university's total needs.
 3. Motion passed that the Ad Hoc Library Committee report be monitored by the current Library/MRC Committee until any new committee is instituted.
 4. Elected Treva Lichti to the Scholarship and Student Aid Committee, and Jolynne Campbell Senator for Health Professions, and Arlene Moore Senator for Academic Services.
 5. Motion passed to request additional information from Provost Cottle where his recommendations differed from College recommendations, to ask college faculties to meet and respond to the report, and to request more information from the Provost on the deployment of new academic resources.
- I. CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER. The meeting was called to order at 3:00 by President Griffith.
- II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS. There were none.
- III. PRESIDENT'S REPORT.
- a. Shirley Palmer, Chair of the Board of Regents, will meet with the Executive Committee September 22. She has agreed to stay and meet with Senate members at 3:30 p.m.. Senators wishing to attend the meeting should notify President Griffith.
 - b. The Presidential Search Committee is unanimous that the new president should be someone who can bring us together.
 - c. The Senate response to the Program Review is due October 20. The Budget Committee report is due September 25. President Griffith has asked the chair of that committee, Senator Clark, to chair the Senate Program Review Committee. Senator Gosman from Engineering, who is on the University Program Review Committee, has been appointed in order to give that perspective. President Griffith asked that Senators from each division select from their division a representative to the committee.
 - d. The Centennial Committee is beginning work.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES. Senator Bajaj moved to approve the minutes of August 24. Senator Armstrong seconded. Minutes were approved.

V. OLD BUSINESS.

1. Library/MRC and Ad Hoc Committee Report. (second reading). Senator Duell said she had two concerns regarding the recommendation to make the Senate committee exclusively Library: (1) It doesn't help us to give up oversight of MRC at a time when it is developing electronic classrooms, etc. (2) It is not wise to have more committees. Senator Duell moved to send the report to the Senate Rules Committee. Senator Carroll seconded. Senator Murphey said an entire year was spent on committee structure, with an objective to cut down on the size and numbers. Senator Dreifort said the idea was to get more senior faculty involved. He said his concern was coordinating these recommendations with others on campus now. There was no coordination of infrastructure reports. Is there any long range plan now? AVP McDougall said that information services proposals are coordinated with a set of actions designed for future facilitation.

Senator Clark said that as chair of the Rules Committee, he would like more comments on size and structure of the Library Committee. Senator Alexander said that strict representation is often not necessary. He would rather look for the right people. That would make for thoughtful appointment, not strict representation. AVP McDougall said that as the committee went through the evaluation process, representatives didn't always have an understanding of how the library affected other colleges. The collection development needs close contact with college representatives and/or deans. Senator Mandt said we should listen to the advice of the committee handling these issues. We should instruct the Rules Committee to consider what this does to MRC, and to consider the size and representation of the committee. Motion passed.

There was discussion of the Ad Hoc Library Committee report. AVP McDougall said that Senator Mandt had asked what the committee wanted the Senate to do. He said it would be beneficial to have the plan endorsed. Senator Dreifort said he did not believe there had been enough discussion among the faculty to endorse the report. He moved to receive it. Senator Masud seconded. Senator Alexander said he did not disagree with anything in the Executive Summary and Strategy. He wanted to know the degree to which resource implications are built into the budget. What is the likelihood we can do this? Senator Horn asked what the current EFT was. Dean Jasper Schad said 25 EFT, which is below comparable urban universities our size. He said he never took this report as being immediately above all other priorities, just what the library should be doing. It sets a direction, it describes our aspirations. Senator Clark asked if we leave out the 6 million for a building, how much does the 2.8 million take us toward parity. Dean Schad said it would take us above where our peers are today.

Senator Dreifort said he endorsed the concepts within the document. How does it fit into the totality of university funding needs? While this could be a framework for the future, he is still concerned with how it fits in the global scheme. Senator Murphey asked if we will be any better prepared to endorse this after only accepting it. Senator Daugherty suggested to approve the report and endorse the strategies outlined, but to note that the special recommendations as to budget and personnel will have to be considered in light of the university's total needs. Senator Alexander moved to substitute this for Senator Dreifort's motion. Senator Wherritt seconded. The motion to substitute passed. The substitute motion passed without dissent.

Senator Wherritt moved that this report be monitored by the current Library/MRC Committee, and it should report to the Senate as appropriate until any new committee is instituted. Senator Mandt seconded. Motion passed without dissent.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Senator Mandt moved to suspend the rules and take up the election of new members. Senator Fisher seconded. Motion passed. The Rules Committee made the following recommendations: Treva Lichti to be appointed to the Scholarship and Student Aid Committee, Jolynne Campbell, nominated by her division, to fill the Senate vacancy in Health Related Professions, and Arlene Moore, recommended by her division, to fill the Senate vacancy in Academic Services. Senator Clark moved to accept the nominations. Senator Murphey seconded. The motion passed unanimously to approve the nominations.

1. PROGRAM REVIEW. Senator Alexander, Chair of the University Program Review Committee, said discussions had been free and open. There were no preconceived ideas on anyone's part that weren't open to discussion, and outcomes were different. These are the Provost's recommendations, not the committee's, but everyone had the opportunity to state and re-state a case, and in doing so changed the outcome. Senator Merriman asked at what point in the discussions did undergraduate education become privileged. Senator Alexander said on Wednesday when the Provost identified potential resources. Senator Horn asked what was the motivation for giving up M.A. programs. Was there criteria? Senator Alexander said LAS was where most were eliminated. The college report didn't give programs priority. The question asked was is the institution well served by focusing on small programs rather than large one. Senator Murphey said he was concerned by the precedent that might be set by this process for the future. It seemed to call for extensive change and extensive faculty work, yet there was no faculty vote, not even in colleges. Is that the process we want in the future? We have given up a lot of faculty governance. Senator Hoyer said he agreed in some respect. Department reports were done with faculty. College committees had little contact with faculty because of time. The final college reports were due before faculty came back in the fall.

Senator Sheffield said the Dean of LAS said, "I'm going to do this because if I don't they'll do this across the street." This raises procedural questions. The Graduate School was not systematically consulted in this process. Programs targeted for elimination have been through two Regents program reviews, and this was not addressed.

Senator Mandt asked how much of a gap was there with information between recommendations and departmental level information base. Senator Alexander said the college committee chairs were knowledgeable about the department reports and gave detailed information.

Senator Billings asked why cut a M.A. if it doesn't save us anything. It seems as if the underlying principle is to the strong go the spoils and the weak to the wall. This is not appropriate to this reconstruction. The 'trickle down' approach is never appropriate for the academic world. She asked what LAS people thought about moving to "Health and Human Resources." Senator Duell said she was bothered by not accepting the process. We had approved it. Senator Mandt pointed out there were outside time constraints. Senator Mandt moved we: (1) Request

a more detailed report and justification in the case of Provost recommendations that differ from College recommendations; (2) Request the faculties of each college or unit meet, discuss and make recommendations of the proposals related to their college; (3) Request more information from the Provost on the possible or likely deployment of new academic resources, if they are made available. Senator Billings seconded. Senator Hoyer said it is important to meet with college representatives and get a feel for rationale. He said he would be more comfortable knowing if these recommendations are serial or parallel. He said he is uncomfortable with parallel. Senator Alexander said there are only four specific items on the list not recommended by the college, and two of the four deal with two colleges.

Senator Dreifort asked when the financial recommendations surfaced. Senator Alexander said late Wednesday morning. There has not been any discussion of details as to how the money would be used. That's a point of concern within our committee as well. Senator Dreifort said he is concerned about whether we can reallocate this money. Senator Hoyer said there was no guarantee. Thirty million dollars of our ninety-nine million dollar budget is non-academic. Senator Benson said he supported Senator Mandt's motion. He said President Armstrong had said Administration of Justice Outreach would be eliminated; Provost Cottle, the following week, mentioned the reestablishment of Outreach. Senator Campbell said her college recommendation was not to eliminate the M.A. in Gerontology. Senator Parker asked for clarification of the 3% total cut. Senator Alexander said 1% a year for 3 years, and that total amount would be permanent.

Senator Sheffield said that Senator Alexander says the College reports were accepted. These are Dean's reports, not Faculty reports. The faculty have not spoken collectively.

Senator Kahn asked if the committee gave any consideration as to how elimination of Gerontology, Sociology and Political Science areas helps our urban mission. Senator Alexander said there was heated discussion. He said again that this was the Provost's report, not the committee's. Senator Duell said the College of Education had the opportunity for input. Senator Mandt said that was not applicable to all, and it was not the same as a total faculty debate. Senator Williamson said we need to build into all processes total faculty discussion. Senator Hoyer said the College of Engineering did have a complete faculty meeting. Senator Alexander said he didn't think any of the people involved in making the process thought of it as setting a precedent. It met specific external circumstances. He said our job is to make certain our decisions and opinions are heard. LAS did have a meeting. Senator Hawley said the College Committee had to sign whether it agreed with the Dean or not. The College of Health Related Professions was the only College that disagreed. Senator Billings expressed concern about the implications or recommendations that affected other colleges.

Senator Erickson said we need to reconsider why we maintained a silence on Friday when we could have made an impact, and were discussing it now when it wouldn't.

Senator Daugherty said at some point she hoped the Senate would recognize the Committee's work. She thinks Wichita College has real possibilities.

Senator Carroll said the statement on the documents says the college committee agrees. Maybe it should have a place that also say "support."

Senator Alexander said the University Program Review Committee met this afternoon without the Provost. The general sense is that we could concur with the overall recommendations, although we would raise concerns about specific items, and we want to talk about these more.

Senator Carroll asked how we could operationalize Senator Mandt's recommendations by September 30. Senator Mandt said Senator Carroll misunderstood his proposal. He was suggesting advise from the college faculty, particularly where there were differences in the report recommendations. We have not had reason to meet as a faculty. He thinks it would strengthen the Provost's hand. He said we could persuade the college committee to agree with us. We are stronger if faculties are all on board.

Senator Kahn asked if there was any prioritization if full money is not given. Senator Hoyer said it is one of the concerns of the committee. Senator Davis asked what is non-academic affairs. Senator Mandt said two thirds of it is under VP Lowe's.

The motion passed with no dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Cavarozzi, Faculty Senate Secretary