



**WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY**

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

1994-09-12 Faculty Senate meeting

Item Type	Administrative document
Authors	Faculty Senate
Citation	Faculty Senate. Agenda and minutes of the meeting of September 12, 1994. -- Faculty Senate Meetings, 1994-1995, v.8
Publisher	Wichita State University
Download date	2026-06-16 10:07:27
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/10057/14632



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1994-1995

Volume VIII

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of September 12, 1994

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 126 CH

3:00 p.m.

!!!! SPECIAL TIME !!!!

Meeting Notice: Monday, September 12, 1994

Order of Business:

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
3:00 - 4:00 Introduction and Meeting with Frank Sabatini, Chair, Kansas Board of Regents
- II. Informal Statements and Proposals
- III. Approval of Minutes
- IV. President's Report
- V. Old Business
 1. Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenurable Teachers report, (yellow attachment)
Gerald Paske, Chr., Robert Alley, Anthony Gythiel, Donna Hawley & Fred Kraft, members
- VI. New Business
- VII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Joyce Cavarozzi, President	3541	Box 53
James Clark, Past President	3220	Box 78
Donna Hawley, Vice President	3610	Box 41
Michael Kelly, Secretary	3590	Box 68
Jolynne Campbell, President-Elect	3146	Box 43
Ron Matson, Elected by Senate	3280	Box 25
Keith Williamson, Elected by Senate	3185	Box 31
Sue Bair, Appt'd by Senate Pres.	3340	Box 16

FACULTY STATUS AND UNCLASSIFIED PROFESSIONAL FULL-TIME TEACHERS

THE SITUATION

There are approximately 30-50 full-time, permanent teachers in the unclassified professional category. These non-faculty teachers do not have faculty standing and are not eligible for tenure. Most of these teachers are in the College of Health Professions.

The existence of a group of non-faculty teachers raises a number of issues such as:

(1) Since these teachers are not members of the faculty they are not subject to faculty review.

(2) Without tenure and/or tenure eligibility, the academic freedom of non-faculty teachers is compromised.

(3) The existence of a category of non-tenurable university teachers raises the question of whether any university teachers need tenure.

(4) The effect of having a group of non-faculty teachers is to separate those teachers from the faculty teachers. This separation divides and undermines the cohesion of the teaching faculty.

HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

The College of Health Professions is the newest of the colleges. The creation of CHP coincided with a national movement of transferring the primary locus of the training of nurses and other health care professionals from non-university programs to universities. The demand for university-trained health care professionals developed very rapidly and presented a unique problem for university programs in that the demand for university teachers far outstripped the availability of "qualified" personnel. (The demand was a result of the very rapid explosion of health care technology which generated an almost immediate need for highly trained health care professionals at the bachelor level.)

The problem faced by universities was not an absolute lack of qualified teachers but rather that available trained professionals did not sufficiently match the ideal of a university-level health care program. Specifically, a problem arose from the university expectation that teaching faculty have a terminal degree. Unfortunately, there were (and are) comparatively few advanced degree programs in many of the health care professions. In short, the development of university-based programs far outpaced the growth of appropriate graduate programs with the result that it was impossible to recruit a sufficient number of terminal degree health care professionals at many universities, including Wichita State.

THE RESPONSE OF THE WSU FACULTY

The health care professions were (and still are) in a state of development. It is crucial that universities offer degree programs in these areas in spite of the fact that there are insufficient graduate programs for the production of sufficient numbers of terminal degree professors.

This challenge is inherent in any developing academic discipline. It is a challenge which requires understanding and accommodation on the part of the regular university faculty. Unfortunately, the faculty at WSU failed to understand and accommodate to the problem. This manifested itself in the fact

that various tenure and promotion committees refused tenure for nominees from the college of health professions to the extent that the College of Health Care Professions would have been unable to meet its staffing needs if the administration had not utilized a new category of teachers; that of unclassified professional full-time teachers. Unfortunately, this removed such teachers from the faculty.

SUMMARY

There are currently 30-50 full-time university level teachers at WSU who do not have faculty status, who are not eligible for tenure, and who are not subject to review by the faculty. The main reason for this is that these teachers do not fit the traditional mold for university teachers. Specifically, most of them lack a recognized terminal degree of an appropriate graduate level. That is, they lack a doctorate, and there is no other degree, analogous to the MFA, which is recognized as terminal. The source of this problem lies in the fact that the development of undergraduate programs has greatly outpaced the development of graduate programs.

PROPOSED SOLUTION

On the assumption that a category of non-faculty full-time teachers is unacceptable, the following is proposed:

(1) All full-time teachers at WSU should have faculty status. It is therefore proposed that all unclassified professional full-time teachers immediately be given interim clinical faculty status (TCF). This is a new category of faculty.

(2) Interim clinical faculty will have all the rights granted to probationary faculty with the exception of tenure eligibility.

(3) Interim clinical faculty are not eligible for tenure. Any person holding an interim clinical faculty position who wishes to seek tenure must first be transferred to a regular probationary line by his department or college.

(4) The category of interim clinical faculty is to be "sunsetting" after six years. At that time, all faculty holding this rank will be terminated or transferred to regular probationary faculty status. The normal expectation is that such faculty will be transferred to regular probationary status.

(5) Within the next six years, those departments using temporary clinical faculty will develop criteria for tenure eligibility for those positions. Such criteria should be compatible with the new tenure and promotion guidelines.

Gerald Paske, Philosophy, Chair
Robert Alley, Curriculum and Instruction
Anthony Gythiel, History
Donna Hawley, Nursing
Fred Kraft, Marketing and Small Business Admin.

ON TENURING AT THE INSTRUCTOR LEVEL

RECENT BACKGROUND

During the spring of 1994, a proposal was presented to the Faculty Senate to establish a non-tenurable category of WSU teachers to be known as Faculty Associates. In the main, Faculty Associates would have a masters but not a terminal degree, although, if market forces permit, Ph.Ds could be hired as Faculty Associates. Faculty Associates would teach skill courses such as composition and beginning math. It was also proposed that they could teach introductory courses. Faculty Associates would teach 12-15 hours, but would be relieved of research and university service requirements.

This proposal was a response to the fact that instructors in skill courses are currently hired under a six-year-and-out procedure. The problems with this procedure are: (1) There are some instructors that the institution may want to retain beyond six years. (2) The procedure makes it difficult to hire the best possible instructors due to the temporary nature of the positions. (3) There is a significant cost in recruiting instructors. (4) The procedure is viewed (by some) as being unfair to those who teach skill courses.

The proposal was overwhelmingly rejected by the Faculty Senate. The main argument against the proposal was that the proposal is incompatible with the standard understanding of academic freedom and with the relationship between tenure, tenurability and academic freedom. Briefly put, the argument is that all teachers have a right to academic freedom and that tenure or tenurability is a necessary condition of academic freedom. A further concern was expressed to the effect that if the Faculty endorses a non-tenurable teaching faculty it would be very difficult to persuade the general public that some faculty members need tenure while others do not. Since the tenure system is always under attack, this possibility is an item of major concern.

THE REMAINING PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION

The rejection of a Faculty Associate category leaves the original problem unsolved. However, there seems to be a simple solution to the problem which the Faculty Senate endorses: If there are instructors who are worthy of being retained beyond six years, then those instructors should be granted tenure.

OBJECTIONS TO THE SOLUTION OF TENURING INSTRUCTORS

Many objections and/or concerns were raised with regard to tenuring instructors, the main ones being:

- (1) Tenure is a reward for the Ph.D.
- (2) The University, its faculty, and its tenure and promotion committees simply won't tenure instructors.
- (3) If we tenure instructors they will become a significant force and will undermine the regular faculty.
- (4) It is not fair to tenure instructors without requiring research while requiring research of those with the terminal degree.
- (5) It is unwise to have any University Faculty who are not required to do research.

RESPONSE TO THE OBJECTIONS

OBJECTION (1): Tenure is a reward for the Ph.D.

RESPONSE: Tenure (or tenurability) is a necessary condition for academic freedom and academic freedom is the right of teachers and/or researchers. To deny any (except probationary) teachers tenure is to cast doubt upon the need of tenure for anyone. The real rewards for the Ph.D. (as well as for publication) are to be found in the granting of higher academic ranks and in higher salary.

OBJECTION (2) The University, its faculty, and its tenure and promotion committees simply won't tenure instructors.

RESPONSE: It is true that in recent years the various tenure and promotion committees have refused to grant tenure at the instructor level. However, this practice is not supported by the university tenure and promotion document, nor do any of the college statements automatically preclude instructors from being tenured. To the contrary, the practice of routinely denying tenure at the instructor level seems to have originated as follows:

A. Before WSU joined the state system in 1965, tenure was often granted to those who lacked the terminal degree. After joining the state system the administration wished to upgrade the faculty (to match KU and KSU) and hence urged and, in some colleges, administratively required the terminal degree for tenure. While many faculty agreed with this recommendation, the matter was never discussed by the faculty. Indeed, whenever the faculty reviewed the tenure policy, the faculty retained the tenurability of the instructor rank.

B. During the late 70's and early 80's, the administration became concerned with the possibility of having too many tenured faculty with the consequence of a dangerous loss of flexibility. To avoid this, the Central Administration introduced the six-year-and-out contracts for instructors in composition and mathematics. While the regular faculty did not oppose these contracts, the existence of such contracts was never approved by the faculty.

Current practices, then, are a result of faculty acquiescence in administrative actions. Since there is little danger that the current faculty will tenure a disproportionate number of instructors, and since the feared over-tenuring of the faculty has failed to materialize, it is time for the faculty to take up the issue of whether there should be an absolute ban on tenuring at the instructor level.

OBJECTION (3) If we tenure instructors they will become a significant force and will undermine the regular faculty.

RESPONSE: At WSU, tenure is seldom granted without faculty approval and there is no reason to suppose that this will change. Thus there is no danger that there will be enough tenured instructors to constitute a significant force.

(To the contrary, were the faculty to endorse a non-tenurable Faculty Associate rank, that rank, over which the faculty would have no control, could easily expand into a significant, independent teaching faculty.)

OBJECTION (4) It is not fair to tenure instructors without requiring research, while requiring research of those with the terminal degree.

RESPONSE: Those with the terminal degree are eligible for promotion and are eligible for salaries which are considerably higher than instructor salaries. Along with these opportunities come higher expectations.

OBJECTION (5) It is unwise to have any University Faculty who are not required to do research.

This is perhaps the most serious objection to having a category of tenured university teachers who are not required to do research. The fear is that without research one becomes intellectual deadwood. This fear is a justified one.

However, whether this concern applies to the teaching of skill courses is another matter, since there is a question of whether research (as distinct from continuing education credits) is necessary for the teaching of skill courses. This is a matter for the relevant departments to determine.

It would be expected, of course, that if the relevant departments wish to propose tenure for instructors, those departments would formulate tenure requirements in such a manner as to ensure that tenured instructors would not become deadwood. Whether continuing education credits, or some other activities, are sufficient for this is for the departments to decide.

CONCLUDING REMARK

All that is being recommended is that the current automatic rejection of tenuring at the instructor level be rejected by the faculty and that the opportunity of tenuring instructors be returned to the departments. The departmental recommendations, of course, would have to be approved by the college and university tenure and promotion committees. Such approval or disapproval should depend upon a fair examination of the cases presented by the departments, and departmental recommendations should not be automatically rejected.

If the above proposal is endorsed by the faculty, and if, subsequently, departments feel that their instructor tenure candidates are being unreasonably rejected by the college and/or university tenure committees, the departments are encouraged to bring this matter to the attention of the Faculty Senate.

FACULTY SENATE

The Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, September 12, 1994

MEMBERS PRESENT: Allen, Badgett, Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Boneh, Burk, Byrum, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Celestin, Chambers, Chaudhuri, Ciboski, Clark, Combs, G. Davis, DeSilva, Duell, Eaglesfield, Erickson, Foster, Fowler, Greywall, Gythiel, Hanrahan, Horn, Houts, Hoyer, Hundley, Kelly, Koppenhaver, Kraft, Lancaster, Mandt, Matson, Parkhurst, Patton, Paske, Schommer, Sharp, Sutterlin, Swan, Terrell, Wahlbeck, Williamson, Yeager, Zandler

MEMBERS ABSENT: Brown, Christensen, L. Davis, Gupta, Hawley, Hay, Hughes, Lansing

GUESTS: S. Krueger

SUMMARY OF ACTION:

I. CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by President Cavarozzi at 3:00 p.m.

President Cavarozzi introduced Frank Sabatini, Chair of the Kansas Board of Regents. He began by telling the Senate about the retreat taken by the members of the Board of Regents and the university presidents. They identified ten subjects and decided on the top three issues for discussion: (1) the mission of the Board and how it does business, (2) governance, and (3) communication.

The discussion concerning the mission concluded that the Board had drifted into management issues and should be concentrating more on policy issues. The Board is now trying to move in that direction. To do this they are in the process of going through all the current policies to determine if they are still valid. The Board members also feel that many of these issues should be addressed at the university level and not at the Board level. Some of the topics to be addressed at future Board meetings include (1) what is the universities impact on the economic life of the Kansas, (2) future enrollment trends, (3) student outcomes, and (4) faculty work loads.

The issue of governance will address the emerging state wide educational system and develop cooperation between the universities and the community colleges with the goal of a master plan for post-secondary education in Kansas.

The communication issue is being addressed toward the Board itself and its' need to improve communications with the universities.

Regent Sabatini closed his talk with the three main things he thinks are necessary for success in education in the future: accountability, accountability, and accountability. This needs to be our number-one priority.

Regent Sabatini then called for questions from the Senate. Senator Duell asked how we, as faculty, can best help the Board be successful. Regent Sabatini responded that because the legislature does not give much value to peer comparisons for salary we need to devise a better way to articulate our salary needs. Senator Terrel followed by asking what is the problem with peer comparisons. Regent Sabatini expressed his belief that the legislature feels that the peer data is contrived to the faculty's benefit. The Board is in the

process of updating the peer groups, but he believes that we need to come up with a another method of comparison.

Senators Lancaster and Swan asked about the mechanism in place at the community colleges to ensure a quality program and the open enrollment issue. Regent Sabatini did not have much information on this issue, but did indicate that programs at Fort Hays and Pittsburg do include coordination with the community colleges. As to the matter of open admissions, he informed the Senate that this was not on the Board's agenda, but felt that the issue will be introduced by someone.

Senators Mandt, Clark, Swan, and Paske questioned Regent Sabatini concerning student evaluations and their role in faculty evaluations. He replied that a Board task force is working on this issue right now, with a report due in September or October. He felt that the student evaluation will only be part of the evaluation process, and he expressed concern that the Board has not done a good job of articulating what faculty do. Senator Terrell recommended that the Board be aware of the concerns of the students when designing a evaluation instrument and asked for clarification if evaluations will be optional for students.

Senator Mandt commented that the communication process works best when the Board receives information from the campuses so they can tell the difference between policy problems and management problems, and he asked how this might be accomplished. Regent Sabatini replied that the Board is looking for ways for the Regents staff to be advisors to the Board, with direct communications between the university presidents and the Board.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS:

Senator Hoyer remarked what a pleasure it was to read the recent editorial concerning the new WSU general education program in the Wichita Eagle. He encouraged everyone to read it. President Cavarozzi seconded Senator Hoyer's comments and congratulated the general education task force. Senator Mandt reported on a story aired about three weeks ago on Channel 3 news showing the comparative cost of attending the three schools in Wichita. President Cavarozzi felt that sometimes we have a difficult time letting people know what a fine education they can get at WSU at a very reasonable cost.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Senator Gythiel recommended changing "Broad" on page three paragraph five to "Board". Minutes of August 29, 1994, were approved as corrected.

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT:

President Cavarozzi will be sending senators questions that Regent Hiebert has collected about faculty evaluations. This will be one of the topics to be discussed at the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents retreat. President Cavarozzi will bring back to the Senate a number of topics that we need to address, especially the issue of student evaluations.

Senator Lancaster asked if there was any mechanism for tracking how students have done in classes. Senator Carroll remarked that in the College of Education all students must pass algebra, English and speech with a "C" or better and are then required to take a standard competency test. Senator Lancaster knew of one faculty member who did track the students from his classes. Although it was a tremendous amount of work, the faculty member felt it did prove very valuable.

Senator Terrell reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluations found that only the faculty in the College of Engineering mentioned student evaluations as one of the top five evaluation criteria, and all faculty who responded rated course content, course design and course materials above student evaluations. On the other hand, responses from department chairs indicated a poor response concerning alternative methods for evaluation. He feels we may be in danger of a homogeneous, generic form for student evaluations being imposed and it will be the only thing used. President Cavarozzi said the committee report will be sent to the Senate members soon. Senator Swan remarked that the IDEA form is generally good, but the problem is with how the student evaluations are viewed. He felt that we need something credible or it will not be used.

V: OLD BUSINESS:

President Cavarozzi introduced Dr. Don Nance, President of the Unclassified Professional Senate, who was attending for the discussion about the Faculty Senate report on Unclassified Professionals. She then turned the discussion over to Senator Paske, chair of the Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Faculty Status and Unclassified Professionals.

Senator Paske recounted the genesis of the this committee. Last year the Vice President appointed a committee that had two assignments: (1) people who were teaching composition and beginning math, classes called skill courses, and (2) teachers who are in the unclassified professional status and not members of the faculty. The committee proposed a faculty associate rank whereby faculty associates could teach indefinitely, but would not be eligible for tenure. The Senate voted to reject the proposal.

The Faculty Senate then appointed this committee to look at these two areas and make recommendations. The committee divided the issue into two distinct types: (1) unclassified professional full-time teachers, and (2) skill teachers. Senator Paske informed the Senate that the report had been discussed with the Vice President, the Dean of the College of Health Professions, the Chair of the Nursing Department, and Barbara Bowman, who had expressed some concerns about the implementation, and finally with the unclassified professional teachers. He felt that one thing they all agreed to was that we must be fair because the university has entered into agreements with these individuals and we should not violate these agreements.

He reported that the main concern expressed was that if the Senate adopted this proposal, we are asking the unclassified professional teachers to join the regular faculty and to stand for tenure and promotion, without clear criteria by which they would be judged. Senator Paske suggested that the Senate approve this proposal in principle and delay its implementation for at least a year with the expectation that the affected colleges will develop criteria for tenure and promotion. He also recommended that the Faculty Senate appoint a committee from the regular faculty to coordinate this work with members of the Unclassified Professional Senate. Senator Paske then asked for questions.

Senator Hanrahan asked if the suggestions from Barbara Bowman on Affirmative Action issues were incorporated in the draft proposal. Senator Paske felt that delaying the proposal for a year would allow time for these concerns to be addressed. Senator Swan asked if the Unclassified Professional Senate will have an opportunity to fashion both the document and the criteria. Senator Paske informed the Senate that only part of the unclassified professionals on campus were involved in teaching and that this group should

have a major role to play; however, if they wanted to include a role for the whole unclassified professional group, that would be a decision for them to make. Unclassified Professional Senate President Nance said that they do want a role to play.

Senator Carroll mentioned that last year President Hughes wanted this in place as quickly as possible. She asked if there was any way to guarantee that, in this time frame, we are not going to eliminate people we want to keep by postponing the issue for another year. Senator Paske said that the matter of six years and out would be addressed in the other proposal and would defer discussion until that proposal is made.

Senator Clark asked how the proposed committee would mesh with those faculty committees currently looking at tenure and promotion guidelines and criteria. Senator Paske felt that these committees would mesh completely.

Senator Wahlbeck asked how the committee was defining full-time teachers and how to deal with those not teaching full time. Senator Paske said the same definition as for Senate membership was being used. The committee did not deal with the issue of less than full-time teachers.

Senator Paske summarized by recommending that all full-time teachers should have faculty status immediately. He explained that they would have all the rights of probationary faculty except tenure eligibility. He did indicate that what was being proposed is not in agreement with the AAUP guidelines. We have a number of people who have been teaching for a long period of time and have not been eligible for tenure and that a shift to a six-year probationary period would be unfair to them. He expressed the desire to give the people in this category a longer than-normal time to reach whatever tenure eligibility is imposed on them after they have taught for six years. As we have already been in violation of AAUP standards, he believes that this would bring us into compliance.

Senator Lancaster reminded the Senate that in the past the university gave funds and time for individuals to get a terminal degree and that he would support this type of arrangement. Senator Paske explained that it was not the issue of support, but rather the opportunities are not there for terminal degrees. He continued that the university must decide upon what the reasonable expectations are to hire at levels of advanced degrees. He said that certain disciplines are in a transitional period with the availability of individuals with advanced degrees better in some areas than other.

Senator Carroll asked when the AAUP standards were last revised? Senator Paske stated that AAUP is continuously revising its standards and that the AAUP tolerates some degree of flexibility. Senator Mandt followed up by saying that the 1940 AAUP statement is a broad statement of principles and concepts of tenure, and that every five or six years a major interpretive statement is made in light of current reality in the profession. He feels that this proposal is in the spirit of AAUP interpretation.

Senator Erickson reminded the Senate not to be hypnotized or hampered by the need for a terminal degree.

Senator Matson expressed some concern that we hadn't asked the unclassified professionals who are instructors, if they want to be faculty members. He continued that in an effort to speed up this process by taking the spirit of tenure, perhaps tenure could be extended to teachers in their current status and perhaps there are some things we haven't considered. Senator Paske replied that he felt that tenure is necessary and those people being denied tenure are being denied their right to academic freedom. He believes every teacher needs tenure. As to the idea that tenure could be extended immediately he felt that the administration would not support this.

Senator Sharp told the Senate that when the unclassified professional rank was developed it was for non-teaching positions. It was never intended to be used for teaching positions. Senator Paske said that the system has developed in an undesirable way with teachers who are not eligible for tenure and do not have academic freedom. Senator Sharp replied that these are kinds of problems that could be solved without resorting to creating a new category like the one being proposed.

Susan Krueger, Chair of the School of Nursing, explained how they had proposed a clinical track parallel to its traditional track, but the proposal was denied. The school then was told by the administration to use the unclassified professional position for teaching faculty about three years ago. It wasn't clear until program review that these people were not faculty.

Senators Terrell and Hanrahan mentioned the problems of hiring and retaining Health Professions' faculty. Both issues will have an impact on this proposal. Senator Paske agreed and said that details like the number of years in probationary status could be worked out during the coming year if the proposal was accepted in principle.

Senator Lancaster questioned the provision of the proposal that allowed for an automatic transfer to probationary status and would prefer to see a national search done. Senator Paske felt that, as a matter of fairness, a person who has worked at the university for six years in a satisfactory manner should not be required to start over.

Senator Burk questioned the statement concerning the lack of review by the faculty of members of the unclassified professional ranks. Senator Paske thanked Senator Burk for bringing this up. The committee was referring to the lack of review by the tenure and promotion committees. Senator Burk made another point that not all people in this category are in the College of Health Professions. He polled the unclassified professional teachers in his area and found they were uncomfortable with the "sunset" provision and might be more comfortable with tenure at the instructor level instead. Senator Burk asked President Nance for his comments.

President Nance commented that they would be supportive of the year of study with a joint committee. He would propose the maximum flexibility for that committee and would hope that the Faculty Senate would not endorse this proposal in such a way so this becomes the guideline for how that committee should proceed.

Senator Paske, in response to President Nance's statement, hoped that during the year of study that a solution to the problem would be found. President Nance replied that the year would be used to study, communicate with other units, study models from other institutions, identify options, and develop recommendations. Senator Paske suggested that if a better option is not brought forward, then the Faculty Senate would go forward with this proposal. President Nance asked for some understanding of the diversity of the people in the unclassified professional ranks, and he expressed reservations that the standard tenure system would satisfy everyone. A joint committee would have a better understanding of the diverse role and what can be accomplished.

Senator Williamson moved to adjourn and resume discussion at a later time. This motion was seconded by Senator Celestin. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Kelly
Secretary