



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1990-1991

Volume IV

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of September 10, 1990

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Room 126 CH

3:30 pm

Meeting Notice: Monday, September 10, 1990

Order of Business:

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
- II. Informal Proposals and Statements
 1. Continuation of report to the Faculty Senate - Dave Alexander
 - c. Report on activities since the last Senate meeting
 - d. Discussion of issues for the fall
- III. Approval of Minutes of April 30, May 7, and May 14
- IV. New Business
 1. Nominations to fill vacancies - Rules Committee
 2. Faculty Benefits Comparison - Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 1)
 3. Grading Standards and Practices - a resolution

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dave Alexander, Senate President	Box 32	3190
Bob Wherritt, Senate Vice President	Box 33	3160
Jolynne Campbell, Senate Secretary	Box 43	3147
A. J. Mandt, President-Elect	Box 74	3125
James Clark, Elected by Senate	Box 78	3220
Mira Merriman, Elected by Senate	Box 67	3555
Elmer Hoyer, Appointed by Senate President	Box 44	3415

THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
Interdepartmental Memorandum

DATE: October 17, 1989
TO: Faculty Affairs Committee
FROM: Elmer A. Hoyer, President, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Faculty Benefits

The determination of the distribution or array of faculty benefits offered to faculty members and the level to which these benefits are funded by the State of Kansas is an issue which needs continuous evaluation. At a recent ad hoc Regents committee on benefits and retirement, the seven Regents institutions were asked to give three benefits not now received which they should consider asking the legislature to fund. Questions were asked at that meeting about the level of funding obtained at peer institutions for these benefits. In large part, this information was not available for this meeting.

CHARGE: To better equip the Faculty Senate President in representing faculty interests in obtaining faculty benefits.

1. Determine a complete list of faculty benefits along with their current funding level provided by the State of Kansas for WSU, KU and KSU faculty. Identify also the faculty member's contributions, both required and optional levels, to obtain these benefits.
2. Do a survey of at least 2 peer institutions (one being Virginia Commonwealth) and at least 2 Doctoral I institutions relative to the types of benefits provided and to the state funding level and required or optional contributions by the faculty member for these benefits. Please coordinate with Dr. Scott's office to avoid duplication of effort.

It is important that this information be available to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for the coming Legislative session for use as input to the Regents. Please report back to the Executive Committee on phase 1 of the charge by the end of the Fall 89 semester and phase 2 by February 1, 1990.

2a

May 14, 1990

TO: Elmer A. Hoyer, President, Faculty Senate

FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee AR

SUBJECT: Faculty Benefit Comparison

In response to the Faculty Senate's request for a comparison of faculty benefits, the committee collected some preliminary information by contacting the benefit officers at two peer institutions (Virginia Commonwealth University and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee) and two doctoral institutions (the University of Nebraska and the University of Oklahoma), in addition to the benefit officer at WSU. The names of the benefit officers are listed below. The information was collected through telephone calls. Because of the complexity and diversity of benefit programs and their administration and because of the ad hoc approach in data collection, the information presented below is by no means complete nor fully accurate. The committee does not encourage the public use of the information presented below. Instead, the committee recommends that, if the Senate wishes to pursue faculty benefit issues, it should compile and analyze more comprehensive information with the help of benefit specialists and with the support of university administration. With this caveat in mind, the committee wishes to note a couple of salient points based on the information collected.

1. University or state contributions to faculty retirement plan are similar among WSU, Virginia Commonwealth University and the University of Nebraska at 7% to 8% of faculty salary. The University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee makes a higher contribution at 10%. The University of Oklahoma makes a significantly higher rate at 15%. In terms of university contribution, WSU (for that matter, all Regents institutions in Kansas) is not favorably compared. More detailed comparisons require a consideration of such aspects as the vesting period, the nature of faculty contribution (mandatory or voluntary), and the availability and range of optional plans.
2. Health care benefits for WSU faculty trail those of the institutions contacted. It appears that the total cost of family coverage runs approximately \$300 per month. Faculty share is about 1/3 of this cost at Virginia Commonwealth and only about 10% at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee whereas the share is about 80% for WSU faculty. It appears that faculty share at the University of Nebraska and the University of Oklahoma is smaller than that at WSU, although they are greater than those at the two peer institutions.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY BENEFITS

I. Institutions and Primary Contacts

- A. Wichita State University
Vangie S. Chavez - (316) 689-3065
- B. Virginia Commonwealth University
Alice Ann Clifton - (804) 786-0566
Jane Eaton - (804) 367-0399
- C. University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
Terry Wellin - (414) 229-4374
- D. University of Nebraska
Mary Jane England - (402) 472-3751
- E. University of Oklahoma
Jean Davis - (405) 325-2935

II. Benefits

A. Retirement pension plan

- 1. WSU
Faculty members contribute 5% of gross salary and University contributes 8%
- 2. VCW
University contributes 7.25% of faculty salary to the Virginia Supplementary Retirement System. No mandatory faculty contribution to the VSRS. Faculty have an option to join TIAA and other tax deferred annuity plans.
- 3. UW-M
University contributes 10% of gross earnings to the Wisconsin Retirement Plan. Five percent is vested immediately and another 5% is vested at age 55. Faculty have an option to join other tax deferred retirement plans. A formula benefit plan is available to faculty who have served 30 years or more, with benefits ranging from 50% to 65% of the earnings of the three highest earnings years.
- 4. NU
Two options available:
 - a. Faculty contributes 5.5% and university 7.5%
 - b. Faculty contributes 3.35% and university 5.5%
- 5. OU
Faculty contributes 6% of gross salary up to \$40,000 to the Teacher Retirement System and university contributes 15% of salary over \$9000 to TIAA.

B. Social Security Contribution

All institutions currently contribute 7.51% faculty salary to the Social Security Funds.

C. Death and Disability Benefits

1. WSU
Death benefit is 100% of annual salary. Disability benefit is 65% of annual salary available until age 65 or retirement. Benefit is offset by awards from Social Security. University contributes .06% of gross salary
2. VCW
Death benefits: 200% of annual salary for natural death and 400% for accidental death. Disability is covered by the Virginia Supplemental Retirement System with benefit depending on the nature of disability and salary.
3. UW-M
University subsidizes 1/3 of the premium of the State Group life Insurance up to the benefit three times of salary.
4. NU
Death benefit is \$20,000 and an extra \$20,000 for accidental death. Disability benefit is either 66 2/3% of income replacement or 50% of salary.
5. OU
Death benefit is 150% of annual salary. Disability benefit is 66 2/3% of annual salary.

C. Health Insurance

1. WSU
University pays the group health and partial dental insurance premium for faculty members (at an average cost of \$152.03 per month) and subsidizes premiums for family coverage (at an average cost of \$47.81 per month).
2. VCW
University pays premium for faculty members if they choose Blue Cross and Blue Shield Insurance. Otherwise they pays a portion of premium. University subsidizes \$195.96 for family coverage and faculty pays \$102.12 per month.
3. UW-M
University pays up to 90% of the standard health plan for both faculty and family. Ten plans available and 6 months waiting period.
4. NU
Seven different plans available to faculty at an average cost of \$84.64 for medical and \$5.32 for dental. For spouse and children the average cost to faculty is \$133.04.
5. OU
Single coverage for faculty is fully paid by university. Faculty pays family coverage ranging from \$128.28 to \$261.00 depending on rank and salary.

D. Workers Compensation

1. WSU
University contributes .01% of gross salary.
2. VCW
Information not available
3. UW-M
Faculty is eligible for compensation under the state plan.
4. NU
University contributes .02% of gross salary.
5. OU
Information not available

E. Unemployment Compensation

1. WSU
University contributes .03% of gross salary.

Information from other institutions is unavailable.

DRAFT RESOLUTION

Preamble: It appears to be the policy or practice in several colleges to base evaluations of faculty members in part on whether or not individual faculty members assign student grades according to a standard, preferred curve or distribution, defined by the college administration. The working assumption appears to be that it is a mark of quality in a professor to assign lower grades, or to achieve a specific overall grade point average, or grade distribution.

Resolved:

- 1) That assignment of grades is a faculty prerogative, as recognized in the Faculty Handbook (section 5.051);
- 2) That administrative definition of standards of evaluation in the assigning of grades constitutes a violation of the right of faculty to determine and assign grades;
- 3) That imposing a fixed grading standard, or requiring a specific grade point average, or grade distribution, without permitting the exercise of professional discretion by individual faculty members responsible for a course, constitutes "prejudiced or capricious academic evaluation" within the meaning of what the Student Bill of Rights prohibits (Faculty Handbook, Appendix G);
- 4) That requiring faculty to engage in prejudicial or capricious evaluation, or inducing them to do so, constitutes a violation of faculty rights;
- 5) That the Senate inform the Student Government Association of its conclusion that the Student Bill of rights is being violated with respect to standards of academic evaluation;
- 6) That the Senate consider means of enforcing faculty rights in the assignment of grades, and the rights of both students and faculty to be free from arbitrary, prejudiced, or capricious evaluations of their work.

FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Meeting of September 10, 1990

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alexander, Bair, A. Bajaj, P. Bajaj, Baldrige, Baxter, Billings, Brady, Breazeale, Brewer, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Clark, Combs, Daugherty, Davison, Duell, Erickson, Foster, Gosman, Griffith, Gythiel, Hartman, Haydon, Hoyer, Hubbard, Huckstadt, Huntley, Kruger, Lee, Mandt, J. Merriman, M. Merriman, O'Flaherty, Olivero, Parkhurst, Perel, Rogers, Sethi, Sweney, Webb, Wherritt, Yeager, Yeotis

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ackerman, Armstrong, Henson, Christensen, Horn, Izbicki, Johnson, Kelly, Lambert, Lansing, Soles

GUESTS: Brunner, C. Perel, Pangburn

Summary of Action Taken:

- 1) Approved the minutes of April 30, May 7, and May 14 as distributed
- 2) Motion to receive Faculty Benefits Comparison Report. Passed.
- 3) Motion that Draft Resolution on Grading Standards and Practices be sent to appropriate committee for investigation. Passed.

I. The meeting was called to order by Pres. Alexander at 3:30 p.m.

II. INFORMAL PROPOSALS AND STATEMENTS:

Senator J. Merriman invited all senators and their colleagues to an AAUP reception for new faculty on Friday, September 14, at the Shadow Lake Clubhouse.

Senator Clark requested that the canceled workshop on Copyright Law be rescheduled.

Senator Billings expressed her concern that problems continue to occur in McKinley. The Safety Committee needs to get going on the problems.

Senator Erickson expressed his concern over the decimation of KMWU.

Senator Mandt asked in what way would the Senate be expressing its opinion on hiring the executive search firm. He asked for a Sense of the Senate vote under NEW BUSINESS.

Senator Wherritt also requested a vote, but thought waiting until NEW BUSINESS would be too late for needed discussion. Pres. Alexander said he would stop remarks at 4:15 and take time for the vote.

Senator Duell asked if there was a roster of members. She suggested that the membership be made known. Senator Mandt replied that it was published in the Sunflower.

Senator Duell remarked that Senate elections are not handled well on occasions. She suggested that the Rules Committee charge one of the Senate committees as a nomination committee, at least one week before the elections occur. Senator Mandt said the Rules committee would take note

and that the nominations along with the new Senate's membership be distributed to senators

of the request.

Senator Yeager asked what effect the donation of the Derby building would have on the library fund. D. Alexander responded that he would pass the question on to the Advisory Committee on Advancement.

1. Continuation of Report to the Faculty Senate

Faculty Handbook Update. All the changes were reviewed and approved by the FS Executive committee. Any comments on the changes are welcome. Does the Senate think that the Handbook needs to be broken up into parts: a policy handbook and a personnel handbook. Senator Gosman asked for the rationale for the changes. Pres. Alexander said the majority were due to Senate actions and the others were due to editing, spelling. The exception was the Substance Abuse Policy which was mandated by the Federal Government.

Two New Committees Formed. The Capital Improvement Committee and the Advisory Committee on Advancement. Their status is still a matter of debate. The CI committee is charged with the review of long range planning. It has two faculty members: Ben Rogers and Nancy Brooks. The ACA is composed entirely of faculty and is the liaison between the faculty and the Board of Governors. It is to report to the FS periodically.

Review of Tenured Faculty. The issue was mandated by the Regents. Modifications were sent to Topeka, however, "Productivity" remains problematic. The Regents defined a nonproductive faculty member as one who has received less than the maximum salary increase in 2 or 3 years. The issue will be addressed in the future but will be difficult.

Mill Levy Budget Development. The Administration asked for faculty involvement as the mill levy budget was being developed. In every case, the recommendations of the FS Exec. Committee appeared in the budget as approved by the Board of Trustees. Since that time, however, the County Assessor has revised the estimates of the income from the mill levy. Therefore, the budget must be revised. The final numbers have not been decided on, but the following is an overview of the budget:

	FY 1990	FY 1991
Debt Service	765,616	809,886
Student Support	743,000	788,300
Econ and Community Support	573,000	682,000
Facilities Devel.	350,000	0
Faculty Support	331,000	638,100
University Support	264,600	296,775
Total	3,028,116	3,215,061

Non-recurring & Carryover monies: New Initiatives

Faculty Recruit/Retention	125,000
Computer Resources	52,959
Library	60,000
Academic Capital Equipment	155,000
Other Infrastructure	65,000
Total	457,959

The budget in 1990 was prepared with the anticipation that money would be utilized for bond repayments, but the bonds were not let. The mill levy budget finds itself in an unusual situation for fiscal 1991 since it was also anticipated that money would be needed for bonds. There are, therefore, monies that are non-recurring items that are carried over from the current year. Some of these items are of direct faculty interest and are represented in the new budget. These are the items the Exec Committee made recommendations on and they speak directly to the results of the infrastructure study conducted last year. Three new programs were proposed to enhance faculty recruitment and retention:

1. Support for new faculty following the first year of service at TWSU. Proposals could come from departments across campus.
2. Research support in areas where external support is nonexistent.
3. Either research or instructional support for faculty to develop or redevelop existing or new instructional programs, or for faculty to retool or develop new research area.

Computer Resources: Really a budget balancing item. It is to support the accessing of faculty to the computer system (ISN system or NSF system off campus, for example.)

Library: To improve the library electronic access since money is scarce for journals. Need to develop faculty expertise in this area.

Academic Capital Equipment: Is small amount but is a beginning. Part of the money was already promised, so \$95,000 is new money.

Senator Rogers asked if the \$95,000 new money had been a recurring line item, and Pres. Alexander replied no.

There was some discussion on the use of money for the library and the rationale behind its allocation.

Pres. Alexander discussed the four vacant positions in the central administration. The purpose of the Definition committees was addressed. Some time was spent on the Dean of Faculty position. The Dean could serve primarily as a personnel officer for the faculty: to review T & P, to review merit increases. The policy issues could be separate from personnel issues.

The composition of the Definition Committees is still undergoing discussion. It will be arrived at by mutual agreement among the FS Executive Committee, President Armstrong and VP Breazeale.

Senator Rogers asked about reports from the Definition Committees. Pres. Alexander replied that they would report directly to Pres. Armstrong and hopefully, in a timely manner, to the FS. Since time is getting on, we must move quickly.

Some discussion followed concerning the Dean of Faculty position description. Pres. Alexander reminded the FS that the Dean of Faculty was a three-year rotating position, to be hired internally. We can be working on that now, possibly as quickly as January. The VP of Research is also in interim position to be appointed internally. The external searches will occur later.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES from April 30, May 7, and May 14.

Senator Perel moved to approve the minutes as distributed. Senator Bajaj seconded the motion.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

1. Nominations to Fill Vacancies. Senator Mandt reported that the Rules Committee would be meeting on September 11 for nominations.

2. Faculty Benefits Comparison. The Faculty Affairs Committee was asked to look into the matter. See the report of May 14.

Senator Baxter asked about the benefits for part-time faculty. Some discussion on their benefits, or lack thereof, followed.

Senator Gosman said the report was excellent. He said, however, that it was hard to make comparisons. Pres. Alexander concurred, but said that the summary statements were most helpful. The general sense of the report is that the Regents institutions are lagging behind the averages in salary and benefits. He said the Regents are aware of the problem. Senators Clark and Hoyer brought up the issue of 0 tuition for faculty and staff children. Senator Perel said the issue had been discussed years ago, and it was decided to increase the state's contribution to health insurance instead. Pres. Alexander said that many institutions are going to the cafeteria method to make the system more fair. The faculty is given an amount and can then choose his/her option. The FS discussed this idea at some length.

Senator Hoyer moved to receive the report. Senator Perel seconded. He requested the FS to thank the committee for their report. The motion passed.

3. Grading Standards and Practices. Senator Mandt brought forward the draft resolution for discussion. He moved that the resolution be sent by the Executive Committee to the appropriate faculty committee for investigation into current practices. Senator Perel seconded the motion.

Senator Perel suggested that a copy of the resolution be sent to the VPAA and to President Armstrong. Senator Baxter raised another point. She said that in the professional colleges, the grade is not always reflective of book work alone. Performance is included. Senator Hoyer suggested that the grading study copy be included with the materials sent to the committee.

The Senate voted on the motion. It passed.

President Alexander suggested discussion on the use of an external search firm. Senator Perel asked for a Sense of the Senate vote on the issue. Senator Lee said a synopsis of the caucus would be helpful before the vote. A lengthy discussion followed including both pro and con opinions. At 5:15, Senator Rogers reminded the Senate that a motion was on the floor. Senator Perel interjected that since it was after 5:00, he would move to adjourn. Motion was seconded and meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

correction made in minutes in Volume.

September 10, 1990 minutes:

On first page, next to last line, after the comma after nomination committee, insert:

and that the nominations along with the new Senate's membership be distributed to senators

This would make that sentence read:

She suggested that the Rules Committee charge one of the Senate committees as a nomination committee, and that the nominations along with the new Senate's membership be distributed to senators at least one week before the elections occur.