



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 1995-1996

Volume IX

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of January 22, 1996

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

Room 107 CH

3:30 p.m.

Note Room Change for Spring semester

Meeting Notice: Monday, January 22, 1996

Order of Business

- I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
- II. Informal Statements and Proposals
 - A. Budget Discussion with VPAA Patton
- III. Approval of Minutes
- IV. President's Report
 - A. Vision 2020 (peach attachment)
- V. Committee Reports
 - A. Exceptions Comm. Interim Report
Elaine Steinke, Chair (blue attachment)
- VI. Old Business
- VII. New Business
- VIII. As May Arise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Jolynne Campbell, President	3146	Box 43
Joyce Cavarozzi, Past President	3541	Box 153
Helen Hundley, Vice President	3150	Box 45
Jean Eaglesfield, Secretary	3591	Box 68
Donna Hawley, President-Elect	3610	Box 41
ELECTED BY SENATE		
Keith Williamson	3185	Box 31
Sue Bair	3340	Box 16
APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT		
Walter Horn	3410	Box 44

VISION 2020

VISION 2020 is a strategy to improve the alignment of institutional priorities, resources and activities with the new realities and expectations facing the Regents universities, within their approved missions.

KEY AREAS FOR CHANGE

VISION 2020 is a multi-year initiative that seeks to prepare the Regents universities for the 21st century through targeted, intelligent and forceful change. Although the Regents universities are likely to be "doing more with less," VISION 2020 is not "downsizing." VISION 2020 is conceived as a rubric for specific changes identified and developed on the campuses of each Regents university.

VISION 2020 evolved through a series of discussions between the Board and university leadership on how to improve the learning environment at a time of diminished resources and increased expectations. These discussions came to fruition at the Board's retreat with the Council of Presidents in August 1995 with a joint decision to promote appropriate changes in the Regents universities. Subsequent discussions among Regents, the presidents, faculty, students, and staff have identified five areas targeted for change. The specific activities of VISION 2020 lie in these five areas:

1. **Curriculum and Instruction.** Each Regents university will identify and develop three key curricular and/or instructional initiatives to serve as a prelude to fundamental change in curriculum and instruction.
2. **Faculty Time and Talent.** Each Regents university will reexamine the allocation of faculty time and performance expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service ~~in order to~~ and optimize the use of institutional resources *accordingly*.
3. **Faculty Development, Support and Rewards.** Each Regents university will reexamine faculty development, support and reward systems ~~to ensure~~ and ensure appropriate recognition of diverse categories of faculty assignments and achievements.
4. **Operations and Support Processes.** Each Regents university will reexamine and reorganize accordingly all administrative operations and support processes to reduce work, increase efficiency, and increase effectiveness in achieving the institution's academic mission. *Included in this area are efforts to establish common systems, as appropriate.*
5. **Financing.** The Board of Regents and the Regents universities will continue to develop and advocate for initiatives that optimize the ability of the universities to utilize and manage financial resources, ~~including tuition accountability~~. The Board and universities will identify and seek change in state regulations that inhibit optimal administrative effectiveness. *The Board's advocacy for tuition accountability and increased delegation of local purchasing authority are examples of suggested changes in this area.*

The Regents universities will report initial plans on 1. - 4. above in May 1996 and follow-up reports in November 1996. The Board, in cooperation with the universities, will report on a plan of action for 5. in May 1996.

A PARTNERSHIP FOR CHANGE

The Board's leadership role in this initiative includes promoting a vision for fundamental changes, holding the Chancellor and Presidents responsible for constructive change in each area, and advocating for changes at the state and system levels that enhance the efficiency, responsiveness and productivity of the Regents universities. The Board will ensure that the changes respect and enhance the unique mission of each institution.

The campuses are responsible for developing and implementing appropriate change in each of the areas, providing the Board with accountability measures. In order to ensure that this initiative proceeds in an organized fashion, the Board of Regents requests that the Council of Presidents develop (1) a consistent format and timetable for reporting activities and results for each of the areas identified above, (2) a methodology to undergird VISION 2020, such as activity based costing, and (3) an evaluation process including measurable performance indicators. The Council of Presidents should report to the Board on its progress in May 1996.

**VISION 2020: TRANSFORMING THE KANSAS REGENTS UNIVERSITIES
FOR THE 21ST CENTURY**

A CONTEXT AND VISION FOR CHANGE

The Kansas Board of Regents is committed to ensuring that the Regents universities will provide high quality, accessible programs at a reasonable cost to students and the state. However, the Board and Regents universities face a variety of circumstances that challenge the ability of the state universities to fulfill this commitment at a level that Kansans expect.

1. **The Regents universities face significant resource constraints, coupled with increased competition for public funds.** The percentage share of State General Fund appropriations to the Regents universities declined from 18.4% in FY 1985 to 13.2% in FY 1995. The percentage share of all other education during the same period increased from 44.3% to 52.2%. The Kansas Director of the Budget has offered very austere recommendations for the Regents universities for FY 1997. Her recommendations for the Regents universities for FY 1997 entail a 4.4% cut from FY 1996 appropriations.
2. **The Regents universities face an increasing demand for their services and a change in demand for the mix of services provided.** Enrollment pressures on the Regents universities are unlikely to dissipate. Projections prepared by Board of Regents staff suggest that headcount enrollments at the Regents universities may increase to 85,500 by the Fall semester in 2003. An analysis of educational needs in Kansas being prepared by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems indicates an increasing need to serve more demographically diverse constituents, including place-bound adults in sparsely populated areas of the State. Increasingly, the Regents universities are asked to deliver courses customized for specific groups of students; courses/programs provided on demand; and courses delivered in nontraditional formats.
3. **Higher education is increasingly expected to anticipate educational and employment trends and to develop appropriate responses in what is taught and how it is taught.** Technological and economic change influences how students learn, how their education prepares them for employment and other post-collegiate experiences, and how they use skills and knowledge in the workplace. Successful responses to rapid technological and societal change will be grounded on a strong foundation of liberal education.
4. **The Regents universities face a continuing and intensifying public demand for accountability in the use of resources and responsiveness to public expectations.** Increasingly, accreditation agencies, the media, the federal and state governments, students, and the public demand "outcomes" information that demonstrates efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness in the use of public resources. There is also an increased emphasis on quality undergraduate learning experiences and increased interest in research that contributes to economic development.

These challenges suggest the need for fundamental changes in various aspects of university operations, or risk diminished levels of quality, accessibility, and support.

Changes in Faculty Handbook Section C that would address Board of Regents Recommendations on Faculty Evaluation

I. Changes necessary to meet recommendation lb. - Broader & more flexible approaches to evaluation of teaching

C33 Multiple data sources for evaluations.

Professional performance is exceptionally complex and cannot be evaluated adequately based on a single source of information. It is essential that faculty evaluation be based on multiple sources of data for each area evaluated in order to provide various perspectives and to avoid a concentration on narrow performance objectives. Lists of suggested activities and forms of documentation appropriate to the evaluation of the various categories of faculty responsibilities can be found in "*Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure, and Promotion.*"

Departments or units should be encouraged to develop a comprehensive, flexible approach to teaching evaluation, where several types of evidence can be collected, presented and evaluated as a portfolio.

C34.2 However, student ratings should never be the only source of information about classroom teaching. Peers, administrators, and other appropriate judges also can offer useful insights about a faculty member's teaching performance. Peer evaluation, defined as a critical review by colleagues knowledgeable of the entire range of teaching activities, can be an important component of the university's teaching evaluation program since peers are often in the best position to interpret and understand the evidence and place it in its proper academic context. Data other than student ratings that provide relevant evidence of teaching effectiveness are described in "*Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion.*" Examples include: course materials such as reading lists, syllabi, and examinations; special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations; preparation of innovative teaching materials or instructional techniques; special teaching activities outside the University; exit interviews, and graduate interviews and surveys to obtain information about teaching effectiveness.

II. Changes necessary to meet recommendation 4 - Objectives for the allocation of faculty time & efforts for purposes of merit evaluation

C45.1 Responsibilities of those who are evaluated.

Each unclassified person will meet annually with the unit or department head to jointly establish personal goals and objectives in research and other creative endeavors, teaching, extension, and directed and nondirected service for the upcoming evaluation period and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the unit's goals. These goals and objectives should reflect the relative percentages of time and effort the person plans to allocate to the appropriate areas in the upcoming period. It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process. It is recognized that the relative emphasis placed on research and other creative endeavors, teaching, extension, and directed and nondirected service may vary over the course of the person's career.

Changes in Faculty Handbook Section C that would address recommendation 1a of the Board of Regents Recommendations on Faculty Evaluation

C34.1 Student ratings of classroom instruction. In most cases documentation submitted by faculty members with teaching responsibilities would be considered incomplete and presumed inadequate, unless evidence of teaching effectiveness is included. Student ratings of classroom instruction are an important source of information in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, provided that the format includes controls for student motivation and other possible bias. The form should contain directions which indicate how the information is used, and the forms should be administered and collected under controlled conditions that assure students' anonymity. Each academic unit should determine the student rating form to be used by its faculty that conforms to the guidelines specified above. Probationary faculty with classroom responsibilities shall be rated by students at least once a year in each course that they teach. Tenured faculty with classroom responsibilities shall have at least one course per year evaluated by the students in the course (unless their department or unit has a policy of evaluating more than one course); however, the faculty member may choose which course will be evaluated. Faculty members with classroom teaching responsibilities ought to include the results of student ratings in the documentation they submit for personnel decisions concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Because the number of students engaged in individualized instruction with any one faculty member is typically small, units may decide to evaluate individualized instruction on a two-year cycle, or only when evaluations are available from a minimum number of students. Faculty members engaged in individualized instruction should be guided by the unit's criteria for evaluating such instruction. (See C32.2)

Changes necessary to meet recommendation 7a - provide assistance for faculty renewal and development, define chronic low achievement, and examine dismissal policies to include chronic low achievement, despite all assistance, as an indicator of incompetence. Sections 31.5, 30.3, 46.1 and 46.4

C31.5 Chronic Low Achievement. Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his/her professional duties as defined in the respective unit shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing university policies. Each department or unit shall develop a set of guidelines describing the minimum acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty as well as procedures to handle such cases. It is expected that departmental faculty will have input into any decisions on individual cases, if requested by the faculty member. When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the department or unit head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department head will also indicate in writing a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards the year following the Department Head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean.

C30.3 It also is clearly understood that faculty renewal, development and improvement are of critical importance to the University in pursuit of excellence. Each department or unit should develop a means of providing feedback to the individual so that he or she can maintain high levels of performance. Faculty members also have a personal responsibility to maintain or improve performance and are encouraged to participate in professional development activities. The department or unit head, in consultation with the Dean of the College and the Provost shall assist the individual with such improvement activities. Often an agency external to the department or unit can contribute to this process. For example, the Office of Educational Advancement provides independent and confidential help to strengthen teaching, the office of Research and Sponsored Programs assists with efforts to design projects and secure external funding, and the Office of Professional and Organization Development in Extension Systems and Agricultural Research Programs (ESARP) assists in program evaluation and development.

C46.1 Responsibilities of evaluators. The unit head will prepare, by January 31, a written evaluation for each regularly appointed (See Note 2) unclassified person. Quantitative ratings may be used to summarize evaluative judgments, but the basis for these judgments must be explained by a narrative account. The evaluation shall provide succinct assessments of effectiveness in performing each responsibility and these statements must include summaries of achievements and evidence which support these assessments. It is the responsibility of the department or unit head to provide written communications regarding specific areas of high or low achievement. (Note 2. Those appointed to regular part-time positions must be evaluated, however. Evaluations are not required for an individual on a term appointment (as defined in C11, even if that appointment will be renewed for another year).)

C46.4 The department or unit head who prepared the evaluations must submit the following items to the appropriate dean (or, for support units, the appropriate administrator): (See schedule as published by the provost each October.)

- a. A copy of the evaluation system used to prepare the evaluations.
- b. A written evaluation for each regularly appointed unclassified person employed for a least three months during the calendar year. The department or unit head will document areas of high or low achievement relative to the faculty member's responsibilities.
- c. A recommended salary adjustment for each unclassified person that should be based directly on the person's evaluation.
- d. Documentation (e.g., a statement signed by the individual evaluated) establishing that there was an opportunity to examine the written evaluation and to discuss with the evaluator the individual's resulting relative standing for the purpose of merit salary increase in the department or unit.
- e. Any written statements submitted by unclassified individuals of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations.
- f. Any recommendations for salary adjustments on bases outside of the annual evaluation, together with documentation which supports these recommendations.

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Faculty Senate

FROM: Elaine Steinke,^{ES} Chair
University Committee on Admissions and Exceptions

DATE: January 5, 1996

SUBJECT: Interim Report of the University Committee on Admissions and Exceptions (UEC)

The procedural guidelines enacted by the Senate in May 1995 have been in use throughout the fall semester. Overall, the guidelines have been effective in expediting cases that are somewhat routine (noted by an asterisk on the agenda). This has allowed the committee to spend time on the more difficult petitions.

In using the guidelines, two areas of concern have been noted and require clarification. One, the colleges have been inconsistent in listing "College only decisions" on the agenda. Only one or two colleges list such petitions for consideration by the University committee, as well as, those actions taken by the College committee that do not require University committee approval. This does not allow the University Committee to track the type of cases that the College is acting upon nor determine if the procedural guidelines are being followed.

A second concern is in relation to complete withdrawal from a current semester after the drop date. The procedural guidelines are not clear on this type of case. The University Committee has taken the position that these cases should be reviewed by the Committee and not be classified as a "college only" decision. The Committee sees no difference between the current policy of reviewing such cases from a prior semester (as an asterisked case) and that of a complete withdrawal from the current semester. In both instances, documentation of viable extenuating circumstances is needed. Some colleges, however, have not been bringing these cases to the University committee. Since the colleges have been inconsistent in providing information on the College decisions on the agenda (as noted in the first concern), there has been no means of tracking these cases (other than a final tally in the annual report).

The University committee believes that fairness and consistency in reviewing cases is of great importance. Therefore, clarifying the procedural guidelines to include these areas of concern is warranted.

Recommendations for Senate Action:

1. Add a statement to the "Official Charge to the Colleges" as noted in bold:
 2. Each college shall prepare an Agenda of cases for each meeting of the UEC (approximately biweekly, with additional meetings scheduled during Registration and Finals weeks), to follow a specific format. **The agenda will list cases to be considered by the University committee and those approved as "College Only Decisions."** [See sample Agenda] Five copies of the Agenda should be brought to each UEC meeting. (Note that some Chairs may ask that these be received prior to the meetings)
2. Add one item to the procedural guidelines for Exceptions cases, "Considerations often reviewed favorably (*):"
complete withdrawal from the current semester after the published last date to withdraw.

THIRD DRAFT .

WSU PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<u>Instructional Program</u>	<u>FY 1996</u>	<u>Goal FY2000</u>	<u>Goal FY2002</u>
1. Percent of undergraduate credit hours taught by faculty			
2. Percent of undergraduate credit hours taught by graduate teaching assistants			
3. Percent of full-time faculty possessing terminal degree			
4. Undergraduate student retention rates (Divided into full-time and part-time)			
No ACT			
ACT <21			
ACT 21-25			
ACT >25			
Total Students			
5. Undergraduate student graduation rates (4-8 yrs) (Divided into full-time part-time)			
No ACT			
ACT <21			
ACT 21-25			
ACT >25			
Total Students			
6. Diversity of student body (by retention and graduation)			
Percent of students by race/ethnicity			
Gender			
Disability			
Transfers from two-year institutions			
Completion of Regents preparation curriculum			
Number of credits earned at time of graduation			
7. Number of students served by distance education technology			

8. Exit exam scores in basic skills
9. Access to university computers (student ratio)

Graduate, Research, and Service Programs

1. Number of graduate students by program
2. Proposals submitted to external funding agencies (Divided into research and other sponsored programs)
 - a. Number of proposals
 - b. Dollar value
3. Proposals funded (Divided into research and other sponsored programs)
 - a. Number
 - b. Dollar value
4. National ranking of programs
5. Pass rates on professional licensure exams
6. Retention rate of graduate students (Divided into full-time and part-time)
 - a. By program
 - b. Total
7. Graduation rate (Divided into full-time and part-time)
 - a. By program
 - b. Time to degree
 - c. Total

Academic and Institutional Support Programs

1. Institutional support expenditures as percent of total
 - a. Support for technology
 - b. Support for library
2. Utilization of instructional building space (Average hours/week)
 - a. Classrooms
 - b. Teaching laboratories (including computer labs)
 - c. Library
3. Graduates who report employment or further academic or vocational training within six months of graduation

4. Number and percentage of accredited programs (by number of programs approved by the BOR to seek accreditation)
5. Number of faculty participating in faculty development activities (by categories)
6. Cost per credit hour of enrollment by units

FACULTY SENATE

Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, January 22, 1996

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alagic, Badgett, Bair, Baxter, Benson, Berry-Bravo, Brooks, Burk, Byrum, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Chambers, Campbell, Christensen, Coats, DeSilva, Detjens, Dreifort, Eaglesfield, Erickson, Fowler, Gythiel, Hamdeh, Hawley, Hitchcock, Horn, Houts, Hoyer, Kraft, Kukral, Leavitt, Lescoe-Long, Matson, Murphey, Nagati, Paske, Riordan, Saalman, Schommer, Sharp, Sutterlin, Swan, Terrell, Wahlbeck, Wang, Williamson, Yeager

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bajaj, Celestin, Chaudhuri, Deyoe, Hundley, Leland, Mandt, Parkhurst, Talia

GUESTS: Barbara Bowman, Elaine Steinke

SUMMARY OF ACTION:

1. Accepted Interim Report of Exemptions Committee. Endorsed recommendations of Interim Report of Exemptions Committee.

I. **CALL OF THE MEETING TO ORDER:** President Campbell called the meeting to order at 3:30.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS:

President Campbell announced that the mailing of January 12 which listed upcoming dates of Senate meetings included an error. The regularly scheduled meeting for March is that of the 11th, and not the 4th. She asked Senators to plan on meeting on the 11th but did note that there is a slight possibility that the meeting might be moved to the 4th. If the latter happens, Senators will be given ample advance notice.

A. Budget Discussion with VPAA Patton.

VPAA Patton summarized the budget as submitted by the Governor. He stressed that it is much better than the "worst case scenario" budget which could have happened and that it is a modest budget. This budget grants WSU the tuition shortfall of \$1.2 million for the current fiscal year. We will be getting this now and this provides some relief for this year. There is a merit salary increase for faculty of 2.5% to start in January of 1997.

There was no funding of enhancements (\$803,000) that the University had requested. Some of these items are: support for the graduate program in Public Health, extra support for the Library, OOE funds, funding the off campus sites, servicing of new buildings. To cover enhancements, VPAA Patton stated that we must continue our conservative budget and have some internal re-allocation. VPAA Patton mentioned that he has requested that there be some restructuring and consolidation

of some administrative costs as a way to save funds. He said that we must re-align our priorities and this budget buys us time for consultation and discussion. At present the Deans are looking at targets for the fall. He stated that we must be responsible in looking at our resources and manage them wisely.

VPAA Patton next addressed the issue of performance measures. This University will be required to provide statistical information to the Regents. He showed via overhead (*copy attached to end of minutes*) a draft of the report currently being prepared. He explained the various measures being documented; for example: percent undergraduate hours taught by faculty, diversity of the student body, number of students in off campus programs, national ranking of programs, and retention rate of graduate students. He stated that much data will be generated.

He noted that accountability measures are a national trend; the majority of states have such measures and it is his hope that there will eventually less micro-management of the University and more accountability of outcomes.

In the discussion that followed, questions and concerns about the budget were: if there were a restructuring plan who was the group working on it (Senator Leavitt), what cuts were being planned to cover enhancements and the status of these plans (Senator Hawley), it is being rumored on campus that Deans are planning to reduce programs and that such actions would have a demoralizing effect on faculty if faculty were not consulted (Senator Cavarozzi), that Library enhancements were not funded by the state and that faculty should encourage colleagues to donate to the Millionth Volume Campaign (Senator Dreifort), would faculty retirements have an effect on the budget and could there be an incentive plan for early retirements (Senator Terrell), that reductions at this time--after a history of wise management of resources on the part of the universities -- would curtail the quality of programs (Senator Wahlbeck).

Questions and concerns about performance measures were: number of credit hours students take to earn degrees (Senator Hoyer), lack of help to foreign students in acquiring English language skills (Senator Erickson), course drop rates (Senator Terrell), and possible increases in associate degrees (Senator Byrum).

President Campbell thanked VPAA Patton for his presentation and discussion with the Senate. She noted that the Senate Executive Committee has charged the Senate Planning and Budget Committee to review the number of positions, both faculty and administrative, over recent years in order to help the faculty analyze issues related to budget and performance measures.

A discussion ensued. Senator Williamson and President Campbell explained that when the Senate Executive Committee discussed the budget with VPAA Patton and President Hughes it was noted that there would be an increase in the physical plant part of the budget this year due to remodeling projects of the residence halls.

Senator Leavitt stated that the budget processes now taking place seemed to him to be a violation of AAUP policy. He stated that faculty have become only a reactive body and suggested that the Faculty Senate take the initiative and become proactive in this situation. President Campbell stated that the Executive Committee has asked the Senate Planning and Budget Committee to review the budget.

Senator Byrum requested that the lists which VPAA Patton showed in his presentation be amended to the minutes of the meeting.

Senator Carroll asked if there were faculty representation on whatever the committees that were making budget decisions. After some discussion, it was concluded that the Deans Council was probably where such decisions and planning are taking place at this time. President Campbell stated she would investigate the possibility of having faculty representation on the Deans Council.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Senator Swan moved and Senator Matson seconded approval of the minutes of December 11, 1995. Motion passed.

IV. PRESIDENTS REPORT:

A. Vision 2020 statement. The Vision 2020 statement is a document of the Board of Regents. President Campbell explained that she had attached to the agenda this latest version of the statement plus a section of the Kansas State University Handbook that describes faculty evaluation. These were informational items only.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Exceptions Committee Interim Report.

Senator Bair moved and Senator Leavitt seconded a motion to accept the report. The motion passed.

Elaine Steinke, Chair of the Exceptions Committee, explained the two issues for which the Committee was seeking Senate approval. First, that in the "Official Charge to the Colleges" a statement be added that all colleges would report "college-only" decisions on their agenda. This would help the Committee have a better accounting of all decisions. Secondly, the Committee requested that the procedural guidelines should include the reporting of Exceptions cases that are complete withdrawals from the current semester after the published last date to withdraw. Senator Murphey voiced concern that such reporting might entail an enormous amount of additional secretarial time. He wanted to know if there were substantial abuses of the system. Elaine Steinke answered that colleges would probably not have increased workload. Senator Baxter stated that this was not a matter of abuse; it was rather a matter of consistency. She stated that colleges vary in reporting of these statistics. She added that there used to be a secretary that handled all this centrally and that since this secretarial position had been eliminated, the colleges had to gather and report the information. It was this reporting that was being done inconsistently.

Senator Hoyer moved and Senator Bair seconded a motion to adopt these recommendations. The motion passed.

VI. OLD BUSINESS: None.

VII. NEW BUSINESS: None.

VIII. AS MAY ARISE:

President Campbell reminded Senators that there would be a meeting January 29 to vote on the proposed honors program.

President Campbell urged Senators to send ideas and comments about the budget to her. She noted that serious actions lie ahead and urged Senators to discuss their questions and concerns with department chairs and deans.

Senator Eaglesfield noted that during January subject librarians would be contacting departments about journal review lists so that feedback could be obtained from departments by March.

President Campbell noted that it was still possible to contribute to the library campaign and urged Senators to encourage their colleagues to do so. Senator Alagic stated that the participation rate is more important than the amount contributed.

Senator Byrum recommended that the library materials budget be made exempt from reallocation cuts that have been planned. Senator Hawley said she would convey this recommendation to President Hughes.

Senator Wahlbeck noted surprise that the faculty advising seminar was being offered as a credit course. Senator Carroll noted that the seminar last fall was excellent.

Senator Bair moved and Erickson seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 4:50pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Eaglesfield
Secretary

THIRD DRAFT

WSU PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<u>INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM</u>	<u>FY 1996</u>	<u>FY2000</u>	GOAL <u>FY2002</u>
1. Percent of undergraduate credit hours taught by faculty.			
2. Percent of undergraduate credit hours taught by graduate teaching assistants			
3. Percent of full-time faculty possessing terminal degree			
4. Undergraduate student retention rates (divided into full-time and part time) No ACT ACT<21 ACT 21-25 ACT>25 Total Students			
5. Undergraduate student graduation rates (4-8 yrs) (divided into full-time and part-time) No ACT ACT<21 ACT 21-25 ACT>25 Total Students			
6. Diversity of student body (by retention & graduation) Percent of students by race/ethnicity Gender Disability Transfers from two-year institutions Completion of Regents preparation curriculum Number of credits earned at time of graduation			
7. Number of students served by distance education technology			
8. Exit exam scores in basic skills			
9. Access to university computers (student ratio)			
<u>GRADUATE, RESEARCH AND SERVICE PROGRAMS</u>			
1. Number of graduate students by program			
2. Proposals submitted to external funding agencies (divided into research and other sponsored programs) a. Number of proposals			

b. Dollar value

3. Proposals funded (divided into research and other sponsored programs)
 - a. Number
 - b. Dollar value
4. National ranking of programs
5. Pass rates on professional license exams
6. Retention rate of graduate students (divided into full-time and part-time)
 - a. By program
 - b. Total
7. Graduation rate (divided into full-time & part-time)
 - a. By program
 - b. Time to degree
 - c. Total

ACADEMIC AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAMS

1. Institutional support expenditures as percent of total
 - a. Support for technology
 - b. Support for library
2. Utilization of instructional building space (average hours/week)
 - a. Classrooms
 - b. Teaching laboratories (including computer labs)
 - c. Library
3. Graduates who report employment or further academic or vocational training within six months of graduation
4. Number and percentage of accredited programs (by number of programs approved by the BOR to seek accreditation)
5. Number of faculty participating in faculty development activities (by categories)
6. Cost per credit hour of enrollment by units