



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 2010-2011

Volume XXIV

Annual Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

Accepted at the Meeting of April 25, 2011

Annual Reports from the Faculty Senate Standing Committees 2010 - 2011

Report from the Court of Academic Appeals - Rajiv Bagai, chair

Members: Rajiv Bagai, Engineering, Chair

Ray Hull, Health Professions

David Soles, LAS Humanities

Mohammad Islam, SGA Graduate Rep

Marcus McNeal, SGA Undergraduate Rep

Candace Well, ALT, Education

Oren Dale, ALT, LAS Social Sciences

vacant -- faculty rep, SGA Undergraduate and Graduate reps

Meeting Schedule and Committee Activities:

The Court meets whenever cases are presented to be heard. Hearings are conducted following careful review of the documentation presented. The year 2010-11 hearings were October 8, 2010 (involving ArtF 137), March 1, 2011 (involving ECE 585/595 & April 12, 2011 (involving HMCD 310)

Pending Issues-- need to elect a chair for 2011-12

Respectfully Submitted, Rajiv Bagai, 4/21/11

Report of Faculty Support Committee - Jay Price, chair

For the 2010-2011 Academic Year the Faculty Support Committee consisted of Rick LeCompte, Paul Rillema, Lind Mitchell, Julie Scherz, Jay Price, Tom Wine, and Sai Deng, with David McDonald serving as ex-officio member. Jay Price is currently serving as chair. The committee could not have done its work without the enthusiastic support of Cindy Miller.

The committee does not have set meeting times, gathering when there is a need to go through proposals, which this year, meant for several lengthy but productive meetings late in the Fall 2010 semester and early 2011 at the offices at NIAR.

This year, the committee examined several applications for sabbaticals, 3 Multidisciplinary Research Project Awards (MURPAs), 6 Awards for Research/Creative Projects in the Summer (ARCS), 4 new Tenure Track University Research/Creative Projects Awards (URCAs), and 9 other URCAs. The final activity of the committee this year was the assessment of WSU excellence awards.

The final task for the committee is an upcoming meeting to assess applicants for the Flossie West program for faculty doing cancer research.

Report of the Standing General Education Committee - 2010-2011 Academic Year -- Paul Rillema, Chair

Committee Members: Ikram Ahmed, Stephen Brady, Lyn Goldberg, Cathy Moore-Jansen, Jeffrey Hershfield, Ted Adler, Chris Broberg, Janice Ewing, and Bill Wynne (ex officio)

The committee was reinstated after its disbandment for the 2009-2010 Academic year. With the exception of a couple of committee members, a large portion of time was spent acquainting committee members with the general education program at WSU, the admission process funneling students into the general education program and transfer credit for general education credit for courses taken at other accredited institutions. After nearly eight months of negotiations between the Administration, the Faculty Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate and the General Education Committee of the Senate, the following guidelines will be followed for the review of transfer courses for General Education credit.

- a. Transfer courses from regionally-accredited institutions outside the state of Kansas may be assigned a General Education attribute by the Registrar if they are at least 3 credit hours, and if
 - i. their title and content is similar to one of WSU's General Education courses or
 - ii. the course is similar in title and content to one or more that have been evaluated for transfer General Education credit by academic departments.
 - b. *Courses that do not meet the above criteria will be referred by the Registrar to the appropriate department for evaluation, along with an appropriate course description or syllabus. Basic Skills and Further Studies courses will always be referred to the appropriate department. The General Education Committee and the Registrar hold the expectation that departments will complete evaluations or request more information within a two-week time period.
 - c. The Registrar will provide regular updates on courses approved for General Education credit to the General Education Committee.
 - d. Reevaluations of general education courses previously approved for transfer credit can be requested at any time by departments, while acknowledging that commitments made by advisors to students will be honored.
- *b. refers to all other transfer courses (in-state, basic skills and further studies) for general education credit.

Other actions of the committee were the approval of three further studies courses, one in each of the following departments: English, Philosophy and Social Science. Bill Wynne was added to the committee as ex officio. Paul Rillema will continue as Chair of the Committee for Academic year 2011-2012.

Assessment reports for Basic Education Courses were obtained from the Communications, English and Mathematics Departments and Follow:
Communication 111 Selected Statistics
Prepared by Rick Armstrong

Director of the Basic Public Speaking Program
April 2011

Grade Distribution and Overall GPA Spring 2008 through Spring 2010

A total of 3,652 students were awarded a letter grade during this period. This figure does not include those who withdrew, audited, or took Communication 111 on a Credit/No Credit basis. For purposes of this report + or – grades are not separated out.

1,032 or 26% earned an A
1,644 or 41% earned a B
555 or 14% earned a C
107 or 3% earned a D
314 or 8% earned an F
Overall GPA: 2.86

Final Exam Mean Scores Spring 2008-Spring 2010

The Communication 111 Final Exam is composed of 100 multiple-choice questions and is based entirely on the textbook readings. Each question is worth 1 point for a total possible score of 100 points, 20% percent of the points available in the course.

Spring 2008 Final Exam mean was 74.4 with a high score of 98 and a low score of 38.
Fall 2008 Final Exam mean was 75.2 with a high score of 97 and a low score of 36.
Spring 2009 Final Exam mean was 75.9 with a high score of 95 and a low score of 25.
Fall 2009 Final Exam mean was 70.8 with a high score of 96 and a low score of 35.
Spring 2010 Final Exam mean was 71.9 with a high score of 95 and a low score of 22.
Overall Final Exam mean: 73.64

Policy Persuasive Speech Mean Scores Spring 2008-Spring 2010

The Policy Persuasive Speech is the last major speech in Communication 111 and is worth 100 points, 20% of the points available in the course. We consider the score on this speech to be a major indicator of student competence in basic public speaking.

Spring 2008 mean: 87
Fall 2008 mean: 85
Spring 2009 mean: 87
Fall 2009 mean: 83
Spring 2010 mean: 86
Overall Policy Persuasive Speech mean: 86
Grade Distribution and Overall GPA
Fall 2003 through Fall 2007

A total of 7,923 students were awarded a letter grade during this period. This figure does not include those who withdrew, audited, or took Communication 111 on a Credit/No Credit basis.

2,230 or 28% earned an A
3,442 or 43% earned a B
1,336 or 17% earned a C
198 or 3% earned a D
717 or 9% earned an F
Overall GPA: 2.79

Final Exam Mean Scores Spring 2005 through Fall 2007

The Communication 111 Final Exam is composed of 100 multiple choice or true/false questions and is based completely on the textbook readings. Each question is worth 1 point for a total possible score of 100 points, 20% of the points available in the course.

Fall 2007 Final Exam mean was 74.8 with a high score of 95 and a low score of 28.
Spring 2007 Final Exam mean was 75.7 with a high score of 97 and a low score of 42.
Fall 2006 Final Exam mean was 74.6 with a high score of 97 and a low score of 38.
Spring 2006 Final Exam mean was 73.5 with a high score of 96 and a low score of 29.
Fall 2005 Final Exam mean was 74.8 with a high score of 95 and a low score of 30.
Spring 2005 Final Exam mean was 76.4 with a high score of 96 and a low score of 36.
Overall Final Exam mean: 74.96

Policy Persuasive Speech Mean Scores Spring 2006-Fall 2007

The Policy Persuasive Speech is the last major speech in Communication 111 and is worth 100 points, 20% of the points available in the course. We consider the score on this speech to be a major indicator of student competence in basic public speaking.

Fall 2007 mean: 86
Spring 2007 mean: 87
Fall 2006 mean: 87
Spring 2006 mean: 83
Overall Policy Persuasive Speech mean: 86

Pre and Post-test Survey

The Elliott School of Communication conducted a pre and post-test survey of Communication 111 students enrolled in the Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 semesters. A total of 1,120 students completed the survey at the beginning of the course over the two semesters, with 820 students completing the survey at the end of the two semesters.

The survey was focused on student perception of their abilities. Findings from the study revealed that:

Students had positive opinions regarding the importance of public speaking.

Students understood the importance of public speaking both within the university context and in the professional world.

Students indicated significant improvements in their perceptions of their skills and abilities for speaking effectively in public.

Students specifically reported:

more knowledge of how to research and construct a speech

Pretest Post-test

2.515 1.602 and an improved belief that they could deliver an effective speech

Pretest Post-test

2.429 1.722 Based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” (1) to “strongly disagree” (5).

“Assessing Student Perceptions Toward and Appreciation for the Basic Public Speaking Course.” By Jeff Jarman and Rick Armstrong. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication Association, Boston, 2005. Paper available electronically from Rick Armstrong).

The Communication 111 program maintains a website where examples of Policy Persuasive speeches (click on Shocker Speakout) by WSU students can be viewed:

<http://esc.wichita.edu/c111/>

Grade statistics provided by WSU Office of Institutional Research.

Final Exam statistics provided by WSU Social Sciences Research Lab.

Policy Persuasive Speech statistics calculated by Rick Armstrong.

Wichita State University English 101 Assessment Breakdown and Evaluation Academic Year 2009/2010

Submitted by Darren DeFrain, Director of the Writing Program

OBJECTIVES: The goal of this assessment was to help determine student perception of course goals effectiveness, faculty effectiveness, and overall curriculum effectiveness as well as the students’ practical application of essay-writing skills (the emphasis of English 101).

The anonymous survey, also included, asks students a series of questions regarding their satisfaction with the way their class met prescribed course goals, the specific effectiveness of their instructor, and the curriculum’s effectiveness in helping them to

learn appropriate writing skills. Each question asked students to rate their answers on a three-point scale reflecting dissatisfaction, satisfaction, or exceeding expectations. There was also room for additional commentary at the end of the survey. This survey was conducted near the end of the semester.

The expectations for the survey were that the course goals, instructor, and curriculum would average out at least meeting student perceptions for success. In all sections of the survey an average score of ≥ 2 on any response would indicate overall satisfaction with those goals. The individualized statistics, including the numbers of valid responses, numbers of missing responses, mean, median, and standard deviation are all included on the frequencies sheets attached to this report.

This assessment also considers the practical application of student's essay writing abilities by comparing scores of diagnostic essays done at the start of the semester with the students' exam examination grade (following the exact same guidelines as the diagnostic but with different essay prompts). Both of the essays (diagnostic and exit exam) were graded on the same 5-point scale using the English 101 grading rubric. These scores and the grading rubric are also included with the supplementary materials of this report.

OUTCOMES: While we offer fewer sections of English 101 in the spring, many of our students who take English 101 in the spring are coming out of either English 011 (or its equivalent) or are retaking English 101. We might anticipate a negative shift in results as more of these students could be expected to struggle in their English 101 courses. However, there again appears to be a slight improvement over the fall assessment where curriculum dissatisfaction scored at a slightly higher-than-anticipated level. The spring assessment again this year shows that all levels of student perceptions are within the acceptable ranges of expectations and most approach 'exceeding' expectations. Of special note, most of these courses were taught by our first year Graduate Teaching Assistants (or GTAs). Most of these GTAs have had little-to-no teaching experience when they start here in the fall, so some of the increase in overall satisfaction, I believe, also points to our GTAs improved teaching abilities from the first semester to the next. Of note: A resounding number of respondents (167 or 79.9%) marked their GTA's "knowledge of materials" as a perfect score of 3.

The fall 2009 average exit examination grade was 2.93 (equivalent to a strong C grade by our standards, the equivalency scale is also included in the supplementary materials). This grade was just slightly lower than those of our adjunct instructors (3.23) and considerably lower than those of our concurrent faculty (3.83). Neither difference is considered significant because of the lower numbers in both of the latter groups. The fall course grade was a 2.19 for courses taught by GTAs (down markedly from the previous year), 3.10 for instructors (roughly equivalent to the previous year's 3.02), and 3.29 (up considerably from 2.7 the previous year) for concurrent faculty. The average grade of 2.49 is consistent with the exit exam grade equivalent of a C and is within range of the prior year's 2.62. The diagnostic average for GTA courses was 2.40, demonstrating good progress over the semester. Adjunct instructor diagnostics

averaged 3.1, showing less improvement but consistency with the other scores above. Concurrents did not provide data even after repeated attempts to solicit cooperation.

The spring 2009 average course grade for GTA courses was 1.9, for adjunct-taught courses the average was markedly higher at 3.0. There were, however, only 21 students combined in the spring 101 sections. For concurrent teachers the average grade was 2.84. The concurrent grade was again noticeably higher than the on-campus sections, however the differential was better than in years past. The average diagnostic score for GTAs was 2.26. Concurrents again failed to report their diagnostic scores as requested. The adjunct average was 2.97 with limited reporting. GTA exit exams scores averaged 2.53, inconsistent with the average grade of 1.9 but consistent with the 2.26 diagnostic. The exit exam scores are especially significant as they are graded by the course instructor and another instructor and then averaged for the final grade. All of these scores are included with the supplementary materials.

RECOMMENDATIONS: While the spring surveys indicate an improved overall satisfaction with our English 101 curriculum I think we will need to continue this assessment for the foreseeable future. We have made some significant changes to our curriculum the last two years with changing text books. We have maintained the same modes-based progression, though, and it will be interesting to see if the relatively low grades last spring for GTA sections were an aberration. The data we collect this year will be especially useful in this regard to see how well the texts and assignments are working with our students.

We will continue to require that GTAs, adjunct instructors, and concurrent instructors all submit data for these assessments. We continue to see a lack of responsiveness from concurrents, though, and I recommend we implement some sort of punitive response as this assessment is crucial to our continued development.

Concerns with the higher grades given to concurrent students will also be continuously monitored. Concurrent teachers typically have students who are more motivated and are upper quartile or 2nd quartile students vs. the wide array of abilities we see in the campus classes, so this may allow for some elevation of scores in those courses. Regardless, everyone teaching English 101 for WSU will be made aware of these results and will be encouraged to dialogue with the Composition Committee about concerns, recommendations, and supportive comments. It should be noted that there may be some effect of WSU's change to the plus/minus grading scale on next year's results.

Assessment April, 2011
College Algebra Program
Basic Skills in Mathematics
M111, College Algebra
M131, Contemporary Mathematics

Prepared by:
Stephen W. Brady

Associate Professor of Mathematics and Statistics and
Director, College Algebra Program

Overall Perspective

Universities recommend that any high school student who wishes to attend any university or college should take four years of mathematics in high school. Three years of mathematics should be minimal preparation. The first college level course in mathematics at any university in the world is Calculus. All other courses before Calculus are remedial whether or not credit is given for those courses. Wichita State University's basic skill requirements in mathematics for graduation came from the realization that most of our students did not initially enroll with have enough prior training in mathematics. Due to our previous open admission policy many were admitted with less than adequate mathematics background to be successful in college. The idea was to raise them to a college entry level of mathematics before they graduated from WSU by requiring knowledge of College Algebra (or higher level mathematics) as part of the general education program. This goal has been made much easier to attain due to the recent rule that the basic skills must be achieved in the first forty-eight hours of coursework.

It should be understood that those who come to WSU prepared with an adequate mathematical background are not part of this assessment. Students with the best mathematics backgrounds either take a higher level mathematics course which is not assessed in this report or are waived from the requirement. So, the program is dealing with what amounts to the D, F, or W student with respect to previous mathematical background. In essence, the program is trying to provide a patch to a garment that developed holes previously; sometimes, many years ago. This assessment deals with the results of applying a patch to garments in various stages of wear including non-use for many years. It also deals with applying patches to patches and using the patch for the whole garment. As the reader will see below, many of those who do not succeed are repeat enrollments allowed by the system to repeat a course for which they did not have adequate preparation. Many others enroll without advising and do not succeed. We are trying to minimize these problems. Also, other agencies in the university are working hard to strengthen enrollment, advising, and retention procedures to improve the success of our students in learning basic mathematical concepts and skills. Overall, I am pleased (but not satisfied) with what the program has done to raise the level of mathematical knowledge of our students. We may not be able to improve much in our success rates no matter what we try to do. I read that nationally the success rate is less than fifty percent. We do better than that each semester.

Math 111, College Algebra

For the last twenty years the departmental final for Math 111, College Algebra has been used as part of an overall assessment of the course. The final is worth at least 30% of the course grade for each section of M111. A student successfully satisfies the final assessment by scoring at least 50% on the final together with a C or better for the

semester overall. The weight of 30% for the final brings the course grade down (in most cases) to the D or F level for anyone not achieving a score of at least 50% on the final exam. Each semester a only a handful of the several hundred students enrolled in M111 are considered "exceptional cases" because they do not achieve 50% on the final but are considered by their instructor to have done so well in the rest of the course to merit a grade of C or better. The returning of the assessment decision to an instructor who knows the student best while requiring an instructor to carefully weigh exceptions (with supervision from the Director) has worked well.

The prerequisites for College Algebra are two years of high school algebra or equivalent and a satisfactory score on the department placement exam or math ACT exam or math SAT exam. Satisfactory scores have been determined to be 15 of 32 on the department placement exam, 20 for math ACT, and 460 for math SAT. The department placement exam, while not a post-assessment tool for College Algebra is an assessment tool for our remedial courses and for a student's previous mathematical preparation. This exam is given at several scheduled times throughout the year and also as a "walk in" exam at non-scheduled times. The purpose of the exam is to see if a student is ready for College Algebra and if not, to help in the decision of the remedial course (M012, Intermediate Algebra; M011 Beginning Algebra; or, M007 Arithmetic) the student should take. In addition, a placement exam has been used for about twenty-three years as a final exam in both remedial algebra courses (M011, M012). Part of the way we can affect student learning outcomes in College Algebra is to make sure the student is (mathematically) ready to enroll in the course. The department feels that our remedial courses themselves have been excellent preparation. The placement exam seems to be working well. Among other things, the placement exam works as a psychological device (like a medical checkup). If a student does well, it helps their overall entry attitude for College Algebra. If they do poorly, it is easy to convince them that remediation would be beneficial. The placement exam that is given as a final exam in M001 and M012 (different exams) has been team graded by instructors to ensure uniformity and has also assisted in producing uniformity in content in the multi-section remedial courses and thorough review by instructors with respect to the "readiness" of their students for the next level. The final in College Algebra has been team graded by the instructors for the same reasons.

For several years there has been a "block" placed on the enrollment into College Algebra for any student who (as far as the university mainframe computer was concerned) did not have one or more of the pre-requisites for the course. While this has resulted in hundreds of calls to the department each year, it attempts to ensure uniform treatment of students with respect to placement, it puts a human element in the determination of placement, and it builds a communication bridge between the Director and students that can be used later after they enroll in case they need help of any kind while in the program. For those students that are "blocked," this has worked well. Recent implementations of mainframe computing checking of prerequisites is expected to help the department in identifying persons at risk with regard to their mathematical backgrounds. One weakness in our system is that once an ACT or SAT exam total has

helped remove the block on enrollment, many students can enroll "on line" without any consultation with any advisor after that.

In 2003, the university made it mandatory that all students finish their basic skills before their 48th credit hour or be forced to enroll in the basic skills courses thereafter until passed. This has been a huge help in changing student habits of putting off their courses until they are seniors (which used to be a big problem for mathematics). Although there are still some returning students who are close to graduation and still have not satisfied their mathematics basic skill requirement, the number of such students is diminishing each semester and is no longer much of a problem. Students didn't used to "have time" to take a remedial course. Now they do if it is needed.

College Algebra has the following overall course outcomes.

The student will understand the body of mathematical knowledge identified as College Algebra in order to:

1. Build a foundation for mathematical problem solving.
2. Apply problem-solving techniques to model both mathematical and real-world contexts.
3. Use mathematical language and symbols as a means of communication while reading, writing, speaking, and listening.
4. Apply critical thinking and analytical reasoning skills in mathematical settings.
5. Retrieve and utilize mathematical skills as opportunities arise.
6. Make connections between mathematical problem solving and its application in other settings.

These outcomes are part of a Course Syllabus (see attachment) that spells out in detail the sections to be covered in College Algebra, the time to be spent on each text section, and the outcomes for each text section. Each class section in College Algebra uses the same book and materials and has access to the same aids provided by the text publisher that includes on-line help. In August, 2010 representatives from the textbook companies (of the texts we have adopted for M011, M012, and M111) presented training sessions to our instructors of these classes with regard to the extensive on-line materials for each class that are available. Several sections are now taught on-line as well as our classroom offerings. Some sections are designated in the University Schedule of Classes publication as designed to actively use calculators in the course.

Each teacher (Instructor, Professor, GTA, Lecturer) has full charge of the class including course lecture preparations and delivery, the making and administration and grading of exams, quizzes, and homework assignments, and determining the course grade. If an assigned class is the first time one has taught it, the first examination must be approved by the Program Director. The course final is a comprehensive departmental exam given simultaneously to all sections. It is (generally) not seen by course teachers prior to the exam and has been team graded by all course instructors who meet together for grading the finals immediately after the final exam is concluded.

The exam is "open-ended" in nature. Rubrics have been developed to make the exam scoring, equal, impartial, fair, and non-biased.

Each GTA and Lecturer has a Mentor (an experienced teacher) assigned to assist the GTA or Lecturer in all aspects of their assigned course. Visits to the class are made by the Mentor who then prepares a department evaluation that is given to the Graduate Coordinator and Algebra Program Director. Videotaping is also sometimes used to assist in strengthening classroom teaching techniques.

In August and January the Program Director in conjunction with the department Graduate Coordinator offers training sessions to new GTA's and Lecturers who teach our lower level classes. The department continues to keep current an Instructor's Handbook covering all aspects of the course to be taught, departmental, college, university rules and procedures, etc. It is required reading for all GTA's and Lecturers. The department is considering developing a required course to provide additional training for GTA's.

A standing committee composed of experienced faculty oversees the course contents, the textbook, the length of time to be spent on topics, etc. Periodically we have a meeting of all the teachers (or distribute by email a questionnaire) to determine how the semester is going, where everyone is with regard to course pace, problems with content coverage, etc. We have recently (April 2011) conducted just such a questionnaire for our Spring 2011 courses.

The Program Director handles complaints to the department concerning problems that arise in the classroom or with the instructional staff. The Director is happy to report that relatively few problems have occurred in 2010 and the ones that have occurred have been handled (hopefully) to the satisfaction of those who complained.

Whenever a course becomes mandatory for graduation, it is unpopular. Many students are taking the M111 or M131 course only to satisfy a graduation requirement. In addition, many students have math anxiety or a previous bad experience in an earlier math course sometime in their past. The Director spends a great deal of time working one-to-one with students before and during their contact with the program. This work includes handling waivers, placement test matters, removing blocks on enrollment, advising (students and instructors), course evaluation for transfer equivalency, math anxiety, and complaints about the class or teachers. At the beginning of the semester we allow transfers for those unhappy with their placement or teacher in order to improve the overall learning atmosphere in the classes. Students are encouraged to contact the Director about any and all issues concerning their math class throughout the semester. Instructors are encouraged to communicate all concerns about their classes to the Director or Graduate Coordinator. The high degree of involvement of the Director, Graduate Coordinator and other staff has succeeded in locating issues and problems (student and/or instructor) at their outset that has added greatly to a successful solution. The Director feels that only in these ways can students receive the treatment they deserve while attempting to satisfy the basic skill requirement for mathematics.

With regard to all the paragraphs above, most concerned how "business in conducted" for College Algebra. Most of what goes on is hard to assess with numerical data. We collect and evaluate "teacher evaluations." Most teacher evaluations are very good. We work hard to put the best qualified people in front of the classroom as we can. Complaints about "accents" seem to decrease each semester as we continually raise standards on who is allowed to teach. We give advice and counsel to students and teachers. I can report that generally speaking all is going very well with College Algebra. I believe that our instructional staff is working hard to be fair and reasonable with students, with tests, with grading, etc. Most of the staff seem to care about their classes and students.

For grade distributions and a few of the conclusions that can be gained from a study of the data base the College Algebra Program keeps on the basic skills courses, see below. In order to gain the correct perspective of the good points of the program and where problems lie, it is necessary to expound a bit on the realistic subtleties of College Algebra "life" at WSU.

As previously stated, the final in M011 and the final in M012 is also used as a placement test. Scores from the department placement test as well as final test results from M011 and M012 are used by the mainframe computer to block or allow entry into M111 and M131. A student with a placement or final test score of 15 or higher in M012 is not blocked from enrolling in M111 or M131. Alternately, one with an ACT math score of 20 or higher or a SAT math score of 460 or higher is not blocked from enrolling in M111 or M131.

The computer does not check on previous mathematics coursework at WSU or elsewhere or a high school transcript to see if the student also has the course prerequisites of two years of high school algebra or equivalent to be allowed entry into M111 or M131. There is no realistic or practical way to do this (I am told) since the university does not have high school transcripts on many of our students. Also, people with the prerequisites sometimes take M011 or M012 as a review or refresher course.

Some students enrolled in M011 wish to proceed directly to M111 without taking M012. Students in M011 who have had two years of Algebra (or equivalent) in high school (with passing grades) may be taking M011 for a refresher or review. They have the prerequisites to bypass M012 as long as they have a sufficient score on our placement exam (15/32) or a score of 20 on ACT or a score of 460 on SAT. These scores remove the block on enrollment for M111. If the score removes the block the student may enroll without talking to anyone in the Math department. If there is not a high enough qualifying score, then the student must talk to the Director to try to get the block removed. Students in M011 who have not had two years of Algebra usually should take M012. However, if they have a sufficient score (mentioned above) that the computer uses to remove the block on M111 enrollment, the student who tries to enroll will be allowed to do so by the computer without talking to the Director or anyone else. This is how some students manage to enroll in M111 without the prerequisites. Some do this ignorantly and some do it on purpose. Since the university does not have every student

high school transcript and since the student can enroll online without seeing any advisor in many instances we have students who get into M111 from M011 who should have taken M012 first.

Some students in M011 who have not had more than one year of high school algebra (or equivalent) previously and sometimes students who have had no previous algebra coursework at all also wish to skip over M012. If such a student comes to the director seeking advice, I consult their instructor (who has seen them for 15 weeks) for a recommendation. We also like to see a 26 of 32 on their final M011 exam. Finally I make a judgment call on their probability for success based on their university academic record and opinions gleaned from the counseling session. When my inclination is not to allow the student to skip over M012, students (depending on many circumstances) are sometimes allowed to enroll (by me) anyway by signing a waiver form that states they wish to enroll in M111 at their own risk in spite of my advice. Over the years only a little more than about one-half of the students recommended by their instructors and allowed by me to skip over M012 subsequently receive a C or better in M111. Unfortunately, most who sign waivers don't subsequently pass M111 with a C or better. Some students demand "the right to fail the course." Remember that students with a 15 or better on any of our tests or 20 or better on ACT or 460 or better on SAT can enroll in M111 without counseling or taking one or more remedial courses.

Some data information is included below for Fall 2010 for Math 111. I also concluded similar data for Math123, Trigonometry which has Math 111 (or equivalent) as a pre-requisite. I thought it might be of interest to include some semesters from 2005 and 2006. √ I believe the distributions for the other semesters follow the same overall patterns as does 2010. There are improvements on average in some areas. However the Withdrawals, No Shows on Finals, and the number of repeat students is too high. While such numbers may be about the same for other disciplines in our university, it is not satisfactory. We are expending a lot of effort to improve these numbers.

Note that some of the categories may overlap

M111

Year A B C D F W I Au Tot

FL2010 132 138 108 77 110 84 0 2 651

20% 21% 17% 12% 17% 13% 0% .3%

23% 24% 19% 14% 19% (Without W, Au, I)

Passed with C- or better 58% (67% without W, Au, I)

Passed 70% (80% without W,Au,I)

Enrolled at Final 565 (+2 Au) No Shows for Final 68

162 of 649 were Repeating=25%; 68 Passed (\geq C-) (68/162=42%)

516 of 649 qualified by Placement/ACT/SAT=79%; 312 Passed (\geq C-)=48%; (312/516=60.5%)

68 Authorizations or Self –Risk Waivers; 25 Passed (\geq C-) (25/68=37%)

431 of 567 satisfied the Assessment (66%); 68 Didn't + 68 No Shows (34%)

For Comparison, M123 is Trigonometry. It has M111 (or equivalent) as a pre-requisite.
M123

Year A B C D F W I Au Tot

FL2010 19 27 22 9 16 33 0 0 126

15% 21% 17% 7% 13% 26% 0%

20% 28% 23% 9% 16% (Without W, Au, I)

Passed with C- or better 54% (70% without W, Au, I)

Passed 61% (79% without W,Au,I)

27 of 126 were Repeating=21%; 13 Passed (\geq C-) (13/27=48%)

104 had documented pre-requisites; 54 Passed (\geq C-)=43%;

(54/104=52%)

There was no block on enrollment/computer pre-requisite checking in Fall 2010.

M111 (Excluding Concurrent Enrollment)

Year A B C D F W I Au Tot

Sp 2010 51 70 88 36 92 76 1 1 415

12% 17% 21% 9% 22% 18% 0% 0%

15% 21% 26% 11% 27% (Without W, Au, I)

Passed with C- or better 51% (62% without W, Au, I)

Passed 59% (73% without W,Au,I)

Enrolled at Final 338 No Shows for Final 67

164 of 415 were Repeating=40%; 61 Passed (\geq C-) (61/164=37%)

146 of 415 qualified by Placement/ACT/SAT=35%; 90 Passed (\geq C-)=22%;

(90/146=62%)

74 Authorizations or Self –Risk Waivers; 32 Passed (\geq C-) (32/74=43%)

212 of 338 satisfied the Assessment (63%); 59 Didn't + 67 No Shows (37%)

M111 (Including Concurrent Enrollment)

Year A B C D F W I Au Tot

Sp 2010 94 152 103 37 94 79 1 1 585

16% 26% 18% 6% 16% 14% 0% 0%

19% 30% 20% 7% 19% (Without W, Au, I)

Passed with C- or better 60% (66% without W, Au, I)

Passed 69% (76% without W,Au,I)

Enrolled at Final 505 No Shows for Final 67

162 Authorizations or Self –Risk Waivers; 118 Passed (\geq C-) (118/162=73%)

Grade Distributions For Other (Arbitrarily Chosen) Semesters

M111

Year A B C D F W I Au Tot

SP2009 57 83 95 41 65 57 0 0 398

14% 21% 24% 10% 16% 14%

17% 24% 28% 12% 19% (Without W, Au, I)

Passed with C- or better 59% (69% without W, Au, I)

Passed 70% (81% without W,Au,I)

Enrolled at Final 341 No Shows for Final 50
 130 of 398 were Repeating=33%; 62 Passed (\geq C-) (62/130=48%)
 259 of 398 qualified by Placement/ACT/SAT=65%; 82 Passed (\geq C-)=32%;
 (312/516=60.5%)
 83 Authorizations or Self –Risk Waivers; 35 Passed (\geq C-) (35/83=42%)
 250 of 341 satisfied the Assessment (73%); 41 Didn't + 48 No Shows (26%)

Below, for earlier year data, the "Drop" totals are for those who withdrew before class started which are not even counted in official university totals. I don't think the "Drops" should be part of the calculations but I have done most calculations with them and indicated where they are excluded

M111

Year A B C D F W I Tot
 Sp2006 64 100 78 42 83 97 2 466
 14% 21% 17% 9% 18% 21%
 17% 27% 21% 11% 23% (Without W, I)
 Passed with C or better 52% (66% without W,I)
 Passed assessment 53% (67% without W, I)
 Qualified by Placement Test 12.4% (70% of those received C or better)
 Qualified by ACT or SAT 44% (41% of those received C or better)
 Authorizations by Department 26% (47% of those received C or better)
 Repeats 21% (35% of those received C or better)
 No shows for final 13.5%

Year A B C D F W Drop I Tot
 FI2005 116 128 108 39 94 85 34 1 605
 19% 21% 17% 6% 16% 14% 6% .1%
 20% 22% 19% 7% 16% 15% (Without Drops, I's)
 Passed with C or better 58% (62% without Drops, I's)
 Passed assessment 56.5% (60% without Drops, I's)
 Qualified by Placement Test 18% (71% of those received C or better)
 Qualified by ACT or SAT 43% (66% of those received C or better)
 Authorizations by Department 17% (44% of those received C or better)
 Repeats 16% (% of those received C or better)
 No shows for final 13%

Year A B C D F W Drop Tot
 Sp2005 91 103 74 42 99 91 23 523
 17% 20% 14% 8% 19% 17% 4%
 18% 21% 15% 8% 20% 18% (Without Drops)
 Passed with C or better 51% (54% Without Drops)
 Passed assessment 48% (51% Without Drops)
 Repeats 20% (30% of those received C or better)
 No shows for final 15%

Year A B C D F W Drop I Tot

FI2004 139 146 108 39 125 102 39 2 700

20% 21% 15% 6% 18% 15% 6% .3%

21% 22% 16% 6% 19% 15% (Without Drops, I's)

Passed with C or better 56% (60% Without Drops, I's)

Passed assessment 56% (59% Without Drops, I's)

Qualified by Placement Test 22% (58% of those received C or better)

Qualified by ACT or SAT 41% (68% of those received C or better)

Authorizations by Department 24% (48% of those received C or better)

Repeats 15% (53% of those received C or better)

No shows for final 14%

Year A B C D F W Drop Tot

Su2004 39 26 20 8 13 19 5 130

30% 20% 15% 6% 10% 15% 4%

31% 21% 16% 6% 10% 15% (Without Drops)

Passed with C or better 65% (68% Without Drops)

Passed assessment 71.5% (74% Without Drops)

Qualified by Placement Test 39% (80% of those received C or better)

Qualified by ACT or SAT 26% (79% of those received C or better)

Authorizations by Department 33% (49% of those received C or better)

Repeats 20% (73% of those received C or better)

No shows for final 8%

Year A B C D F W Drop I Tot

Sp2004 85 87 100 31 100 102 30 1 536 16% 16% 19% 6% 19% 19% 6% .2%

17% 17% 20% 6% 20% 20% (Without Drops, I's)

Passed with C or better 51% (54% Without Drops, I's)

Passed assessment 51% (54% Without Drops, I's)

Qualified by Placement Test 9% (50% of those received C or better)

Qualified by ACT or SAT 23% (62% of those received C or better)

Authorizations by Department 27% (48% of those received C or better)

Repeats 14% (50% of those received C or better)

No shows for final 14%

Year A B C D F W Drop I Tot

FI2003 117 128 129 37 87 116 36 650

18% 20% 20% 6% 13% 18% 5.5%

19% 21% 21% 6% 14% 19% (Without Drops)

Passed with C or better 57.5% (61% Without Drops, I's)

Passed assessment 61% (64% Without Drops, I's)

Qualified by Placement Test 10% (73% of those received C or better)

Qualified by ACT or SAT 40% (24% of those received C or better)

Authorizations by Department 18% (47% of those received C or better)

Repeats % (29% of those received C or better)

No shows for final 11%

Those qualifying by ACT or SAT have usually had their mathematics in high school and some time may have passed between their last math class and their enrollment in M111. Those who qualify with the placement test have a variety of backgrounds and lengths of time since any previous algebra was attempted if any.

Math 111/013, College Algebra With Review

Several years ago the department started offering a 5 hour course M111/013 that satisfies the same 3 hour graduation requirement as M111. It offers two more contact hours to enable the same material as M111 to be studied at a slower pace. The same text is used and the same material is studied except that in M013/111 the course starts on page 1 of the book in a review chapter while M111 starts in Chapter 1 of the text which is usually about 80-100 pages later. The final is the same final as that taken by M111 students and is graded together with the M111 finals. The same placement test determines placement. Students enrolling in this course are usually those who are more uncertain as to their background in mathematics and wish to have more time per topic to help them succeed. The grade distributions are included in what has already been presented above and are not normally separated from M111. I include some sample grade distributions here that are for M013/111 only for comparison and/or conclusions by interested parties. Most semesters there are only one or two sections of M111/013.

Year A B C D F Drop/W Audit I Tot
 FI 2010 4 2 6 2 3 2 0 0 19
 21% 11% 32% 11% 16% 11%
 Percent with C or better: 63%

Year A B C D F Drop/W Audit I Tot
 SP 2010 2 4 2 1 6 8 0 0 23
 9% 17% 9% 4% 26% 35%
 Percent with C or better: 35%

Year A B C D F W/Drop Tot
 Sp2006 1 7 5 6 4 7 30
 3% 23% 17% 20% 13% 23%
 Percent with C or better: 43%

Year A B C D F W/Drop Tot
 FI2005 4 6 3 1 12 17 45
 9% 13% 7% 2% 27% 38%
 Percent with C or better: 29%

Year A B C D F W/Drop Audit Tot
 Sp2005 7 8 7 6 10 19 1 58
 12% 14% 12% 11% 17% 33% (57 used in data)
 Percent with C or better: 38%

Math 131, Contemporary Math

In Math 131, Contemporary Mathematics the department uses a different approach for assessment of this alternative to College Algebra for some students in some disciplines. Math 131 has not and will not be taught by GTA's or Lecturers. The class is taught by faculty at the rank of Instructor or higher and has been taught several times by Associate or Full Professors. The department wanted M131 to be a course taught by an experienced professor or instructor who could bring the wealth of their experiences to the students. Therefore, there is no department final for the exam or any extensive assessment in place. The faculty member teaching the course decides on content, grades, etc except that each section has the same textbook.

Year A B C D F Drop/W Audit I Tot
FI 2010 2 7 12 4 11 5 0 0 41
5% 17% 29% 10% 27% 12%
Passed With C- or Better: 51%

Year A B C D F Drop/W Audit I Tot
Sp 2010 6 10 6 4 7 2 0 0 35
17% 29% 17% 11% 20% 6%
Passed With C- or Better: 63%

Year A B C D F Drop/W Audit I Tot
Sp 2009 10 8 9 1 3 3 0 0 34
29% 24% 26% 3% 9% 9%
Passed with C- or Better: 80%

Year A B C D F W Tot
Sp2006 6 16 11 2 8 5 48
13% 33% 23% 4% 17% 10%
Percent with C or better: 69%

Year A B C D F W Tot
FI2005 12 20 18 4 5 7 66
18% 30% 27% 6% 8% 11%
Percent with C or better: 75%

Year A B C D F W I Tot
Sp2005 12 20 16 6 4 10 2 70
17% 29% 23% 9% 6% 14% 3%
Percent with C or better: 69%

Year A B C D F W I Tot
FI2004 31 20 10 0 3 7 1 72
43% 28% 14% 0% 4% 10% 1%
Percent with C or better: 85%

Year A B C D F W Tot
 Sp2004 4 9 27 3 9 11 63
 6% 14% 43% 5% 14% 17%
 Percent with C or better: 63%

Math 112, Pre-Calculus

The College Algebra portion of Pre-calculus (a combination of Algebra and Trigonometry), M112, is considered to be equivalent to M111 and is an alternate path that can be used to satisfy the basic skills requirement. It is usually taken by those who have a need or desire to take higher level mathematics but who do not feel ready to take Calculus. The class is taught mostly by regular faculty with some classes taught occasionally by our more senior graduate teaching assistants. Each instructor gives their own final and is responsible for all aspects of the course. The only assessment done is by the faculty teaching the course and by grade distributions such as are found below. The department is considering a departmental final similar to that for M111, but this is only in the planning stage at present. Some sample grade distributions follow.

Year A B C D F Drop/W Audit I Tot
 FI 2010 18 19 16 6 10 11 0 0 80
 23% 24% 20% 8% 13% 14%
 Passed with C- or Better 66%
 Repeats 14 Passed with C- or Better: 9
 M112 (Excluding Concurrent Enrollment)
 Year A B C D F Drop/W Audit I Tot
 Sp 2010 8 6 14 1 27 8 0 0 65
 12% 9% 22% 2% 42% 12%
 Passed with C- or Better: 43%

M112 (Including Concurrent Enrollment)
 Year A B C D F Drop/W Audit I Tot
 Sp 2010 41 33 22 1 27 10 0 0 135
 30% 24% 16% 1% 20% 7%
 Passed with C- or Better 70%

Year A B C D F Drop/W Audit I Tot
 Sp2005 7 7 4 3 4 13 1 0 39 18% 18% 11% 8% 11% 34% (38 used in data)
 Passed with C or better 47%

M112

Year A B C D F Drop/W Audit I Tot
 F2004 12 13 7 4 11 20 0 1 68 18% 19% 10% 6% 16% 30% (67 used in data)
 Passed with C or better 48%

Year A B C D F Drop/W Tot
 Sp2004 6 11 3 3 9 11 43 14% 26% 7% 7% 21% 26%
 Passed with C or better 47%

The plans for the 2011-2012 Academic Year are to:

- Revise the Committee Charge
- Request a General Education Coordinator with specified duties
- Add Basic Skills as Prerequisites to Introductory Courses or Other Alternatives
- Implement the Guidelines for General Education Transfer Credit
- Design a procedure for dealing with ignored transfer credit requests
- Design and implement a pilot study for assessing an introductory course(s) based on outcomes
- Continue to approve courses submitted for introductory, further studies and issues and perspectives general education credit.
- Request membership on the Advisory Council and the Academic Operations Committee

Report from the Honors Committee - Clyde Stoltenberg, chair

HONORS COMMITTEE, 2010-2011—Report to the Faculty Senate

Members:

Trisha Self, Health Professions
Gemma Blackburn, University Libraries
Yanwu Ding, Engineering
Clyde Stoltenberg (Chair), Business
Betty Monroe, Fine Arts
Chinyere Okafor, LAS Humanities
Ken Ciboski, LAS Social Sciences
Johnnie Thompson, Education

_____, SGA Representative
HONORS COMMITTEE, 2010-2011—Report
to the Faculty Senate

Members:

Trisha Self, Health Professions
Gemma Blackburn, University Libraries
Yanwu Ding, Engineering
Clyde Stoltenberg (Chair), Business
Betty Monroe, Fine Arts
Chinyere Okafor, LAS Humanities
Ken Ciboski, LAS Social Sciences
Johnnie Thompson, Education

_____, SGA Representative

Charges:

1. Counsel the Director and review the Director's activities.
2. Review and recommend changes as needed to the Honors Program.
3. Recommend changes in the rules and policies under which the program functions.
4. Consult with the Director regarding students who want to undertake independent study leading to a degree with departmental honors.
5. Annual reports to the Senate shall include recommendations made to and actions taken by the Honors Director.

Actions and Recommendations:

The year began with an internal search to fill the position of Director of the Honors Program. Interim Director William Vanderburgh chaired the search and Committee Members Trisha Self and Clyde Stoltenberg represented the Honors Committee in that process. Annette LeZotte (Art and Design) was appointed the new Honors Program Director in late September.

The Director has successfully implemented the changes to the program approved last year regarding 1) increasing admission requirements, 2) clarifying progression requirements, 3) increasing the number of hours in the lower division, and 4) and increasing the number of hours in the upper division. Specifically, with respect to item (4), she has implemented a course in Advanced Composition and a Research Seminar, to be offered in 2011-12.

In the course of the year, the Director consulted with the Committee on a number of

items, including:

- 1) The Honors Admissions and Appeals Process
- 2) Collection of data from an Honors Student Survey and Focus Groups to provide student input on improvements to the program
- 3) Curriculum development and Honors Course offerings for Spring 2011 and Fall 2011: The Director has successfully initiated 6 new Honors Courses to be offered in Fall 2011, five of which are at 300- or 400-level, and four of which fulfill GE requirements. These courses are distributed across a variety of disciplines, including Archeology, Fine Arts, Behavioral Science, Aerospace Engineering and Biological Sciences. The Committee applauds the Director for the initiative she has taken to achieve Honors curriculum expansion during her first year in the position.
- 4) Graduation Audit: While only three students graduated from the Honors Program in 2009-2010, it is likely that as many as twelve may graduate in 2010-11. The Committee regards this as a significant improvement in yield and the beginning of a trend toward having more students who enter the Honors program complete it. The Committee applauds the Director for the efforts she has undertaken to achieve this result and to work with students in completing requirements.
- 5) Residential learning community initiative: The Director has worked diligently with Housing to strengthen the Honors Residential Living Learning Community. Members of the Committee have participated in functions at Fairmount Towers with Honors students constituting that Living Learning Community. The Director has consulted with the Committee on the provisions of the Floor Agreement which participating Honors Students execute.
- 6) Honors Course GE Designations: The Director has inventoried prerequisites for GE Honors courses and has consulted with the Committee on efforts to rationalize and streamline prereq hurdles.
- 7) Recruitment: The Director has consulted with the Committee on new Honors student recruitment processes and initiatives, including Orientation for new Fall 2011 entering students. She has also shared drafts and sought input on literature and materials utilized in that process.

The Committee has been pleased to consult with the Director on the new initiatives she has taken to re-energize the Honors Program and to lay the groundwork for more students who enter the Honors Program to complete it. We recommend that next year's Committee continue to monitor implementation of the changes to the Program approved last year and to actively consult with the Director on continued Program improvement efforts.

Report from the Library Committee - Robert Feleppa, chair

DATE: April 21, 2011

SUBJECT: 2010-11 Committee Report

1. Membership:

Amy Baker-Schwiethale (Fine Arts), Tim Craft (Business), Bob Feleppa (LAS-Humanities), Bill Hendry (LAS-Math/Natural Sciences), Robert Manske (Business), Kim McDowell (Education), Peer Moore-Jansen (LAS-Social Sciences), Charles Yang (Engineering)

Ex Officio:

Kathy Downes (Associate Dean), Cathy Moore-Jansen (Coordinator of Collection Development), Nan Myers (Director of Public Services), Ravi Pendse (Dean)

2. Meeting Schedule:

The Committee met four times: October 5, October 26, December 7, March 29.

3. Activities:

*The committee was given the charge of revising its charge and presenting its proposed changes to the Senate. The committee considered and proposed revisions designed to clarify the Committee's advisory position with respect to the Senate and the Library. Charge revisions were approved by the Senate in November.

*The committee had several discussions of the selection criteria and search process for the new Dean. Committee members who were also on the search committee communicated the Library committee's interests and concerns to the search committee. A number of members had opportunities to communicate directly with the Dean candidate during the search process.

*The committee was asked to look into the Shocker Open Access Repository (SOAR) in the interest of getting a clearer understanding of its current status, its potential advantages for faculty and students, and any significant issues concerning governing policy, implementation, and expansion of services. A report of the Committee's discussions was sent to the Senate President.

4. Pending issues:

The committee plans to continue discussing the aforementioned SOAR issues with the new Library Dean next semester. It is also planning to assist in the development of a new survey of Faculty priorities, interests, and concerns with respect to Library services

Report from the Planning and Budget Committee -- Frederick Hemans, chair

2010-2011 Members

Frederick Hemans, President of the Faculty Senate, chair

Steve Skinner, President-elect of the Faculty Senate

Deborah Soles, Past President of the Faculty Senate

Silvia Carruthers, Fine Arts

Terence Decker, Barton School

Will Klunder, LAS Humanities

Susan Matveyeva, University Libraries

Ken Miller, LAS Math/Natural Sciences

Peer Moore-Jansen, LAS Social Sciences

Betty Smith-Campbell, Health Professions

Johnnie Thompson, Education

Mehmet Yildirim, Engineering

2010-2011 Ex officio members

Gary Miller, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research

Rick Muma, Associate Provost

Keith Pickus, Associate Provost

Linda Claypool, President of the Classified Senate

Grady Landrum, President of the Unclassified Senate

Meeting Schedule for 2010-2011:

The Planning and Budget Committee met five times during the fall semester, and approximately six times during the spring semester (every other Friday from 1:00-2:30).

Committee Charges:

The Planning and Budget Committee is charged with a number of tasks, including:

- Identifying and defining the most appropriate avenues for faculty participation in the planning and budget processes
- Advising the President of the Faculty Senate and the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and Research on faculty concerns and priorities to budget policies
- Reviewing all matters pertaining to university planning and budgets, and expenditures, including budget policies and assumptions
- Developing the faculty perspective on strategic issues and the direction of the University, through direct participation with the Provost and other constituencies
- Review the revision/reallocation process that occurs after the legislature determines the actual budget allocations to the University.

Following the precedent set over the last two years, the committee has been a forum for the discussion of a wide variety of planning issues broadly related to the Reshaping Initiative.

Fall Semester: Program Review and Foresight 2020

During the fall semester the committee primarily worked on revising the Program Review process and did planning work aimed toward implementing KBOR's strategic plan, Foresight 2020. Revisions to the Program Review process were prompted by

revisions to KBORs Program Review Policy (January 2011) and were drafted by Associate Provosts Martha Shawver and Rick Muma who worked with a subcommittee composed of Peer Moore-Jansen, Susan Matveyeva, and Hemans.

The intent was to create a process that is more thoughtful and to include feedback to departments. To accomplish this the timeline for departmental review was extended to a full year and the current annual reporting was changed to a three-year cycle. The three-year departmental reports will be used by the Program Review committee to compile its reports to the KBOR.

The committee also established priorities for the implementation of Foresight 2020 in a planning exercise that related its goals based on the impact on the University and their relevance to the role of Faculty.

The new Program Review procedure can be found on line

at: <http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=shockerassessment&p=/ProcessforProgramReview>

Faculty priorities for Foresight 2020 can be downloaded from the Faculty Senate's "Current Topics" web page. The priority matrix for all constituent groups is in draft form and was reviewed during the spring semester.

Spring Semester: the new HLC process; Graduation Partnership; and Online Distance Education plan

During the spring semester the committee met with Associate Provost Rick Muma to begin planning for the new Higher Learning Commission process, which will entail the creation of a Quality Improvement Plan. The committee also reviewed the Graduation Partnership (including WSU 101) and the Distance Education plan with Associate Provost Keith Pickus.

At our last meeting of the semester we began the review of a financial model being developed by the Provost's office that will evaluate the costs of academic programs. This work will continue in the upcoming academic year.

Report from the Rules Committee -- Steven Skinner, Chair

2010-2011 Academic Year

The Faculty Senate Rules Committee consisted of Steven Skinner (Chair), Clyde Stoltenberg, Krishna Krishnan, Cathy Moore-Jansen, Dharam Chopra, Christopher Brooks, Peer Moore-Jansen, Julie Bees, Daniel Bergman, Barbra Hodson, and Johnnie Thompson. The committee does not have set meeting times, gathering when there is a need.

This academic year, the committee:

- Voted to absorb the University Curriculum Committee into the Academic Affairs Committee and changing the charge of the Academic Affairs Committee.
- Voted to absorb the University Admissions Advisory Committee into the Exceptions Committee and changing the charge of the Exceptions Committee.
- Voted to make a change to a charge of the Scholarship and Student Aid Committee.
- Voted to add a charge to the Academic Affairs Committee.
- Approved various committee assignments.
- Filled vacant committee assignments.

The committee is presently working on a change in Policies and Procedures, regarding Court of Student Academic Appeals.

Report from the Scholarship and Student Aid Committee - Mary Walker Chair

Members of the Committee

Faculty

Doug English (LAS Math/Natural Sciences)
Douglas Parham (Health Professions)
Jodi Pelkowski (Business)
Suzanne Tirk (Fine Arts)
Craig Torbenson (LAS Humanities)
Mark Vermillion (Education)
Mary Walker [Chair] (University Libraries)
Sam Yeager (LAS Social Sciences)
vacant (Engineering)

Ex-Officio Members

Deb Byers (Financial Aid)
Kim Sandlin (Admissions)
Sheelu Surender (Scholarships / Financial Aid)

Student Member

Vacant

Meeting Schedule

Agendas and meeting minutes are available on the Faculty Senate website.

Meeting

agendas: <http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=facultysenate&p=/1011/committeeactivities/>

Meeting

minutes: <http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=facultysenate&p=/1011/comm.minutes/committeeminutes/>

The committee gathered together for:

- 1 hearing for two scholarship appeals (July 2010)
- 5 fall meetings (8/31, 9/15, 9/28, 10/20, 12/1)
- 3 spring meetings (2/16, 3/9, 4/13)

Committee Activities

1. Distinguished Scholarship Invitational 2010
 - a. Committee met three times to discuss issues related to the DSI
 - b. Recruited Nick Wyant, Assistant Professor and Research and Information Services Librarian, to write scenario
 - c. Assisted with recruitment of DSI volunteers
 - d. Reviewed and assembled DSI questions
 - e. Received report from Admissions regarding DSI participation and results:
 - i. 346 student participants (all of whom had at least a 24 ACT score & a 3.5 GPA)
 - ii. All participants receive some scholarship money
 - iii. 54 semi-finalists received 4-year awards for \$10,000.

- iv. 8 finalists were interviewed for the Gore Scholarship (Note: The Chair of the Scholarship and Student Aid Committee serves on the Gore Scholarship Committee.)
- v. 3 Scholarship and Student Aid Committee members participated in the review of applications and/or served as an observer

2. Address Issues Raised by Faculty Senate Executive Committee

a. WSU Foundation's "Scholarship Opportunities for Students" Web Page Revision.

The format of the current page located at http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=foundation2&p=/DonorRelations/scholarship_opportunities/ makes it difficult to discover scholarships unless the student knows the specific name of the scholarship they are trying to locate. A meeting was held with Patsy Selby, Sherry Compton, and Nate Gould on February 9 to discuss updating the page with a more user-friendly interface. An idea was presented regarding the addition of a search box which would make the discovery of scholarships possible for current and potential students. The Foundation was receptive to the suggestion and will check with their contact in UCATS on the possibility of adding this search feature. The Foundation does not have full-time staff to support their web page and must rely on the availability of UCATS personnel.

b. Scholarship Data Made Available to Departmental Scholarship Administrators

The Foundation determines what monies are allocated per fund and those balances are shared with each department in late fall. Each College has a College Scholarship Coordinator who meets with Financial Aid and the Foundation regularly.

Historical scholarship information for individual students is available in Banner to the College Scholarship Coordinator back to when Banner was brought online. Departmental Scholarship Administrators (DSA) do not have access to this part of Banner but can request this information from their College Scholarship Coordinator. There are no plans at this time to grant access to the Departmental Scholarship Administrators due to the limited ability to customize restrictions within Banner, the additional staff time it would take to train and support DSAs accessing the system.

After some investigation, the Committee determined that each college handles scholarship distribution similarly. The colleges solicit the applications for scholarships. Renewing students are reviewed and are allocated awards before the remaining funds are distributed to new students. Although the process of selection is similar, how the process is handled varies slightly. Some departments have a single person who coordinates the scholarship distribution, seeking nominations and suggestions from faculty within the department. Other departments use a committee to review nominations. Ultimately, the departments select their scholarship recipients and notify the Foundation. If departments are having difficulty acquiring the information they need to award scholarships, they should talk to their College Scholarship Coordinator to request the desired data.

The current College Scholarship Coordinators are:

College Person Title

Business Kate-Kung-McIntyre Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Programs

Education Patrice Hein Community Coordinator

Engineering Samantha Corcoran Assistant Dean

Fine Arts Brenda Achey Accountant IV

Health Professions Mandy Konecny Academic Advisor

Liberal Arts & Sciences Candace Weathers Senior Administrative Specialist

c. Financial Aid Scholarship Reporting.

There are five major areas of institutional scholarships: general scholarships, academic college scholarships, athletic scholarships, outside scholarships, and departments and campus organization scholarships. General scholarships are awarded through Enrollment Services to incoming/new students and continuing/current students. Academic college scholarships are awarded through each academic college and are coordinated with Financial Aid to ensure compliance with federal regulations. Athletic scholarships are awarded through the athletic department but are coordinated with Financial Aid to ensure compliance with NCAA regulations. Outside scholarships are awarded to students through external organizations. Departments and campus organization scholarships are awarded through departmental funds, student fees allocations, and/or grants.

Scholarship reports are generated by Financial Aid for various departments on campus including the President's and Provost's offices. Data is collected and then must be manually manipulated to produce these reports. Detailed departmental reports are not available unless officially requested from the Faculty Senate and have received Provost approval.

The FY11 Scholarship Allocations and Award Summary report, provided by Sheelu Surender, Associate Director for Scholarships, is attached to this report. It summarizes the fiscal year 2011 scholarship allocations as of March 30, 2011. The total allocated amount is correct as of the time of the report; amounts may fluctuate by the official end of the fiscal year dependent upon any additional monies that may become available. "Offer Awards" is the number of students offered a scholarship. The "Decline Awards" are the number of students who declined the scholarship offer. Some scholarship offers were cancelled (Cancel Awards) because students did not enroll at WSU, graduated in December, or failed to meet the requirements of the scholarship at renewal.

d. Policy to Review: Should scholarship money be tied to a specific sport or activity or should it be tied to only the student's academics?

Is it possible to award a scholarship that is not tied to any department or activity so that if a student changes their mind about their major or activities, they would not lose their

scholarship? Scholarships have restrictions and even with the general awards (albeit fewer), there are still criteria that have to be met. Specific scholarships such as an athletic scholarship or Fine Arts scholarship usually require the student to be involved with the activity for which they have received the scholarship. Donors usually have a say in how the money they donate can be used and what will be expected of the student for them to receive the scholarship. Financial Aid and the Foundation must uphold these requirements.

Southwestern College, in addition to their traditional scholarships, has a “scholarship” that allows students to change majors/activities and not lose that money. This is a sum of money given to each student by the college when they first enroll to be used while at the college. Creating a funding system such as this would require planning, procedures to be developed, and finances allocated before it could be implemented at an institution the size of WSU.

3. Elected a Chair for 2011-2012
Craig Torbenson, LAS Humanities

4. Pending Issues

a. Work with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to further refine the information requested regarding Scholarships.

Recommendations for Senate to consider

The Scholarship and Student Aid Committee recommends the Faculty Senate encourage faculty across campus to participate in the variety of opportunities mentioned in the attached document titled “Faculty Involvement and Scholarships” from Sheelu Surender. Such activities include being either a DSI application reviewer or a DSI observer, participating on the Incoming Student Scholarship Application Review Committee, or helping to select departmental scholarship recipients.

The University Admissions and Exceptions Advisory Committee (UAE) - Mehmet Barut, chair
April 20, 2011

1) The University Admissions and Exceptions Advisory Committee currently consists of the following members: Mehmet Barut (Chair; Business), Rachel Crane (University Libraries), Stephen Hathaway (LAS Humanities), David Hughes (LAS Social Sciences) Kirsten Johnson (Fine Arts), T. S. Ravi (Engineering), and Bin Shuai (LAS Math/Natural Science). We currently have two vacancies in Education and Health. We have a non-voting representative from Center for Student Leadership, and non-voting Ex-officio members including William Wynne and Gina Crabtree from the University Registrar Office; Wade Robinson, the VP for Campus Life and University Relations; and Booby Gandu from Undergraduate Admissions.

2) Mehmet Barut is re-elected to serve as the chair of the UAE Committee for the 2011-2012 Academic Year.

3) The committee generally meets twice a month near the second and fourth Thursdays with additional meetings and extended meeting hours up to five hours at the beginning of each semester in August and January, when the number of petitions is at the peak. We meet once, however, during the off-peak months when one single session meets the monthly petition demand. We eliminated the first meeting right after each semester starts in order to eliminate late re-admission petition behavior. Thus, meeting schedule for the following academic year is as follows:

Meeting No Date Time

- 1 August 4, 2011 1:00 – 5:00 PM
- 2 August 11, 2011 1:00 – 5:00 PM
- 3 September 22, 2011 2:00 – 4:30 PM
- 4 October 6, 2011 2:00 – 4:30 PM
- 5 November 10, 2011 2:00 – 4:30 PM
- 6 December 8, 2011 2:00 – 4:30 PM
- 7 January 5, 2012 1:00 – 5:00 PM
- 8 January 12, 2012 1:00 – 5:00 PM
- 9 February 16, 2012 2:00 – 4:30 PM
- 10 March 1, 2012 2:00 – 4:30 PM
- 11 April 12, 2012 2:00 – 4:30 PM
- 12 May 3, 2012 2:00 – 4:30 PM
- 13 May 31, 2012 2:00 – 4:30 PM
- 14 June 21, 2012 2:00 – 4:30 PM
- 15 July 19, 2012 2:00 – 4:30 PM

Meeting agendas are comprised of petitions ruled on by college-level admissions and exceptions advisory committees. The university level committee reviews the college-level rulings on qualified admissions, readmission following dismissal, late add, drop, and withdrawal requests, and other exceptions to established rules. The committee has reviewed a total of more than 1300 petitions since last May.

4) Besides the petitions, the following major issues are discussed:

- Discussed the proposal by Dr. Robinson to place qualified admissions under the purview of the Dean of Enrollment. Advantages and disadvantages were discussed in cross functional meetings. Instead of replacement, suggestion was to design a pre-approval procedure in conjunction with the Dean of Enrollment to improve the enrollment procedure. Bill Wynne's contribution to our thought process was noteworthy. Frederick Hemans, Faculty Senate President, provided a briefing on KBOR's remarks on qualified admissions.
- It came to our attention that Banner fails to restrict students on probation for a semester or so from enrolling at current semester. Once the probation decision entered

into the Banner, students were able to enroll at current semester. The problem was solved by manually forcing students to drop from the courses. We discussed the issue with Keith Pickus, Associate Provost and the system issue seems to be corrected for the next semester.

- Discussed the official statement regarding the admission of high school students to WSU and their ability to enroll before turning in a final transcript. Statement warrants admission without a final high school graduation transcript and allows them to enroll.

5) The following issues are pending to be resolved later this Spring or will be carried over to the next Fall semester.

- Students requesting special consideration for general education transfer requirements petition University Admissions and Exceptions committees. The Senate's proposed procedure, however, requires the appeals to be processed at the Registrar's Office or the Office of Academic Affairs and Research and forwarded to the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs committee. We have been making decision on such cases and we will clarify this later this Spring with units involved.

- Currently, three committee members are regularly attending the meetings. Two members in Math/Natural Science and Fine arts were not able to attend due to their teaching requirements. Members in Social Sciences and Engineering were also among the non-attending list. We suggest this to be solved by next Fall 2012. We hope that faculty members serving on UAE committee do not schedule afternoon courses on Thursdays. We believe that the above provided meeting schedule for the 2011-2012 should serve as a guide for those who would like to serve in this committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Mehmet Barut, UAE Committee Chair
Associate Professor
Barton School of Business