



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY
*COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
INSTITUTE*

WSU Town Hall Report

for

WSU Office of Academic Affairs

September 12, 2018

Town Hall Meeting about Strategic Priorities

Background

In support of its ongoing commitment to making progress on the University's strategic plan, the Wichita State University Office of Academic Affairs desired to gather feedback from the University at large on four Strategic Priority areas deemed most important for the Office of Academic Affairs. Those priorities include:

1. Advance a culture of shared governance built on trust and integrity
2. Support Strategic Enrollment initiatives
3. Innovate academic offerings for student seeking new degree options or alternative credentials
4. Evaluate new regard structures for faculty in teaching, research and service in light of the changing higher education landscape.

Assistance for this process was requested from the WSU Community Engagement Institute (CEI) to help design, prepare and facilitate an open invitation Town Hall Meeting. In consultation with Provost Rick Muma, Kaye Monk-Morgan, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and Gery Markova, Faculty Development Fellow (Planning Committee members), a design was created for a productive town hall with the following objectives:

1. Provide a process for participants to have meaningful and substantive initial conversations about the priorities with fellow employees and students across the University.
2. Gather feedback from participants about their understanding of and questions about the priorities.
3. Offer opportunities to encourage participants' future engagement in moving these priorities forward.

The event was held on Tuesday, September 4, 2018 at the Rhatigan Student Center. Approximately 160 people participated in the gathering. During the gathering, participants were provided an introduction to the priority areas as well as written descriptions of the priority areas and their corresponding dimensions. Staff from the WSU Community Engagement Institute then facilitated a process to encourage participant conversation and feedback about the priority areas. Participants were invited to participate in table discussions about an assigned priority area and to record their responses to the following questions.

1. What clarity do we need about this priority?
2. Why is this priority relevant or important?
3. What is working well in this area currently?
4. What else could we do in this priority area?
5. How do you see yourself being a part of/working on this priority?

This process was followed by a large-group call out and recording of key ideas about each priority area.

In addition, a link was provided for a Qualtrics survey where additional feedback could be offered. Those responses were incorporated into this report in the appropriate priority sections.

Detailed Participant Notes Per Priority Area

Priority #1: *Advance a culture of shared governance built on trust and integrity*

1. **What clarity do we need about this priority?**

Themes to consider:

- Define shared governance—with and between whom?
- What are the various councils (including Innovation Advisory Council) and what are their authorities and purposes?
- Both qualitative and quantitative data are needed to make good decisions by all
- Need a trustworthy process

Participant responses:

- Everyone has a voice
- No “how” will it be executed
- How do we measure success, growth
- How do the bullet points support trust & integrity
- How can we assist with strategic planning 2.0
- More information on data they want vs. data we want to/have to provide
- Further define shared governance
- How would we support the IA council (what is it?)
- What is the role of each senate? How do WSU members learn more about the role/work of the senate?
- What is sustainable innovation? What is the Innovation Advisory Council? Are there other groups like this?
- We need an assessment of where faculty, staff, and students are in terms of trust, understanding of decision-making structures.
- Who is providing the data to inform decision-making?
- As more USS employees migrate to UP, the USS folks are disenfranchised.
- The three senates are siloed. What is their authority and purpose? How do they “fit” with shared governance? Do the three senates truly represent their constituents?
- Confidence that there is not fear of retaliation for opinions and feedback.
- Is everything open to be shared?
- What and who provides data & what is needed?
- Why the specific Innovative Advisory Council? There are many other councils. How do they align and present clarity?
- How do we support the council and what do they do?
- How will we know our roles at different council levels?
- What is straight (real) information (not spin-doctors)?
- How can we relate the “real stuff”

2. Why is this priority relevant or important?

Themes to consider:

- Creates trust and transparency
- Promotes shared decision-making and good communication
- Increases safety of bringing ideas to the table
- Culture of inclusion in decision-making builds broader support and trust

Participant responses:

- Example: Pushing website out: Had the university known why it was pushed out when it when out, the university would have been bought in,
- We need to be included in the conversation from the beginning.
- It makes us insecure of our jobs
- Communication is key to shared governance
- If decisions happen without discussion and without the right people in the room, poor decisions are made
- Shared governance = trust
- Need trust and shared understanding to move forward
- Those invested in the university (stakeholders) need to know what is going on to continue to invest time/energy/etc.
- Open and honest communication, feedback from community is important for clear shared vision
- It is okay to admit mistakes, wrong moves, but need to be clear and own up. Acknowledge it and learn from it, correct the priority or strategy. Maybe things have changed since setting that priority.
- Promoting work of faculty, staff, and students is important for shared vision, so we can see what progress we are making (including small victories).
- Perception exists that upper administration has not been transparent, particularly with decision-making.
- Information before something happens will assist with a more positive view and broader support.
- How do we “count” enrollment numbers?
- To be transparent and “real” to the public a university should be shared governance.
- A lot of action is coming out, but we should have joint decisions.
- Create a culture that is more inclusive.
- The priority is an acknowledgement that we have a shared governance.

3. What is working well in this area currently?

Themes to consider:

- Various methods for feedback and communication: briefs, sites for feedback, strategic plan, Town Halls/meetings for feedback

Participant responses:

- SSC software is working well
- Need one user friendly software rather than 4 different systems
- Thursday University Briefings
- This event
- Weekly briefings
- Rick is doing a hell of a job!
- Amount of sites for feedback, FOI Act pg
- Starting to acknowledge and address issues by holding town halls for feedback. Increasing transparency.

- We have a strategic plan as a road map and starting point.
- We have a lot of data – now need to use it to inform decision-making. Need to share data and make more accessible.
- Knowing the problems
- This is the first time we are hearing that trust and integrity are important
- Thursday briefings
- The event today!
- The spirit of the UNISCOPE model
- Steps being taken – website for info
- Bringing people “to the table”
- Some of the provost’s actions, e.g. putting info on paper
- Actions taken on the needs
- Added a person to the Innovation Advisory Council & President Bardo stating these are open meetings
- Acknowledgement of work on faculty, staff, and students

4. What else could we do in this priority area?

Themes to consider:

- Clearer communication about data
- All open/accessible data we can discuss
- Clarity about funding priorities and distribution of funds
- Acknowledgement & showcasing/celebration of good work from faculty, staff and students

Participant responses:

- The new format for WSU today is 50/50 on whether people like it or not
- We are changing so much; can we stick with certain items for longer?
- We are not trusted with the analysis of data, only providing the data. Is it working?
- Speak and Communicate in ways we can all understand (Stop using acronyms). Keep it simple. Speak as if there is someone new in the room.
- Continue to find creative ways to communicate with all employees at WSU.
- More opportunities to come together and discuss Strategic Plan 2.0
- Central data we can all access (Early Intervention Systems)
- Spend more time on proactively debating topics before decisions are made, instead of playing clean-up on the back-end
- Shared governance is a mind-set. We are trying to get back to that mind-set. We are doing a lot of tactical things, but how do we get back to that?
- Sharing data, making it accessible, using it to inform decision-making at multiple levels.
- Individualize the processes, so we each learn what we can do, our role, and take ownership.
- Promote work of faculty, staff, and students in various ways. Share with the community; include different types of success (not just grants or high profile projects). This should also help build trust with the community.
- Explain more about the Innovation Advisory Council and other groups like it.
- Ability to suggest topics for Thursday briefings
- Involve the senates in decision-making

- More transparency about distribution of funding
- What are the institutional priorities for funding?
- Greater funding priorities for teaching, our core purpose!
- Improve relationship with the Sunflower.
- Acknowledge work and showcase work that has value and that is not necessarily tied to money that the work brings, no matter what the job, e.g. physical plant
- Qualitative data to balance out quantitative data; show what we do.
- Improving quality of celebrating.

5. How do you see yourself being a part of/working on this priority?

Themes to consider:

- Participate in events like this
- Promoting WSU to alumni and to the community
- Growing enrollment

Participant responses:

- Making sure we are coming to events like this
- Making sure people feel like they can participate
- We showed up today!
- Being a representative (ambassador) of WSU in the community
- Growing enrollment within all our areas
- Providing our voices and feedback
- Promote work of our students and colleagues – learning how to do this better.
- Hard to envision!
- Being a part of activities like today
- Working with alumni and helping them understand the changes
- Great representation of WSU
- Help people be proud of working with WSU and wanting to be a part of us.

Other Comments:

- Needs to be better defined
- Up and USS does not feel comfortable bringing items to the table, items are brought to the table and they have to comply.
- Are they helping or observing us?
- Build a level of trust takes a lifetime
- Need follow up on this meeting ASAP
- 360` evaluations – Admins, Deans, Chairs
- The more we seek out private partnerships, the threshold for communication and transparency goes up
- Less Salary, more responsibility
- Innovation fatigue
- Put the WSU Today back in the body of the email
- There are individuals who fear retribution, jobs, Sunflower write-up

- Need more onboarding/orientation for new faculty and staff about our university, our strategic plan, vision of the university. This helps build a culture and shared vision (not just a checklist).
- Questions about innovation campus and transparency

Hot Topics

Providing both quantitative and qualitative data for informed decision-making

Strength – wanting to represent Wichita State with our pride and try to share that in the community

Online responses

- Our table had a lot of discussion of “them” vs “us” and the need to be more inclusive.
- It’s hard to believe integrity exists when decisions are made without consultation. It’s hard to believe trust exists when work is removed that we believed we were doing extremely well.
- I would like to discuss about the promotion of excellent work of faculty. What have we done in this area as a university? Annual evaluations have become a joke that no one seems to care about. The only way to correctly incentivize and reward faculty is merit raises regularly. This will automatically align faculty to the university’s mission (as long as merit raises are tied to the mission). Right now we get what we pay for. Faculty awards are a paltry sum, one-time in most cases. Promotions and PIR result in only about a \$5k raise, that too after 5 years. One should look at how K-State decided to address its salary issues. A promotion results in a salary increase of 15% of the median salary in the university. This comes to about a 12k raise when one is promoted.
- We do not have enough resources. However, faculty are at the core of the university. They should be rewarded adequately and merit emphasized. Last 5 years, merit is nowhere in the discussion. A good university with strong programs and meritorious faculty leads to national recognition and students will come. So where do we get resources? It is all about priorities. We have a lot of soft money positions on campus which should be redirected to investing in the faculty core. All administrators have 12-month salaries and secretarial help to boot. Cut down on administrative time to just one month over the summer for most of these positions. Faculty should be provided the same secretarial help as administrators as their time is also important; I do not see that line of thinking at this university. Finally, adopt an RCM model in the university so growing programs get the resources they desperately need.
- The university needs to invest more in advancing the excellent work of faculty and students. Currently, there isn’t enough information about the wonderful research happening in different departments. This needs to be promoted better. For example, the university should invest in having a photographer take professional headshots of faculty and uploading them onto the department website, thereby increasing the visibility of the researchers, as well as the departments.

Priority #2: *Support Strategic Enrollment initiatives*

1. What clarity do we need about this priority?

Themes to consider:

- What’s the specific goal and priority here? \$ vs student #s? Recruitment or retention of those recruited? # students vs meeting workforce needs?
- Do we have the infrastructure to support and sustain increased enrollment? How to create this?

Participant responses:

- What is the specific goal?
- Need more resources for more students
- Specific strategies for retention: Meeting student’s needs; what are current retention rates?
- What should we be involved with meeting priority? What is our role?
- “Vibrant LAS education” – What does that mean to university leadership?
- Do we have realistic expectations?
- Are they achievable and sustainable? Once you achieve them, is it possible to exceed them?
- Do we have enough money to increase infrastructure and resources
- Departments are expected to absorb cost instead of getting extra funds to hire additional faculty and staff once they have achieved their initial expectations.
- Why does liberal arts education fit under this priority?
- Has research been done at other institutions around strategic enrollment?
- Is there a defined goal or target for recruitment?
- Quality of those we recruit?
- Are there plans to support increased enrollment (financial resources – faculty retention)?
- Losing students to Butler CC because classes are at capacity (e.g. waitlists)
- Waitlists vary by department
- Availability of the plan
- What exactly does rapid mean? Where are we in that process?
- Standard
- What is the impact on retention, considering undergraduate credit hours are 120?
- Questions around our priorities on how much money we are bringing or the number of students.
- Why is it important for us to grow? Why are we striving for 22,000? Is it about money or pride?
- More transparency in the breakdown of number of students – badge vs true freshman vs geography.
- Numbers vs impact – what is important?
- Need clarity in retention not enrollment. What does it look like here and at other institutions?
- Whom are we comparing ourselves to? Other peer institutions?
- What is considered rapid enrollment?
- Do we want to focus on helping students before they get here or after?
- Increasing in recruitment and enrollment. Do we need to focus on all programs or narrow to workforce need of the community?
- Need to define successful employment opportunities.
- Rapid degree completion – What does it mean (credit for life experience) quicker – Would the quality be the same?
- Perhaps clarify bullet #3 to academic excellence in all colleges support by LAS.

2. Why is this priority relevant or important?

Themes to consider:

- Increases diversity

- Increases student success
- Meets supply/demand
- Provides WSU with flexibility and revenue to do more

Participant responses:

- Need students to have a university
- Want students to have a quality experience
- More students can support smaller students; increase diversity
- Supports local community; increase workforce available
- Future of organization
- Student success and type of students you are admitting
- Revenue!
- We want to be recognized as leaders compared to other universities
- The need to have happy students, who are able to get a job with minimal debt.
- Supply and demand – students will choose another institution if not getting needs met.
- Have to do this in order to survive – financially we need to grow.
- Higher percentage of students allows students to be surrounded by a more diverse student body – developing our students.
- It is our bread and butter; it is what keeps us going as a higher education institution.
- Alternative routes i.e. badges to meet the needs of students
- Making education more accessible
- Resources
- Helps us choose our own destiny
- Flexibility of decisions with resources

3. What is working well in this area currently?

Themes to consider:

- Recruitment from the I-35 corridor
- More creative options and support to meet student needs
- Adult learning opportunities that include online learning, applied learning, WSU Tech, Veteran’s Center

Participant responses:

- Admissions – getting students, particularly along I-35 corridor
- Online degree options: Meet needs for students who might not be able to make traditional classes; rapid degree completion
- Creativity to meet needs of students and community
- Applied learning opportunities – Creative, diverse, unique communication to students on importance of applied learning experiences
- Admissions/OneStop is working well
- Domestic Admissions
- Expansion of I-35 corridor
- Lifelong learning working well
- Adult Learning/Veteran’s Center

- Expansion of online training
- Good job in recruitment – I-35 corridor
- Tuition break
- Early Admit!
- Focus on underserved students
- Applied learning is great! Always looking for more opportunities.
- Recruitment – Visibility had been enhanced
- Decrease from 124 to 120 hours – students see this as a positive
- Advisor knowledge has increased in some colleges, allowing them to share with students various degree options
- Applied learning focus – colleges are focusing on this more and sharing stories
- More flexible with some of the policies for students
- I-35 corridor – what else could we do to increase it?
- Recruitment – increase in incoming Freshmen
- Set up support systems for student success
- Start new successful programs: Education; Shocker Studios
- Affiliation with WSU Tech: Shocker Pathways – 2+2 programs

4. What else could we do in this priority area?

Themes to consider:

- Support capacity to have classes available
- Increase retention through improved advising, customer service, greater connections, and increased attention to student direction and understanding of what they want and how to get it
- Care and feeding of 1st generation students, course offerings and faculty
- Connecting better across departments—specifically to how things contribute to LAS education

Participant responses:

- Matching resources to growth – funds, personnel, time – What can be reallocated?
- Connecting academic and student affairs departments: establishing direct communication; clarifying different priorities of each department
- Clarify how other departments support LAS education – incentives needed
- Communicate how LAS is not exclusively academic; clarify applied learning in this area
- Online learning – how do we build in community/WSU experience? What does it look like for an online student?
- Clash of Colleges online game – idea
- Rethink calendar from 9 month to 12 month incentives; approval committee gone for summer
- Rethink/prioritize administrative thinking around teaching – online, badges, etc. to keep up with student needs so they can be successful
- Perhaps market to students exactly how applied experiences pertain to their degree. Highlight less obvious degrees, i.e. history?

- Courses have to be available in general education classes (required). Losing students because psychology and chemistry classes are full. If they leave (Butler) and might find it saves money, might lose them for good.
- Courses stated in catalog not available?
- Capacity to support the program.
- Offer excellent customer service
- Increase retention
- Help students understand degrees offered – many don't know what they want to do and incur more debt
- Tiered tuition system – less in first year to allow exploration of classes/degrees.
- Link for students the value of courses (e.g. women's studies)
- Take a deeper look at general studies – have required too high?
- What are we doing to retain the high percentage of first generation students?
- Getting them engaged socially as well as academically
- Finding ways to connect with the student who is not traditional i.e. online only students – “Cloud Community”
- Retention sophomore to junior year
- Improved advising throughout
- Improved work with first generation
- Communicate with programs who are first generation: communicate with faculty who are first generation and why it is important

5. How do you see yourself being a part of/working on this priority?

Themes to consider:

- Participate in recruitment and retention committees, networking and other processes
- Moving past ‘us vs them’ regarding policy priorities and changes in approach
- Promote WSU everywhere and provide excellent customer service; help students be connected to resources that exist

Participant responses:

- Recruitment and retention committees in different areas – join conversations
- Networking – cross silos of various departments and colleges
- HR – getting employees in as students and family members
- Everyone can be a recruiter – should be informed on opportunities/resources
- CCHT – applied learning in LAS
- Move past “us vs them” with regards to old and new university priorities and approaches
- Student affairs – helping students be connected to WSU outside of class
- Facilitate/Develop classes/administrative processes
- Keeping the ball rolling
- Promote WSU! (staff and faculty) Word of Mouth!
- Excellent customer service; answer emails, smile more, honor office hours, grades in on time
- Making sure students are equipped with soft skills
- Staff need to become familiar with university resources
- Help students see opportunities available and help them understand relevance

- Attend meeting to gain knowledge
- Communicate back to others
- Be available (always) to help students

Other Comments:

- Culture Change – struggle with online options, accessibility, innovation-focused
- Help students assess when online learning is or is not good choice for them – support/resources for students and professors/instructors
- Academic Affairs – advisors key to recruitment and retention; bridge academic and student affairs
- Explore how we can meet students where they are at – utilizing off-site campuses; full degree program at off-site campuses
- Applied learning and having enough engagement with the community on resources for applied learning
- Listening and working closing with community on what their needs are for the types of degrees they are wanting
- Figure out retention – how do we keep students? How do we keep good faculty?
- Rapid and/or alternative degree completion
- Improve clarity WSU Tech to WSU

Hot Topics

Define rapid degree completion – credit for life experience? Quicker?

Help us choose our own destiny and have flexibility – more resources

Online responses

- Rapid degree completion feels more like a manufacturer with students on a conveyor belt. Perhaps we decided the piece of the assembly line which installed student development theory was a piece of equipment with little ROI so we took a shortcut and ditched it.
- Invest in good programs and keeping good faculty foremost. This leads to everything else. Invest in a detailed scrutinization of who is doing great work and find ways to reward them before they leave.
- A problem I have had with applied learning experiences is that the number of hours students devote to this is over and above the tuition hours they pay for. Moreover, the student population coming to WSU work multiple jobs to afford this tuition, and on top of that they need to find time to work on assignments, complete readings, and be successful at school. It sometimes isn't practical for us to ask students to invest more hours in applied learning. Instead, we should find a way to integrate it better into the number of hours students are expected to work for each class.
- I am concerned about online courses. I think they can be a very good option for students, but faculty need more one-on-one support.

Priority #3: Innovate academic offerings for students seeking new degree options or alternative credentials

1. What clarity do we need about this priority?

Themes to consider:

- Shared definitions: "Micro-Masters", "Certificate", "New Degree Options", (others?)

- Constituent Needs/Wants/Expectations: Students – current, Students – prospective, University/College/Unit, Community, Industry/Employers, Culture(s)
- Drivers: Fad -- Media (Social/Commercial), Trend -- Peer (Institution) Pressure, Sustained Long-term Need/Reward
- Resources: Availability, Current, Potential, Efficient Use Of, Non-Duplication, Competing Priorities

Participant responses:

- What do students want (say vs actually want)?
- What resources can we make available to develop?
- What are Kansas and other peers doing? Where is our niche? E.g. ASL program
- What is fad? Trend? Sustained demand?
- What hasn't been demanded yet, but should be?
- What programs are too resource intensive, e.g. Online courses, to be cost effective or long term high value
- Current offering or considerations (e.g. stackable degrees)
- Terminology
- What exactly is micro-masters?
- How do we accomplish this without watering down academic experience?
- How do we know what students are seeking/why they are coming to unit?
- Quality of the degree?
- Is there a mechanism for developing new degrees? Options that students need
- Are the new credentials recognized outside of our institution?
- Do non-academic staff have a role here?
- What do we mean by “new degree options”? – dual degrees, inter-professional degrees
- How does this fit with proposal to develop interdisciplinary courses?
- Does distance education fit here?
- Collaborations with WSU Tech, Shocker Studios
- Difference between inter-professional and inter-disciplinary programs
- Difference between a certificate and a micro-master?
- Do we have priority niches?
- What is our target student?
- What are the current needs in town/state/nation to fill?
- How permanent, long-term are these areas? Fluidity? Adaptable?
- How do you get KBOR to be more responsive to current needs?
- What is the process for establishing new degree vs credential vs certificate vs new courses?
- Is a certificate just a cluster of existing courses or new courses?
- What resources are available for development of new offerings?
- Breadth vs specialist areas
- Space for new courses/students
- Why/what is the purpose to do this (strategic reasons)?
- Will we be given additional resources?
- Can we have definitions of the options? Not sure we all have the same understandings.
- How do we market to our potential students what these options are and what they can do.

- Do we have benchmarks/competitors/data?
- Use resources to best advantage.
- How do we increase knowledge about and interest in new learning opportunities?
- Clarity on needs/market analysis of the types of certificate/badges, etc. that are needed of derived.
- What is micro-masters?
- What are life-long learning opportunities now? What do people in our community need/want?
- How will resource constraints be addressed?
- How will we work together to not duplicate?
- What does our community/faculty/potential students/industries want or need and how do we learn that?
- How do we wrestle through competing priorities (e.g. concept of innovation vs. resources vs. current tenure and pwm practices) in order to implement this effectively?

2. Why is this priority relevant or important?

Themes to consider:

- Increase Enrollment:
 - Attract Interest of: current/potential students, Business/industry (support), Better serve the non-traditional student, Perception of 'Cutting-Edge' educational innovation, 'Grow' the University (more market share)
- Support for "Life Long Learning" philosophy/mind-set
- Increase the Constituent Community

Participant responses:

- Demand from top to grow enrollment
- Need to serve our urban community
- Our “non-traditional” students need evidence of progress – completion of something, rather than an unfinished degree, so badges, stackable, etc. are better.
- Need to really emphasize life-long learning program for community development as opposed to job training
- Helps recruit degree-bound students
- Supports universally strategic enrollment mission (employers, community, stakeholders)
- Life-long learning!
- How is this a benefit to the student?
- Is this a process of micro credentialing? What is needed in business/industry?
- Benefit or detriment to how business/outside sees WSU?
- To increase enrollment
- Are some degrees we now offer irrelevant and are new ones emerging?
- Need to be responsive to student interests and workforce needs
- Being ahead of our competition to gain new students
- If not providing programs of relevance, industry will not support
- Better match between courses/degrees and job market
- Increase enrollment

- Workforce development – different delivery method/programming for learning
- Life-long learning can be more flexible
- Capture market ASAP
- Allows Beta tests for other options
- Enables flexibility
- Need to communicate and collect with community
- Remain relevant to trends and needs of community
- Increase enrollment to remain competitive in the market; keep them engaged; maintain and grow our university

3. What is working well in this area currently?

Themes to consider:

- Stable Enrollment Levels
- Response to This Opportunity to Be Involved (Town Hall)
- Badges/Certificates
- Deans Working Collaboratively

Participant responses:

- We don't know; Need longitudinal studies of things like job intentions well as civic improvement and community building – including matters that cannot truly be measured
- Think adult learning is going well
- Need place or website where prospective students can request programs, courses
- Badges, Certificates
- Bachelor of Applied Arts – Media Arts
- Increased degree offerings
- Our enrollment numbers are remaining constant
- Seems like it is too early to tell
- Could be that is used to bring interest/help students decide what to do
- Development of badges (but need better marketing)
- Deans are working well together collaboratively
- Turnout today indicates interest in this process - feeling of mutual concern across campus
- WSU Tech
- Accelerated Nursing program
- CMD – Well known in community
- Badges – Kim is known expert in US
- Cargill program
- Graduate certificates in English
- Departments are offering new courses
- On-line courses
- Badges

4. What else could we do in this priority area?

Themes to consider:

- Better Connection Between Developers (Faculty/Staff) And End(Community/Industry): Reduced development risk; Increased development reward (community perception)
- Systematic Integration of Development Effort Into Faculty Load/Recognition/Reward System
- Interdisciplinary & Dual Degrees vs. Minors
- Applied learning across disciplines
- Better Information on Actual Constituent Need: Student, Industry Community/Culture, University

Participant responses:

- Big disconnect between faculty positions and community, i.e. we do not know where the real demand is and asking us to propose program with miniscule compensation is too high risk.
- Need to know it is worth developing
- Need course release and tenure “credit” for doing this work
- Life-long learning opportunities; Returning students to certify in a couple of areas, Raising awareness about marketing (more advertisement)
- Considering diverse student populations (i.e. single mothers with children, rural populations, “non-traditional students)
- Being systematic of building what the students want/need
- Develop mechanism for finding what is needed
- Better collaboration with other colleges, community colleges
- Better awareness of what is going on across campus that we could all be a part of
- Better sense of what the top employers in our city would need
- Teaching and research faculty need to push new initiatives ~ constant vigilance
- Better use of our advisory boards
- More integration with WSU Tech
- Interdisciplinary and dual degrees vs minors
- Better match to market – how do departments determine needs of industry?
- Applied learning across disciplines
- Credit badge approval
- Marketing strategies for these opportunities
- Reward structure for faculty (i.e. time, funds, support)
- Serve specific markets that WSU can serve
- Build in more applied learning/community engagement opportunities
- Develop/include more faculty to increase “buy-in”, rewarding and promoting faculty
- Invest on those of us who have access to potential students

5. How do you see yourself being a part of/working on this priority?

Themes to consider:

- Quality - Quality – Quality: Badges - does quality of content match the purpose? New Programs - quality is paramount
- Where Is The Funding?

- Finding A Supporting Balance Among: Cost constraint, Innovation, and Load/Tenure/Promotion policies

Participant responses:

- Provided appropriate resources to develop program and adequate information about what might be promising and truly useful to students. We are quite happy to go for it
- Emphasis on job training, in business badges, etc. have been discouraged in humanities, so need to move lifelong learning up the priority list
- History and Philosophy of Science and Technology Certificate
- Sustainability as life-long learning program of badge
- Being a local resource, how to do it, and be a liaison with Kim Moore
- Finding new prospects to get donations and build support for the the programs
- Willing to serve on a review committee
- Augmentation and rhetoric in public life (life-long learning)
- IT access for teachers to technology like chrome books
- Poll communities of interest about badges, certificates, and degrees
- Collaboration with WSU Tech
- Continue to look for funding and prioritizing use of resources
- Continue to support co-curricular and connection to academics, learning outside of the classroom
- Academic units/faculty develop/design what is being asked for?
- Directing students/business to where they need to go.... English, WSU Tech, etc....
- Asking additional questions to direct appropriately
- Be a champion for our ideas to keep moving
- Look at ways to broaden student outcomes to be more responsive to changes in society (diversity)
- Know what kind of employee/skill sets do employees need ~ take advantage of new technologies
- Break down unnecessary barriers
- Developing badges
- Be creative on programs
- Look at externa; validation (quality matters) for courses/badges
- Active in introducing opportunities to businesses
- Yes, we work with over 1,500 youth (not to mention parents, teachers, businesses, etc.) and with the support of resources from WSU (e.g. pencils, pens, buttons, etc.), we are happy to promote
- Help develop and promote stackable badges/certificates/courses

Other Comments:

- Purpose of Badges? – Quality of Content
- As we develop new programs, new degree options, we want to be able to ensure the quality of them.
- Keep the quality
- Need more ways to break out of current academic 3 hour programming

- Where is the funding?
- How will we deal with the struggles of the cost constraints/innovation/ tenure and promotion? Policies that do not support their innovations, etc.?
- What about applied learning?

Online responses

- Emphasize quality over quantity
- While this is a great idea in general, these new degree options that are being explored are those that need zero resources, where faculty who are already doing so much are asked to do so much more.

Priority #4: *Evaluate new reward structures for faculty in teaching, research and service in light of the changing higher education landscape*

1. What clarity do we need about this priority?

Themes to consider:

- More clarity about the UNISCOPE model: Does it drive process or vice-versa? How widely does it need to be understood and by whom? Can it accommodate variation in application/implementation in different academic, research and service areas?
- More clarity about “reward structures” on campus: What is currently in use and is it implemented uniformly? What is desired to replace the status quo? Application for “teaching” vs “research”? Involvement with adjunct and non-teaching positions?
- More clarity on reward structure funding and resources (financial and chronological)
- More Town Halls

Participant Responses:

- Research teaching service – UNISCOPE for not those three bins – but no one has a clue about UNISCOPE – we need more clarity on this model
- T&P Department level is set in stone
- T&P University level and college level they need to change
- How do we vary by department and fieldwork?
- How will the workload policy changes fit within the UNISCOPE model? Will UNISCOPE drive that or process?
- What are some effective processes for communicating UNISCOPE across campus?
- There is already opportunities for professional development; the problem is more about finding time to take advantage of it.
- Compensation for required training? Realistic to expect adjuncts to complete all required training?
- Sponsored research applications across colleges
- Applications of UNISCOPE model (implementation challenges)
- More training and exposure to UNISCOPE model
- Assessment
- Administrative and non-teaching, and support staff aren’t represented in priority (at least the first sentence given)
- Not clear what non-teaching positions and PET can do to contribute to this priority

- Status of adoption of UNISCOPE model by colleges
- How do you define “changing higher education landscape”?
- What does this mean for the variety of colleges?
- More information about demographics
- What is the current reward system?
- Funding sources – Where is this coming from?
- Clarity of teaching and research – is it one or the other? Or both?
- Define reward structure
- How each unit/college using UNISCOPE
- More town halls to build consensus on rewards structure
- Increase communication
- Not clear – everywhere what the concepts of T & P are; in other disciplines, e.g. chemistry, it is clear
- Primary teaching: Still research, but research or teaching (Chemistry) What does this mean? How do you measure teaching? Peer-review could be formalized, student course evaluations are unreliable

2. Why is this priority relevant or important?

Themes to consider:

- Recruitment/retention of talented faculty & staff (as well as students)
- Impact on morale and infectious enthusiasm across department/unit boundaries
- Reduction of uncertainty in “workload evaluation” and other criteria

Participant Responses:

- Concern that we’ll have a multi-tiered system where some faculty do not feel valued or;
- A definite separation of teaching faculty vs. research faculty
- To prevent burnout and communicate value/reward for faculty
- To attract & retain broad spectrum of faculty
- Can help move the needle on affirmative action plan
- Retention of faculty is as important as retaining students
- Accreditation mixes
- Attracting new talent
- Tenure and promotion
- Transfer of UNISCOPE to other universities
- Retention of faculty and staff
- UNISCOPE model requires a different model for faculty evaluations
- Recruit/retain talent
- Uncertain on “workload evaluation” – Is this coming from KBOR or WSU originally?
- Vital if research is an important priority – “research active” could be on a decline
- Essential to have rewards in teaching; threat of creating a 2-tiered reward structure – teacher; Teaching status will have a lower status than will be paid less than research – members of both groups need to see value of other group

3. What is working well in this area currently?

Themes to consider:

- Salary increases (both tenured and non-tenured)
- Cooperation among faculty within and between departments/units

Participant Responses:

- When faculty on sabbatical – other faculty pick up classes or hire adjunct **Can we allow for faculty pick up a class for a professor who needs more time for research and then they would, in turn, do the same
- Do have professional development available with variety of topics
- Badges/MBT available to faculty/staff
- Most of not all colleges have adopted UNISCOPE
- NTT for promotion
- Good internal Professional development opportunities
- Renewal awards for faculty
- Path for promotion for non-tenure
- Discussion being started, letting people know what is
- Little changes
- Non-tenure – boost in salary and title changes
- Increase salary and job protection
- Dual system – tenure and non-tenure
- Co-teaching with key classes from different degree programs
- The PIR process – puts the decision away from department, and onto T&P committee
- NTT open a line for research faculty
- UNISCOPE

4. What else could we do in this priority area?

Themes to consider:

- Standardize and support evaluation criteria for tenured and untenured: reduce/remove impression of criteria as “moving targets”
- Listen to faculty—more Town Halls!
- Greater investment in faculty: Professional development funding, professional grant funding, merit pay

Participant Responses:

- Evaluating – find standards @ lowest level and stick with it
- Untenured faculty – find standards at lowest level and stick with it
- Untenured faculty shouldn't feel like they are chasing a moving target
- More town halls where people can voice their opinions
- Clarify what the process will be to employ changes
- Make a distinction between needs of colleges and overall needs of WSU. Not a one size fits all.
- Hear the voice of the faculty – maybe a task force to evaluate models
- Understand college specific missions

- Invest in professional development (resources)
- Forms for UNISCOPE aren't working well
- Clarify which colleges are using the UNISCOPE already and what the deadline is to be using it
- Increasing funds for professional development
- Expand professional grant resources
- Merit pay
- Encouragement of cross pollination from different universities/industries for professional development
- Distribution of credits for cross-listing (encourage credit sharing across colleges to increase student learning)
- MTTTS research series
- Better system to measure teaching
- UNISCOPE

5. How do you see yourself being a part of/working on this priority?

Themes to consider:

- Communication of priorities, mindset shifts and policies
- Participation in Town Halls
- Development of equitable workload assessments
- Importance of involvement of all stakeholders
- Awareness by everyone of various roles and their inter-related ness, value and importance (faculty, staff)

Participant Responses:

- Committee members
- Update department policies
- Town Hall meetings
- On individual person basis, faculty can try to shift mindsets – to embrace UNISCOPE and give value to all aspects of faculty role
- Take more responsibility for community WSU priorities to others we interact with
- Conversation around workload will require frank conversation and may require.
- System needs to be equitable
- Change of mindset!
- Conversation about workload needs to continue - # of classes are not the only true measure of workload
- Educating on workload distribution (i.e. credit hour production)
- Managers seeking out opportunity for paid staff (and seeking resources in advanced)
- Town Hall – for more contributions from all voices
- LAS major committee will be evaluating this fall
- Provide a Student Affairs perspective
- Tenure and promotion – needs to be communicated
- Adopting the long view

Other Comments:

- Don't do it for us without us
- Looking for ways to get awareness of faculty roles vs. staff roles
- Priorities of each and a way for each group to feel validated in their roles
- Recognizing all units/colleges are unique and have different needs. Have a process that captures that and provides for equitable policies/practices
- Any faculty – what is the expectation of the workload
- How do we factor in non-performance – are there consequences?
- Input more on priorities

Online responses

- Reward structures should include non-teaching staff.
- Today's session (which saved the University tens of thousands in consulting fees) included a lot of valuable feedback and perspective from support staff, admins, advisors, media specialist, technology staff, librarians, etc. and nothing is mentioned about their 'rewards'. Many have same level or even higher degrees than some teaching faculty/staff and need to be included in the reward conversation.
- While all staff (faculty/adjunct/non-teaching/support/etc.) have greater and lesser levels of contribution outside their bare minimum of showing up every day, a point system should be used to increase salary for those that go above and beyond. I would have rather had a voucher for \$\$ towards an article of WSU clothing (which I am required to wear at all times), than the money that was spent on wine and cheese, which will have a large amount wasted.
- Every year dept. chairs should create a role for the faculty. If they believe they can do well in research, then increase that component and decrease others.
- A merit raise every year will mean faculty will naturally ask for a role they can excel in. We will just need to make sure that faculty roles then meet what the units and university wants.
- Currently faculty take the easy options knowing there is not much stake anyway. We need to create a good risk-reward balance. Research has lots of risks associated with it; no one is going to do that unless there are significant rewards associated with it. Who will start a new business in an environment where there are no incentives to do so? Many faculty have left the university in the last two years to other places. These were research-active faculty who did not see what they would get here for the risks they take. A research-active faculty has to suffer the pain of declined grant proposals, competitive research articles; why would they do that here at WSU? A deterministic-life with no failures is the easy path and that is what most at WSU are taking.
- This is a very important priority. One should keep in mind that different colleges and different departments have various teaching load and research expectations. It isn't fair to review a humanities professor in LAS, teaching 3/3 classes with an aerospace engineering who has a 2/2 teaching load. Most humanities departments still have 40% research and 40% teaching expectations, while some engineering departments value teaching more than research. This seems highly unfair. Especially given that engineers make double of what humanities professors make. Thus, workload orientation is an important priority that should be explored further.
- I am concerned that the UNISCOPE model will be given lip service but not actually implemented.

Additional online responses

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY | *Community Engagement Institute* | 1845 Fairmount Street | Wichita, Kansas 67260-0201
tele: (316) 978-3843 | toll-free: 1-800-445-0116 | fax: (316) 978-3593 | web: communityengagementinstitute.org

What other priorities should we consider?:

- We moved to the AAC Conference. We need to support our faculty to be successful in a similarly competitive environment. We can't provide MVC like resources and have them compete in an AAC like environment.

Further suggestions about the process:

- Thank you for not hiring another 10k consultant company to do what we can tell you simply by listening to us. I look forward to actually seeing feedback from this administration. This is at least the 3rd time I have sat at a round table with different people and provided feedback on a piece of paper. I want to keep coming to these town hall meetings but I've been here for almost 12 years and have yet to feel like administration cares about what I have to say and more like I just need to sit in my office and do what I'm told.
- I do appreciate that many if not all of the facilitators have come from previous positions on campus and worked their way up the ladder. Kaye made a comment of "they could hear you if they would stop talking." Please do not forget that you used to be one of us and what it felt like to be one of us. Many of us do not feel our voice is heard and that change is made without our regard. When we are giving a voice, please do not act high and mighty. It felt like individuals were patrolling around the room watching us vs. offering help. That room was full of highly educated individuals, we are more capable than you are giving us credit for.

Next Steps

Committee members will review and distribute this report along with data collected from a Qualtrics Survey on the Office of Academic Affairs website. The next Town Hall meeting is scheduled for October 18, 2018 from 3p to 5p. This gathering will offer participants to help take next steps on the strategic plan for the University.

Appendix

The following 153 people (2 Students, 55 Faculty, 59 Staff, 34 Administrators) participated in this Town Hall, as an expression of shared governance.

Name		
Aaron Austin	Student Affairs	Administrator
Aleks Sternfeld-Dunn	College of Fine Arts/School of Music	Faculty
Alicia Huckstadt	College of Health Professions/School of Nursing	Faculty
Alicia Newell	Student Affairs	Administrator
Alicia Sanchez	Office of Diversity and Inclusion - Student Affairs	Administrator
Allison Farres	Center for Combatting Human Trafficking	Staff
Amy Tully	WSU Foundation	Staff
Anand Desai	Barton School of Business	Administrator
Andi Stipp	Rhatigan Student Center - Shocker Store	Administrator
Andrew Hippisley	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Administrator
Angela Dean	Libraries	Faculty
Angela Hill	Graduate School	Staff
Anita Barrett	Information Technology Services	Staff
Anna Lanier	President's Office	Staff
Anthony Ho	Student Affairs	Staff
Arlene Thomas	Barton School of Business Dean's Office	Staff
Ashlie Jack	College of Applied Studies	Faculty
Barbara Gonzalez	College of Health Professions/Dental Hygiene	Faculty
Bayrom (Mehmet) Yildirim	College of Engineering/Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering	Faculty
Betty Smith Campbell	College of Health Professions/School of Nursing	Faculty
Bill Hendry	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/Biology	Faculty
Bobby Berry	College of Applied Studies	Faculty
Brandon Kesler	Housing and Residence Life	Staff
Brien Bolin	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/School of Social Work	Faculty
Carol McCall	Graduate School	Staff
Carolyn Elerding	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/Women's Studies	Faculty
Chelsea Dey	Student Success	Staff
Cheryl Miller	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Staff
Christina Folkerts	College Of Health Professions Advising Center	Staff
Christine Taylor	President's Office	Administrator
Clay Stoldt	College of Applied Studies	Faculty
Courtney Marshall	Alumni Association	Administrator
David Eichhorn	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/Chemistry	Faculty
David H Moses	General Counsel	Administrator
David Miller	University Budget	Administrator
Dean Roush	College of Fine Arts/School of Music	Faculty
Debbie Neill	Liberal Arts and Sciences - Dean's Office	Staff

Debbie Willisie	School of Social Work	Faculty
Deepak Gupta	Engineering	Faculty
Delinda Roysse	Campus Life and University Relations	Staff
Denecia Angleton	Graduate School	Staff
Denise Gimlin	Graduate School	Staff
Dennis Livesay	Graduate School/RTT	Administrator
Diana Cochran-Black	College of Health Professions/MLS	Faculty
Douglas Parham	College of Health Professions/Comm. Sciences and Disorders	Faculty
Elizabeth King	WSU Foundation	Administrator
Gary Brooking	College of Engineering	Faculty
George Dehner	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Faculty
Gergely Zaruba	College of Engineering/Electrical Engineering & Computer Sci.	Faculty
Gina Stewart	College of Health Professions	Staff
Ginger Williams	Library	Administrator
Jamie Olmstead	Human Resources	Staff
Jan Hudson	Academic Affairs and Research	Staff
Jan Twomey	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/English	Faculty
Jane Hodge	Graduate School	Staff
Jane Link	Institutional Equity/Office of Equal Employment Opportunity	Administrator
Jania Kistler	Institutional Equity/Office of Equal Employment Opportunity	Staff
Jason Holmes	Information Technology Services	Staff
Jay Price	History	Staff
Jaya Escobar-Bhattacharjee	Trio - Upward Bound Wichita Prep	Staff
Jean Griffin	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Faculty
Jeanne Patton	Information Technology Services	Staff
Jeff Pulaski	Art Design and Creative Industries	Faculty
Jeffrey Hershfield	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/Philosophy	Faculty
Jeffrey Jarman	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/Elliott School	Faculty
Jenna Farhat	The Sunflower	Student
Jennifer Pearson	College of Liberal and Sciences/Sociology	Faculty
Jessica Provines	Student Affairs	Administrator
Jill Johnson	Barton School of Business/CEDBR	Staff
John Calabro	Graduate School	staff
John Jones	Media Resources	Staff
Jordan Oleson	Graduate School	Staff
Judy Espinoza	Human Resources	Administrator
Julie Holmes	Health Professions	Staff
Julie Scherz	College of Health Professions/Comm. Sciences and Disorders	Faculty
Karen Countryman-Roswurm	Social Work/Center for Combatting Human Trafficking	Faculty
Karen Wright	College of Engineering/Electrical Engineering & Computer Sci.	Staff
Karissa Hoffman	Foundation	Staff

Kathy Downes	University Libraries	Administrator
Katie Austin	Housing and Residence Life	Staff
Keith Nuefeld	Information Technology Services	Staff
Kerry Jones	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/English	Faculty
Khawaja Saeed	Barton School of Business	Faculty
Kim Kufahl	Career Development	Staff
Kim Moore	Hughes Metropolitan Complex/Continuing Education	Administrator
Kimberly Engber	Honors College - English	Administrator
Kris Sprague	Office of Research	Staff
Krissy Archambeau	Registrar's Office	Staff
Laura Manning	Alumni Association Office	Staff
Lisa Belt	College of Health Professions/Dental Hygiene	Faculty
Lisa Hansen	OneStop	Administrator
Liz Roberts	College of Applied Studies/School of Education	Faculty
Lois Tatro	Financial Operations	Administrator
Lou Heldman	Strategic Communication	Administrator
Lynn Loveland	Alumnii Association	Staff
Maggie Slack	Career Development	Staff
Mandie Craven	Student Affairs - HRL	Staff
Mark Glasor	Public Administration	Faculty
Mark Porcaro	Online learning	Administrator
Mary Walker	Library	Faculty
Masud Chand	Barton School of Business	Faculty
Mathew Muetner	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/Physics	Faculty
Matthew Kelly	The Sunflower	Student
Megan Macken	Library	Staff
Mehmet Barut	Barton School of Business	Faculty
Melissa Ward	College of Health Professions	Staff
Moriah Beck	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/Chemistry	Faculty
Neal Allen	Political Science	Faculty
Nicole Rogers	College of Health Professions/Public Health Sciences	Faculty
Pam O'Neal	Adult Learning	Staff
Patricia Phillips	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Advising Center	Staff
Polly Basore Wenzl	College of Engineering	Staff
Rannfrid I. Thelle	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/Religion	Faculty
Reitha Deiter	College of Health Professions/MLS	Faculty
Rhonda Hanneman	College of Health Professions/Physician Assistant Department	Faculty
Rita Malinauskas	Engineering - Dean's Office	Staff
Rocio del Aguila	MCLL - Spanish	Faculty
Rodney Miller	College of Fine Arts	Administrator
Rosemary Hedrick	Student Life/Campus Recreation - Heskett Center	Staff

Sally Jones	Coll. Liberal Arts and Sciences/Int. English Language Center	Staff
Sandra Bibb	College of Health Professions	Administrator
Sara Muzzy	Career Development	Administrator
Sarah Nickel	College of Health Professions/MLS	Faculty
Shadi TaFaroji	Information Technology Services - Desktop Support	Staff
Shane Coelho	College of Health Professions	Staff
Shaunna Miller	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences/School of Social Work	Faculty
Shauntelle Thompson	Trio - Upward Bound Empowerment	Staff
Sheelu Surender	Financial Aid	Administrator
Shelly Martins	Strategic Communication	Administrator
Shirley Lefever	College of Applied Studies	Faculty
Stan Longhofer	Barton School of Business	Faculty
Stephen Arnold	College of Health Professions/Public Health Sciences	Faculty
Steve Oare	College of Fine Arts	Faculty
Susan Castro	Philosophy	Faculty
Susan Martin	Human Resources	Staff
Susan Norton	Adult Learning	Administrator
Susan Parsons	College of Health professions - Nursing	Faculty
Sydney Payne	Graduate School	Staff
Tasha Stevens	Office of institutional Equity and Compliance	Staff
Teri Hall	Student Affairs	Administrator
Teri Robertson	Career Development	Staff
Tierney Mount	College of Applied Studies	Staff
Tiffany Morgan	College of Applied Studies	Staff
Tom Delillo	Mathematics and Statistics	Faculty
Toney Flack	Information Technology Services	Administrator
Trish Gandu	Honors College	Staff
Voncella McCleary-Jones	College of Health Professions/School of Nursing	Faculty
Warren Glore	Information Technology Services	Staff
Wendy Hanes	College of Fine Arts	Administrator
Werner M Golling	Administration and Finance	Administrator
WF Woods	Honors College	Faculty