Annual Reports 2018-2019

FACULTY SENATE REPORT

Summary of Senate Activities 2018 2019

Submitted by President Betty Smith Campbell

Committee Members 2018 to 2019
https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/1819senators.php

Frequency of Meetings: Meeting Agendas and minutes:
https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/agendas_minutes_fy2019.php

Summary of Senate Activities (supporting documents:
https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/Docs_Reps_1819.php)

Information's sessions:

- Human Resources Open enrollment health benefits
- John Jones - update of University Accessibility committee and possible Senate committee
- Provost Muma – Academic Priorities
- Provost Muma – Budget Update
- Provost Muma – Kansas Board of Regents-KBOR Process and WSU response to Triggered Programs (i.e. not meeting KBOR program expectations)
- Provost Muma – Campus Improvement updates
- Assistant, Vice President Academic Affairs, K. Monk-Morgan; Strategic plan Update process
- ICAA-Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Bayram Yildirim, Chair and faculty appointee/representative; Julie Scherz Faculty Rep. appointed by President; Gretchen Torline Academic Coordinator; Darren Boatright, Athletic Director
- Associate Vice President Academic Affairs, C. Shaw update Recruitment and retention
- Information on DUO Two-faculty Authentication Security setup; S. Tafaroji IT Director Client Services: T. Flack IT Chief Information Officer and staff
- Provost Muma – Draft WSU Admission Recommendations to KBOR
- D. Wright, Chief Data Officer – SEAS update
- Provost Muma and VP C. Shaw – information on Academic Faculty Fellow awards
- Provost Muma and J. Olmstead Budget update and Compensation Report (follow-up from committee that had faculty representatives)
- C. Shaw – provided brief update of a WSU sustainability working group

Joint UP, USS and Faculty Senate meeting Oct. 29th, 2018; Presentations/Discussion with:

- Christine Taylor - Director Institutional Equity & Compliance
- Roy Moye III - United Way
- Elizabeth King -WSU Foundation CEO/President
- John Jones - Accessibility Training
- Dr. Mark Green - Prevention Service Advisory Board
- Dr. John Bardo - WSU President

New Initiative – Senate Deliberations – discussion prior to policy recommendations (and follow up actions)

1. Should Accessibility AD Hoc committee move to a Standing Senate Committee
    a. Standing Committee approved and included in Senate Rules approved at the General faculty meeting

2. Discussion of developing an AD Hoc Senate Committee on Diversity
    a. AD Hoc Committee formed
3. KBOR request review faculty Review policies – Deliberation questions: Issues/concerns with our current faculty review/workload system
    a. Faculty Workload/Review Task Force formed –used Senate deliberations for the committees discussion/review
    b. Annual report provided with recommendations to be discussed 2019.2020
4. Discussion on 4.13 Chair Policy and Procedures – current policy not being followed, discussion on issues/concerns
    a. Ad Hoc Committee on Chair Policy formed
    b. Draft recommendations provided – with formal recommendations to come 2019.2020
5. Discussion Question: what would the Senate like the Senate Planning/Budget committee to review?
    a. Budget committee used information in their committee discussions

Work of the Senate-based on Committee recommendations:
Faculty Affairs:

- Assigned the request from Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) to update Consensual Relationship policy, Faculty Affairs Committee presented a policy recommendation that was approved by the Faculty Senate and then send to KBOR.
- Reviewed multiple Human Resources (HR) new and modified policies; Provided Senate members with information ono the strength and limitations of each policy and recommended changes. Senate members then provided feedback and recommendations that were then send to HR.
- Asked to review policy for Tenured faculty members on Chronic Low Performance and Dismissal for Cause: charge: To provide consistency and clarity related to policy 4.22 Performance related Dismissal, 4.23 Faculty evaluation and chronic low performance, 4.15 Post-Tenure Review for Faculty. To maintain within the policy faculty reviews and actions related to those reviews a process that is fair, unbiased, non-retaliatory and non-discriminatory. Revised policy recommendation approved by Senate and approve at the General Faculty meeting with amendments; request for policy approval change sent to WSU Provost and President.

Rules Committee

- Multiple recommendations for committee and senate appointments
- Recommended changes to Bylaws, Constitution and Rules all Approved at the General Faculty meeting. https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/documents/42919/RulesCommitteeAndSenateRecommendedChanges_4.22.19.pdf
- Vice President G. Markova provided updates on election process for election of Senators

General Education Committee

- Proposal to modify 1st year Seminar General Education program from a pilot to a required program. Approved by Senate and approved at General Faculty meeting with amendments.

Budget and Planning committee

- Reviewed Compensation and equity report- information provided by Provost – Action – recommending salary adjustments based on Market analysis and equity – information provided to the Senate by Provost Muma

Faculty Senate Accessibility Committee:

- Recommendations on Open Educational Resources – approved by Senate

SPTE Review Committee (ad hoc)

- Reported that due to increased costs IDEA will no longer be used, still evaluating recommendations for changes to SPTE and other evaluation tools.

All Faculty meeting agenda: April 29th

- Four Town hall meetings in April to provide a forum for faculty to discuss proposals to be voted on at the General Faculty meeting, April 29th.

Pending Issues

- General Education Revision Committee (non-standing committee of the Senate) Charge: to examine the necessity to revise, maintain or replace the General education Program as currently practiced. Committed focused on Revision – (by reduction of reducing Credit Hour requirements) Tentative recommendation in Annual Report
- Faculty Workload/Review Taskforce: report and recommendations.
- Faculty Chair Policy Taskforce: policy recommendations still under review

Submitted by Senate President: Betty Smith Campbell

FACULTY SENATE
COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORTS
AY 2018-2019

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Ramazan Asmatulu	Engineering
Cheyla Clawson	Fine Arts
Fran Conner, Chair	LAS Humanities
Jeffery Jarman	LAS Social Sciences
Bryan Lehecka	Health Professions
Jodi Pelkowski	Business
Mark Schneegurt	LAS Natural Sciences
Jennifer Stone, Temp chair for spring	Applied Studies
University Libraries	vacant
Linnea GlenMaye	ex officio, Academic Affairs, Associate Vice President
Student rep	needs to be appointed

Frequency of Meetings

The committee met 3 times during the 2018-2019 academic year. The following is a brief description of what was discussed at those meetings.

Work Undertaken by the Committee

Sept 20 –Academic forgiveness policy (recommended removal of the age restriction on the policy) Discussion of the A+ grade. Discussion of change in approval process for the Applied Learning Programs. Expedited Programs Proposal feedback requested for KBOR, suggestions as follows were forwarded (though the discussion was tabled at KBOR):

- A suggestion that the library should be consulted as part of this process to determine whether it has resources to support a proposed program;
- Multiple concerns that there does not seem to be a clear role for faculty during this process (neither the General Education Committee nor Academic Affairs appear to be consulted.)
- Concern that the language 'unforeseen, immediate circumstances' can be used to circumvent the normal process. I think this and the above comment might be taken to say that some safeguards might be appropriate here.

Nov 17 – Discussed the proposition for an A+ grade being added to the scale as put forth by a student proposition. After discussion, the committee recommended that the grading scale stay as is., assignment of temp chair for the committee – J. Stone (CAS) assigned for spring

March 7 – Discussion of current senate "charges" for committee

- No changes deemed necessary
- Noted that we do not have a replacement for Mary Walker (University Libraries) or a student member
- Discussion of programs applying for applied learning experience approval:
    - BBA – ECON – denied, sent feedback for revisions
    - BBA- ACCT – denied, sent feedback for revisions
    - BBA-GBUS – denied, sent feedback for revisions
    - BBA-MKT – approved
    - MA-ECON – approved
- Discussion of diversity related content having a vetting process similar to applied learning process through AAC.

Pending Issues

Another meeting may be needed for later in the semester as further applied learning applications are expected.

Recommendations

Above

COURT OF ACADEMIC APPEALS COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Committee: Dan Close, chair, LAS Social Sciences; Dr. Rajiv Bagai, faculty member, Engineering; Dr. Kim Darden, faculty member, Health Professions; Isaac Rivera, undergraduate student member (via SGA); Dr. Jeff Hayton, alternate faculty member, LAS Humanities; Dr. Jim Granada, alternate faculty member, Applied Studies; Dr. Kirsten Johnson, alternate faculty member, Fine Arts; Ryan Eilts, alternate undergraduate student member (via SGA). SGA did not appoint two graduate student members.

Frequency of Meetings

As cases arise.

Work Undertaken by the Committee

The committee has so far heard 11 appeals filed by 7 students in the 2018-2019 academic year:

Department	*Cases*	*Case Decided*	*Appeal Outcome*
Dental Hygiene	1	9/1/18	Denied (student did not show via Zoom)
Chemistry	3	9/26/18	All 3 Denied
Psychology	1	2/13/19	Upheld
Philosophy	1	3/1/19	Denied
Sociology	1	3/19/19	Denied
IME	3	4/11/19	All 3 Denied
Entrepreneurship	1	4/12/19	Denied

General Notes:

1. The committee has elected Rajiv Bagai as chair for academic year 2019-2020.
2. There was a huge uptick in the number and complexity of the cases heard this year. In a normal academic year, 1-3 cases are filed. This year, the committee will have heard 11 appeals filed by 7 students. More appear to be waiting in the wings for the fall semester. Despite that, committee members performed patiently and admirably and are to be congratulated.
3. A meeting will be held between the outgoing chair (Close), the incoming chair (Bagai) and Dr. Linnea GlenMaye (associate VP for academic affairs) before the end of the semester to explore the reasons for the surge in cases, in addition to ways of getting cases to the committee in an expedient way. Members of the AY 2018-2019 committee also will be invited to attend, as well as members of Dr. GlenMaye's staff. The meeting time and day are TBD.

4. Kirsten Johnson, who has served for many years, has requested to be released from all committee duties. She will need to be replaced ASAP by the Faculty Senate.
5. Dan Close will be cycling off the committee. A replacement needs to be appointed ASAP by the Faculty Senate. He has identified a possible replacement, Sandra Sipes of the Elliott School.

Pending Issues - None noted

Recommendations - None noted

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - No report provided

FACULTY SUPPORT COMMITTEE - No report provided

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Amy Drassen Ham	Health Professions
Aaron Rife	Applied Studies
Steve Oare	Fine Arts
Kamran Rokhsaz	Engineering
Becky Nordyke	Basic Skills Rep
Chris Broberg	Business
Shirlene Small, Chair	LAS Social Sci
Kathy Delker	University Libraries
Rannfrid Thelle	LAS Humanities
Mathew Muether	LAS Natural Sci

Frequency of Meetings

The committee met the second and fourth Monday of the month.

Work Undertaken by the Committee

I. Process
   - In the fall semester, the General Education Committee gathers and assesses the data that has accumulated since the last review (i.e., learning outcomes, changes) and writes a report to the Faculty Senate.
   - In the spring semester, the report with any recommendations for change is presented to the senate so that the senate has the time for thorough consideration prior to taking the recommendations to the general faculty later in the semester.
   - Any changes approved by the faculty (e.g., to the general education program) will be instituted in the following version of the undergraduate catalog

II. Activities
   - Submitted a new proposal recommending all freshmen be required to take an FYS (beginning in AY 2021-22).
   - The Gen Ed Committee reviewed updated Student Learning Outcomes AY 2018-2019

III. The Committee: Actions Taken
   - Presented the upcoming proposal to the Senate Executive Committee on the First Year Seminar (FYS) program design.
   - Presented the first read of the motion to approve the proposal for the First Year Seminar (FYS) program to be required to the Faculty Senate.

IV. Summary of information/data reviewed
- FYS Data: FYS Pre and Post Writing Rubric Test Scores, Fall 2018
  - With the exception of Syntax, post-test score differences were statistically significant at the .05 level with post-test scores being higher than pre-test scores with moderate to high effect sizes. Sample size prohibited control for class section and student academic performance and demographics.
- General Education Writing Rubric Assessment, Fall 2018
  - Pre and Post test scores on the composite Writing Rubric and each of the individual sub scores showed statistically higher post-test scores relative to pre-test values with effect sizes.
- WSU Foresight 2020 Student Learning Performance, including:
  - CLA
  - NSSE
    - NSSE outcomes include participation in High Impact Practice, and 10.7% of undergraduate students participated in study abroad, down slightly from 2017 (2020 goal is 15%).
  - English 101 Post-test scores from English pre- and post-test writing performance assessment (not available for 2017 or 2018)
  - Student Learning Performance Dashboard for overall student learning outcomes.
    - Students (Seniors) were performing below expectations on the CLA (96.9% of expected score) but this was up from last year's score of 95.2%. The English 101 writing performance evaluations were not available at the time this report was written (and were also not available for 2017). The Communications 111 score was not available for 2918. Student perception of oral/written competency (from the exit survey) was down slightly from 89% to 88.7% (target for 2020 is 90%). Students continue to perceive their chosen degree will be useful to them in their career (87.3%) and 82.5% of them are employed within 6 months of graduation (up from 79% in 2017).

Pending Issues - None noted

Recommendations
The General Education Committee to re-address the assessment system/process we have in place for first year seminar with the goal of obtaining valid and reliable data for the writing measure (based on the lack of info for 2017 and 2018).

GENERAL EDUCATION REVISION COMMITTEE

Committee Members
William Hendry (chair-LAS math/natural science), Aleks Sternfeld-Dunn (Fine arts), Atul Rai (Business), Bobby Berry (Applied Studies), Helen Hundley (LAS humanities), Jeff Jarman (LAS social/behavioral sciences), Kamran Rokhsaz (Engineering), Lisa Garcia (Health Professions), Roy Myose (Honors) Susan Matveyeva (Library), Shelby Rowell (SGA) Ex officio members: Jessica Raburn (Honors), Linnea Glenmaye (Academic Affairs), Mandy Konecny (Health Professions), Patricia Phillips (LAS), Sally Fiscus (registrar)

Frequency of Meetings
The committee usually meet every other week on Friday.

Work Undertaken by the Committee
- In light of the recent request by the Kansas Board of Regents to cap degree programs at a total of 120 credit hours and requests from the College of Engineering to examine credit hour requirements rather than total

course standards, the General Education Committee recommends that the issue of revising the General Education Program be placed before the Faculty Senate. While the goals and outcomes of General Education have not been called into question, the best method to achieve those goals and outcomes while balancing the demand of the major bear a revisiting by the body of the faculty. Accordingly, the General Education committee requests the Faculty Senate take up the question of whether to examine the necessity to revise, maintain, or replace the General Education Program as currently practiced.

Pending Issues - None noted

Recommendations

PROPOSAL BY GENERAL EDUCATION REVISION COMMITTEE (4/5/19) based on motion as follows:

Maintain the following components of General Education:

- GOAL: The goal of general education is to enable you to live a rich, meaningful life by developing: an informed appreciation of the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences; an ability to intelligently follow and participate in current events; and a sensitive and tutored appreciation of diverse cultures and ways of living.
- OUTCOMES: Embedded throughout general education and furthered in the major are the skills that enable graduates to contribute productively to society and the on-going culture. Therefore, upon graduation the faculty expects you to:
    - Have acquired knowledge in the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences
    - Think critically and independently
    - Write and speak effectively
    - Employ analytical reasoning and problem solving techniques

Change the following components of General Education:

- Reduce credit hours to 33 hours from 42.
- Combine introductory, further studies & issues and perspectives into one general education category.
- Allow up to 3 credit hours of approved general education to be counted toward the major.

MOCK UP OF GENERAL EDUCATION USING CURRENT WEB PAGE STRUCTURE

GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE REQUIREMENTS, IN A NUTSHELL.

The 33-hour General Education Program at WSU consists of two areas containing four kinds of courses.

FOUNDATION COURSES: Complete four courses (12 hour minimum) within the first 48 hours of enrollment with a grade of C- or better. Foundation courses cover the fundamental skills you will need throughout your college career and should be taken at the beginning of your studies.

- English I
- English II
- Public Speaking
- Math

AND DIVISION COURSES: Complete 4 courses (3 hours/division) in each of the following 4 divisions:

- Fine Arts
- Humanities
- Social/Behavioral Sciences
- Math/Natural Science

AND An additional 3 courses (nine hours) from approved general education courses.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Huzefa Kagdi	Engineering	2016-2019*
Barb Smith	Health Professions	2016-2019*
Robert Feleppa	LAS Humanities	2017-2020
Michelle Adler	Applied Studies	2017-2020
Kelly St. Pierre	Fine Arts	2017-2020
Jodie Simon, Chair	LAS Social Sciences	2018-2021
Raina Rutti	Business	2018-2021
Mary-Liz Jameson	LAS Natural Sci	2018-2021

Next Year's Roster will need an Engineering replacement, as Huzefa Kagdi will no longer be at the university.

Frequency of Meetings

We met monthly through the Fall and Spring semester in the Dean's Library Conference Room and encouraged the active participation of the ex officio members.

Work Undertaken by the Committee

I. Updated our Charge to reflect the actual individuals represented on our committee.
    a. Submitted to Rules Committee:
        i. Composition: 16:8 Faculty, one chosen from each of the Senate academic divisions, 1 representative appointed by the Graduate Council, 2 students (one graduate student, one undergraduate student), ~~5~~ [3] library staff (ex-officio, non-voting): Dean, Coordinator for Collection Development, Associate Dean for ~~Access Services~~ [Academic Engagement & Public Services], ~~Head of Reference, Associate Dean of Administration~~

II. Reviewed the data from the Faculty Survey conducted by Dean Downes and the library faculty/staff. We used it to determine what needs should be addressed. Additionally, this aided in the Town Halls regarding implementation of the various needs highlighted in this survey in conjunction with the Shock the Future Initiative.

III. Dean Downes reviewed the University Libraries GU controllable budget from FY2015-FY2019. The GU controllable budget has steadily decreased over the last 5 years. We used this information to discuss and disseminate altered resources and affected services.

IV. Hosted discussions on the OER project with Ginger Williams serving as a representative of the OER Committee.

Pending Issues - None noted

Recommendations

We look forward to taking on a charge from the Senate.

PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Susan Castro	LAS Humanities	2017-2019
Jeff Noble	Applied Studies	2017-2019
Nick Solomey	LAS Natural Sci	2017-2019
Aaron Bowen	Library	2017-2019
Open	LAS Social Sci	2018-2020
Bayram Yildirim	Engineering	2018-2020
Terence Decker	Business	2018-2020
Ray Hull	Health Professions	2018-2020
Jeff Pulaski	Fine Arts	2018-2020
Betty Smith-Campbell	President-Chair	
Peer Moore Jansen	Past President	
Jeff Jarman	President - Elect	

Frequency of Meetings

The committee met on Feb. 15 and April 12

Work Undertaken by the Committee

Summary of Committee meetings, agendas included:

- WSU Compensation study report – Provost Muma, Jamie Olmsted-HR
- Overview of WSU Budget- including update on Legislation related to the budget; by Werner Golling, Vice President for Finance and Administration
- Reviewed committee charge and suggestions on information to provide the full Senate

Pending Issues

No work pending

Recommendations

No recommendations on policy changes or changes to the committee charges

PRESIDENT'S INNOVATION ADVISORY COUNCIL - No report provided

RULES COMMITTEE - No report provided

SCHOLARSHIP AND STUDENT AID COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Abu Asaduzzaman	Engineering
Whitney Bailey	Applied Studies
Rebecca Bechtold	LAS Humanities
Carol Bett	Health Professions
Dan Close	LAS Social Sciences
Michael Imhof	Business
Justine Sasanfar	Fine Arts
Lizzy Walker, Chair	University Libraries
Kandatega Wimalasena	LAS Natural Sciences
Student representative	Vacant

Frequency of Meetings
One meeting for the academic year.

Work Undertaken by the Committee
The committee met on October 19th, 2018 to review the charge and suggest revisions. We recommend the following:

Strike 1-4 from the charge.

5. Act as the final appeals board for students with scholarship grievances.

The Scholarship and Student Aid Committee should retain this assignment. Dan Close called Gretchen Torline during the meeting regarding the usefulness of this committee, and she was favorable toward keeping this as an option to students, even though a case has not been brought forward in a while.

6. Annual reports to the Senate shall include recommendations to and actions taken by appropriate administrators

Of course this is essential in reporting activities to Faculty Senate.

A further recommendation is to make students more aware of this committee and enhance efforts to recruit for a student representative.

Pending Issues - None noted

Recommendations
As noted under the work of the committee

TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEE

Committee Members
The University Tenure and Promotion Committee was made up of 14 members:

Tim Craft	Business
Donna Sayman	Applied Studies
Gamal Weheba	Engineering
Pina Mozzani, Chair	Fine Arts
Doug Parham,	Health Professions
Jason Ferguson	LAS
Susan Matveyeva, Secretary	University Libraries
Margaret Dawe	At Large Tenure Track
Peer Moore-Jansen	At Large Tenure Track
Whitney Bailey	At Large Non-Tenure Track
Perlekar Tamtam	At Large Non-Tenure Track
Linnea GlenMaye	Ex-Officio
Aaron Rodriquez	Student Representative

Frequency of Meetings
The committee met the week of January 7-11.

Work Undertaken by the Committee

Deliberated on 12 Non-Tenure Track candidates for promotion and 39 Tenure Track candidates for tenure and/or promotion. The final day was spent evaluating new Tenure and Promotion documents provided by three different colleges:

- Health Professions
- Fine Arts
- W. Frank Barton School of Business

The Committee passed the documents for the Barton School and the College of Health Professions. They have requested clarification and some changes from the College of Fines Arts, and will discuss their document after receiving the updated document.

The committee was impressed with the wonderful work the WSU faculty continue to produce. The committee was made op of dedicated faculty who spent many hours evaluating and discussing all of the candidates for tenure and promotion. It was a privilege to work with such a fine committee. I have included some recommendations based on a few difficulty situations in our deliberations. Most difficult was the change of President and Provost during our deliberations. I have attached recommendations for future committee deliberations.

Pending Issues - None noted

Recommendations

Recommendations and considerations are to share with Candidates and Review Committees. The committee discussed concerns from last year's deliberations, and were surprised that similar issues are of concern for the current committee:

- External reviewers should be selected with care in order to avoid the perception of a conflict of interest or bias on the part of the external reviews. When a committee reads that an external evaluator has known the candidate or has been friends with the candidate for several years, the effectiveness of the external review is compromised.
- In cases of a split vote (even a positive one), a letter, endorsed by the full membership of previous committees with a synopsis of the concerns would be helpful, allowing the University Committee to have a full committee evaluation of those concerns.
- Faculty members coming up for early tenure or promotion should offer that information in the primary document or in the department evaluation with clarification or justification. If a candidate is hired with prior years of service, this should be validated either through the contract or by a letter of clarification from the Dean or Chair.
- It would be helpful if faculty members would add the percentage of assignment for non-tenured faculty members coming up for tenure (teaching, service and scholarly activity) in a consistent and prominent place early in the document. This information was omitted or inconsistent from document to document.
- At large, non-tenure track members of the University committee were not given access to all documents. According to current practices, they can only be present during deliberations of non-tenured faculty members. This created an awkward hierarchy in our deliberations. The committee feels that, while they cannot vote for tenure track candidates, like ex-officio members, the non-tenure track faculty should be present for the discussions, and thus be able to access those documents.
- Promotion of visiting professors. Can visiting professors be promoted using current tenure and promotion guidelines?
- The committee indicated that there are no clear indications of the function of Ex-Officio members in the committee. Is the function purely advisory? Clarification is necessary.
- The committee strongly recommends training of department chairs, T & P committee members and academic administrators on best practices to ensure clarity and consistency of approaches to T & P cases.

UNDERGRAD RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Name	College	Term ends
Shuang Gu	Engineering	2019
-	Education	-
Abu Asaduzzaman	Engineering	2020
Anthony May	Business	2020
Kelly Anderson	Health Professions	2020
Susan Sterrett	LAS - Humanities	2020
Shirlene Small	LAS - Social Sciences	2021
John Hammond - chair	LAS – Natural and Applied Sciences	2021
Jessica Mirasol	University Libraries	2021
Kimberly Engber	Dean, Honors College	N/A
Jessica Wewer	Student Member	N/A

Frequency of Meetings

Meetings were conducted via email both in the fall and spring.

Work Undertaken by the Committee

I. Undergraduate Research Committee: 2018-2019 Charge

The charge of the Undergraduate Research (UR) Committee was to organize, administer, and review the 19th Annual Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity Forum (URCAF) that will take place on Friday, April 19, 2016, at the Rhatigan Student Center. The UR Committee was assisted greatly in its URCAF charge by Teruko Mitchell, Senior Administrative Specialist, University Conference Office. Her contribution was essential to the overall success of this year's URCAF.

II. WSU Student Participation in the 2019 URCAF

The UR Committee focused its attention during the 2018-2019 academic year on URCAF submission recruitment across the University's Colleges. Through our advertising and recruitment, we maintained the level of participation we gained last year. We had a total of 53 undergraduate students presenting this year. The College- and category-specific submissions are presented in the following table:

	Oral Presentations			Poster Sessions	
WSU Senate division	NS & E[a]	SS & H[b]	CA & P[c]	NS & E[a]	SS & H[b]
College of Business	0	1	0	0	0
College of Education	0	2	0	0	0
College of Engineering	10	0	0	7	0
College of Fine Arts	0	0	0	0	0
College of Health Professions	1	1	0	1	1
Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	3	8	0	15	3
Total Across Colleges	14	12	0	23	4

[a]NS & E = Natural Sciences and Engineering. [b]SS & H = Social Sciences and Humanities. [c]CA & P = Creative Activity and Performances.

III. 2019 URCAF Highlights

The URCAF is occurring this year on April 19, after this report is submitted to the Faculty Senate. As a result, we don't have highlights for the event at this time.

Pending Issues - None noted

Recommendations

Increase the number of undergraduate student presenters across WSU, particularly in the Fine Arts colleges. Action Plan: The UR Committee, working in conjunction with the Honors College, will begin the recruitment of undergraduate student researchers early in the Fall 2019 semester. Additionally, we will meet with members of Fine Arts to boost encouragement of students to present. The 2020 goal of URCAF is to have 60 presenters, and this seems feasible based on our increase in participation over the past four years.

UNIVERSITY EXCEPTIONS COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Members: Jim Bann (LAS Math/Natural Sciences); Susan Bray (Applied Studies); Rachel Crane (Chair; University Libraries); Brandy Jackson (Health Professions); Kirsten Johnson (Fine Arts); Madeline McCullough (LAS Social Science) for a portion of the year; Mike McLeod (Business) for a portion of the year; Brigitte Roussel (LAS Humanities); Perlekar Tamtam (Engineering). A student representative did not participate.

Frequency of Meetings

The committee meets 14 times per year, including summer months. Meetings were held on the following dates: August 15, August 16, September 20, October 18, November 15, and December 13 of 2018 – January 16, January 17, February 21, and March 21, of 2019. Upcoming meetings are scheduled for April 18, May 16, June 13 and July 18. A new chair will be elected at the April meeting.

Work Undertaken by the Committee

In the last academic year, the committee continued to review student petitions, with meeting agendas comprised of petitions ruled on by the college-level exceptions advisory committees, including rulings on readmissions, late adds, late drops, withdrawal requests and other exceptions to established rules.

Pending Issues - None noted

Recommendations

The UEC recommends there be a reassessment of the Academic Forgiveness policy, located in the University Undergraduate Catalog, specifically the student qualifications:

> "To qualify, petitioners must be at least 25 years old, must have been out of a degree program of college studies for at least four years, and must demonstrate ability to progress in college work."

In the course of UEC meeting discussions, the committee feels that age requirement of "at least 25 years old" is not only arbitrary, but a likely obstruction to otherwise qualified students. In at least one petition before the committee, a student was found ineligible at age 24, being only a few months shy of 25. We feel that a review of the policy would be beneficial for all parties concerned.

ACCESSIBILITY COMMITTEE

Committee Members

John P Jones, Chair
Nils Hakansson
Mara Alagic
Ginger Williams
Whitney Bailey
Laura Sooby
Neal Allen
Glynn Rimmington
Ex-Officio Linnea GlenMaye

Frequency of Meetings

Monthly meeting began in January.

Work Undertaken by the Committee

Note: This is a new committee developed from the ad hoc committee on this topic. The Senate already voted to make this a standing committee. This language is recommended by the Rules committee to provide the official charge and composition.

Composition: 10
9 faculty, one chosen from each of the senate divisions;1 student
1 Representative of the University Accessibility Committee (ex officio, non-voting)
Selection: members are nominated by the Rules Committee to be confirmed by the Senate.
Charge:

- Develop practices and standards that are consistent with the university's commitment to provide education that is accessible to all, and that also are consistent with academic integrity and academic freedom;
- Develop and update guidelines for textbook and resource adoption;
- Promote instructional practices for access and full inclusion;
- Suggest evidence based practices and standards for the use of Open Educational Resources (OERs) including free alternatives to traditional print textbooks;
- Develop requests for necessary institutional support for instructional staff in the effort to make content accessible, including resources and expectations for support from the institution and resources for training faculty;
- Participate in the work of the University Accessibility Committee organized by the Accessibility Coordinator.

Background (provided by Senate President) The Senate Accessibility Committee was asked to review a Proposal developed by Kansas Student Government Associations and presented to the Board of Regents. The request also asked for recommendations that could then be used in discussions at the Board of Regents meetings and with WSU faculty. Below is their response:

Open Educational Resources (OERs) are educational resources that are free to access online and licensed in a way that is less restrictive than copyright. OERs provide an effective, flexible alternative to traditional textbooks that can make a significant impact on the expense to students, which is a SEM/Retention issue.

At Wichita State University, the faculty take seriously the challenges inherent in providing a high quality, effective learning experience for students while being sensitive to the expense and limitations of traditionally published course materials. The University must consider the time and effort inherent in creating textbooks, and the need for WSU to incentivize the production and selection of instructional materials in areas that can have the most impact.

For the effective implementation of a campus-wide OER program, coordination and support are necessary.

Pending Issues - None noted

Recommendations

The Accessibility Committee requests the Faculty Senate support the following recommendations:

- The university administration be encouraged to follow the model of institutions like Kansas State University and set aside funds for grants to target OER development in areas of critical need and high impact for WSU students, based on the number of students taking classes, the expense of publisher materials for those texts, and the lack of acceptable OERs in the subject area.
- The university administration is encouraged to seek additional grants for OER creation from outside agencies and university donors
- The University Tenure and Promotion committee explore updates to the procedures that would consider the creation of OER materials with the appropriate weight as textbook publication in the tenure evaluation process.
- Faculty be strongly encouraged to investigate existing Open Educational Resources as alternatives to traditional texts for their classes.
- The university administration is encouraged to provide incentives for instructional staff who design courses that exclusively use OERs and have no cost to students for textbooks and resources.
- Faculty be strongly encouraged to submit their research and creative work with the University Libraries, which makes the University's digital scholarship available to a global audience.

FACULTY SENATE
NON-STANDING COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORTS
AY 2018-2019

LGBTQ TASK FORCE

Committee Members

Faculty Senate Representative: Jennifer Pearson – LAS Social Sciences

Work Undertaken by the Committee

1. **Name Use in Banner 9**

   Banner 9 allows students to enter a chosen name, but the university is still working on connections between programs used in various offices and departments to make this consistent. The goal is for a student's chosen name to show wherever possible, especially on their Shocker ID and in course rosters (important exceptions are financial aid, transcripts, and diplomas where legal names must be used). Application for admissions now also includes space for chosen name, more inclusive gender categories, and pronouns. The LGBTQ Coordinator is working with the Registrar's Office and the Director of Institutional Equity and Compliance to clarify a process through which students can change their name in Banner.

2. **WSU LGBTQ Climate Study**

   Jennifer Pearson is working with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion to repeat the WSU LGBTQ Climate Study conducted in 2016. The survey will close at the end of the semester, and findings should be available at the start of Fall 2019.

3. **Muma-Case Equality Scholarship**

   This scholarship is awarded on the basis of a student's commitment to LGBTQ equality. A subcommittee evaluated the 16 applications received. Two students were awarded $2,000 each.

4. **Non-Discrimination Policy**
   Although current practice within the university is to allow students to use facilities consistent with their gender identity, there is no formal policy protecting this right. The task force discussed adding "facilities" to the university's non-discrimination policy, and this change has been recommended to administration. The task force also discussed creating a statement of cultural norms and expectations for campus partners for buildings not under direct university control.

5. **Creation of LGBTQ Student Guide**
   A committee made up of faculty and staff from various departments will work of the summer to create an LGBTQ student guide, which will be a general guide for LGBTQ students on our campus including name change, housing, Spectrum, student health, and other resources.

6. **Campus Pride Index**
   The Campus Pride Index is a national benchmarking tool that seeks to measure how safe and inclusive campuses are for LGBTQ students. The index rates campuses in terms of policy inclusion, institutional support, academic and student programs, housing and residence life, campus safety, counseling and student health, and recruitment and retention efforts. The task force worked to update Wichita State's information, and our rating improved to 4.5 out of 5 stars.

7. **MBLGTACC Conference – February 15-17, Hyatt Regency and Century II**
   A committee of students, faculty and staff organized the Midwest Bisexual Lesbian Gay Transgender Asexual College Conference (MBLGTACC) - an annual conference held to connect, educate, and empower queer and trans+ college students, faculty, and staff around the Midwest and beyond. This was the first year in 27 years that the conference was held in Kansas, and the committee planned 3 days of workshops, keynote presentations, and entertainment for around 1,000 attendees. Keynote speakers included Jessica Pettit, Pidgeon Pagonis, Nyle DiMarco, and Janaya Khan.
   2019 MBLGTACC Final Program

Pending Issues - None noted

Recommendations - None noted

FACULTY SENATE WORKLOAD REVIEW COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Allen, Neal ; Bagai, Rajiv; Bray, Susan; Clawson; Cheyla; Crane, Rachel; Hammond, John; Harrison, Paul; Hayton, Jeff; Livesay, Dennis; Moody, Linda; Pulaski, Jeff; Betty Smith-Campbell- Chair.

Ex-Officio: Provost Rick Muma

The mission of WSU is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good. Vision: Wichita State University is internationally recognized as the model for applied learning and translational research.

Committee Charge: to assess Faculty review (workload) structures/policies in relationship to our Mission/Vision.

- Policies that support all faculty
- Seek equity in faculty policies
- Expectation there will be different paths to meet the Mission of the University within Colleges/Departments
- Seek ways to incentivize faculty when meeting the mission of the University
- To move the University forward to meet current and future needs of students, faculty, and community

- Respond to KBOR charge related to faculty development. *The faculty play an important role in the student experience as well as our institutions' successes. Developing their talents both in the classroom and in conducting research is important for the universities and the State. In light of the rapidly changing higher education environment and recognizing the uniqueness of institutional mission, the Board will direct state universities to review their* reward structures to ensure they support faculty members' professional success throughout their career

Committee Report: 5.2019

Current WSU reward structures that ensure and support faculty members' professional success throughout their career, as well as proposed recommendations and next steps:

1. Promotion (incentive) process for non-tenure track teaching faculty (12/2017)
    a. Support the recommendations from faculty committee that brought this policy forward, to provide multi-year Contracts to non-tenure track teaching faculty (i.e. 2 yrs. if promoted to associate; 3 yrs. if promoted to Professor/Senior. Consistent with Regent policy Kansas Board of Regents Policy Manual, Chapter II, Section C
    b. Next Steps work with WSU Leadership on possible implementation
2. Professor Incentive Review (PIR) available every six years for tenured and non-tenure track teaching faculty
3. Unified Faculty Scholarship Model (UniSCOPE) (expanded "incentive" definition of Scholarship) adapted by Faculty Senate (5/2016). Faculty Tenure and Promotion policies being modified at each College to incorporate the UniSCOPE model. As a new incentive – not currently embedded in WSU culture or University Policy
    a. Recommendation: Modify WSU Tenure and Promotion Policy to include UniSCOPE model language as suggested by Senate Taskforce on Faculty Workload/Review (Appendix A)
    b. Next Steps:
        i. Provide town hall meetings to share with faculty draft T & P language changes and seek feedback. This to be followed by recommendations to the Faculty Senate and then vote by Faculty
        ii. UniSCOPE not clearly incorporated in University Faculty policy or culture – provide workshops/training sessions to faculty and T & P committees at department, college and University level on the UniSCOPE model
        iii. Assess the need to modify the Faculty Annual Review (FAR) form to better incorporate UniSCOPE model
4. Current Policy on Teaching Workload: WSU Policy for Standard Teaching Loads (The standard teaching load normally shall be the equivalent of a 12-hour maximum, with no more than three different preparations) (4.12) https://www.wichita.edu/about/policy/ch_04/ch4_12.php
Actual implementation of this policy varies by department and college. Some department/colleges decrease teaching loads to accommodate for their area and faculty needs. For example – faculty with funded research or graduate teaching assignments, may have decreased teaching loads.
    a. Recommendations
        i. To foster a culture of research and increase credit hour production and meet teaching needs – WSU policy needs to provide flexibility in Workload assignments
        ii. Policy language should recognize faculty work in three areas: student-centered work (e.g., teaching), disciplinary/professional-centered work (e.g., research), and community-centered work (e.g., service). And workload refers to "total professional effort, which

includes the time (and energy) devoted to class preparation, grading, student work, curriculum and program deliberations, scholarship…, participation in governance activities, and a wide range of community services..." https://www.aaup.org/issues/faculty-work-workload/what- do-faculty-do

iii. Modify WSU Tenure and Promotion Policy to include UniSCOPE model language/

iv. Allow for increased flexibility in the faculty workload based on department/college need as well as involvement from individual faculty based on their expertise/interest areas, through modified Workload policy. (Appendix B and Appendix C- Drafts)

v. Recommend individualized workload expectations be discussed and documented with Faculty at least annually.

b. Next Steps

i. Taskforce finalize draft recommendations and then provide town hall meetings to share with faculty draft language changes and seek feedback. This to be followed by recommendations to the Faculty Senate and then vote by Faculty (By the end of Spring 2020).

Appendix A

Current Policy	Recommendations from Taskforce
It is acceptable to establish differential criteria for tenure and promotion for faculty with different assignments, so long as the differential criteria and the nature of the faculty assignments are clearly identified and recorded on the annual evaluation form. https://www.wichita.edu/about/policy/ch_04/ch4_21.php	
Workload: Tenure and promotion (incentive) process for tenure-eligible faculty- clear incentive policy for promotion including specific criteria for promotion TENURE TRACK The award of tenure normally requires documented evidence of effective teaching/librarianship and a record of research, scholarship, or creative activities which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level. Assistant Professor Evidence is normally expected of the following: A) demonstrated adequacy in teaching/librarianship; B) potential for achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activity; and C) some University service appropriate to the mission of the department and College/School/University Libraries. Associate Professor Evidence is normally expected of the following: A) documented effectiveness of teaching/librarianship; B) a record of research, scholarship, or creative activities which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level; and C) some professional or University service. Professor Evidence is normally expected of the following: A) sustained effectiveness in teaching/librarianship; B) a record of substantial accomplishment in research, scholarship, or creative activities which has led to recognition in professional circles at the national level; and C) demonstrated academic leadership in the form of service to the University and the profession	Workload: Tenure and promotion (incentive) process for tenure-eligible faculty- clear incentive policy for promotion including specific criteria for promotion TENURE TRACK*: The award of tenure normally requires documented evidence of effective teaching/librarianship and a record of scholarship of teaching/librarianship, the scholarship of research and/or the scholarship of service which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level. **Assistant Professor** Evidence is normally expected of the following: A) demonstrated adequacy in teaching/librarianship; B) potential for achievement in the scholarship of teaching/librarianship, the scholarship of research and/or the scholarship of service; and C) some University service appropriate to the mission of the department and College/School/University Libraries. **Associate Professor** Evidence is normally expected of the following: A) documented effectiveness of teaching/librarianship; B) a record of the scholarship of teaching/librarianship, the scholarship of research and/or the scholarship of service which has earned recognition in professional circles at the regional or national level; and C) some professional or University service. **Professor** Evidence is normally expected of the following: A) sustained effectiveness in teaching/librarianship; B) **compelling evidence of significant achievement** in scholarship of teaching/librarianship, the scholarship of research and/or the scholarship of service which has led to recognition in professional circles at the national level; and C) demonstrated academic leadership in the form of service to the University and the profession.

	Modify all Faculty policies that state" **a record of research, scholarship, or creative activities"** Change to: scholarship of teaching/librarianship, the scholarship of research and the scholarship of service *Based on the Uniscope model as approved by the Faculty Senate, 2016
Tenure: A) All probationary faculty must undergo review for tenure during their sixth year of employment at Wichita State University unless their employment at the University is to be terminated at the end of their seventh year of service. Those individuals given credit for prior experience in higher education at the time of initial appointment shall undergo review for tenure according to the policies stated. https://www.wichita.edu/about/policy/ch_04/ch4_21.php C) Under normal circumstances, a faculty member should not expect to be considered for promotion with less than six years in rank. The standards for teaching, librarianship, scholarship, and service for each rank are indicated below. The relative significance of teaching; librarianship; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service may vary from case to case. Consideration, in context of the candidate's entire career, will be given to teaching, librarianship, research, scholarship, creative activities, and the service conducted while the candidate has been employed at the University.	Tenure A) All probationary faculty must undergo review for tenure during their sixth year of employment at Wichita State University unless their employment at the University is to be terminated at the end of their seventh year of service. The only exception are for individuals who were ~~to this time. Those individuals~~ given credit for prior experience in higher education at the time of initial appointment. ~~shall undergo review for tenure according to the policies stated~~.- ~~C. Under normal circumstances, a faculty member should not expect to be considered for promotion with less than six years in rank~~. The standards for teaching, librarianship, scholarship, and service for each rank are indicated below. The relative significance of teaching; librarianship; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service may vary from case to case. Consideration, in context of the candidate's entire career, will be given to teaching, librarianship, research, scholarship, creative activities, and the service conducted while the candidate has been employed at the University.

Unified Faculty Scholarship Model Resolution

Approved by the WSU Faculty Senate May 9, 2016

Affirming the seven strategic goals positioned to serve our University's Vision and Mission,

Bearing in mind the need of transformation set forth by these goals, *Cognizant* of the importance of faculty role in achieving these goals, *Recognizing* the increased scope of the faculty's scholarly activities, *Aware of* the rigidity of the current definitions of scholarly activities, and

Having studied the UniScope scholarship model that provides transparency, consistency, and universality across colleges,

Now therefore, the Faculty Senate:

1. Endorses the UniScope Scholarship Model as a framework for scholarly activities;
2. Affirms that this requires "a culture change rather than a paper process change" in order to achieve strategic goal #7;
3. Proposes the deployment of UniScope Scholarship Model for tenure and promotionassessments,incentives,andrewards processes;
4. Requests colleges to revisit and redesign their tenure and promotion policies
    a. Recommends the resolution to be implemented gradually on a rotation academic units/colleges come up to Tenure and Promotion policy review asnoted here:
        i. 2016-2017: College of Education, College of Engineering
        ii. 2017-2018: College of Fine Arts, Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University Libraries
        iii. 2018-2019: Barton School of Business, College of Health Profession
5. Accepts that each academic unit or field will have its own examples for different dimensions of scholarly activities in this framework.

UniScope		DISCOVERY OF KNOWLEDGE	INTEGRATION OF KNOWLEDGE	APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE	EDUCATION OF KNOWLEDGE
The FORMS of Scholarship	**TEACHING/ LIBRARIANSHIP** Scholarship	- course innovation - course improvement - conceptual insights from course preparation or discussion - faculty insights from supervision of theses and dissertations	- cross disciplinary teaching - multi-disciplinary teaching - integrative courses - capstone courses	- course innovation - course improvement - conceptual insights from course preparation or discussion - faculty insights from supervision of theses and dissertations	- course innovation - course improvement - conceptual insights from course preparation or discussion - faculty insights from supervision of theses and dissertations
	RESEARCH Scholarship	- basic research - original works - evaluation research	- multi-disciplinary and integrating research - cross disciplinary teams - integration of creative works from several fields	- applied research - policy research - performances of original works - demonstrations - technical assistance	- student laboratories - theses and dissertation research (the objective is educating students about research and methods)
	SERVICE Scholarship	- participation in task forces, think tanks, and other problem solving activities - creative, theoretical, or conceptual insights as a result of service to society	- academic governance - assistance to corporations, government, and communities that involves integration across disciplines	- leadership in professional societies - peer review activities - editorship of journals and professional publications - academic administration - assistance in ones' field to groups, corporations, organizations, government, and communities	- student advising and career counseling, advising student activities and organizations - mentoring students - Internships - service learning - expert testimony and

Appendix B DRAFT- POLICY

Faculty Workload

Current Policy: ADD to Workload

It is acceptable to establish differential criteria for tenure and promotion for faculty with different assignments, so long as the differential criteria and the nature of the faculty assignments are clearly identified and recorded on the annual evaluation form.

https://www.wichita.edu/about/policy/ch_04/ch4_21.php

ADD: Faculty work in three areas: student-centered work (e.g., teaching), disciplinary/professional-centered work (e.g., research), and community-centered work (e.g., service). And workload refers to "total professional effort, which includes the time (and energy) devoted to class preparation, grading, student work, curriculum and program deliberations, scholarship…, participation in governance activities, and a wide range of community services..." https://www.aaup.org/issues/faculty-work-workload/what-do-faculty-do

Appendix C

DRAFT

*Sample teaching model (NOT POLICY)

Assignments based on Department/College needs, faculty expertise and faculty input related to any changes in assignment after an initial appointment; as noted in written documented role expectations

4/4 teaching Load (generally 12 cr. hrs. /semester)
Generally for non-tenure track-faculty "Teacher"
Service and scholarship duties as determined in the role statement

3/3 teaching load (generally 9 cr. hrs. /semester)
Scholarship and service as determined in the role statement
Generally reserved for tenured, tenure eligible; or non-tenure track faculty with an assigned leadership role)

2/2 teaching load; (generally 6 cr. hrs. / semester)
Scholarship and service as determined in the role statement
Generally reserved for tenured, tenure eligible, involved with graduate programs and/or significant/ funded research; non-tenure track or post-tenure faculty that take on a time-consuming assigned leadership role

1/1 teaching load; (generally 3 cr. hrs. / semester)
Scholarship and service as determined in the role statement
Generally reserved for tenured, tenure eligible, involved in funded research; or non-tenure track or post-tenure faculty that take on a time-consuming assigned leadership role

*Modified Hanover report pg. 15: ASPIRANT UNIVERSITY: FTE Workload levels

Using current WSU Policy; and workload percentages noted by some departments.