**Faculty Senate Regular Meeting: Oct. 21st, 3:30 - 5:00 pm (Clinton Hall Room 126) - Draft**


Absent: Bukonda, Celestin, Hammond, Lee, Popejoy, Solomey, Tamtam, Yildirim

Excused: Bowen, Price, Pulaski

### Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Process / External Link</th>
<th>Notes and Outcome/Action/Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to order</td>
<td>3:30pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  o Mentioned recent article about gender pay gap – the gap is almost double when an individual does not work [overload i.e.,] extra hours  
  o This means that a spouse [who fulfills the homemaker role] is required to help with the family while [the breadwinner] must work 60-70 hours per week to pursue promotion  
  o If WSU is serious about diversity hiring, then the university needs to have a better sense of proportion [about workload]  
• Informal statement by Senator Ahmed regarding Sustainability (see left-hand column for link to full statement)  
  o There are three groups on campus and everyone is encouraged to attend / join the groups  
  o Earth Day 2020 is 22 April – hoping to have a guest speaker  
  o Website for sustainability activities is [www.wichita.edu/sustainability](http://www.wichita.edu/sustainability)  
• Senator Castro mentioned that during the Board of Regents (BoR) visit with the Senate Exec, the BoR was very enthusiastic about WSU’s effort for a new minor in Sustainability |
| Approval of minutes | Sept. 23, 2019 minutes | Moved & seconded, approved unanimously |
| President's Report | Senate President Jarman | • Guests in attendance from SGA Committees: Academic, Student Involvement, Diversity  
• President’s Report: Town Halls involved very productive conversations  
• BoR visit: Exec had breakfast with BoR, were able to mention positive goings on at WSU  
• Open & Alternative Textbook (Open Educational Resources or OER) Initiative to be discussed in a future Senate meeting  
  o OER proposal is to provide monetary incentives for faculty to create new textbooks that will have zero student cost (except for a $10 per course fee)  
  o Funding will come from the $10 per course fee for courses that have OER material  
  o OER proposal document is on the Senate website  
  o Neal Allen is a member from WSU on the committee, and he is the contact person  
  o Senate role is to provide feedback  
• General Faculty meeting is scheduled for Monday 11/11 @ 3pm  
• There is a vacancy on the SGA Supreme Court, need a faculty rep appointed by the President, please send nominations to Faculty Senate President Jarman this week  
• Nominations for reps from each division is needed to populate the new SPTE committee |
<p>| Committee Reports | Rules: Aleks Sternfeld-Dunn | • Recommendation from Rules Committee for appoint to Senate Committees |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Business</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All documents for the year are posted online at: [https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/Docs_Reps_1920.php](https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/Docs_Reps_1920.php)

Note: If the links below do not work, please try a different browser or download the document (using the given link) and open the pdf directly on your device.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Workload, Betty Smith-Campbell (chair)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recommendation from Faculty Workload Ad Hoc Committee Workload Draft Updated Proposal: [https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/documents/102119/UPDATED10.21.19MotionFromFacultySenateWorkloadTaskforce.pdf](https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/documents/102119/UPDATED10.21.19MotionFromFacultySenateWorkloadTaskforce.pdf)

- Changes were made to the proposal based on feedback from Townhalls; ad hoc Workload committee approved this revised proposal [being discussed today]

Comments and amendment related to Workload on page one:

- There was concern expressed that the Chair and/or Dean makes the decisions concerning workload expectations
  - Response given was that wording in the last sentence was changed from “negotiate” in an earlier version to “discuss” in the revised version; reason for change is that “negotiate” may actually be ignored [by administrators] and it may also give an impression to junior faculty that they may be able to “drive” this more than they are actually able to
  - Comment was made that currently Chairs and/or Deans do not discuss workload [in some departments] so the proposal is more than the current process
  - Suggestion was made [but not yet an amendment] to change wording so that Chair and/or Dean provide an explanation / justification for a faculty member’s workload expectation
  - Response given was that there is an expectation that this discussion occurs during FAR
  - Comment was made that many faculty do not write a rebuttal during FAR
  - Suggestion was made [but not an amendment] to change wording to “discuss and negotiate” in 2nd to last sentence and then in the last sentence “provide a written summary of the (delete “their”) decision …”
  - Comment was made that expected workload [at time of FAR] may differ from actual accomplishments – question was asked about when changed expectations are documented
  - Proposed amendment delete the word “their” and add “or whenever revisions are made” to read: Faculty members are to discuss workload expectations with the Chair and/or Dean at least annually or whenever revisions are made. The Chair or Dean should provide a written summary of their decisions concerning the faculty member’s workload expectations.
  - Question was asked regarding revisions – is it necessary to document the change in expectation when most people simply teach the same courses?
  - Response – this is probably needed for those who teach a large number of preps
  - Comment was made that there is a lot of variability on decision maker / process
  - Provost suggested adding a statement in FAR instead; Betty Smith-Campbell mentioned that would be specific to policy
  - Comment was made that role statements should be available for every faculty
  - Voice vote on amendment [not full Workload policy] – amendment passes

- Does the change in title [in page 1] mean that research and service is added to [i.e., on top of] teaching?
  - Response – this is already current policy
  - [Similar question rephrased/asked:] Shouldn’t the 2nd paragraph state that the standard
workload is … rather than the standard teaching load is …?
- Response – 12 credit hours of teaching plus some service plus some research is standard
- Comment was made that it would be a paradigm shift to reduce from 12 credit hours of teaching for standard expectation to teaching plus service plus research
- Based on comments during the Senate discussion, the last two sentences of the last paragraph was split out as a separate [i.e., new last] paragraph

Comments and amendment related to Uniscope on page two:
- Wording about Uniscope now states that it is a framework to “enhance” …
  - Comment was made that the original passage of the Uniscope concept by the Senate was that it is not a requirement – the current proposal does not reflect this
  - Amendment to change the wording describing what the Uniscope allows in terms of enhancement: wording “for research, scholarship, or creative activities” changed to “faculty activities”
  - Comment was made that Uniscope is about scholarship not teaching or service
  - Amendment passes

Comments related to going up early for tenure / associate rank on page three:
- No comments made

Comments related to going up early for full professor rank on page four:
- Wording in earlier version “demonstrate” was changed to “document” in revised version
- Comment was made that language needs to be cleared up
- Question was asked whether exceptional merit relates to accomplishments over a shorter time period when going up early or if it is for the entire [i.e., six year] record
  - Response given was that it is for the shorter period only

Second reading of the proposal will be at the next Senate meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Revision, Jeff Jarman (chair)</th>
<th>Recommendation from General Education Revision Committee</th>
<th>SGA Statement on Gen Ed Revision</th>
<th>Gen Ed Revision Presentation (with Faculty Only data shown)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note #1: amendment still pending on the floor from the 9/23/19 Senate meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note #2: additional amendment [to be considered in next Senate meeting] – at least two courses in general education must be numbered 300 or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment to increase proposal’s Gen Ed requirement from 33 credit hours [11 courses] to 36 credit hours [12 courses], and to complete the FYS (if required) outside the distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Comment was made that this amendment will cause Engineering programs to take 12 courses totaling 44 to 45 credit hours to fulfill Gen Ed; part of the reason for this high number is the restriction that FYS be taken outside of the distribution; it should be kept in mind that the FYS was originally intended to be an Intro course counted within the divisional distribution; instead of a restrictive program, we should have a flexible Gen Ed program that allows individual colleges to enhance Gen Ed with additional restrictions to meet individual college needs rather than imposing such restrictions campus-wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Comment was made by an individual who has taught FYS at WSU and elsewhere that FYS is interdisciplinary so they should not be counted within disciplinary divisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Comment was made [to support the amendment increasing Gen Ed requirements to 36 credit hours] that math courses required by a major should not be counted as fulfilling Gen Ed; comment in response was made that not allowing math [or other courses required by the major] to count as Gen Ed would increase total credit hours required for many degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A clarification question was asked related to the main proposal’s terminology – what are Gen Ed electives? Answer is any course currently counted as Tier 2 Introductory or Tier 3 Advanced Study or Issues &amp; Perspectives courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Question was asked whether the amendment would still allow one course in the major to be counted as Gen Ed; response by person putting forth the amendment is that there is no change to this part of the proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note #1: amendment still pending on the floor from the 9/23/19 Senate meeting

Note #2: additional amendment [to be considered in next Senate meeting] – at least two courses in general education must be numbered 300 or above
Comment was made that changing from 33 credit hours to 36 credit hours will help; however, no evidence has been provided to support changing the paradigm of Gen Ed while at the same time it will devastating to LAS; [therefore the main proposal should be rejected]

Comment in response was made that Gen Ed is not a “keep employment for LAS”; the survey results for Engineering faculty and the SGA resolution considers the current Gen Ed program to be overtaxing and perhaps onerous; furthermore, the conversation about modifying Gen Ed has been ongoing for over two years

A Fine Arts Senator expressed sharing the concern that LAS has about the loss of credit hours and its impact on LAS; at the same time, the Music Education program dropped from 136 credit hours down to 120 credit hours – a 16 credit hour drop; lots of programs have made cuts while Gen Ed has not been changed at all; it is possible to live with this reduced credit hour major, but preference is a Gen Ed program reduced to 33 credit hours

- Call the question [to end debate] – vote result was in favor of ending debate
- Vote on amendment (by show of hands): 17 in favor and 17 against – motion to amend the proposal does not pass [as it requires 50% plus 1 vote in favor]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As May Arise</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>5:05 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Senate Meeting Oct. 28th, 3:30 - 5:00 pm, Clinton Hall Room 126