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


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]  
  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 |
| Committee Reports | Rules: Aleks Sternfeld-Dunn | • Recommendation from Rules Committee for appoint to Senate Committees |
### Old Business

**None**

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.

### Faculty Workload, Betty Smith-Campbell (chair)

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

General Education Revision, Jeff Jarman (chair)

Recommendation from General Education Revision Committee
SGA Statement on Gen Ed Revision
Gen Ed Revision Presentation (with Faculty Only data shown)

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

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

- 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
  - 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
  - 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
  - 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
  - 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 & Perspectives courses
  - 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
o 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]
o 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
o 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]

As May Arise
None
Adjournment 5:05 pm

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