Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, October 28, 2019

3:30 - 5:00 pm, Clinton Hall Room 126

Senators Present: Ahmed, Bailey, Billingham, Bowen, Bray, Buerge, Bukonda, Carlson, Castro, Clawson, Core, Decker, Dowling, English, Figy, Hakansson, Harrison, Hill, Hull, Jarman, Ma, Marble-Flint, Millar, Mirasol, Mozzani, Muthitacharoen, Myose, Navarro, Newman, Nicks, Price, Pulaski, Ross, Schwartz, Small, Smith- Campbell, Solomey, Sternfeld-Dunn, Storrer, Sylvester, Tamtam, Weheba, , Yildirim Zewde

Absent: Flynn, Jeffres, Kalomo, Lee

Excused: Barut, Celestin, Granada, Hammond, Lockard, Markova, Moody, Popejoy

Agenda Item	**Process / External Link**	**Notes and Outcome/Action/Completed**
Call to order	3:30 pm	
Informal statements & proposals		None
Approval of minutes	October 21, 2019 minutes	Moved & seconded, approved unanimously
President's Report	Senate President Jarman	• KBOR will be discussing guidelines about credit for prior learning • UP/USS food bank challenge to see which Senate can donate the most number of food items to the Shocker food locker during 11/11-22 time frame • General Faculty meeting will be 11/11 (with a quorum requirement of 50 faculty present)
Committee Reports		None
Old Business	None	All documents for the year are posted online at: 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	• Second reading of the Workload Policy proposal Comments and amendment related to Workload on page one: • Proposed **amendment** to revise first two sentences in 2nd paragraph (revision in red between quotes) as follows: The standard "maximum" teaching load "for someone with 100% teaching assignment is 12 credit hours with no more than 3 preparations" (based on a 3 credit hour course). "Faculty with research and/or service responsibilities are expected to receive course load reductions commensurate with those additional loads." o **Vote on amendment – fails** • Statements from Senators speaking in favor or against the proposed language on page one: o Against – there appears to be no significant clarification about workload policy provided by the current wording o In favor – the last paragraph is new so there will be a discussion between the faculty member and the Chair and/or Dean o Against – current language does not account for difference in teaching graduate students o In favor – there is language about undergraduate teaching and graduate student supervision • Proposed **amendment** to add the wording "in conjunction with the standard annual review and" to second to the last sentence (revision in red between quotes) as follows: Faculty members are to discuss workload expectations with the Chair and/or Dean at least annually in conjunction with the standard annual review and" whenever revisions are made. o **Vote on amendment – passes**

		• Proposed **amendment** to add the wording "in conjunction with the standard annual review and whenever revisions are made" to the last sentence (revision in red between quotes) as follows: The Chair or Dean should provide a written summary of decisions concerning the faculty member's workload expectations "in conjunction with the standard annual review and whenever revisions are made." o Comment was made that this is already implied from the second to last sentence o A question was asked whether the word "should" is sufficient [compared to "must"] o **Vote on amendment – fails** • Motion and second to table the Workload Policy proposal – reason: more research should be done to determine whether the proposed language appropriately reflects actual practice campus-wide o Comment was made that Robert's Rules of Order stipulates that tabling a proposal will only send the proposal for a vote to the next Senate meeting – it is not an indefinite tabling o Vote on **tabling** the proposal - **fails** • Call the question [to end debate] – vote result was in favor of ending debate • **Vote on proposal's 1st page – passes** Comments and amendment related to Uniscope on page two: • A Senator spoke in favor – proposed language refers to Uniscope as a way to enhance the description of faculty activities • **Vote on proposal's 2nd page – passes** Comments related to going up early for tenure / associate rank on page three • No comments • **Vote on proposal's 3rd page – passes** Comments related to going up early for full professor rank on page four: • Friendly amendment to add the words 'individuals who' to second sentence as follows: "The only exceptions are for individuals who were given credit for prior experience in higher education at the time of initial appointment as an Associate Professor or 'individuals who' document exceptional merit meeting Department and College criteria." • **Vote on friendly amendment – passes** • **Vote on proposal's 4th page – passes**
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)	Discussion & vote related to amendment #1: "First year seminars shall count toward one of the required elective courses in general education." [Background on effect of amendment #1: This changes the existing policy where First Year Seminars count as one of the 4 Intro [see *note in 4th bullet below] courses (one from each of fine arts, humanities, social science, math/natural science)] • Moved & seconded; statements from Senators speaking in favor or against amendment #1 o Against – FYS should be classified as introductory level o In favor – an FYS [classified as an introductory course in a discipline, but] taught by an instructor outside that discipline should not be counted as fulfilling that discipline's only required Gen Ed course o Comment was made that elective courses should be sequenced, but the FYS is not a follow-up course o *Comment was made that calling an FYS an Intro course is deceptive because the proposal collapses the Intro / Advanced Studies categories

- In favor – FYS should be counted as an elective
- Against – this amendment would cause Engineering programs to complete 44 to 45 credit hours of coursework to fulfill Gen Ed
- Comment from an administrator – this amendment would allow students more flexibility by moving the FYS to the elective category
- Comment was made that faculty should only teach in their division [i.e., specialty field]

- Call the question [to end debate] – vote result was in favor of ending debate
- **Vote on amendment #1 – passes**

Discussion & vote related to amendment #2: Four additional courses from any General Education course (minimum of 12 hours)

[Background on effect of amendment #2: This changes the proposal to increase the number of hours from 33 to 36 – the additional hours are electives]

- Moved & seconded; statements from Senators speaking in favor or against amendment #2
  - In favor – there is a need for more Gen Ed in the STEM area
  - Against as STEM folks can take Gen Ed in the STEM area
  - In favor
  - Against – we already voted against an amendment at the last Senate meeting that was amendment #1 and #2 combined
  - In favor – we should require 36 credit hours of Gen Ed
  - Against – there are already significant constraints
  - In favor
- Call the question [to end debate] – vote result was in favor of ending debate
- **Vote on amendment #2 – passes**

Discussion & vote related to amendment #3: Elective hours must come from at least **three** different divisions in General Education* (see green-colored notation below)

[Background on effect of amendment #3: This changes the proposal to require more breadth across the divisions – the existing proposal would allow students to stack all of the electives in one division or even one department]

- Moved & seconded; statements from Senators speaking in favor or against amendment #3
  - Against – doesn't allow flexibility
  - In favor – diversify by giving breadth
  - Against – reduces flexibility
  - Against – too far on the other side
- Friendly amendment to change from requiring **three** different divisions to **two** different divisions
  - In favor – minors are still encouraged
  - Against – minors are less possible when two different divisions are still required
  - In favor – the lack of flexibility comes from major [requirements]
  - Against – lack of flexibility doesn't come from the major, but requirements from accreditation agencies
- Call the question [to end debate] – vote result was in favor of ending debate
- **Vote on friendly amendment reworded to requiring to two different divisions – passes**
- **Vote on amendment #3, as amended – passes**

Discussion & vote related to amendment #4: At least three courses must be numbered **200** or above* (see green-colored notation below)

[Background on effect of amendment #4: This changes the proposal to require something akin to an upper-division requirement – the existing proposal would allow students to take courses at any level, including all 100-level]

- Moved & seconded; statements from Senators regarding amendment #4
  - Friendly amendment to change the wording about the course level from **200** to **300**
  - Comment from non-Senator faculty member – student should take some upper division Gen Ed courses
  - Question was asked with regard to the applicability of previously passed Senate rule regarding community college transfers being required to complete two 300 or above level Gen Ed classes at WSU [https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/m51214.php]
  - Response was that proposed amendment closely aligns with the current rule requiring community college transfers being required to complete two 300 or above level advanced studies [Tier 3] courses at WSU; since there are very few 300 level courses in the current Introductory [Tier 2] category, it should be possible to continue to require community college transfer students to complete two 300 or above level Gen Ed courses at WSU
- Call the question [to end debate] – vote result was in favor of ending debate
- **Vote on friendly amendment reworded to 300 level – passes**
- **Vote on amendment #4, as amended – passes**

Discussion & vote related to amendment #5: 33 Gen Ed CH+FYS with following conditions:

ia) FYS cannot be from one's own college/division

ib) No credit for any Gen Ed from one's own major, (e.g. NO CREDIT for any math/physics/chemistry courses towards Gen Ed for Engineering, or no Gen Ed credit for Econ 1xx/2xx/3xx for Business majors)

Rationale: 1. Every major needs to be equipped with an opportunity/tools for "thinking outside the box"

2. Almost 50% of our students are First Gen, urban students, who cannot afford the luxury of a liberal arts education (and the skills and qualities that come with it) that is increasingly being sought by high tech companies

ii) This newly reduced Gen Ed requirement will NOT affect CoE's Gen Ed requirements (no reduction from current load; no increase either to match 36 CH applicable to the rest of WSU)

Rationale: 1. CoE is already enjoying a reduced Gen Ed requirement (30 CH) --- CoE is also under pressure to reduce total CH for graduation (by misinformed state level political leaders) while having to meet their own requirements as imposed by ABET, Employers, Professional Societies, Licensing Body (e.g. P.E.)

2. Engineering students need critical thinking and communications skills more than ever, as they face fewer jobs and scopes for life-long advancement with skills becoming obsolete fast, if not taken over by Artificial Intelligence (AI), even for such complex skills as design, or whole plants along with R&D shipped overseas

Moved & seconded; statements from Senators speaking in favor or against amendment #5

- In favor – Engineering has a large number of required math and science classes which should not be counted as General Education
- Against – this amendment would cause Engineering to add more Gen Ed coursework,

		beyond the current 42 credit hour program • Call the question [to end debate] – vote result was in favor of ending debate • **Vote on amendment #5 – <u>fails</u>** <u>Discussion & vote on [main] Gen Ed revision proposal</u>: no further discussion • Call the question [to end debate on main proposal] – vote result was in favor of ending debate • **Vote on Gen Ed revision proposal, as amended – <u>passes</u>**
As May Arise	None	
Adjournment	5:05 pm	

General Faculty Meeting: November 11, 3:30 - 5:00 pm, CAC Theater

Next Senate Meeting: December 9, 3:30 - 5:00 pm, Clinton Hall Room 126