

What: General Faculty Meeting Minutes - Draft
 When: November 11, 2019, 3:30 - 5:00 pm
 Where: CAC Theater

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Notes/Discussion/Process</u>	<u>Outcome/Action/Completed</u>
Call to order	3:30 pm	
Opening Statement	Jeffrey Jarman, President of the Faculty Senate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend appreciation to veterans in the audience as well as family members of those in the audience who are veterans Brief moment of silence for veterans who have passed away
Appointments	Secretary	Appointed Roy Myose as Secretary
Approval of minutes	April 29, 2019	Moved & seconded – voted to approve
New Business	Revision to General Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two microphones were made available: left microphone to make statements in favor of a topic and right microphone to make statements against a topic <u>Discussion on main motion</u> Speaking in favor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board of Regents capped total credit hours for a degree which has caused some programs to reduce major coursework – cutting into the “curricular bone” and core of the major The higher learning commission requires a minimum of 30 credit hours for Gen Ed, KU and K-State require 30-36 hours while peer institutions require 30-36 hours Results from the faculty survey show that 49½% prefer 30-33 credit hours for Gen Ed while nearly 80% prefer 36 hours or less <u>Discussion & vote related to amendment #1: Current proposal of “at least 9 hours must be numbered 300 or above” amend to 6 hours</u> Moved & seconded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speaking in favor – current proposal would make it difficult for students in some programs and involve additional hours Against – 300-level coursework is important for students to gain a depth of understanding In favor – current requirement for transfer students is 6 hours [so it would be consistent to require 6 hours instead of 9 hours] Against – requiring depth provides significance to Gen Ed A Powerpoint slide on the rationale behind requiring 9 hours of 300-level Gen Ed coursework was presented by the originator of the 9-hours of 300-level requirement <u>Vote on amendment #1 by voice vote – motion fails</u> <u>Discussion & vote related to amendment #2: Moved to strike out allowing “one course in the major can count toward General Education”</u> Moved & seconded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor – Gen Ed should not include course in the major Against – proposed amendment would penalize those who change majors Question was asked whether the idea of allowing a course from the major to count for Gen Ed was in the Ad Hoc committee version [when the total number of credit hours for Gen Ed was

		<p>33 credit hours] – response was yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vote on amendment #2 by show of hands – motion fails <p><u>Discussion (continued) & vote on main motion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question was asked what a “No” vote means; response was that existing [42 credit hour Gen Ed] program would continue to be the university Gen Ed requirements • Against – Board of Regents has built in the possibility of exception to the 120 credit hour limit and some programs have received exceptions due to accreditation requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WSU is the only institution within 100 miles that delivers a rigorous, deep and broad education that our students need and this proposal will do great harm to that component of our mission • In favor – a world class Fine Arts and Engineering program while requiring a large number of Gen Ed is not possible [under a credit hour limit]; from a [pragmatic] political viewpoint, this proposal is likely to gain a favorable view from the Board of Regents and the legislature • A comment was made that this proposal is a temporary band aid, a major revision would take too much time, and perhaps Gen Ed requirements deserve to be revisited in the future • Spoke against – this is a major change, [Gen Ed is] not just English composition that students have to study; many students are falling behind because they do not have the communication skills [that are improved in subsequent Gen Ed courses] so we should not reduce Gen Ed • In favor – the music program used to require 159 credit hours, but it was cut to 130 hours by cutting the core, and then recently to 120 credit hours with another 10 hour cut to the core; our [music major] students are going out impoverished in their own area • Against – I don’t want to get engaged in a race to the bottom; we should still maintain that there are course in a university that are important for an educated person to have access to • Against – [with regard to the earlier comment about the proposal being a temporary band-aid:] General education not being resolved? It is a major change; why change if there is going to be another major change in the future; these changes are for all students; this is Wichita State University, not Wichita State Tech graduating technicians <p>Vote on main motion (by paper ballot) – passes (165 in favor versus 69 against)</p> <p>[Senate passed version is passed without any changes]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment #1: the change will be effective starting catalog year 20-21, but current students must follow all the new rules (including changes to their program) if they choose the new Gen Ed • Comment #2: program changes will be part of the 20-21 catalog as long as CIM form is approved by the department / college and in process before the holiday shutdown; if no CIM form is submitted, then those programs’ 6 extra credit hours will revert to free electives
	<p>Faculty workload</p>	<p><u>Discussion on main motion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Betty Smith-Campbell, chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, speaking in favor – committee worked on this proposed language for a year, received feedback during townhalls, and tweaked the language further during Senate meetings • Question/clarification on page 1 of policy #1, regarding the term: is it disciplinary or professional? Response is discipline or profession. • Question regarding “should be determined at the department level” – what does this mean? Response from ad hoc committee member: committee tried to come up with a way for individual

		<p>faculty to advocate for themselves, difficult to come up with language that fits all cases when there are badges, etc.; not meant to change the way courses are counted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up question – why not use the language used in the FAR? Response – FAR may change while we want this to be overarching policy. • Question on page 2 of Policy #1: the word “standard” in standard teaching load in the current policy is ambiguous; response is that we do more than just teaching, and the new language gives more latitude; teaching part is 12 credit hours. • Question – will this change the FAR? Response: not necessarily because FAR may change; if FAR changes then policy would have to be amended. • Spoke against – standard teaching load in AAUP is that 12 credit hours is full load with reduction from it for service and/or research so this policy is in conflict with AAUP <p><u>Discussion & vote related to amendment – addition to wording in the 2nd line of the 2nd page of policy #1: ...preparations “for faculty with 100% teaching role”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved & seconded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Speaking against – many faculty are already teaching more than 12 hours and doing research and/or service on top; ramifications are wide ranging from a budget perspective ○ In favor– if 12 hours plus other duties, then those faculty should be paid more ○ Against – wording in amendment is poor ○ Changed to put amended language “for faculty with 100% teaching role” to right after standard teaching load ... ○ Are there faculty who are 100% teaching with no service – response from faculty member in audience is yes ○ Perhaps the Workload policy should be tabled and debated further ○ In favor of passing, then there is a way to protect faculty • Vote on amendment by show of hands – fails <p><u>Discussion (continued) & vote on main motion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question was asked whether this policy proposal had been debated; response was that Senate had debated this over 4 meetings and that there was feedback sought during 4 townhalls • Two different Senators mentioned that the Workload proposal had been debated extensively • Speaking against – the proposal would be a change to the workload policy and there are concerns with the present wording of the proposal • No further comments or discussion about proposed policy #1 • No comments or further discussions about proposed policy #2 or #3 or #4 • Question was asked what a “No” vote means; response was that the existing policy specified by the black-font lettering would continue as the policy <p>Vote on main motion (by paper ballot) – <u>passes</u> (146 in favor versus 74 against) [Senate passed version is passed without any changes]</p>
<p>As May Arise</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question was asked whether there should be absentee balloting in the future in light of the fact that there are nearly 500 faculty and not everyone came to vote today <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There was a comment against this idea – the faculty survey was conducted electronically and yet there were not many more votes with the survey than today’s meeting

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps the Senate Rules committee should be charged to look into the absentee voting idea • President-elect Sternfeld-Dunn mentioned that there is a need for more faculty to volunteer to serve on committees, in particular the Accessibility committee and the Rules committee
Final Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President Jarman thanked the members of both Gen Ed & Workload ad hoc committees for their hard work over the past year • President Jarman thanked everyone for coming to one of the largest General Faculty meetings ever at WSU
Adjournment	4:45 pm	