

# Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

**Monday, September 23, 2019**

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

**Senators Present:** Ahmed, Bailey, Billingham, Buerge, Bukonda, Carlson, Castro, Celestin, Core, Decker, Dowling, English, Flynn, Granada, Hakansson, Harrison, Hill, Hull, Jarman, Jeffres, Lee, Lockard, Ma, Markova, Millar, Mirasol, Mozzani, Muthitacharoen, Myose, Navarro, Newman, Nicks, Pulaski, Ross, Schwartz, Small, Smith-Campbell, Sternfeld-Dunn, Storrer, Sylvester, Tamtam, Weheba, Yildirim, Zewde

**Absent:** Barut, Bowen, Bray, Moody, Price, Showstack, Solomey

**Excused:** Clawson, Figy, Hammond, Popejoy

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Process / External Link</u>	<u>Notes and Outcome/Action/Completed</u>
<b>Call to order</b>	3:30 pm	
<b>Informal statements &amp; proposals</b>		Betty Smith-Campbell recommends getting flu shots
<b>Approval of minutes</b>	<a href="#">Sept. 9, 2019 minutes</a>	Moved & seconded, approved unanimously
<b>President's Report</b>	<a href="#">KBOR OER Action Plan (Draft)</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KBOR Open Educational Resources (OER)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Neil Allen represents WSU on this task force</li> <li>○ KBOR wants to know how much students spend on textbooks</li> <li>○ There are grants available to support development of such material</li> <li>○ Some courses may be appropriate for zero cost text, but others may not be</li> <li>○ There may be a fee if the textbook cost is zero, and a fee would go to the department</li> <li>○ KBOR task force will come up with guidelines</li> <li>○ KBOR is likely to come back to this body (with the document), perhaps seeking approval from the Senate by the end of December</li> <li>○ Some faculty would like to know what resources are available and request help from the libraries</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	Senate President Jarman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KBOR update: Admissions changes were approved by KBOR, Senate saw the changes in February 2019 will go in effect fall 2021</li> <li>• Meeting scheduled for Oct. 21<sup>st</sup> in addition to Oct. 28<sup>th</sup></li> <li>• Town halls scheduled for: 1) 9/30 @ 11am in RSC 262, 2) 10/1 @ 9:30am in RSC 262, 3) 10/2 @ 12:30pm in RSC 313, and 4) 10/3 @ 2pm in RSC 262</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Reports</b>	Rules: Aleks Sternfeld-Dunn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation for <b>Faculty Senate</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ LAS Natural Sciences-Thalia Jeffres (one semester replacement)</li> <li>○ LAS Social Sciences-Eveline Kalomo (one semester replacement)</li> <li>○ College of Health Professions-Karissa Marble-Flint (two year term)</li> <li>○ College of Health Professions-Ngoyi Bukonda (two year term)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Recommendation for <b>Committees</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Academic Affairs:</b> LAS Natural Sciences-Justin Ryan, Business-Raina Rutti</li> <li>○ <b>General Education:</b> Libraries-Maria Sclafani, Engineering-Roy Myose (replacing Kamran Rokhsaz for his last year on the committee)</li> <li>○ <b>University Exceptions:</b> Libraries-Angela Paul, LAS Social Sciences-Peer Moore-Jansen</li> <li>○ <b>Planning and Budget:</b> LAS Natural Sciences-Nick Solomey, Libraries-Aaron Bown</li> </ul> </li> <li>• All recommendations approved unanimously</li> </ul>

<p><b>Old Business</b></p>	<p>None</p>	<p>All documents for the year are posted online at:  <a href="https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/Docs_Reps_1920.php">https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/Docs_Reps_1920.php</a>  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.</p>
<p><b>General Education Revision,</b>  Jeff Jarman (chair)</p>	<p><a href="#">Recommendation</a> from General Education Revision Committee  <a href="#">SGA Statement</a> on Gen Ed Revision  <a href="#">Gen Ed Revision Presentation</a> (with Faculty Only data shown)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendment to change “33 cr hrs” total to “42 cr hr” total (details to be determined) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Comment was made that the core (major) does not have strength if Gen Ed is 42 cr hr</li> <li>○ Comment was made that many schools including KU/KState have less Gen Ed – at what point then will a university become a trade school then?</li> <li>○ Provost Muma mentioned that KBOR has denied appeals when there are others with less total credit hours for the same degree</li> <li>○ Comment was made that we always looked at our own degree requirements for cuts in the past and cuts to Gen Ed wasn’t even considered, but why is Gen Ed immovable?</li> <li>○ Comment was made that content and quality balance is required</li> <li>○ Question: is it possible to have one course in the major cover the content of two current courses in the major – response: it is not possible to “stuff” two courses worth of content in one course</li> <li>○ Question: How is it possible to meet Gen Ed goals with fewer courses – response from Ad Hoc Gen Ed committee member(s) was that Gen Ed goals could still be met with fewer courses</li> <li>○ Comment was made that other programs across the country have a Gen Ed program with fewer courses</li> <li>○ Comment was made that the best degree possible should be offered at WSU</li> <li>○ Comment was made that cuts were made in core (major) – a balance between major and Gen Ed is important</li> <li>○ Comment was made that 120 credit hours is correct for the sake of students</li> <li>○ Question was asked whether there is any evidence that employers are shunning our graduates when we have less coursework in the major</li> <li>○ Follow-up question was asked whether any major at WSU is willing to be 9-12 credit hours less KU or K-State [to find out whether there are any effects or not]</li> <li>○ Comment was made that employers ask about professional knowledge</li> <li>○ Comment was made that we need to listen to employers talking about the need for soft skills</li> <li>○ Comment was made that postings online from students ask why WSU requires so many Gen Ed classes</li> <li>○ Comment was made that the SGA passed a resolution about Gen Ed and the resolution is available to read online in the Senate website</li> <li>○ Comment was made that students ask for a lot of things, but many of them are not good for them</li> <li>○ Comment was made that this proposal may be hard for LAS, but others in the majors have lost significant coursework – it is not fair that Gen Ed is the only program that is not cut</li> <li>○ Comment was made that trying to fit a one size fits all may be a problem – perhaps it is better for individual programs to tailor Gen Ed for their major</li> <li>○ Question was asked whether there is any evidence/documentation that showed that 36 credit hours total for Gen Ed rather than 42 would hurt a program – response from Ad Hoc Gen Ed committee member(s) was that there were many Gen Ed programs with less than 42,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<p>often in the 36 range</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Comment was made that many of our programs are crippled with the KBOR credit hour requirements and it will stay that way without a reduction in Gen Ed</li> <li>○ Comment was made that enrollment and credit hours are paramount at WSU, and there is concern that a reduction in credit hours may see ramifications in the long run</li> <li>○ Comment was made that KU and K-State allow course(s) in the major to be counted as fulfilling Gen Ed requirements</li> <li>● Amendment to change “33 cr hrs” total to “42 cr hr” total (details to be determined) – more nays than ayes – motion fails</li> <li>● Amendment to change “33 cr hrs” total to “30 cr hr” total <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Comment was made that professional skills are important and needed</li> <li>○ Comment was made that student do not know what is needed</li> <li>○ Comment was made that there is no data showing employers want professional skills</li> <li>○ Comment was made that data collected in the State of Pennsylvania suggests that communication skills are more important</li> <li>○ Comment was many that many of [Gen Ed] topics are taught in high school, but students need to study them again and learn more</li> <li>○ Comment was made that 30 credit hours is way too low with a follow-up comment that the percentage of 1<sup>st</sup> generation students is increasing at WSU so 30 credit hours is too low</li> <li>○ Comment was made that critical thinking, writing, speaking, and reasoning [skills] are also covered in the majors – Gen Ed is not the only place where these skills are taught</li> <li>○ Harvard only requires four* Gen Ed [specific] courses</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>*Ed. comment: Harvard’s website indicates a total of 11 courses must be taken in Gen Ed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment to change “33 cr hrs” to “30 cr hrs” – more nays than ayes – motion fails</li> </ul> <p>Amendment to change “33 cr hrs” to “30 cr hrs”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment to change “33 cr hrs” total to “36 cr hr” total along with FYS course not counting as part of the distribution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A friendly amendment to the amendment was proposed that the 3 electives outside the distribution cannot be pre-requisites [taken by the major] – this proposed friendly amendment was tabled to determine the outcome of the current amendment</li> <li>○ Comment was made that there are two proposed changes in a single amendment: (1) changing “33 cr hrs” to “36 cr hrs” and (2) that FYS cannot be counted in the distribution</li> <li>○ Comment was made that some programs may be able to handle one of these changes while another program may not be able to handle the first change</li> <li>○ Comment was made that perhaps these two proposed changes being suggested in this amendment should be taken up individually</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Out of time – amendment tabled until next meeting</p>
<p><b>Faculty Workload</b>, Betty Smith-Campbell (chair)</p>	<p>Recommendation from Faculty Workload Ad Hoc Committee  Workload Draft Updated Proposal:  <a href="https://www.wichita.edu/academic/s/facultysenate/documents/92319/WorkloadDraftUpdate.ProposalSenateMtg_9.23.19.pdf">https://www.wichita.edu/academic/s/facultysenate/documents/92319/WorkloadDraftUpdate.ProposalSenateMtg_9.23.19.pdf</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Faculty Workload Ad Hoc Committee met on Wednesday <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Revision (as shown) was considered, but it did not receive a majority vote (5yes and 6 no comments)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Executive Committee has suggested bringing it to the Faculty Senate for a 1<sup>st</sup> read on 10/21 and a 2<sup>nd</sup> read on 10/28</li> <li>● Based on Senate discussion on 9/9, the language about teaching load as follows will be kept: “The standard teaching load normally shall be no more than the equivalent of a 12-credit hour</li> </ul>

- maximum per semester with no more than three different course preparations
- Comment made that this may pose a problem in some units that do not teach two different sections of the same course in a semester
- Current version has the statement “Individualized workload expectations are to be discussed and documented with the Chair and/or Dean at least annually.”
- Comment made questioning what individualized expectations mean, whether the administration can place a faculty member in a role that that individual may not want
- Another comment was made that the reverse may occur where administration does not account for individualization
- Comment made about how badge courses can be accounted for within the three prep policy means suggests that the policy has not kept up with the times
- There was a suggestion that stating 9-credit hours of distinct courses could account for the previous issue regarding badge courses
- There was a question about how the policy would account for graduate student project, theses, and dissertation with response by some stating that this is accounted for with the credit hours generated while others stating that their college does not account for this
- Comment made that the policy does not account for large versus small class size issue
- A question was asked that perhaps what maximum fits each college should be determined
- There is no change to T&P, but the uniscope model is used as a framework
- All examples mention the uniscope model, and colleges & departments can set T&P guidelines within the university’s overarching framework
- University-level T&P committee looks to see if university policy is followed
- Which document has the (workload) percentage breakdown (for teaching, research, & service) was unclear
- How can one change something when it is unknown
- There was a question about what happens when an individual has a 50% appointment – response
- Exceptions for going up early are specified in WSU policy 4.18 and 4.19
- Exceptions for promotion and PIR are specified
- Exceptions statement is being put in because issues have come up in the university-level T&P committee
- There was a suggestion to send the workload policy back to the Ad Hoc Committee after the townhalls because there is no timeline from KBOR
- Provost commented that problems can occur at the university-level T&P committee when there is not clarity in the university’s T&P guidelines – this is the primary reason rather than KBOR
- Lack of clarity in T&P guidelines mean that issues may come up at the university-level T&P committee again in the future

<b>As May Arise</b>	None	
<b>Adjournment</b>	5 pm	

**Next Senate Meeting: October 21, 3:30 - 5:00 pm, Clinton Hall Room 126**