Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Monday, September 9, 2019

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

Senators Present: Ahmed, Bailey, Billingham, Bowen, Buerge, Carlson, Castro, Celestin, Clawson, Core, Decker, Dowling, Figy, Flynn, Granada, Hakansson, Harrison, Hill, Jarman, Jeffres, Lee, Lockard, Ma, Markova, Millar, Mirasol, Moody, Mozzani, Muthitacharoen, Myose, Navarro, Nicks, Price, Pulaski, Ross, Schwartz, Smith-Campbell, Solomey, Sternfeld-Dunn, Storrer, Sylvester, Tamtam, Weheba, Yildirim

Absent: Barut, Bray, English, Showstack, Small, Zewde

Excused: Hammond, Hull, Popejoy

Agenda Item	Process / External Link	Notes and Outcome/Action/Completed
Call to order	3:30 pm	
Informal statements & proposals	_	No informal statements
Approval of minutes	May 13, 2019 minutes	Moved & seconded, approved unanimously
President's Report	Provost Muma https://www.wichita.edu/about/str ategic_plan/19-20-priorities.php https://www.wichita.edu/academic s/academic_affairs/Priorities_info_s heet_results.pdf	 Provost Muma introduced three new Deans – Larisa Genin, Dean of Barton School of Business; Coleen Pugh, Dean of Graduate School and AVP R&T and Dennis Livesay, Dean of Engineering (starting this academic year) Provost Muma introduced strategic priorities for 2019-20 along with results from last year; there are two continuing priorities and two new priorities – facilities & IT
	Senate President Jarman https://www.wichita.edu/academic s/academic_affairs/shocker_circle_k eepers.php	 Shocker Circles starting in 2 weeks – foster conversations, talk about concerns, help to inform our new incoming President, signup for 3 hours blocks (poster will be posted) KBOR meets on 18 Sept, WSU Trustees & WSUIA meets on 20 Sept National Council of Faculty Senates on 19 Oct, call for anyone interested to attend / online Interdisciplinary program competition due 29 Nov Call for faculty member on IT committee (need name right away)
Committee Reports Rules: Aleks Sternfeld-Dunn Other committee reports	None	Recommendation for LAS Social Science Senator – Jessica Newman, approved by Senate Recommendation to fill other vacancies to committees (see attachment), approved by Senate
Old Business	None	
New Business	All documents 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 Table about Uniscope model was given as handout (see p.6 of link): https://www.wichita.edu/academic s/facultysenate/documents/51319/ FacultyWorkloadCommitteeRecom mendations5.2019.pdf	 Presentation by Workload Ad Hoc Committee chair Draft recommendation made in May 2019, 1st reading of proposal/policy today; next step is town hall meetings followed by 2nd reading in Senate & potential vote in General Faculty meeting (possibly Nov/Dec) Uniscope model was endorsed by the Senate & has been incorporated by the colleges Background on current policy was presented Intent is to provide policies that support all faculty while responding to KBOR charge related to faculty development KBOR directed state universities to review their reward structures

		 Recommendation from committee was to remove the current wording about 12-hour, 3-prep limit, but suggestion was made from the Senate floor to keep the wording about 12-hour, 3-prep limit and then add wording about teaching load reduction based on work in other areas such as research and/or service Comment: possibly mention the difference between in-load and extra/additional workload (i.e., maximum in-load is 12-hours which may be reduced based on) Comment: need to state who (e.g., which administrator) and when (e.g., when FAR is submitted) the individualized workload expectation is determined Comment: some programs do not have multiple sections so 3-prep is not in force anyway Comment: there is a difference in teaching workload between large and small sections as well as 200- vs. 900-level courses Comment: thesis & dissertation advising involves faculty workload Suggestion was made to add wording in the policy about UniScope Scholarship Model & attach the framework table to the policy document; in particular language from UniScope such as "a record of scholarship of teaching, scholarship of research, and/or scholarship of service" Comment: may need to discuss what the term scholarship means; i.e., define in the policy document what is scholarship because some view scholarship as having knowledge rather than publishing or presenting at a conference Comment: some departments do not use UniScope and there is concern about including it in the policy which would imply requiring the UniScope model Comment: T&P policy at college level has interpretations for each college Regarding language for full professor section Suggestion to add "compelling evidence of significant achievement" Comment: the word compelling is hard to define – possibly "sustained" is better Regarding language about going up for tenure in their 6th year, add wording: "the only exception is for prior experience"
General Education Revision, Jeff Jarman (chair)	Recommendation from General Education Revision Committee SGA Statement on Gen Ed Revision	 Presentation by Ad Hoc Revision Committee chair Historical timeline: Informal Statement in Senate on 10/9/17, Dec. 2017 - standing (regular) Gen Ed Committee recommended that Senate consider whether to maintain, revise, or replace Gen Ed; Senate voted unanimously with one abstention on 1/22/18 to have this considered by an Ad Hoc committee; Bill Hendry (Biology) announced as chair in March 2018; other Ad Hoc committee members determined via college-by-college election in April 2018 Ad Hoc committee met every other week for an entire year, including during the summer Background: current Gen Ed is 14 courses with a minimum of 42 hours, but many degree programs end up having to take more than 42 hours Several majors had to cut requirements in their major to reduce total credit hours to try to meet KBOR 120 credit hour limit Ad Hoc committee compared to our Gen Ed to other programs – HLC, KU, K-State, peers, aspirational First step: Ad Hoc committee considered whether to keep the Gen Ed program as is; vote was 0 in favor of maintaining, 10 against, and 1 abstention Ad Hoc committee next voted on whether to revise the current system or to consider a radical change (i.e., start from scratch); resulting vote was 8 in favor of revision and 3 in

As May Arise	None	favor of radical change / starting from scratch • Ad Hoc committee conducted a survey to obtain a "sense" of the faculty's views on Gen Ed 3 12 faculty (60%) participated in the survey with LAS being 100 out of 312 participants Question about how many courses: less than 1/4 wanted 13 or 14 courses • Most favored 30 to 36 credit hours with 33 credit hours being about in the middle • Thus, very little support for 13-14 courses, 10-12 was the dominant choice • Cross table of what category to drop from Gen Ed showed that faculty were split equally between those favoring only Intro classes being dropped and those favoring only Advanced Studies (Tier 3) being dropped • Revised Gen Ed in a nutshell: • Retained – goals/outcomes, foundation course requirement (basic English x2, Speech, & Math), concept of some breadth in four divisions, FYS still counts as an "Intro" course • Reduce breadth to one course per division for a total of 12 credit hour minimum • Three additional courses from any Gen Ed category (Intro or Advanced Studies) for a minimum of 9 recdit hours • Can count one course from the major towards Gen Ed • Couple of salient features: • Provides flexibility of breadth or depth • Allows some students searching for a major to keep taking some additional Intro classes • Comment/question: does this revision allow the Gen Ed goals to be met? Are we underselling students in terms of a well-rounded education? We are not a training college, but a university with liberal arts & sciences • Comment/question: KU & K-State have 9-12 credit hours more Engineering major coursework than WSU, and we are limited by KBOR credit hour reduction; is there any program who would be willing to have 9-12 credit hours less major coursework than a comparable program than KU & K-State? That's the problem we are facing. • Question: have syllabi for Engineering courses at WSU been compared with those at KU & K-State to see if we are covering more in each course than a KU or K-State Engineering course? • Comment: how many
Adjournment	5 pm	
As May Ariso	None	in each area
		• Comment: students would not get sufficient variety of breadth if only one course is required
		comparable program than KU & K-State? That's the problem we are facing.
		program who would be willing to have 9-12 credit hours less major coursework than a
		o Can count one course from the major towards Gen Ed
		Studies (Tier 3) being dropped
		· ·

Appointments to Standing Committees

Approved by Faculty Senate on 9/9/19

Academic Affairs

Laura Sooby-Health Professions Wujun Si—Engineering

Academic Appeals

Szde Yu-Social Sciences Kerry Jones-LAS Humanities

Faculty Affairs

Kyoung Lee-LAS Social Sciences Kerry Jones-LAS Humanities Deepak Gupta-Engineering

Faculty Support

Foudil Latioui-LAS Natural Sciences Kathleeen Perez-LAS Social Sciences Angela Beeler-Applied Studies

General Education

Steven Kelly-Health Professions Brittany Lockard-Fine Arts

Libraries

Barbara Smith-Health Professions Wei Wei-Engineering Claudia Pederson-Fine Arts

Rules

Jennifer Ray-Fine Arts Bobby Berry-Applied Studies Jolynn Dowling-Health Professions

Scholarship and Student Aid

Pattie Bradley-Business Cristina Castaldi-Fine Arts

University Exceptions

Pattie Bradley-Business Gina Riggs-Health Professions

Undergraduate Research

Aravinthan Visvakumar-Engineering

University Budget and Planning

Jay Price-LAS Humanities