



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF
HEALTH PROFESSIONS

Department of
Communication Sciences
and Disorders

TO: Whitney Bailey, President, Faculty Senate

FROM: Douglas Parham, Chair and Program Director
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders

DATE: Monday, April 25, 2022

RE: Informal Comment for Faculty Senate regarding P&P 4.24.H.1

Thank you, Whitney and my fellow Faculty Senators.

I am requesting both a clarification and a correction to the Policies and Procedures of the tenure and promotion process related to external reviews. This indirectly relates to all Non-Tenure Track faculty who don't require external reviews. And this will be my point: What is unclear for one of our collective constituencies, is likely unclear in other areas for another.

I ask everyone to consider the current wording of P&P 4.24.H.1
(https://www.wichita.edu/about/policy/ch_04/ch4_24.php):

"The candidate will give the departmental chair the names and addresses of five potential external reviewers, six sets of reprints or copies of work that the candidate believes best represents his/her research, scholarship, or creative work, and six copies of a complete bibliography that clearly delineates the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative work. Any material that the candidate wishes to have returned should be so marked."

The last approved revision of 4.24 was **April 09, 2018**. Here is what the process was at that time: The candidate makes six paper copies of everything related to scholarship: one (1) copy for the Dean's Office's records and five (5) copies for the Dean's Office to mail to selected external reviewers. Six paper copies. This was never ambiguous or controversial.

The 2022 interpretation across several colleges was that a candidate could only submit six exemplars of research, scholarship, or creative work. That interpretation seemed odd to me, so I reached out laterally to Chairs and Directors in all other WSU Colleges to ask about each respective College's interpretation of P&P 4.24.H.1. It turns out that the policy is not interpreted the same way across Colleges.

I have a PhD in Communication Sciences and Disorders, so I have at least a layperson's understanding of English syntax and semantics. Consider the noun phrase "six sets of reprints or copies of work." First, take out the noun "set" and the preposition "of" from the phrase. Now, restate the phrase as "Six reprints or copies of work." This phrasing then makes perfect sense that only six examples of research, scholarship, or creative work can be included by the candidate.

But that is not what the policy says. Add back the missing noun and preposition: "Six sets of reprints or copies of work..." "Six sets of" means collections of whatever is included in the "reprints or copies of work." This could include one, six, or 100 examples.

If you somehow believe that the phrase is still refers to a limit of six examples, then you have to interpret the next requirement of "six copies of a complete bibliography" to mean that the candidate creates a bibliography (whatever that means), saves it as a PDF (as per the 2022 instructions), copies the same PDF five more times, and emails six identical copies of the PDF to the candidate's Dean's Office. That is absurd.

Moreover, there is a "Mandela Effect" in that everyone recalls the number "six" from somewhere. "When I went up, I think it was six" or "So-and-so only needed six last year" or "At my previous university, it was always six."

This is the forgetfulness of institutional accretion. The current wording of P&P 4.24.H.1 can only be an artifact from when paper copies were mailed out to external reviewers by Dean's Offices. Any other interpretation simply beggars belief.

Let change the wording.

Thank you for your time.