

# Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

**Monday, October 21, 2019**

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

**Senators Present:** Ahmed, Bailey, Barut, Billingham, Bray, Buerge, Carlson, Castro, Clawson, Core, Decker, Dowling, English, Figy, Flynn, Granada, Hakansson, Harrison, Hill, Hull, Jarman, Jeffres, Kalomo, Lockard, Ma, Marble-Flint, Markova, Millar, Mirasol, Moody, Mozzani, Muthitacharoen, Myose, Navarro, Newman, Nicks, Ross, Schwartz, Small, Smith-Campbell, Sternfeld-Dunn, Storrer, Sylvester, Weheba, Zewde

**Absent:** Bukonda, Lee, Solomey, Tamtam, Yildirim

**Excused:** Bowen, Celestin, Hammond, Popejoy, Price, Pulaski

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Process / External Link</b>	<b>Notes and Outcome/Action/Completed</b>
<b>Call to order</b>	3:30 pm	
<b>Informal statements &amp; proposals</b>	<p>Informal statement by Senator Jeffres regarding Gender Pay Gap – <a href="https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/documents/102119/RemarksFromThaliaJeffresRegardingGenderPayGap.pdf">https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/documents/102119/RemarksFromThaliaJeffresRegardingGenderPayGap.pdf</a></p> <p>Informal statement by Senator Ahmed regarding Sustainability – <a href="https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/documents/102119/InformalStatementfromIkramAhmedRegardingSustainability.pdf">https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/documents/102119/InformalStatementfromIkramAhmedRegardingSustainability.pdf</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informal statement by Senator Jeffres regarding Gender Pay Gap (see left-hand column for link to full statement)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mentioned recent article about gender pay gap – the gap is almost double when an individual does not work [overload i.e.,] extra hours</li> <li>○ This means that a spouse [who fulfills the homemaker role] is required to help with the family while [the breadwinner] must work 60-70 hours per week to pursue promotion</li> <li>○ If WSU is serious about diversity hiring, then the university needs to have a better sense of proportion [about workload]</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Informal statement by Senator Ahmed regarding Sustainability (see left-hand column for link to full statement)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are three groups on campus and everyone is encouraged to attend / join the groups</li> <li>○ Earth Day 2020 is 22 April – hoping to have a guest speaker</li> <li>○ Website for sustainability activities is <a href="http://www.wichita.edu/sustainability">www.wichita.edu/sustainability</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Senator Castro mentioned that during the Board of Regents (BoR) visit with the Senate Exec, the BoR was very enthusiastic about WSU’s effort for a new minor in Sustainability</li> </ul>
<b>Approval of minutes</b>	<a href="#">Sept. 23, 2019 minutes</a>	Moved & seconded, approved unanimously
<b>President's Report</b>	Senate President Jarman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guests in attendance from SGA Committees: Academic, Student Involvement, Diversity</li> <li>• President’s Report: Town Halls involved very productive conversations</li> <li>• BoR visit: Exec had breakfast with BoR, were able to mention positive goings on at WSU</li> <li>• Open &amp; Alternative Textbook (Open Educational Resources or OER) Initiative to be discussed in a future Senate meeting               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OER proposal is to provide monetary incentives for faculty to create new textbooks that will have zero student cost (except for a \$10 per course fee)</li> <li>○ Funding will come from the \$10 per course fee for courses that have OER material</li> <li>○ OER proposal document is on the Senate website</li> <li>○ Neal Allen is a member from WSU on the committee, and he is the contact person</li> <li>○ Senate role is to provide feedback</li> </ul> </li> <li>• General Faculty meeting is scheduled for Monday 11/11 @ 3pm</li> <li>• There is a vacancy on the SGA Supreme Court, need a faculty rep appointed by the President, please send nominations to Faculty Senate President Jarman this week</li> <li>• Nominations for reps from each division is needed to populate the new SPTE committee</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Reports</b>	Rules: Aleks Sternfeld-Dunn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation from Rules Committee for appoint to Senate <b>Committees</b></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Academic Affairs:</b> Fine Arts-Ted Adler</li> <li>○ <b>General Education:</b> Applied Studies-Greg Novacek</li> <li>○ <b>Undergraduate Research:</b> Applied Studies-Soonchun Lee</li> <li>○ <b>Planning and Budget:</b> LAS Natural Sciences-Nick Solomey</li> <li>● Recommendations were approved unanimously</li> </ul>
<b>Old Business</b>	None	<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>
<b>Faculty Workload</b> , Betty Smith-Campbell (chair)	<p>Recommendation from Faculty Workload Ad Hoc Committee  Workload Draft Updated Proposal:  <a href="https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/documents/102119/UPDATED10.21.19MotionFromFacultySenateWorkloadTaskforce.pdf">https://www.wichita.edu/academics/facultysenate/documents/102119/UPDATED10.21.19MotionFromFacultySenateWorkloadTaskforce.pdf</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Changes were made to the proposal based on feedback from Townhalls; ad hoc Workload committee approved this revised proposal [being discussed today]  <u>Comments and amendment related to Workload on page one:</u></li> <li>● There was concern expressed that the Chair and/or Dean makes the decisions concerning workload expectations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Response given was that wording in the last sentence was changed from “negotiate” in an earlier version to “discuss” in the revised version; reason for change is that “negotiate” may actually be ignored [by administrators] and it may also give an impression to junior faculty that they may be able to “drive” this more than they are actually able to</li> <li>○ Comment was made that currently Chairs and/or Deans do not discuss workload [in some departments] so the proposal is more than the current process</li> <li>○ Suggestion was made [but not yet an amendment] to change wording so that Chair and/or Dean provide an explanation / justification for a faculty member’s workload expectation</li> <li>○ Response given was that there is an expectation that this discussion occurs during FAR</li> <li>○ Comment was made that many faculty do not write a rebuttal during FAR</li> <li>○ Suggestion was made [but not an amendment] to change wording to “discuss and negotiate” in 2<sup>nd</sup> to last sentence and then in the last sentence “provide a written summary of the (delete “their”) decision ...”</li> <li>○ Comment was made that expected workload [at time of FAR] may differ from actual accomplishments – question was asked about when changed expectations are documented</li> <li>○ Proposed <b>amendment</b> delete the word “their” and add “or whenever revisions are made” to read: <b>Faculty members are to discuss workload expectations with the Chair and/or Dean at least annually</b> or whenever revisions are made. <b>The Chair or Dean should provide a written summary of <del>the</del> decisions concerning the faculty member’s workload expectations.</b></li> <li>○ Question was asked regarding revisions – is it necessary to document the change in expectation when most people simply teach the same courses?</li> <li>○ Response – this is probably needed for those who teach a large number of preps</li> <li>○ Comment was made that there is a lot of variability on decision maker / process</li> <li>○ Provost suggested adding a statement in FAR instead; Betty Smith-Campbell mentioned that would be specific to policy</li> <li>○ Comment was made that role statements should be available for every faculty</li> <li>○ Voice vote on <b>amendment</b> [not full Workload policy] – amendment passes</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Does the change in title [in page 1] mean that research and service is added to [i.e., on top of] teaching? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Response – this is already current policy</li> <li>○ [Similar question rephrased/asked:] Shouldn’t the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph state that the standard</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<p>workload is ... rather than the standard teaching load is ...?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Response – 12 credit hours of teaching plus some service plus some research is standard</li> <li>○ Comment was made that it would be a paradigm shift to reduce from 12 credit hours of teaching for standard expectation to teaching plus service plus research</li> <li>● Based on comments during the Senate discussion, the last two sentences of the last paragraph was split out as a separate [i.e., new last] paragraph</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments and amendment related to Uniscope on page two:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Wording about Uniscope now states that it is a framework to “enhance” ...</li> <li>○ Comment was made that the original passage of the Uniscope concept by the Senate was that it is not a requirement – the current proposal does not reflect this</li> <li>○ Amendment to change the wording describing what the Uniscope allows in terms of enhancement: wording “for research, scholarship, or creative activities” changed to “faculty activities”</li> <li>○ Comment was made that Uniscope is about scholarship not teaching or service</li> <li>○ Amendment passes</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments related to going up early for tenure / associate rank on page three:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No comments made</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments related to going up early for full professor rank on page four:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Wording in earlier version “demonstrate” was changed to “document” in revised version</li> <li>● Comment was made that language needs to be cleared up</li> <li>● Question was asked whether exceptional merit relates to accomplishments over a shorter time period when going up early or if it is for the entire [i.e., six year] record <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Response given was that it is for the shorter period only</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Second reading of the proposal will be at the next Senate meeting</b></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> <p>Note #1: amendment still pending on the floor from the 9/23/19 Senate meeting</p> <p>Note #2: additional amendment [to be considered in next Senate meeting] – at least two courses in general education must be numbered 300 or above</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment to increase proposal’s Gen Ed requirement from 33 credit hours [11 courses] to 36 credit hours [12 courses], and to complete the FYS (if required) outside the distribution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Comment was made that this amendment will cause Engineering programs to take 12 courses totaling 44 to 45 credit hours to fulfill Gen Ed; part of the reason for this high number is the restriction that FYS be taken outside of the distribution; it should be kept in mind that the FYS was originally intended to be an Intro course counted within the divisional distribution; instead of a restrictive program, we should have a flexible Gen Ed program that allows individual colleges to enhance Gen Ed with additional restrictions to meet individual college needs rather than imposing such restrictions campus-wide</li> <li>○ Comment was made by an individual who has taught FYS at WSU and elsewhere that FYS is interdisciplinary so they should not be counted within disciplinary divisions</li> <li>○ Comment was made [to support the amendment increasing Gen Ed requirements to 36 credit hours] that math courses required by a major should not be counted as fulfilling Gen Ed; comment in response was made that not allowing math [or other courses required by the major] to count as Gen Ed would increase total credit hours required for many degrees</li> <li>○ A clarification question was asked related to the main proposal’s terminology – what are Gen Ed electives? Answer is any course currently counted as Tier 2 Introductory or Tier 3 Advanced Study or Issues &amp; Perspectives courses</li> <li>○ Question was asked whether the amendment would still allow one course in the major to be counted as Gen Ed; response by person putting forth the amendment is that there is no change to this part of the proposal</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Comment was made that changing from 33 credit hours to 36 credit hours will help; however, no evidence has been provided to support changing the paradigm of Gen Ed while at the same time it will be devastating to LAS; [therefore the main proposal should be rejected]</li> <li>○ Comment in response was made that Gen Ed is not a “keep employment for LAS”; the survey results for Engineering faculty and the SGA resolution considers the current Gen Ed program to be overtaxing and perhaps onerous; furthermore, the conversation about modifying Gen Ed has been ongoing for over two years</li> <li>○ A Fine Arts Senator expressed sharing the concern that LAS has about the loss of credit hours and its impact on LAS; at the same time, the Music Education program dropped from 136 credit hours down to 120 credit hours – a 16 credit hour drop; lots of programs have made cuts while Gen Ed has not been changed at all; it is possible to live with this reduced credit hour major, but preference is a Gen Ed program reduced to 33 credit hours</li> <li>● Call the question [to end debate] – vote result was in favor of ending debate</li> <li>● Vote on amendment (by show of hands): 17 in favor and 17 against – motion to amend the proposal does not pass [as it requires 50% plus 1 vote in favor]</li> </ul>
<b>As May Arise</b>	None	
<b>Adjournment</b>	5:05 pm	

**Next Senate Meeting: October 28, 3:30 - 5:00 pm, Clinton Hall Room 126**