

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
March 27, 2017
3:00 PM – Kansas Room, Memorial Union**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approval of the Faculty Senate meeting minutes of March 6, 2017 (pp. 2-5)**
- III. President’s Opening Remarks**
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents**
- V. VPAA Update—Dr. JuliAnn Mazachek**
- VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports:**
- VII. University Committee Reports:**
 - **Receipt of the Graduate Council meeting minutes from January 30, 2017 (p. 6)**
 - **Receipt of the Assessment Committee meeting minutes from March 9, 2017 (p. 7-8)**
- VIII. Old Business:**
 - **17-3 Graduate Council Wording and Membership Changes (pp. 9-11)**
 - **17-4 Conceal Carry Exemption (p. 12)**
- IX. New Business:**
 - **17-6 Agenda Transmission and Timeline Changes (first reading) (pp. 13-14)**
- X. Information Items:**
- XI. Discussion Items:**
- XII. Announcements**
- XIII. Adjournment**

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
March 6, 2017
3:00 PM – Kansas Room, Memorial Union**

PRESENT:

Ball, Barker, Erby, Farwell, Francis, Kapusta-Pofahl, Kwak, Mansfield, Mazachek, Memmer, Moddelmog, Ockree, Petersen, Prash, Sadikot, Schmidt, Schnoebelen, Scofield, Siemens, Smith, Sourgens, Stacey, Steinroetter, Stevens, Tutwiler, Wasserstein, Wohl, Worsely, and Zwikstra

ABSENT:

Alexander, Garritano, Mastrosimone, Matthews, Treinen, and Weiner

GUESTS:

Bearman, Dohrman, Holthaus, Liedtke, Tate, and Wynn

- I. President Schmidt called the meeting to order at 3:02pm.**
- II. The Faculty Senate meeting minutes of February 20, 2017 were approved.**
- III. President's Opening Remarks:**
 - **With regard to the information item from our last meeting regarding the Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) standards: Schmidt indicated that he had been under the impression that it was an option to adopt them. He has since learned that adoption is not an option.**
 - **Schmidt expressed his congratulations to the debate team for their recent national tournament win.**
 - **Schmidt also indicated that the VPAA search continues. At presented, he said there is one final candidate set to visit campus tomorrow and Wednesday. He encouraged everyone to attend the open forums. Schmidt also noted that recordings of the open forums and the CVs for all candidates will be available online shortly and indicated that all should send comments to Dr. Farley.**
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents: NONE**
- V. VPAA Update—Dr. JuliAnn Mazachek:**
 - **Mazachek indicated that revision the Faculty Appeal Process is still underway. She noted this was one part of a comprehensive effort to revise the bylaws of the Faculty Handbook—a process that is ongoing.**
- VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports:**
 - **The Academic Affairs Committee meeting minutes from September 12, 2016 were approved.**
 - **The Academic Affairs Committee meeting minutes from January 20, 2017 were approved.**
 - **The Faculty Affairs Committee meeting minutes from November 14, 2016 were approved.**
- VII. University Committee Reports:**
 - **The International Education/International WTE meeting minutes from November 10, 2016 were received.**

- The Library Committee meeting minutes from February 15, 2017 were received.

VIII. Old Business:

- 17-2 Update of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Policies was presented by Alan Bearman. Schmidt noted that the one major addition to this draft was the second part that deals with how we go about adopting these standards (it will be done on a department/unit basis). Prasch wondered if that specific language was sufficient; perhaps it should be changed to “consider aligning” to the standards rather than mandating it. Bearman noted that you can choose to increase these standards but it would have to be voted on by the Regent schools. Mazachek noted that the alignment will happen, so changing the language is unnecessary. Petersen wondered what would happen if a department said no to adopting these policies? He added the question, shouldn’t we make the departments feel involved and that we welcome their feedback? Worsely wondered if note 1 would help to assuage this concern. Prasch offered a friendly amendment to add the word “consider.” Barker moved to make this an amendment rather than a friendly amendment. Mazachek noted that if the Senate chose to depart from the language as is, it requires following an official process to address the change. The amended motion passed.
- 17-5 Faculty Handbook Committee was presented by Stevens. Mazachek passed around hard copies of a slightly amended version of this proposal. The amended motion passed.

IX. New Business:

- 17-3 Graduate Council Wording and Membership Changes was presented by Mazachek. (NOTE: the Senate voted to move this proposal to New Business to allow for a second reading) For clarity, the language had been amended prior to today; Mazachek passed around copies of the amended proposal. Barker said he was disappointed that the language allowed for proxy voting, asserting that votes might be cast without hearing the debate at the actual meeting. Mazachek said this was the decision of the committee and only applied to administrative decisions affecting all programs and not curriculum changes. In terms of the advance voting option, Mazachek asserted this is not a traditional proxy as views could be expressed via e-mail before hand and that if significant policy changes occurred at the meeting, the vote would not be counted. Ockree wondered what the rest of the Senate felt about the advance voting option. Moddelmog said she wasn’t familiar with the inner-workings of the Graduate Council but indicated she was sympathetic to the idea of being present and fully informed in order to vote. Petersen asked how often administrative versus curriculum issues come up? Mazachek said it is a mix. Petersen wondered if there was a demonstrable problem that required the change. Mazachek said that often the curriculum problems are less problematic as these go through multiple levels of approval before they come before the Council; it’s the administrative matters that apply to all different areas and units with graduate programs that are somewhat problematic. Moddelmog wondered if this might affect meeting attendance. Mazachek said this concern had come up, but that most indicated it wouldn’t. Prasch indicated his support of being present to vote. Mansfield, a member of the Graduate Council, said the intent was to accommodate those who, for whatever reason, couldn’t attend a meeting to still be heard—it wasn’t really meant to take away discussion. Prasch moved to remove the e-mail/advance voting portion of the proposal. Mazachek worried that removal of the two sentences allowing for e-mail voting might confuse that paragraph of the proposal. Ockree wondered if it was appropriate for the Senate to revise the language to control what the Graduate Council does. Ockree asserts that given the nature of the council and the diverse interests they try to serve, voting via e-mail should be allowed so that the members voice may

be heard. Sadikot said that information presented at a meeting might be problematic. Prasch said that voice and vote are different; there's nothing to stop someone from contacting other Council members and expressing ideas before a meeting they miss. Scofield said the paragraph should be considered as a whole and not just the last 2 sentences—the entire paragraph makes less sense if these sentences are omitted. Smith wondered if other University committees allowed for this, and if so, why are we coming down so hard on the Graduate Council? Mazachek added that most of the programs act pretty independently and have accreditation standards they must follow, so the Council's job is to standardize what we can and simplify the processes involved in graduate education at Washburn. She added the super majority (2/3 of voting members) is very important to council members in relation to administrative policy/procedure changes. Ball said it seems that this is the best way for the Graduate Council to conduct business. The amendment was not adopted. The motion was closed on first reading.

- 17-4 Conceal Carry Exemption (first reading) was presented by Prasch and Wynn. Wynn noted that the evidentiary footnotes were left off of this version but she would be happy to add them back in for the second reading. Ball revealed some concerns shared by a colleague in Business—that the 3rd paragraph was a better focus than the 2nd paragraph. Ball noted she wasn't making a suggestion for change—just sharing an idea presented by a colleague. Ball said this same colleague also indicated we may want to choose a different phrase than “stand with us” to avoid offending some conservative politicians. Prasch said taking out the second phrase is fine; he takes issue with removing the second paragraph, though, as he feels it is essential to the argument. Sadikot said that Universities are some of the few places where we are able to express ourselves freely, so paragraph 2 should stay. Mansfield recommended removing the budget phrase at the end of paragraph 2. Prasch said that this could be an issue with recruiting and retaining faculty in addition to the logistical demands to ban guns on campus as mandated by the current policy, and thus, the budget concerns should likely stay. Wasserstein said he saw little risk with toning down the language. Scofield said she would prefer evidence to be added to paragraph 2. Wynn wondered if the previously noted footnotes would be sufficient or if something else was necessary. Scofield said that the footnotes would probably work. Moddelmog said that even if Washburn had an unlimited budget, she wouldn't support the budget comment. Prasch noted he would add back in the footnotes for the second reading. He will also amend the ‘stand with us’ language. Mansfield suggested explaining the budgetary concerns, as well, in advance of a second reading. Schmidt wondered where this should go after the final Senate vote. Ball said it doesn't need to go to the General Faculty—once approved, we should simply publicize it. Prasch said the thinking was that we wanted to make a public statement in a timely manner, so it would just start and end with the Senate. Barker recommended asking a legislator who is friendly with Washburn to carry our message to the legislature. Mazachek cautioned that anything that might indicate an official Washburn stance would have to go through Dr. Farley's office. The motion closed on first reading.

X. Information Items: NONE

XI. Discussion Items:

- Updating Undergraduate Student Classification to match new Academic Probation of Reinstatement Policy (presented by Richard Liedtke): NOTE: This item will be going to the Academic Affairs Committee for review soon, but if there are things that are missed, please let Liedtke know. Ockree indicated that the hour-based versus status-base issue might create a

hardship for some students. Tate noted that the classification (not the hours) is the issue and it requires an override in the system. Barker wondered about why we are changing something that has been working well for years in order to satisfy a policy adopted recently. Bearman said that research indicates this will improve student success and on-time graduation particularly for those students that experience classification-based financial aid issues. Liedtke said the reason for the policy that we made last year (that Barker referred to) was passed to because Washburn's standards were the strictest in the state. Ball said the reinstatement policy would have to be revised if this isn't addressed in order for students to get to the 2.0 GPA for graduation. Wasserstein wondered if this hourly change might delay students taking EN 300. Barker wondered if this policy change might negatively affect some students attaining upper-division credits. Petersen wondered if this might alter the registration schedule, as well; Liedtke said that it would. Smith wondered if there would be a problem with seniors taking 100-level classes as a result of the re-classification system. Schmidt said that AAC would take these items in to account.

XII. Announcements:

- Erby: please attend the advocate candidate forums on Thursday and Friday of this week.
- Prash invited colleagues to attend the 20th anniversary celebration of Buffy: The Vampire Slayer that will take place on March 15th!
- Schmidt reminded those present that Apeiron registration is due by March 30th and that the actual event will be on April 28th.

XIII. President Schmidt adjourned the meeting at 4:22pm.

Graduate Council Minutes

January 30, 2017

12:00 – 1:00 p.m.

Lincoln Room/Union

Members Present: Michael Rettig (ED), Vickie Kelly (AH), Jim Schnoebelen (C/L), Bobbe Mansfield (SON), Bob Boncella (SOBu), Bruce Mactavish (MLS), Kayla Waters (HS), Shirley Dinkel (SON), Bassima Schbley (SW), Kandy Ockree (SOBu), Brenda Patzel (SON), Michael McGuire (PY), Kelley Weber (Mabee), Sandy Tutwiler (Fac. Sen.), JuliAnn Mazachek (ex-officio)

1. Meeting was called to order at 12:01pm.

2. Motions to approve/second meeting minutes from November 28, 2016, were made; minutes approved.

3. Council members discussed ways to revise the current written charge of the Council to reflect the actual scope of the work required to be addressed. Because the Council currently needs to act in ways similar to a graduate school, members suggested including language regarding administrative matters and change membership language to specify Graduate Program Directors or a designee. Members also discussed potential changes to the voting process.

4. Council members briefly discussed assessment of common outcomes for graduate programs. Concerns were expressed regarding the applicability of common outcomes among specialized programs and the potential negative impact the assessment time commitment would have on program delivery. For HLC purposes, members agreed to focus on one common outcome—ethics—as the assessment conversation continues.

5. Council members agreed that Dr. Mazachek should initiate a petition with the Kansas Graduate Deans Council to participate in the 2018 Capitol Graduate Research Summit.

6. Meeting was adjourned at 1:07pm.

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, March 9th, 2017
2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
Cottonwood Room-Memorial Union

In attendance:

Vickie Kelly (Chair), Michael Hager, Gloria Dye, Kayla Carter, Louise Krug, Cindy Wooldridge, Sarah Cook, Erin Grant, Amy Memmer, Debbie Isaacson, Melanie Burdick, Catlynn Jaynes (administrative support)

Follow-up on Assessment Extravaganza

Vickie discussed that attendance was down this year but that we should be happy with 75 in attendance. The committee will need to decide how to format the Assessment Extravaganza next year. The format discussions should begin when the committee meets in September. Vickie is hoping to still have best practices for next year from Washburn Institute of Technology and have them attend the Extravaganza. Next year will be USLO data. HERI and NSSE results will be available next year as well.

Several formatting ideas were discussed. Gloria suggested asking departments or divisions to present something they are doing in their department to encourage better participation. Asking them to present something that they are doing might encourage departments and faculty to attend to support their department and maybe even encourage others within their division to attend. Information can be presented in a roundtable fashion instead of a poster session. Vickie suggested a combo poster and possible roundtable discussion. Melanie suggested having a NSSE representative come to campus and explain NSSE results. Erin suggested doing a speed-dating type poster session. Amy suggested offering different topics to present and allowing faculty to pick what table or poster they will go to. Sarah suggested having part of the Extravaganza be an introduction/presentation first before having faculty look at posters. The committee should think about ways to balance the format so that presentations are on one side of the room and food and posters are on the other side. Louise suggested doing a self-assessment. Cindy suggested talking about assessment down to the course level. If we could give awards based on department chair feedback then there would be more incentive for them to attend. It would also encourage other faculty from that department to attend in support of their colleague. This would also be good for tenure. Vickie is going to make attending the Extravaganza and presenting a condition of receiving an award.

Kayla would like to close the loop and present the findings to the university faculty about how results are elaborated or compared. Melanie discussed assessment being perceived as drudgery and would like to change the perception about how we are presenting assessment. Assessment it about improving and progress monitoring. Change a person's thinking from instead of this has to be done to ways they can improve.

Assessment Retreat

The Assessment Retreat is scheduled for August 26th. We will feed you. The reports are already formatted and are ready to go. You have accessibility to the files in S: drive but Cat will send them out after spring break to everyone. Teams of 2-3 will be formed for reviewing reports and plans. The teams should review their reports and plans and compare findings prior to the Assessment Retreat.

Update on University-Wide Assessment

Kayla gave an update on University-wide assessment. Nursing has sent a lot seniors for testing this year. Unless we can get a large enough group to test we can't compare how students are doing per department. Part of the problem with getting seniors to test is that many are not on campus their senior year.

HERI (Higher Education Research Institute)-Closes on March 17th. 197 completed out of 376 which is a 52% response rate. Partial completion is 61% response rate.

NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement)-Closes on March 17th. The last reminder was sent out on Monday. There are 579 completed which is a 28% response rate. We are lower on freshmen and first year students. 270 completed for freshmen and 309 completed for seniors.

ETS Proficiency Profile-Ends next week. 262 freshmen and 176 seniors have tested. We are low on seniors and will need 250 for a comparable amount.

SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy)-This is given to all 1st time seniors after spring break.

Other

We are leading into HLC (Higher Learning Commission) accreditation. Fall of 2019 is when we requested HLC to come but they could possibly come in the spring of 2019.

Vickie asked if anyone would be going off the committee this year. Michael stated he may not be on the committee next year. The committee is doing a three-year rotation with a six-year maximum. This is to allow more faculty to be involved.

Vickie may not have anything to discuss in April.

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM NO 17-3

Date: February 27, 2017

Submitted by: Dr. JuliAnn Mazachek, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Proposal for Graduate Council Charge and Membership—
Faculty Handbook, Section 3, VII. A: Graduate Council

Rationale:

Undergraduate academic issues come through the Academic Affairs Committee which reports to the Senate. For consistency, it would seem that graduate academic issues should have the same type of path, beginning with Graduate Council and flowing to Faculty Senate.

Additionally, it is advantageous for the programs and for Washburn University for this Graduate Council to also serve as an advisory council on administrative matters touching more than one graduate program.

Therefore, the following language is proposed for consideration and approval by the Faculty Senate.

Current Wording

GRADUATE COUNCIL

*The **Graduate Council** reports to the Faculty Senate and is charged with evaluating and making recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding (1) all new graduate programs (majors, degrees, certificates and the like) proposed by any major academic unit of the University; (2) major revisions to existing programs (such as a change in major designation or the addition of a major or concentration); and (3) new graduate academic programs or revisions to such programs that originate from units other than major academic units. The primary concern of the Council shall be consistency of the proposed program with applicable University-wide and external accreditation guidelines and regulations including admission criteria and procedures, potential impact of the program on other established graduate programs in the University, and financial implications of such new or revised program. Joint programs including School of Law are subject to this review. All programs exclusively to the School of Law are not.*

The Office of Graduate Programs and Academic Outreach will collaborate with the Office of Institutional Research to provide appropriate data regarding graduate programs, respond to requests for information, and assume other administrative duties deemed appropriate by the Graduate Council, Faculty Senate, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Office of Graduate Programs and Academic Outreach also will collaborate with Enrollment Management on generating information on student recruitment, financial aid, and graduation.

*The **Graduate Council** voting membership will consist of one faculty member from Mabee Library and at least one faculty member from each School and the College (excluding the School of Law) with a maximum of one faculty member from each graduate program. Committee members shall be faculty who regularly teach or support graduate courses in the programs. The major academic units that offer graduate degree programs and Mabee Library will determine their own procedures for electing or*

appointing their representatives to the Graduate Council. Each representative will serve a two-year term. The Graduate Council will elect a Chairperson annually who will also serve as a member of the Faculty Senate. The Dean of the Office of Graduate Programs and Academic Outreach, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and a representative from the School of Law will serve as non-voting ex-officio members of the Council.

Decisions of the Graduate Council will require the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the voting members; two-thirds of the members shall constitute a quorum to conduct business. Actions taken by the Graduate Council will serve as the first reading of such action for the Faculty Senate and must be submitted to the full Faculty Senate in writing at least one week prior to a second (final) reading by the Senate.

Proposed wording:

GRADUATE COUNCIL

The Graduate Council is charged with evaluating carefully and making recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding (1) all new graduate programs (majors, degrees, certificates and the like) proposed by any major academic unit of the University; (2) major revisions to existing programs (such as a change in major designation or the addition of a major or concentration); and (3) new graduate academic programs or revisions to such programs that originate from units other than major academic units. In these matters, the primary concern of the Council shall be consistency of the proposed program with applicable University-wide and external accreditation guidelines and regulations including admission criteria and procedures, potential impact of the program on other established graduate programs in the University, and financial implications of such new or revised program. Joint programs including School of Law are subject to this review. All programs exclusive to the School of Law are not.

In addition to the review and decision responsibilities listed above, the Graduate Council shall also serve as an important advisory council for providing input into the decision process on administrative matters and procedures affecting multiple graduate programs across the campus, and as an important collaborative council for seeking opportunities to coordinate and cooperate in ways to best support and strengthen graduate programs at Washburn University.

Decisions of the Graduate Council regarding the matters forwarded to Faculty Senate will require the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the voting members in attendance; a majority of the members shall constitute a quorum to conduct business. In these matters, actions of the Graduate Council will serve as the first reading of such action for the Faculty Senate.

Actions of the Graduate Council regarding administrative matters (matters not forwarded to Faculty Senate) will require the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the voting members; a majority of the members shall constitute a quorum to conduct business. If a member is unable to attend the meeting in person, the member may issue their vote on an administrative action item in advance of the meeting by submitting their vote in writing via email to the Chairperson of the Graduate Council. The email vote will be recorded in the minutes as part of the action.

*The **Graduate Council** voting membership will consist of the director (or a designee) of each graduate program including the School of Law, and one faculty member from Mabee Library designated by the dean of the library. The Graduate Council will elect a Chairperson annually. There must be one faculty senate representative on the Graduate Council, who will serve as a voting member. This representative*

may be an existing member of the council (e.g. a Graduate Program director), in which case, he/she will cast only one vote per issue. The Vice President for Academic Affairs (or their designee) will serve as a non-voting ex-officio member of the Council.

The minutes of the Graduate Council meetings shall be forwarded to Faculty Senate in a timely manner.

Financial Implications:

None

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2017

Request for Action:

Approved by: Graduate Council

AAC on date:

Faculty Senate on date:

Attachments: No

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM NO 17-4

Date: 17 March 2017

Submitted by: Thomas Prasch on behalf of Kerry Wynn

SUBJECT: Resolution of Washburn University Faculty Senate Against Concealed Carry on Campus

Description:

We, the elected representatives of the faculty of Washburn University, oppose legislation allowing concealed carry of firearms on Washburn University's campus. We respectfully request the legislature of the state of Kansas to continue to exempt colleges and universities from the provisions of the Personal and Family Protection Act.

Colleges and universities in the United States have historically been designated gunfree zones, reflecting their mission as educational institutions. The concealed carry of firearms on campus--in residence halls, classrooms, and arenas--threatens to restrict open discussion and debate, presents dangers for the physical safety of students, faculty, and staff, and hampers the ability of institutions to recruit faculty and staff and to thrive within their budgets.¹

We strongly support efforts to make college campuses gun-free zones for students, faculty, staff, parents, and community members. We ask the legislature to respect the rights of institutions to determine their own policies according to the needs of each community.

We therefore call on Kansas's legislators to permanently exempt all institutions of higher learning from the mandate to allow concealed carry on campus.

Rationale: As noted above, guns make campuses less safe and cost them more.

Financial Implications: None for the resolution in itself; if it convinces the legislature to change their minds, some savings.

¹ 1Nathan Deal (Governor of Georgia), Veto of HB 859 ("Veto 9"), retrieved 2/21/17: <https://gov.georgia.gov/press-releases/2016-05-03/deal-issues-2016-veto-statements>; Daniel Webster, et al. "Firearms on Campus: Research Evidence and Policy Implications." Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Research, 2016. Retrieved 2/20/17: http://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-gun-policy-and-research/_pdfs/GunsOnCampus.pdf ; Sara Shepard, "KU police adding more positions, equipment to prepare for campus carry," Lawrence Journal World, February 5, 2017, retrieved 3/13, 2017: <http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2017/feb/15/ku-police-adding-more-positions-equipmentprepare-/>

Proposed Effective Date: When passed by the Faculty Senate

Request for Action: *Approval by Faculty Senate* *Faculty Senate on Date*

Attachments Yes No X No

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM NO 17-6

Date: 3/27/17

Submitted by: *Shaun E. Schmidt ext: 2265*

SUBJECT: *ESTABLISHING A TIMELINE FOR AGENDAS FOR FACULTY SENATE, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, FACULTY AFFAIRS AND THE GRADUATE COUNCIL*

Description: *Currently the Faculty Senate (FS) Constitution and Faculty Handbook requires the agenda for Faculty Senate to be set and distributed one week in advance of a meeting. There is no such requirement for Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs or the Graduate Council. This agenda item would specify and reduce the requirement to six calendar days.*

Delete current wording in Section V.A. of the FS constitution and Section 1.VI.E.1 of the Faculty Handbook

Agendas for each meeting will be distributed to all members of the Faculty Senate a week in advance of any scheduled meeting time and made available to the University community.

Add proposed wording as Section IV.G. of the FS constitution and Section 1.VI.D.7 of the Faculty Handbook

Agendas for each Faculty Senate meeting will be distributed to all members of the Faculty Senate six days in advance of any scheduled meeting time and made available to the University community. Academic Affairs Committee agendas, Faculty Affairs Committee agendas and Graduate Council agendas which contain items which constitute first reading for Faculty Senate will be distributed to all members of the applicable committee and the Executive Committee six calendar days in advance of any scheduled meeting time.

Rationale: *In an effort to encourage transparency and openness, this legislation will establish a timeline for agendas for the sub-committees of the Faculty Senate which conduct the first readings for most of the items coming before Faculty Senate. While all of the committees have followed the "week" guideline in practice, it is not an actual policy in the Constitution of the Faculty Senate or in the Faculty Handbook*

The second change that this legislation proposes to make is to reduce the timeline for agenda dissemination by one day, from one week to six days. As a practice meeting of the subcommittees of Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate meet on alternate Mondays in the late afternoon. By delaying the disseminations by one day, there would be actual time to prepare and edit agenda items before the deadline. The impact on transparency and openness in the process would be minimal as the community would still have days to read, research, and prepare for the meeting where the item will be acted upon.

Financial Implications: *Costs involved are minimal to none.*

Proposed Effective Date: *July 2017*

Request for Action: *Approval by FS/ Gen Fac*

Approved by: *Faculty Senate on date*

Attachments Yes No
