

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
April 20, 2015
3:00 PM – Kansas Room, Memorial Union**

PRESENT: Alexander, Averill*, Ball, Bearman*, Berry, Chamberlain, Francis, Frank, Friesen, Jackson, Kwak, Lewis*, Lunte, McConnell-Farmer, McHenry, Modellmog, Palbicke, Pembroke, Petersen, Routsong, Russell, Sadikot, Schmidt, Schnoebelen, Smith, Sourgens, Stacey, Stevens, Sun, Treinen, Weiner, Wisneski

ABSENT: Childers, Dick, Florea, Mapp, Perret, Rubenstein, Sanchez, Schbley, Scofield, Stevenson

***Guests**

- I. President Ball called the meeting to order at 3:02pm.**
- II. The Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 6, 2015 were approved.**
- III. President's Opening Remarks:**
 - **Come to May 4th meeting—our last of the year! We will be welcoming our new senators at that time.**
 - **Congratulations to Eric McHenry on being named the Kansas Poet Laureate.**
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents: None**
- V. VPAA Update—Dr. Randy Pembroke:**
 - **The Kansas Board of Regents approved the process of Washburn self-rule with regard to undergraduate programs.**
 - **We will start to make a general announcement for successful candidates for Tenure and Promotion. For this year a message will go out this week, but in the future we'll do it the week after the Washburn Board of Regents meeting wherein these become official.**
 - **On the issue of quorum: it been a while since we've determined the best time for these meetings. There were some suggestions about alternate times, so I've been reflecting on this. I want to confirm that we have that meeting located in as light a teaching space as possible. For this semester, there are 61 classes (fewer than 10% involved) that meet during that time period.**
 - **On a related note, he has been thinking about how faculty governance works and the idea of faculty as a whole as a governing body. When counting both the main and the tech campuses, it won't be long until we will have 10,000 students with both campuses, so going to the faculty as a whole may become even more problematic. Do we still like this model or should we use designated bodies only? It's an issue we'll come back to at some point.**
- VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports**
 - **The Academic Affairs Committee Minutes from March 30, 2015 were approved.**
 - **The Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes from February 9, 2015 were approved.**

VII. University Committee Reports: None

VIII. Old Business:

- **15-22 Modification of the Probation-Reinstatement Policy was presented by Schmidt. Pembrook expanded on this a bit: we have a pretty strict standard for this by comparison to other Kansas public schools. Part of our policy reflects the need for a 2.0 cumulative GPA and then after a year of non-improvement, you're dismissed (2.25 is the benchmark for improvement). The idea of the warning zone in the proposal is to warn students but to also put them on a path to success and clarify for them the absolute requirements to stay enrolled. Schmidt asked for those who attended the open house forums about this to offer insight. Ball reported that a concern she heard was that we're giving students more rope to hang themselves by with the GPA changes. Modellmog wondered why we don't just follow the University of Kansas model and use the current GPA instead of the cumulative GPA. Pembrook said we tried to borrow the best of many policies. He asserted that we might want to provide more time than KU for our open enrollment students. He asked us to consider how much time we want to allow students to improve. Chamberlain asked about when students go on academic warning, if there was any limit on hours (a place where some get into trouble because they might take too many). Pembrook said that the warning program requires a specific type of academic advising that would advise against overloading the student with too many classes. Bearman said that this is very individualized and yes, does usually entail a smaller normal of hours. Pembrook noted that the average student drops 7/10ths of a grade point between the end of their high school career and the end of their first semester in college. Thus, after 2 semesters, they could be dismissed under the current policy if this trend continued. The proposal will hopefully help solve for this since the overall goal of the proposal is to help students find their footing and buy themselves more time to do so (since currently we lose approximately 200 students to dismissal each year under these guidelines). It's important to be conscientious about student debt, but only if it's based on false hope. If we provide additional time that allows students to 'find themselves' and attain a secondary credential, then this will give them access to a better quality of life. Sadikot wondered about a student who falls below a 1.5 in their first year if they get put in this program. Pembrook says that yes—if they fall below a 1.6 then they're placed in probation. Sadikot then asserted that perhaps the GPA requirement should be higher (2.25). Pembrook said that if a student has mostly Cs in their last 60 hours, then they could make it to the 2.0 finish line standard for graduation. Schmidt circulated a proposed amendment; he wants to strike the last paragraph, add an addition to the rationale, and suggest the new wording that will require reporting of data to let us know if the program guidelines are actually working. Bearman added language to this amendment; he said his center is excited about this proposal. The data will come back to the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) annually, and every 5 years the AAC will come back to the senate with the data to ask if the program is working or requires revision. Ball asked for a vote on the amendment; it passed unanimously. The amended motion carried.**

[Pembrook asked: what do you think he (or we) can do between today and April 30th to ensure this proposal is passed? Sun noted that some faculty are concerned about this proposal; she encouraged him to e-mail the administrative staff with the concerns. Sun added that it's important to talk to the faculty directly. Pembrook then offered to talk to anyone who has expressed such concerns and suggested that they contact him (or let him

know who had concerns and he could contact them). If anyone has other suggestions, please let him know. Sadikot said one thing to make her more comfortable was if she knew they were equipped to help a large number of students who have academic problems; she then read an e-mail from one of her colleagues that indicated that a big issue with some students not passing is because of non-academic concerns (family matters, full-time work load, etc.). Petersen said faculty members have the responsibility in the classroom and as advisors to deal with academic concerns but should be wary of getting too personal with this type of decision calculus.]

- **15-23 Amendment of Faculty Handbook-Faculty Roles and Responsibilities** was presented by Tom Averill (representative of the ad hoc committee). He noted that this measure was trying to create consistency with actual faculty loads and some flexibility with some dates involved in the process. Stevens noted that Dr. Tate came to the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting last week and said that this was really more updating than anything this part of the Handbook hasn't been updated since the 1970s. Schmidt asked about a couple of the due dates (should the dates be specified); Averill said the current language covers the deadlines that fall on weekends and that it allows for flexibility. Pembroke added that there is communication about these dates every year; such communiqués can clarify these issues specifically for those particular years. Petersen wondered if this matters since applications aren't being looked at on those days (when they are weekends). Russell said that they could be submitted electronically. Ball said that signatures are required so they would have to be hard copies. Ball asked for a proposal to clarify the dates and heard none. Modellmog said that we should clarify what a full-time load is. Averill said that it's further complicated in terms of faculty working with students on independent studies; could this then allow faculty to "bank" hours toward load in later semesters? Pembroke then asked who the "banker" would be—the chair, Dean, or someone else? He argued that it should be at the Dean's level or lower to ensure mass economic implications don't occur and clarity of the hours "banked." Averill believes that the Dean would ultimately be making these decisions. This is true for those who serve on service committees but who don't relieve any release time (all but the Faculty Senate president). The language allows for these situations so that a faculty member could have the possibility of "banking" these loads. Petersen wondered if we need to get these things in writing in order to protect both faculty and academic units (especially if it can be done retroactively). Averill said that he wasn't sure the committee did cover this completely (in terms of how retroactive the policy could go); he guessed it would start with the passage of this revision. The motion carried.

IX. New Business: None

X. Information Items: None

XI. Discussion Items: None

XII. Announcements:

- Schmidt reminded everyone that Apeiron is on April 24th. Presentations start at 10:30am and the last lecture will be at noon. Oral presentations will be from 1:00-3:00pm, followed by the poster presentation session from 3:00-5:00pm. Get your students AND colleagues there!

- **Weiner announced that the 2nd weekend of *The Glass Menagerie* ends this week.**
- **Pembrook reminded everyone that we have a General Faculty meeting on April 30th!**

XIII. **President Ball adjourned the meeting at 4:01pm.**