

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate

March 12, 2007
3:30 PM Kansas Room, Memorial Union

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of February 12th, 2007.*
- III. President's Opening Remarks
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.*
 - A. Minutes of the Academic Affairs Committee meeting of February 5th, 2007 and February 19th, 2007.
 - B. Minutes of the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of January 19th, 2007 and February 19th, 2007.
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
- VII. Old Business.
 - A. Consolidation of planning documents proposal – revised (07-01)*
- VIII. New Business.
- IX. Discussion Items.
 - A. Restoration of Research Funds
- X. Announcements
- XI. Adjournment

*Attachments

Faculty Senate
Washburn University

Minutes of February 12, 2007 Meeting
Kansas Room, Memorial Union

Present: Baker, Bayens, Boyd, Camarda, Dinkel, Elisha, Godman, Jacobs (President), Jackson, Lalonde (visitor), Liang, Lockwood, Manske, Martin, Meador, Nobo, Ockree, Palmer, Patzel, Pownell, Prasch, Ray, Renn-Scanlan, Roach, Russell, C. Schmidt, S. Schmidt, Shipley, L. Smith, C. Sullivan, S. Sullivan, Tate (VPAA proxy), Walker

- I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:33 PM.
- II. The minutes of the January 22nd, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks.
 - A. President Jacobs reported that he has been selected as the Faculty Senate representative on the VPAA search committee.
 - B. President Jacobs inquired as to whether the proposal for the "Consolidation of planning documents (07-01)" should be treated as New Business, thereby requiring two readings, or as an information item, requiring only a single reading, as requested by the VPAA. Those in attendance supported the notion that the proposal be treated as New Business.
 - C. A communication from the Faculty Senate representatives from the School of Business asked President Jacobs to raise three issues:
 - i. Whether it was possible for faculty to have greater insight and participation into the allocation of technological resources. Nancy Tate reported that a new system involving technological requests has recently been implemented and that the glitches are still being worked out. Tate also stated that she will determine whether greater faculty participation in the process is possible.
 - ii. Whether it was possible to provide electronic versions of grades to faculty, which can be uploaded into an Excel spreadsheet that would allow for data analysis. Donna Lalonde reported that a pilot group is presently exploring the use of an electronic grading book that may remedy this problem. It was also reported that ITS is willing to send to faculty an electronic copy of the results of scanned exams.
 - iii. It has been rumored that overhead projectors will not be replaced when they wear out. Nancy Tate stated she will look into this.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
 - A. At the January 26, 2007 meeting of the Board of Regents, the Board approved a 4% increase in the salary pool, based on the same tiers and guidelines used in the last few years. The Board further approved all six academic sabbatical applications for the 2007 – 2008 academic year, the

appointment of Mr. Thomas Romig as the Dean of the Washburn University School of Law, and design development for the renovation of Whiting Field House as the site for the University Athletic Strength and Conditioning Facilities.

- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
 - A. The minutes of the Faculty Affairs Committee of 01/19/2007 were approved.
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
 - A. The minutes of the Board of Student Publications meetings of 09/08/2006, 10/13/2006, and 11/10/2006 were accepted.
- VII. Old Business. There was no Old Business.
- VIII. New Business.
 - A. Brief discussion was given to the Consolidation of planning documents proposal (07-01). A small number of wording changes were made to the document. Nancy Tate will make the corrections and resubmit the proposal for a second reading. The motion to close the first reading was approved.
- IX. Discussion Items.
 - A. Concerns were voiced about the decisions being made by ISS. More specifically, it was suggested that some of the actions of ISS were insensitive to the needs of the faculty. It was requested that others who have additional concerns should make them known.
- X. The meeting was adjourned at 4:24 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Mike Russell, Secretary to the Faculty Senate

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 5, 2007

Jorge Nobo, chair, convened the Academic Affairs Committee at 3:30 pm in the Boswell Room of the Memorial Union. Members present were: Pat Munzer, David Pownell, Bill Roach, Steven Elisha, Patricia Renn-Scanlan, Shaun Schmidt, and Loran Smith.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the December 4, 2006 meeting were previously approved by e-mail.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Jane Carpenter announced that because of a conflict she would be unable to attend AAC or Faculty Senate meetings this semester.

AGENDA 1 - Institutional Research Data about PE 198

Dr. Nobo distributed information regarding the distribution of grades in PE 198. For the 2005-2006 academic year, 1656 students enrolled in the course. About 1.1% enrolled in the course on an A-P/F basis and 21% of those students earned an "A" grade. The withdrawal/drop rate for students taking the course A-P/F was higher than the rate for those taking the course for a grade (37% to 25%). The failure rate was also higher for those who took the course A-P/F (16% to 8%). The statistics are somewhat misleading because of the 1656 students, only 19 took the course A-P/F.

The committee had an informal discussion about what feedback we had heard or learned so far about the proposals that we sent out to the constituent units.

AGENDA 2 - Proposed Policy Statement: Course Numbering, Prerequisites, and Intended Audience.

Dr. Nobo distributed this document which he had received from the VPAA's Office. It was approved by the College Faculty Council on December 6, 2006. Items 1-4 of the document were proposed as University standards while item 5 only applied to CAS.

Smith moved to send the document to the schools for their review, comments, suggestions, and possible changes before taking up the matter in the Committee. The motion was passed.

AGENDA 3 - Visit of Dan Royer - February 19, 2007 Dr. Dan Royer will visit Washburn on February 19th. The schedule has him giving a presentation to faculty at 1:30 on the directed self-placement idea and then a second session with faculty on writing in English classes. At 3:30 pm, he will meet with the Academic Affairs Committee.

There was consensus that publicity about his visit was essential. Dr. Nobo would see if information fliers could be produced and distributed to faculty. It was also urged that Dr.

Royer's presentations be videotaped (with his permission) by Washburn staff so those faculty unable to attend the presentations could see the tapes in the library.

AGENDA 4 - Housekeeping Items

- A. Committee may have incorrectly interpreted the Nursing comments about the math preparation of its students.
- B. Briefly discussed the Math University Requirements. No suggestions were made at this point. The Committee would prefer to deal with all three University Requirements at the same time.
- C. Briefly discussed the need to insure that quality adjuncts be hired and then mentored to provide uniformity in presenting our courses.
- D. Committee was alerted to the possibility that a technology requirement (essentially computer competence) is being proposed as another University Requirement.

NEXT MEETING: February 19, 2007 at 3:30 pm in Boswell Room. Dr. Dan Royer will be visit with Committee.

ADJOURNMENT: 4:40 pm

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
MINUTES
February 19, 2007

Jorge Nobo, chair, convened the Academic Affairs Committee at 3:45 pm in the Boswell Room of the Memorial Union. Members present were: Pat Munzer, David Pownell, Bill Roach, Steven Elisha, Patricia Renn-Scanlan, Shaun Schmidt, and Lorán Smith. Guests were: Dr. Ron Wasserstein and Dr. Dan Royer of Grand Valley State University.

Dr. Nobo introduced our guest who is the Chair of the Department of Writing at GVSU and who spent the past two hours talking to faculty about the two items of interest to the committee: (1) Directed Self-Placement for Freshman English and (2) Portfolio Group-Grading.

Dr. Royer said his university faced the same problem as others: What writing course should incoming freshman take? At GVSU, the choice was between EN 098, the basic writing class (WU equivalent, EN 100) and EN 150, the regular writing class (WU equivalent, EN 101.) GVSU struggled with this problem in several ways: use ACT English scores, high school GPA, or have students provide a writing sample at summer orientation. The results were that about 30% of students were enrolled in the basic class. But, upon closer review, GVSU found that some who were placed in the basic class should have been in the regular class and vice versa.

The first step was to determine whether there existed a placement problem or a grading problem. If a significant number of students who should have been in the basic class are doing well in the regular class, it may be a grading problem. So the first thing is to have standards as to what constitutes an A, a B, etc. If it is a placement problem, the answer GVSU developed was Self-Placement. It starts off with a letter from the Writing Department to every incoming freshman which explains the difference between the two courses and urges students to think carefully about which course is best for them. It is critical to emphasize that there is a meaningful difference between the two courses. A brochure accompanies the letter which asks students to take a brief survey which may help them to make a decision. During summer orientation, students are presented with a brief explanation of the two courses and why a student might take the basic course. Students then enroll but during the first week may switch from one class to the other.

Except for one semester, the number of students enrolled in the basic course is consistent at about 16% (compared to the 30% done by placement exam.) It is important that the course is not designated a remedial course, but an additional course to help students write; "if you choose it, you need it."

Dr. Royer then discussed the Writing Program at GVSU. He said that the writing process is only as good as the products they yield. Students write during the semester, their writing is critiqued and suggestions made but no grade is given. The grade in the course is based on products, not on attendance, participation, or how they work. Grade is given

at the end of the course when students submit a portfolio of three of their best products.

How the grade is determined starts with a group of five faculty who teach the same course. They meet for one hour each week and review three pieces of writing to determine what grade each piece should receive. Slowly, over the course of the semester (or about 10 weeks), this faculty group norms itself. They develop a consensus as to what constitutes A writing, B writing, etc. At the end of the course, a student submits the portfolio. The teacher doesn't comment, doesn't correct any errors but simply determines a letter grade based on the three pieces of writing. Without revealing that grade to anyone, the five faculty redistribute the papers among themselves and the second reader also assigns a grade (a straight A, B, C, or D). If the two grades agree, the instructor of record may add a + or - to the grade based on attendance, effort, etc (at GVSU, a + or - have different grade point values). If the two disagree, they give the portfolio to a third reader. If the process works as it is supposed to, there should not be many third reads.

"The aim of a first year writing course is to prepare students for the kind of writing they will be required to do in freshman and sophomore courses at the university." That makes the first writing course a service course and there is nothing wrong with that, in fact, he and his colleagues embrace the idea.

In response to questions, Dr. Royer made the following comments:

1. In the basic course (EN 098), students want to be there so teachers are more enthusiastic. So students have a greater incentive to succeed.
2. GVSU has the same problem as Washburn. They require transfer students to take EN 305 (WU equivalent = EN 300). But students take a Placement Exam. They have discovered that 70% of the students get the course waived as a result of the exam. Of the 30% remaining, if they take the Placement Exam a second time, 70% of THEM get the course waived.
3. There is a generalized rubric that constitutes what is an A,B,C, or D in writing. Everyone agrees on it and everyone says they use it. But, the rubric is an abstraction. One needs a practical application to a piece of writing to develop a consistent and normed grading system.
4. Grading as assessment. Individual grading is not standardized so the general rule is that grades can not be used for assessment purposes. But the public grading is normed. If one spends one hour a week every week for ten weeks articulating what you mean by an A,B,C,or D and at the end of term you share your graded paper with a colleague and most often that colleague arrives at the same grade, you have a standardized grade which can be used in assessment.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Next Meeting will be at 3:30 pm on March 5, 2007.

Washburn University
Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes of January 19, 2007 Meeting
1:00pm Mosiman Room, Memorial Union

Present: Lee Boyd, Andrew Evans, Park Lockwood, Kandy Ockree, Brenda Patzel, Mike Russell, Sharon Sullivan.

- I. The meeting was called to order.
- II. Sabbatical application procedures and guidelines were discussed.
 - a. The wording regarding the formation of the Sabbatical committee was revised. The suggested revision is as follows:
 - i. The Faculty Affairs Committee shall appoint members of the Academic Sabbatical Committee (ASC). The ASC will also serve as the Sweet Summer Sabbatical Committee. Each member of the ASC/SSC will serve a term of 2 years. However, during the first year, 5 members of the committee will only serve a one-year term. These 5 members will be selected by lot. This method of staggering will provide the ASC/SSC with both experience and fresh input. Each spring, the FAC shall request that each School and Division of the College of Arts and Sciences needing to nominate members to the ASC submit those nominations by the end of the academic year. The FAC shall consider all nominations at the first meeting of each fall semester and select an appropriate ASC committee.
 - b. The wording for the Academic Sabbatical Leave section of the Faculty Handbook was revisited. Some suggestions were presented and those suggestions will be discussed with the VPAA office prior to presentation at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
 - c. Sabbatical Guidelines were discussed and revised. There continues to be ongoing discussions regarding the content of the guidelines and the residence of the entire document (ex. VPAA website, Website for sabbaticals, etc.).
- III. There was a discussion of the Conflict of Interest policy and procedures. A revised version of such procedures was presented and discussed. Further revisions were suggested. These revisions will be completed and sent to the FAC via email. Upon receiving these revisions, the FAC will suggest any final changes in order for this document to be presented at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- IV. Meeting was adjourned at 2:25pm.
- V. Next meeting will be February 19th at 3:30pm in the Mosiman room.

Submitted by Park Lockwood, Secretary of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Washburn University
Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes of February 19, 2007 Meeting
3:30pm Rice Room, Memorial Union

Present: Lee Boyd, Andrew Evans, Mo Godman, Park Lockwood, Brenda Patzel, Mike Russell, Sharon Sullivan.

- I. The meeting was called to order.
- II. Sabbatical application procedures and guidelines were discussed.
 - a. The wording for the Academic Sabbatical Leave section of the Faculty Handbook was reviewed. The wording of this document will be presented to the Executive Committee prior to the next FS meeting. In addition, the financial implications will be discussed with the VPAA office. Once feedback is received from the Executive Committee and the VPAA office, the Sabbatical procedures will be submitted to the FS as an action item.
 - b. Sabbatical Guidelines were discussed. There continues to be ongoing discussions regarding the content of the guidelines and the residence of the entire document (ex. VPAA website, Faculty Senate website, etc.). The FAC is currently discussing with the VPAA where and how this will occur.
 - c. The Sabbatical Committee formation process was approved by the FS in the fall of 2005. An amalgamation of this process is presented as an information item (see attached).
- III. There was a discussion of the Conflict of Interest policy and procedures. A revised version of such procedures was presented and discussed. Further revisions were suggested. This revised policy was then compared with the current Grievance policy. It was noted that the two policies were similar, therefore the FAC will continue to compare policies to determine the necessity and, if necessary, continued revisions of the COI policy.
- IV. The Domestic Partnership policy was discussed. A subcommittee of the FAC will continue to examine this policy. Continued discussion over this policy will occur next FAC meeting.
- V. There was a brief discussion over the Faculty Tenure and Promotion appeal process. Further discussion is scheduled for the next FAC meeting.
- VI. Meeting was adjourned at 5:15pm.
- VII. Next meeting will be March 26th at 3:30pm in the Mosiman room.

Submitted by Park Lockwood, Secretary of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Information Item

Amalgamation of the Sabbatical Committee Procedures

The Faculty Affairs Committee shall appoint members of the Academic Sabbatical Committee (ASC). The ASC will also serve as the Sweet Summer Sabbatical Committee. Each member of the ASC/SSC will serve a term of 2 years. However, during the first year, 5 members of the committee will only serve a one-year term. These 5 members will be selected by lot. This method of staggering will provide the ASC/SSC with both experience and fresh input. Each spring, the FAC shall request that each School and Division of the College of Arts and Sciences needing to nominate members to the ASC submit those nominations by the end of the academic year. The FAC shall consider all nominations at the first meeting of each fall semester and select an appropriate ASC committee.

AGENDA ITEM

Date: February 12, 2007

Number: ____07-01 (rev)____

Subject: Consolidation of planning documents

Description:

One of the benefits of engaging in the Higher Learning Commission Accreditation Self Study process is the opportunity to review our effectiveness in communicating what is important to Washburn University. As a part of the process, we also have the opportunity to consider new venues for communication. One such venue we would like to use is, of course, the World Wide Web.

Over the past several months, a number of academic administrators and faculty have reviewed the documents, print and electronic, which inform the community about the vision, mission and core values of the institution. Presented here for your information and comment is a consolidation of those documents. We felt this consolidation was appropriate and important, allowing us to succinctly communicate the vision, values, and mission of Washburn University.

The preamble and vision statement comes from the Academic Plan and the Washburn Transformational Experience description approved by the Faculty Senate. The mission statement is the “mission summary” previously adopted by the Washburn Board of Regents. The core values are as addressed in the “full mission statement” and the mission statement of the VPAT area, and are representative of the shared values of all members of the Washburn community.

As this consolidated document does not represent anything new, it is presented as an information item. Suggestions for improvement are eagerly sought.

Requested action: Faculty Senate review and comment

Originated by: Ron Wasserstein, VPAA, on behalf of the HLC Self-Study Steering Committee

Washburn University Vision, Values, and Mission**Preamble**

The road to graduation from Washburn University must be a transformative experience, not merely be a series of transactions by which a student completes an array of courses and is rewarded with a diploma. Washburn’s goal is to graduate students who are highly principled citizens who make a difference in society.

Vision

Washburn University will be widely recognized for academic excellence, evidenced by student and faculty achievement, leadership development, community commitment, and global understanding.

Values

- Washburn University values high quality instruction in the learning/teaching process.
- Washburn University values diversity, is dedicated to equality, and is committed to serving a diverse population including residents of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas, the nation and the world.
- Washburn University values the fundamentals of a general education.
- Washburn University values helping individuals reach their full academic potential.
- Washburn University values a collegial and interactive process in planning and decision making, promoting civility, understanding, and mutual concern.
- Washburn University values improvement, continuously assessing undergraduate and graduate programs to meet community needs and professional expectations.
- Washburn University values both tradition and innovation.
- Washburn University encourages the growth and development of all learners and those who facilitate these processes.
- Washburn University values integrity and ethical behavior in all matters.
- Washburn University provides a professional and supportive work environment where our employees enjoy freedom of conscience and the right to refuse to engage in actions that violate ethical principles and standards or provisions of law.
- Washburn University values transformational experiences in leadership, community service, international education and scholarly and creative activities for all students.
- Washburn University values its role in the community and is closely engaged with the community beyond the campus, providing services and outreach activities that enhance the social and economic vitality of the region.

Select Mission

Washburn University shall prepare qualified individuals for careers, further study and life long learning through excellence in teaching and scholarly work. Washburn University shall make a special effort to help individuals reach their full academic potential.

Approved by the Washburn Board of Regents, September 17, 1999