

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate

March 10th, 2008
3:30 PM Kansas Room, Memorial Union

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of February 11, 2008. (pp. 2 – 3)
- III. President’s Opening Remarks.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
 - A. Minutes from the Academic Affairs Committee meeting of December 3, 2007 and February 04, 2008. (pp. 4 – 7)
 - B. Minutes from the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of February 18, 2008. (p. 8)
 - C. Report from the Electoral Committee
 - D. Report from the Academic Integrity Committee
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
 - A. Minutes from the International Education Committee meeting of January 31, 2008. (p. 9)
- VII. Old Business.
- VIII. New Business.
 - A. Action item #08-01, entitled “Change in Composition of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)” (p. 10)
- IX. Information Items.
 - A. WTE Faculty Compensation Committee
- X. Discussion Items.
 - A. Emergency Response System
 - B. Status of Stoffer Science Hall
- XI. Announcements.
- XII. Adjournment.

Faculty Senate
Washburn University

Minutes of February 11, 2008 Meeting
Kansas Room, Memorial Union

Present: Bayens, Bowen (VPAA), Boyd, Camarda, Chorba, Croucher, Dinkel, Dunlap (visitor), Ginzburg, Hornberger (visitor), Jackson, Jacobs (President), Lockwood, Lunte, Martin, Munzer, Ockree, Patzel, Petersen (visitor), Pownell, Prash, Ramirez, Renn-Scanlan, Roach, Russell, S. Schmidt, Sharafy, Shipley, S. Sullivan, Walker

- I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 PM.
- II. The minutes of the December 10th, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks.
 - A. It was noted that the Electoral Committee will begin preparations for this semester's Faculty Senate elections.
 - B. President Jacobs spoke with VPAA Bowen and determined that each student will only receive funding for one WTE project, even though they are free and welcome to do more than one WTE.
 - C. President Jacobs noted that the Faculty Senate recommendation for tuition reduction for adjuncts was forwarded to President Farley for his consideration.
 - D. The opinions of the faculty as well as Faculty Senators on the proposed Risk Management policies were also forwarded to President Farley.
 - E. President Jacobs spoke briefly about the recent changes to the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) membership. He noted that there was a paragraph describing the AAC membership in the version of the Faculty Senate Constitution approved by the Board of Regents and the General Faculty. However, President Jacobs also noted that the version of the Faculty Senate constitution that was online and that was the only version available did not contain that paragraph. Given that a description of the AAC membership was lacking, the newly formed Faculty Senate approved a membership that was identical to that of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). President Jacobs stated he accepts full responsibility for the oversight and he assured those present that the change in AAC membership was not done with any malicious intent.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
 - A. The Board of Regents met on January 25, 2008 and approved a 4% increase in salary pool for the 2008-2009 fiscal year.
 - B. The Board of Regents also approved an enrollment management contract to a firm whose purpose will be to identify problem areas and weakness in an attempt to increase student enrollment.
- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
 - A. The minutes of the Academic Affairs Committee meetings of 11/19/2007 were accepted.
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
 - A. The minutes of the International Education Committee meeting of 12/13/2007 were accepted.

VII. Old Business. There was no old business.

VIII. New Business. There was no new business.

IX. Information Items.

- A. It was reported that the faculty parking problem over at Stoffer Hall is due to the fact that the parking signs indicating faculty only parking were removed due to the recent renovations and not reinstalled. Attempts are being made to have the signs re-installed.
- B. It was noted that while Washburn University does not have an Academic Technology Committee, there is faculty representation on the Technology Steering Committee. However, a number of faculty feel as if their input is either limited or ignored and, thus, the academic needs of faculty are unmet. It also appears that the advice and recommendations of faculty is not being translated into policy.

X. Discussion Items.

- A. Discussion was given to the recently approved changes to the membership of the AAC. Dan Petersen reported that it was the desire of the creators of the Faculty Senate Constitution that the AAC would be composed of one individual from each of the major academic units so that no one unit would have more votes than any other unit. Lengthy discussion was given on how to proceed from this point. Shirley Dinkel, Dan Petersen, and Kanalis Ockree agreed to form a committee that will present a formal proposal to the Faculty Senate in the near future.

XI. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Mike Russell, Secretary to the Faculty Senate

Academic Affairs Committee, 3 December 2007

In attendance: Patricia Renn-Scanlan, Jorge Nobo, Karen Camarda, Dave Pownell, Frank Chorba, Caren Dick Robin Bowen, Bill Roach (acting as secretary until), Tom Prasch (arriving late).

The minutes of 19 November 2007 were amended (to include Caren Dick as being in attendance) and approved.

The issue of university policy regarding course numbering was taken up. Nobo pointed out that some of the normative rules in the College of Arts and Sciences, such as the one that restricts upper-level courses from being introductory, might not apply to other schools. After a wide-ranging discussion of the practices of various programs and other colleges, and a general agreement that developing more broadly standardized numbering systems was probably a good idea, it was decided that Robin Bowen, with assistance from Jorge Nobo, would bring in proposal for action at the next meeting.

Discussion then turned to goals and strategies for dealing with changes in general education. Discussion focused on methods to bring issues before the broader constituencies involved. Nobo, underlining the two-way street he'd mentioned at the past meeting, suggested the development of smaller groups to generate proposals for each of the three types of general-education program (smorgasbord, developmental, and core). It was noted that it would be helpful to have more information and examples for each type; noted as well that skills could be expected to be part of any proposal. Roach raised the problem of turf wars in any reform process. Nobo returned to his idea of three core courses (cosmological, social scientific, humanistic). Bowen raised the question of whether other schools could be involved with general education; Nobo defended the special status of the College of Arts and Sciences by alluding to its traditional role and mission, and Prasch added that the history of the development of humanistic studies in universities supported the approach. Nobo added that proposals could be accepted now from outside the college, if approved by the college, and Roach noted the example (albeit a somewhat anomalous one) of Econ 100. Prasch noted the need to develop a set of criteria for upper-level general education. Bowen suggested that the best colleges mentioned in Pope's *Colleges That Change Lives* tended to have general education woven through the curriculum and connected with some capstone experience. Chorba wondered why it was necessary to change the existing system at all.

Meeting was adjourned without further action of the matter.

Academic Affairs Committee, 4 February 2008

In attendance: Jorge Nobo, Bill Roach, Pat Munzer, Karen Camarda, Patricia Renn-Scanlan, Frank Chorba, Tom Prasch; as guests, Dan Peterson, Willie Dunlap, David Sollars, Russ Smith

The minutes of the meeting of 3 December were approved.

The first agenda item was devoted to personal remarks by Jorge Nobo connected to the operation of the committee since its installation and responses by guests, in response to action by the General Faculty to amend the Faculty Senate constitution to make it consistent with the way the committee had already been operating. As Nobo recalled, the posted version of the Faculty Senate constitution was missing the paragraph in the approved constitution defining the membership of the committee, and that paragraph was therefore never implemented. Operating without knowledge of that missing paragraph, the executive committee of the Faculty Senate developed its own structure for the committee. That original makeup included three members from the College of Arts and Sciences, one from each other school except the School of Law, and one representative from the library; in that original formation, two representatives were included from SAS, but one of those was a temporary member representing associate degree programs.

The committee met with that structure in the fall of 2005, but issues raised by the committee and then-VPAA Ron Wasserstein led them to initiate a change in the structure, so that the committee's membership was the same as that of the Faculty Affairs committee, except for the exclusion of the School of Law. Action by the committee required a vote of 6 of the 9 members, to ensure that the College of Arts and Sciences could not control the committee; the VPAA had a standing invitation to attend as a guest, and usually did so. Those changes were approved by the Faculty Senate in March 2006; because it was not recognized that this was a change in the Faculty Senate constitution (because the missing paragraph was still missing), the change was not forwarded to the general faculty for approval, or to the Board of Regents. That committee structure has seemed to work fine.

Dan Peterson, responding to Nobo's narration, argued that he was concerned that the committee's representational structure should reflect not just proportions of the general faculty, but each academic unit. At the Faculty Senate level, this balance was carried forward by the presence of at-large members. For the Academic Affairs committee, the argument for representation of each unit concerned the need to avoid a "tyranny of the majority," leading to a formula of representation for each program or academic unit or program on the committee. It was voted this way for a reason, Peterson argued, and that reason should be considered regardless of the effectiveness of the current structure. Peterson also found it problematic that the committee structure had been changed without proper procedures, which would have entailed following the procedures for an amendment to the Faculty Senate constitution. Peterson concluded that issues of representation were linked to perceptions of fairness.

Pat Munzer wondered how it would have been possible to know that an amendment to the Faculty Senate constitution was required, given the printed and on-line versions of the constitution (all lacking the key paragraph).

Russ Smith suggested that the changes to the committee structure had never been fully debated, and declared that he was personally offended by the procedures.

Nobo responded that he was personally mortified to have discovered the mistake. He added that the committee had tried to respect concerns about representation with the supermajority provisions, which ensured that the College of Arts and Sciences could not override the collective voice of other units.

The committee then turned to the VPAA's proposals for a uniform course numbering system. Robin Bowen introduced the proposal by noting that it reflected typical numbering patterns at other institutions and left the possibility open for Washburn to develop doctoral-level programs in the future.

Munzer commented that she couldn't speak for her school's graduate program, and expressed concern about the committee taking action without allowing time to consult all affected units. Nobo offered the reassurance that the proposal would be amply discussed.

Bowen summarized the proposal, noting that it proposed a basic numbering system for courses, some optional additions, and provisions relating to graduate and undergraduate students taking courses.

Tom Prasch noted that the basic numbering system seemed relatively unproblematic, but that the option for using 2d and 3d numbers to reflect specific sorts of courses would be more troublesome. In the history department, for example, those numbers were already employed as other sorts of indicators.

David Sollars raised concerns over the use of a fourth digit, another of the options, having found that difficult to implement and less than useful in practice at another institution.

Willie Dunlap noted that the proposal would require changing the numbers for the entire master's program in his unit, and suggested that it would be important for the committee to consult with people who operate the Banner system and the Registrar's office.

Bill Roach noted that the proposal failed to define exactly what constituted a 300-level course, and whether such courses should require prerequisites.

After some discussion among committee members about how widely present policies (where they originated, how widely they were meant to apply, how widely they did not), Nobo conveyed an email from David Pownell, unable to be at the meeting, that his unit had no problems with the proposed changes.

Bowen at this point raised a procedural question, asking if the proposal needed to go back to schools and departments before being implemented. Nobo noted that the procedures were not entirely clear in the new system. Before returning to the procedural problem, a range of other issues were raised. Munzer pointed out that numbers could not be re-used. Nobo added that the Banner system and Registrar's office could carry both changed and previous numbers for awhile. Peterson noted problems for graduate degree programs with the 500-600 numbers, and alluded again to the issue of fairness in the lack of a defined protocol.

Returning to the procedural issue of establishing protocols, Roach noted that the previous mechanism—in which the VPAA and the chair of the University Council agreed on procedures—was essentially analogous to processes in the present committee. Peterson suggested that the more

information that goes back to units the better, and proposed that there should be deliberate redundancy in reporting. Nobo recalled that committee minutes used to be forwarded to all deans, and suggested reverting to that practice; Prasch said sure, he could do that. Dunlap hypothesized that this was the first proposal since the institution of the Faculty Senate that affected both this and the graduate committee. Munzer suggested that there should be reporting to all units, departments, and graduate schools, and then perhaps let the matter be taken up by a committee combining the academic affairs and graduate committee. Bowen averred that she would prefer to work with both entities rather than a hybrid new one. Roach, with Munzer concurring, noted that it was only the undergraduate components of the proposal that came under the purview of the committee; he added that, to cover all bases, this proposal would necessarily be a “tree killer,” requiring reaction from all departments. Munzer suggested that committee members could take the proposal back to their constituents. Nobo proposed forwarding it to the graduate committee as well as divisions and departments. Bowen suggested a process that began with feedback from constituent groups, then moved to this and the graduate committee, then to the Faculty Senate. Roach proposed bring the Registrar’s office and Banner experts into the discussion to ensure the practicality of the proposed changes. Bowen queried the group about mechanics of changes that involve impacts beyond the department proposing a change; members of the group concurred that this committee acts as a check on such changes being implemented without all concerned groups being brought into the process.

Other issues with the proposal were then raised. The 500-level courses, Bowen noted, were necessitated by financial aid rules for graduate students. Prasch suggested that the limit on 8 hours of such courses might provide a problem for the Master of Liberal Studies program. Smith, with Munzer concurring, suggested that the program director, not the instructor, be the person designated to allow undergraduates to take graduate programs for credit; after some discussion, other members of the committee seemed to concur with the discussion.

By vote of the committee, it was decided to eliminate the “options” section of the proposal.

Nobo, returning to the issue of procedural protocols, suggested that the VPAA can initiate action in the graduate committee, and that the proposal be forwarded for discussion to deans and the curriculum committee. Roach suggested adding the Registrar to the list. Karen Camarda, with Smith concurring, suggested that an explanatory narrative be added to the proposal; Prasch volunteered to develop one, and to forward it to the committee for comment. Bowen volunteered to revise the proposal in light of discussion and return it to the committee. Nobo instructed committee members to take the proposal back to their constituencies for comment; comments, it was agreed after some discussion, would come back to the committee.

The meeting was adjourned.

Washburn University
Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes of February 18, 2008 Meeting
3:30pm Rice Room, Memorial Union

Present: Brenda Patzel (Chair), Linda Croucher, Barbara Ginzburg, Park Lockwood, Kandy Ockree, Mike Russell, and Sharon Sullivan.

- I. The meeting was called to order.
- II. Sabbatical application procedures and guidelines were briefly discussed. The term “eligible” when referring to eligible applicants for a sabbatical has been found to be ambiguous within this document. The FAC will discuss this with the VPAA office prior to the next meeting in an attempt to resolve the ambiguity. In addition, the revised sabbatical criteria and document will be sent to the VPAA office in order to be placed on the VPAA website. The FAC will continue to work with the VPAA office until all Sabbatical documents are officially placed on the website.
- III. Conflict of Interest and Grievance policies. The FAC is currently looking at grievance policies from other universities and will continue the review and revision process of these policies. The FAC has decided to keep and revise the current grievance policy to address concerns related to conflict of interest and to explore the inclusion of promotion and tenure issues. Revisions to the policy are being drafted and will be presented and discussed at the next FAC meeting.
- IV. Meeting was adjourned at 4:50pm.
- V. Next meeting will be Wednesday, March 12 at 10:00am.

Submitted by Park Lockwood, Secretary of the Faculty Affairs Committee

**International Education /International WTE Committee
January 31, 2008, International House**

In attendance: Dmitri Nizovtsev, Brian Ogawa, Betsy Campbell for Shirley Dinkel, Matt Arterburn, Mary Sheldon, Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas, Alex Glashausser, and Baili Zhang

1. Minutes of Dec. 13 were approved.
2. Du's request for funding was approved based on verification of paper acceptance.
3. Zhang reported that the Study Abroad Fair was just held, that 60 AFS students from across Kansas representing 24 countries were on campus for three days, and that the Mulvane is showing Paraguayan art. Nizovtsev reported new study abroad opportunities in Finland under the Magellan program.
4. Faculty-sponsored student group travel proposals were discussed.

Memcott's International Social Work-Mexico program was approved.

Gamboa's Orchestra Concert in Honduras was approved conditionally, pending clarification and further information on the "cultural interactive element". It was not clear to the committee what kinds of cultural contacts the group will have on the ground with the Honduran people/musicians /students. Several members also pointed out the narratives regarding this piece were fine but no actual details were indicated in the day-by-day itinerary. Other words, the link between narratives and the actual itinerary was missing. (The proposal was subsequently approved via email by the committee after the additional information was provided and reviewed.)

5. Freeman's Spring Break in Barcelona was viewed as more recreational than educational. Therefore, the committee was unable to sanction it as a university study abroad program. The committee also suggested that the WSGA or some other approving venue be explored in terms of gaining university status and / or funding for the program.
6. Desanto's proposal to bring in Dr. Danny Moss was viewed as more of an administrative development project. Therefore it was not recommended for funding out of the faculty travel line. The committee encouraged other funding avenues to be explored involving the offices of the Dean, International Programs and the VPAA.

Respectfully submitted,

Baili Zhang

Faculty Senate Agenda ItemNumber: 08-01

SUBJECT: Change in Composition of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)

DESCRIPTION: After review of the Faculty Senate Bylaws approved by the Board of Regents, it was suggested that the composition of the AAC be changed to more accurately reflect the original intent and language.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: NONE.

RECOMMENDATION: Members of Faculty Senate requests that the composition of the AAC be as follows:

“The Academic Affairs Committee shall be chaired by the Vice President of the Senate. Other members shall include one Senate member from each Major Academic Unit (CAS, SOB, SON, SAS), and the Senate representative of Mabee Library/CRC. The Deans from the Major Academic Units, or their designates, and the VPAA or his/her designate, will serve as ex officio, non-voting members.”

Date: January 15, 2008

Shirley Dinkel (Electronic Signature)
FS member