

Washburn University  
Meeting of the Faculty Senate

*October 12, 2009*  
*3:30 pm Kansas Room, Memorial Union*

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 14, 2009 (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 September 9, 2009 (pp. 4-5)
- VI. University Committee Reports
  - A. Library Faculty Committee Meeting of September 17, 2009 (pp. 6-7)
  - B. Curriculum Development Grant Committee Meeting of September 16, 2009 (pg. 8)
  - C. Faculty Development Grant Committee Meeting of September 21, 2009 (pp. 9-11)
  - D. Honors Advisory Board Meeting of September 16, 2009 (pp. 26-27)
  - E. Honors Advisory Board Meeting of September 23, 2009 (pp. 28-29)
- VII. Old Business
  - A. Appointments to Benefits Committee
  - B. Constitutional Amendment Clarifying Faculty Representation ( Item 09-09) (pp. 12-13)
  - C. Proposed Change to Graduate Committee (Item 09-11) ( pg. 14)
  - D. Proposed Change to Student Financial Aid Committee (Item 09-12) ( pg. 15)
  - E. Proposed Change to Board of Student Publications Committee (Item 09-13) (pp.16-17)
- VIII. New Business
  - A. Proposed Revision to Appendix IV – Human Subjects Research Policy (Item 09-14) (pp.18-19)
  - B. Proposed Revision to Major Research Grants Committee (Item 9-15) Options 1 & 2 ( pp.20-25)
  - C. Appointments to the Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee
- IX. Information Items
- X. Discussion Items
- XI. Announcements
- XII. Adjournment

**FACULTY SENATE**  
Washburn University

*Minutes of September 14, 2009*  
*Kansas Room, Memorial Union*

Present: Averett, Barker, Berry, Bowen (VPAA), Catanzaro, Childer, Croucher, Faulkner, Jackson, Janzen, Kauffman, Kelly, Love (WSGA), Lunte, Mazachek, McBeth, Melick, Menzie, Naylor, Ockree, Onek (WSGA), Prasch (President), Quinn, Ramirez, Rich, Routsong, Shaver, Sullivan, Unruh, Walker, Wynn

- I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:34 PM.
- II. The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of August 24, 2009 were approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks

The President opened the floor to Garrett Love, President of WSGA to present the draft proposal for WSGA Success Week (see attachment). Garrett Love stated that the proposal was going through academic affairs. The purpose of the proposal was for instructors to not give tests, but it instead emphasize review. Comments may be forwarded to Garrett Love at [garrett.love@washburn.edu](mailto:garrett.love@washburn.edu) or Caley Onek at [caley.onek@washburn.edu](mailto:caley.onek@washburn.edu)

- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents
  - a. Prasch reported that on the Washburn Board of Regents Meeting of September 11, 2009
    - i. Gene Wunder had been awarded Emeritus status.
    - ii. Dr. Bowen reported on the status of the strategic planning initiative. Due to a medical leave, the deadlines have been relaxed from October 9 until a date later in October. The final date will be announced later. In addition, it was noted that faculty attendance has been sparse and faculty were encouraged to attend. Last, Kim Morse has resigned from the enrollment management subcommittee.
    - iii. Prasch reported on the changes in the insurance policy. A copy of the material that was sent to faculty and staff was handed out, showing the tier system of payment. Discussion from the Senators included the contention that with the loss of merit pay, this was a double-whammy to faculty. There was also concern about how the tiers were created, and why the upper break point is \$58,000. The Senate will issue an invitation to Harold Rood to address how the numbers added up to create the tiers.
- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports
  - a. No minutes were available from faculty senate committees.

- VI. University Committee Reports
  - a. Minutes from the Gen Ed Task Force meeting of August 20 2009 were accepted.
  - b. Minutes from the Assessment Committee meeting of August 11, 2009 were accepted.
  
- VII. Old Business
  - a. Establishment of Ad-hoc Committee on Strategic Planning (Item 09-08)  
Approved by the full senate.
  
- VIII. New Business
  - a. Appointments to Benefits Committee – tabled until next meeting for further recruitment.
  - b. Proposed Change to Graduate Committee ( Item 09-11)- Approved on first reading
  - c. Proposed Change to Student Financial Aid Committee (Item 09-12) – Approved on first reading
  - d. Proposed Change to Board of Student Publications Committee (Item 09-13) Approved on first reading as amended:  
*Section 4 Membership – add the following: No more than two students will have the same major.*
  - e. Constitutional Amendment Clarifying Faculty Representation ( Item 09-09) Approved on first reading as amended:  
*Section B: Representation - line 6 - add the words “part-time” before... faculty at the level of half-time or above....*
  - f. Technology Resolution (Item 09-10) Tabled until future meeting.
  
- IX. Announcements: The next meeting will be Monday, October 12 in the Kansas Rom
  
- X. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM

## Academic Affairs Committee

September 9, 2009

### Members in attendance:

Kathy Menzie  
Howard Faulkner  
Keith Mazachek  
Paul Byrne

Debbie Isaacson  
Cal Melick  
Robin Bowen  
(Rebecca Atnip, recorder)

Dr. Robin Bowen, Chair, opened the meeting.

### Presentation from WSGA

Garrett Love and Cayle Oneck, WSGA, presented a proposal for adopting "Success Week" on Washburn University Campus. They shared their research with the committee (attached to these minutes).

After some discussion, the committee agreed a "Success Week" was feasible, although it may not be an entire week. This time would comprise two-three weekdays before the onset of finals.

Dr. Bowen noted the Department Chair or Dean would be the appropriate monitor for this project, not the VPAA office.

The committee recommended the following changes to the proposed guidelines. Garrett Love agreed to provide a completed draft for the next meeting of the committee, which would include a clarification of the terminology to be used for this designated time on campus.

### WTE and Transfer Committees

Dr. Bowen explained the funding for WTE was cut 37% (\$350,000) this fiscal year. The current need was for additional direction and recommendations as to whether this program should be required or optional.

In addition, a need was identified to make Washburn more "Transfer friendly." Any plan would need to be put in place to be implemented next year in order to increase student enrollment.

Members of the Academic Affairs committee were asked to volunteer for each committee so they would be directly involved in this process. Following is the result of committee assignments:

### WTE

Kanalis Ockree  
Kathy Menzie  
Debbie Isaacson  
Cal Melick  
Lori Khan

### Transfer

Howard Faulkner  
Keith Mazachek  
Linda Croucher  
Paul Byrne  
Jeanne Catanzaro

### **Ongoing Business**

- Course changes and proposals
- General Education
- First Year Experience (Freshman Seminar)
- Other curricula issues

### **Membership question**

A question arose about membership requirements as the Faculty Senate approved two people from each academic unit. Dr. Bowen agreed to verify this information with Nancy Tate and Tom Prasch.

### **Chair of Academic Affairs Committee**

Dr. Bowen requested a volunteer to chair the committee, Kathy Menzie volunteered to take this responsibility.

Rebecca Atnip was assigned to work on finding a time for the next Academic Affairs, WTE and Transfer committee meetings and will send lists of the members of the two new WTE and Transfer committees to Academic Affairs committee members.

Meeting adjourned.

*Library Faculty Committee Meeting*

*September 17, 2009*

*3:30 p.m.*

*Room 105, Mabee Library*

**TO:**

<i>Dr. David Bainum</i>	<i>Mrs. Judy Druse</i>	<i>Dr. Meredith McKee</i>	<i>Dr. Tom Schmiedeler</i>
<i>Dr. Karen Barron</i>	<i>Dr. Andrew Herbig</i>	<i>Mrs. Marilyn Masterson</i>	<i>Mrs. Heather Smith-Collins</i>
<i>Dr. Alan Bearman</i>	<i>Dr. Rob Hull</i>	<i>Dr. Jay Memmott</i>	<i>Dr. Lee Snook</i>
<i>Dr. Cheryl Childers</i>	<i>Dr. Reinhild Janzen</i>	<i>Ms. Caley Onek</i>	<i>Dr. Sharon Sullivan</i>
<i>Dr. Frank Chorba</i>	<i>Dr. Terry Knowles</i>	<i>Dr. Karen Diaz Reategui</i>	<i>Dr. Brian Thomas</i>
<i>Dr. Barry Crawford</i>	<i>Dr. Sam Leung</i>	<i>Dr. Michael Rettig</i>	<i>Dr. Jennifer Wagner</i>
<i>Ms. Linda Croucher</i>		<i>Dr. Leslie Reynard</i>	

The Library Committee convened in the Mabee Library, Room 105 at 3:30 p.m. The following members were present: Dr. Bearman, Dr. Chorba, , Ms. Croucher, Ms. Druse, Dr. Herbig, Dr. Hull, Dr. Janzen, Mr. Knowles, Dr. Leung, Dr. McKee, Ms. Onek, Dr. Diaz Reategui, Dr. Rettig, Ms. Smith-Collins, Dr. Sullivan, Dr. Wagner, Ms. Weber. Dr. Baron, Mrs. Masterson, Dr. Reynard, Dr. Schmiedeler and Dr. Thomas sent word they would be unable to attend.

Introduction of committee members.

Dr. Bearman again discussed details about the purchasing decisions for the 2009/2010 materials budget. Although the library didn't receive a budget cut last year, this year's allocation did not increase, which resulted in a 9% reduction in purchasing power. This resulted in some substantial budget cuts in some departments. Your library liaison will e-mail a final list of material cuts and/or additions. If there are any questions, please contact your library liaison. With faculty support the library will continue to evaluate and assess library resources in order to balance the needs of the campus with what the library can afford.

Dr. Bearman reported that the Libraries Annual Report will serve as the basis for the first draft of the University's response to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) report regarding its concerns about the Washburn Libraries. The response is being written by Drs. Tate and LaLonde and is due July 1, 2010. Dr. Bearman will send the annual report to committee members for their comments.

**The 2011 operating fund requests will occur in the near future. So that Dr. Bearman can make accurate requests to the VPAA, each departmental representative should send their liaison a “wish list” as soon as possible.**

**The reference and circulation desks are in the process of construction to be combined to form a “Welcome Center.”**

**Endowment funds established for specific purposes have previously been used to supplement the material’s budget. This year, depending where money is available, these funds will be used for a one time special purchase. Begin thinking through what your department would like to purchase. More information will follow.**

**Dr. Bearman encouraged the faculty to attend as many WU Strategic Planning Forums as possible to advocate for library resources.**

**Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted**

**Ginger D. Webber, Administrative Secretary**

<p><b>NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p><b>THURSDAY</b></p> <p><b>October 15, 2009</b></p>
--

## CURRICULUM GRANTS COMMITTEE

### Minutes

September 16, 2009

#### Members Present:

Nancy Tate, Chair  
David Pownell  
Don Kellogg  
Janice Schrum  
Ellen Carson

Nancy Tate welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. Nancy informed the committee this is the second meeting to award funds for Fiscal Year 2010. The applications received and the committee decision regarding each application follow:

**Sarah Cook** Requested \$1,800  
Proposal: Access codes for the ALeKS System for use with developmental algebra courses.  
Application awarded fully.

**Norman Gamboa** Requested \$1,616  
Proposal: Rental of Wagner instruments to enhance orchestra performance.  
Application denied.

**Sam Leung/ Sue Salem** Requested \$1,067  
Proposal: Enhancement of data collection of the GOW-MAC gas chromatograph in the Chemistry Department.  
Application awarded fully.

**Jeff Mott** Requested \$2,000  
Proposal: Leadership Simulation Curriculum Development.  
Application denied.

**Margaret Wood** Requested \$910  
Proposal: Curriculum Development Project for Classical Archaeology.  
Application awarded fully.

#### Summary

The total amount awarded during this meeting: \$3,777.00. The total amount awarded for FY 2010: \$7,777.97. The total funds available for FY2010 is \$14,000.00, which leaves the balance of available funds: \$6,222.03



**Notes**  
**Faculty Development Grant Committee**  
**September 21, 2009**

**Members Present:**

Nancy Tate, Chair  
Kevin Charlwood  
Kelley Weber  
Pat Munzer  
Janice Schrum  
Lori McMillan  
Nora Clark

Nancy Tate welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. She informed the committee that, at the present time, there are no anticipated reductions in the budget for FY10 internal grants.

Nancy explained to the committee that there has been some confusion about committee membership. After some discussion, the committee members recommended the membership include the Faculty Development Coordinator, the New Faculty Mentor Coordinator, one representative from each academic unit not represented by the two coordinators, and one librarian. They recommended the librarian and the additional representatives be appointed annually by their respective academic deans. Nancy will forward this recommendation to the President of the Faculty Senate to determine how to proceed.

The applications submitted for consideration by the committee are for the FY2010 fiscal year, and no other applications were received this past Spring. The committee received a total of 17 faculty development grant applications, for a total of \$7,830 in requested funds. A summary of the applications received and the committee decision regarding each application follow:

**Baker, Tammy** Requested \$500  
Load Profile Workshop for training to work with library files on integrated library system  
Application awarded fully.

**Bayens, Gerald** Requested \$500  
Present at Annual ACAD OF Criminal Justice Sciences conf and write article about experience  
Application awarded fully.

**Charlwood, Kevin** Requested \$500  
Joint winter math meeting (Natl Conf sponsored by Am Math Soc. And Math Assoc of America)  
Application awarded fully.

**Corwin, Dean** Requested \$295  
Brick & Click Libraries Symposium

Application awarded fully.

**Druse, Judy** Requested \$378.42 (adj for correct mileage allow.)  
Brick and Click Academic Libraries Symposium  
Application awarded fully.

**Harrison, Kimberly** Requested \$500  
Social Work Education Annual Program Meeting  
Application awarded fully.

**Lockwood, Park** Requested \$500  
Attend Am. College of Sports Medicine Conference  
Application awarded fully.

**McBride, Maryellen** Requested \$500  
American Association of Historical Nursing Annual Conference  
Application awarded fully.

**Norman, Mark Allen** Requested \$500  
Guest conductor and tuba Performer with Fountain Brass Band (England)  
Application awarded fully.

**Ogawa, Brian** Requested \$500  
International Congress of Morita Therapy  
Application awarded fully.

**Peng, Xianofeng (Sheldon)** Requested \$500  
Present research findings at China Investment and Finance Conference  
Application deferred to the January meeting pending receipt of additional information.

**Roach, William** Requested \$500  
International Association of Computer Information Specialists  
Application awarded fully.

**Rocci, Keith** Requested \$500  
Present on information literacy programs at WU at the LOEX National Conference  
Application awarded fully.

**Shiple, Michelle** Requested \$500  
Attend AHIMA Conf on ICD-10-CM/PCS (Train the Trainer)  
Application awarded fully.

**Smarsh, Sarah** Requested \$500  
Assoc of Writers and Writing Programs Annual Conf.

Application awarded fully.

**Winchester, David**

Requested \$500

25th Annual Conference of the North American Serials Interest Group

Application awarded fully.

**Wood, Margaret**

Requested \$185

Attend Society for Historical Archeology annual Conference

Application awarded fully.

### **Summary**

The total amount requested was \$7,480. The total awarded during this meeting: \$7,358.42. The total funds available for FY2010 is \$14,000.00, which leaves the balance of available funds of \$6,641.58.

**Faculty Senate Agenda Item**

Number 09-09

SUBJECT: Amendment to the Faculty Constitution Clarifying Faculty Representation

DESCRIPTION: The electoral committee, redoing faculty counts to determine representation for each unit this past semester, came across a problem relating to the existing wording of the constitution: eligible faculty are defined as those “on an annual contract” only, without specifying anything further. In II B, the number of “eligible faculty” determines the proportions of representation (which means that we fix it both places by fixing it here). In the case of the School of Nursing, how one counted part-time appointments was the issue. Are they eligible faculty or not? Given hiring patterns in the wake of the budget crisis, it is likely not only Nursing for whom this will be a problem. So the constitution must be made more specific. We can go two ways on this one: making eligibility and proportionality counts include only full-time faculty or also count part-time (down to half-time in the proposal below). One of the two following amendments should be moved for a vote (changes indicated in boldface):

RECOMMENDATION:

Current Language:

**II. ELIGIBILITY AND MEMBERSHIP**

- A. Only faculty on an annual contract are eligible to vote for and to serve on the Faculty Senate, excluding those serving more than half time in administrative capacities; provided, however, faculty on authorized leave of absence or sabbatical shall not be eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate during such period of leave or sabbatical. Any eligible faculty member may put his or her name forward for election.

**Proposed Change:**

- A. **Faculty Eligibility:**  
**Only full-time faculty on an annual contract are eligible to vote for and to serve on the Faculty Senate excluding those faculty serving more than half time in administrative capacities and faculty on authorized leave of absence or sabbatical**

***during such period of leave. Any eligible faculty member may put his or her name forward for election.***

Current Language:

- B. The School of Law, School of Business, School of Applied Studies, School of Nursing, and each division within the College of Arts and Sciences shall elect representatives to the Faculty Senate in proportion to the number of eligible faculty in each unit, with one senator selected to represent each ten faculty members (that number to be rounded up or down to the nearest figure in each voting unit). Representation will be based on the number of faculty in each unit at the start of the spring semester.

**Proposed Change:**

**B. Representation:**

The School of Law, School of Business, School of Applied Studies, School of Nursing, and each division within the College of Arts and Sciences shall elect representatives to the Faculty Senate in proportion to the ***number of faculty*** in each unit, with one senator selected to represent each ten faculty members in each unit. ***The number of faculty in each unit shall include all faculty on annual contract. However, part-time faculty at the level of half-time or more (excluding adjuncts) will be counted at a rate of ½ faculty position per person, in order to determine senate representation.*** (The number of faculty in each unit **will** be rounded up or down to the nearest figure in each voting unit). Representation will be based on the number of faculty in each unit at the start of the spring semester.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: None

REQUESTED ACTION: Faculty Senate Approval

Date: September 14, 2009

Originated by: Thomas Prasch  
Faculty Senate President

## Faculty Senate Agenda Item

No. 09-11

SUBJECT: Revision of the Composition of the Graduate Committee

DESCRIPTION: The Faculty Handbook language for the composition of the Graduate Committee clearly predates the establishment of the graduate program in Nursing. It follows that Nursing should be represented because of their graduate program and not have the at-large member they presently have.

MOTION: To excise from the Faculty Handbook the final sentence of the description of the composition of the Graduate Committee, as illustrated below:

**The Graduate Committee consists of the following members: deans of major academic units with graduate programs, department chairs (where appropriate) of departments with graduate programs, one faculty member (other than the department chair) from each department or major academic unit with a graduate program, elected by the faculty in the department/area, one faculty member from the Master of Liberal Studies Committee, elected by the MLS Committee, four tenured faculty members elected at large as described below, one Mabee Library faculty member elected by the Mabee Library faculty, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.**

**At-large members will be elected for two-year terms by the faculty. The College of Arts and Sciences will elect two at-large members from the faculty in departments in the College that do not have graduate programs. The School of Applied Studies will elect one at-large member from faculty in the departments in the School that do not have graduate programs. ~~The School of Nursing will elect one at-large member from its faculty.~~**

REQUESTED ACTION: Faculty Senate Approval

DATE: September 14, 2009

Submitted by: Thomas Prash  
Faculty Senate President

**Faculty Senate Agenda Item**

No. **09-12**

SUBJECT: Revision of the Faculty Handbook Language on the Student Financial Aid Committee

REASON: At present, the Executive Director of Enrollment Management serves on this committee, but the Faculty Handbook does not reflect this fact. Since that service is appropriate to the committee, the change in language adds him to the membership.

MOTION: To modify the language in the Faculty Handbook defining the membership of the Student Financial Aid Committee as follows (with the addition indicated by underlining):

**Membership of this Committee shall consist of the Chief Student Affairs Officer, the Vice President for Administration and Treasurer, the Director of Financial Aid, the Director of Admissions, the Executive Director of Enrollment Management, a representative from the Athletic Department, a representative from the Music Department, one faculty member from each of the major academic units appointed by the respective unit heads, a student representative from the Washburn Student Bar Association, and two students selected by the student government for one-year terms. The Chief Student Affairs Officer serves as Chairperson.**

REQUESTED ACTION: Faculty Senate Approval

Date: September 14, 2009

Submitted by: Thomas Prasch  
Faculty Senate President

## Faculty Senate Agenda Item

No. 09-13

SUBJECT: Board of Student Publications and Faculty Handbook discrepancies

REASON: There appear to be some discrepancies between the Constitution of the Board of Student Publications and the Faculty Handbook. Since 2000, the Board of Student Publications has functioned within its constitution. Board members were unaware the Faculty Handbook has not been changed to reflect the practices of the board.

The Faculty Handbook suggests that the Dean of Students represent the Board of Student Publications at the Faculty Senate. As one member of the Board is from the Faculty Senate, it seems unnecessary and inappropriate for the Dean of Students to represent the Board at Faculty Senate meetings.

The Faculty Handbook also allows the Washburn Student Government Association to appoint four student members to the Board. This is an inappropriate requirement, as it, in effect, allows the government to control the press.

MOTION: In light of these and additional concerns, the following changes to the Faculty Handbook are proposed:

### -----2. The Board of Student Publications (VPAA/VPSL)

**The purpose of the Board of Student Publications shall be to set general policies for student publications (as outlined in the board's Constitution), to enforce the "Policy for Student Publications of Washburn University," and to encourage effective student publications at Washburn University.**

**The board reports to the Faculty Senate. ~~The Dean of Students~~ **The Faculty Senate member of the Board** will represent the board at Faculty Senate.**

**The board shall be responsible for safeguarding the editorial freedoms of student publications as outlined in the "Policy for Student Publications of Washburn University;" for selecting the best qualified applicants for the positions of Review Editor, Kaw Editor, Business Manager and Ad Manager; for interviewing and hiring a production adviser; and for reviewing and accepting into record an annual budget submitted by the Business Manager of the two publications at the first ~~March~~ **fall** meeting of the board.**



Membership of the board shall consist of three members of the faculty ~~and staff~~ of Washburn University and four students in good standing at the University. There must not be more than one faculty member from any one academic department, nor shall student members be either elected officials of **members of WSGA**, be serving as an executive officer of that organization, or be on staff of student publications. The advisers ~~and editors~~, **editors, business manager, and advertising manager** of the Kaw and Review are ex officio members.

1. ~~The Vice President for Academic Affairs appoints the faculty members to the board. One member shall be a member of the Faculty Senate and the others shall not.~~
2. **Faculty.** The faculty members of this board will be appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the chair of the Department of Mass Media, and shall include: (1) a member of the faculty of Mass Media, (2) a member of the Faculty Senate, and (3) a third member of the faculty. There shall not be more than one faculty member for any one academic department.
3. ~~The Washburn Student Association will recommend to the Faculty Senate the names of four currently enrolled Washburn students meeting the qualifications outlined above.~~
4. **Students.** The four students will be appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The appointments will be made from a list of student applicants submitted to a review committee. The WSGA office and the Board of Publications will advertise the positions and take applications on an all-campus basis. No more than two students will have the same major. The review committee will be the Dean of Students, Chairperson of the Board of Student Publications, the Director of Student Publications, and the WSGA president. The review committee will meet at the end of April of each academic year to review applicants for the following year and make their recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

~~There are two officers of the board, a chair appointed by the chair of the Department of Mass Media and an administrative assistant hired by the board.~~ **The chair of the board is elected by the members of the board.**

REQUESTED ACTION: Faculty Senate Approval

Date: September 14, 2009

Submitted by: Thomas Prasch  
Faculty Senate President for  
Kathy Menzie, Interim Chair  
Mass Media Department

## Faculty Senate Agenda Item

Number: **09-14**

**SUBJECT:** Change to Appendix IV (Human Subjects Research Policy) of the Faculty Handbook.

**DESCRIPTION:** The Institutional Review Board (IRB) is a committee established according to federal regulations and charged with the protection of human research subjects. The purpose of an IRB review is to assure that appropriate steps are taken to protect the rights and welfare of humans participating as subjects in the research. All research involving human participants conducted by Washburn University students, faculty, and staff must be reviewed and approved prior to the initiation of research.

Between 2001 and 2005, the IRB received and reviewed an annual average of 53 applications. In 2006, 2007, and 2008, the IRB received 98, 113, and 107 applications, respectively, with approximately 93% of the applications being reviewed during the Fall and Spring semesters. The amount of work is burdensome for everyone including the external reviewer (an individual with no affiliations with Washburn University). In response to the increased number of submissions, it is requested that the size of the IRB be increased. Increasing the number of IRB members would result in a decrease in member workload. Increasing IRB membership will also provide researchers with additional sources of information about the IRB process and policies.

In the Fall of 2008, the IRB moved to an electronic submission and review process. Using the Washburn University email system, IRB applications were submitted and distributed for review. This move was expected to make the application and review process easier for applicants and reviewers. It was also expected to decrease the amount of time needed to review applications.

Increasing the membership of the IRB and the acceptance of electronic submissions of IRB applications requires modification of certain sections of Appendix IV (Human Subjects Research Policy) of the Faculty Handbook (see attachment).

Finally, according to the Faculty Handbook (IV.D.2.d.), IRB membership is term limited. The ability to accurately review an IRB application requires extensive experience. For this reason, it is requested that this section be deleted.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:** None.

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is requested that Faculty Senate approve the following modifications of Appendix IV of the Faculty Handbook.

Appendix IV: Human Subject Research Policy

### **D. Institutional Review Board (IRB); Establishment and Membership**

1. The Institutional Review Board shall consist of at least seven appointed members. The President and VPAA ~~Provost~~ will serve as ex officio members.
2. Membership
  - c. Membership shall include the following:

1. **At least one** member shall be appointed from each of the five major academic areas. **The number of members from one academic area may not vary by more than one from any other area.**
  2. **At least one** member shall be appointed who is not affiliated with the University, nor is related to anyone affiliated with the University.
  3. **At least one** member shall be appointed who is a full-time upper-division or graduate student with a 3.0 grade point average or better.
- d. ~~Members shall serve for a term of two (2) years; except for three initial appointees to the Board who shall have one (1) year appointments so that membership will be staggered.~~

#### **F. Institutional Review Board; Reports and Documentation**

The Institutional Review Board shall prepare and maintain adequate documentation of its activities including:

2. ~~Minutes of IRB meetings reflecting attendance at the meetings;~~ **Records (written or electronic) of** actions taken; the vote on actions approving or disapproving research proposals, including the number of members voting for, against, and abstaining; the basis for requiring changes in, or disapproving, research; and a ~~written summary~~ **record** of the discussion of controversial issues and a resolution;

#### **H. IRB Review of Application and Approval**

2. Normal review process.

~~The IRB meets the first Monday of each month. The Investigator is to submit nine (9) **hard** copies **or one (1) electronic copy** of the application to the Chairperson of the IRB. Proposals should be sent to the IRB two (2) weeks before the regular monthly meeting for review. Proposals received less than two weeks before a regular meeting may be subject to delay, however, every effort will be made to accommodate the Investigator.~~ The application will be assigned a number, recorded and distributed to IRB members for review. The application will be evaluated, recorded and an "IRB PROPOSAL EVALUATION" form will be returned to the Principle Investigator or the Faculty Supervisor. The IRB keeps the original application on file along with a copy of the IRB PROPOSAL EVALUATION.

3. Expedited review process.

If the Investigator requests an expedited review, he/she must submit three (3) **hard** copies **or one (1) electronic copy** of the application. The Chairperson of the IRB and one other committee member will make the evaluation and return the IRB PROPOSAL EVALUATION. If either one or both decide that the proposal requires full committee review then the Investigator is notified with a request for six (6) more **hard** copies of the proposal (**assuming hard copies of the application were originally submitted**) and it will follow the normal review procedure.

Originated by: Mike Russell, IRB Chair

Date: October 12, 2009

## Faculty Senate Action Item

### Item 09-15 Option 1

Subject: Clarification of the structure of the Major Research and Grant Review Subcommittee

Rationale: At present, the Major Research and Grant Review Subcommittee is defined as a subcommittee of the Research Committee, which would entail that its members also serve on the committee it is sub- to, but that is not how appointments to the committee have actually been made for several years; they have been appointed by the deans of the academic units when a committee member's term is expiring. According to the Faculty Handbook, members of the Grant Review Subcommittee "shall not be eligible for grants from the committee while serving on the committee"; however, there is no such restriction indicated for committee members of the overarching Research Committee. In addition, the Grant Review Subcommittee has only been reviewing internal grants and prioritizing them for the Research Committee which allocates the funds for all internal grants. Members of the Grant Review Subcommittee are "urged not to serve on other major university committees." This restriction does not appear to be necessary under the present circumstances. We need to decide whether 1) to let things operate as they currently do and have this committee report to the Research Committee; or 2) make this an actual subcommittee. We also need to determine 1) whether or not members of both the Research Committee and the Grant Review Subcommittee should be restricted from being eligible for receiving research grants and 2) whether the Grant Review Committee should take on the task of reviewing external grants, which it has not been doing. If the decision is made to retain the review of external grants by this committee, there could be serious repercussions with grant deadlines not being met due to the lack of timeliness of review by the Grant Review Committee since, according to the Faculty Handbook, "The Review Committee shall act on proposals twice annually: in October and in April. The spring meeting will review projects to commence during the following summer and fall semester, while the fall meeting will be concerned with projects planned for the following spring semester." Currently, external grants are reviewed by the department (if applicable), the academic dean, and the VPAA as well as the Grant Facilitator, the Grant Budget Manager, and the VPAT.

Recommended Change:

-----1. Research Committee

a. Purpose and Function

The purpose of this Committee is to allocate funds for the support of scholarly activities of the full-time faculty of Washburn University.

In this capacity the Committee will review requests for funds to cover all reasonable expenses associated with scholarly activities.

- 1) Scholarly activity refers to original research that results in the advancement of the arts, humanities, sciences, social sciences, or professions.
- 2) Reasonable expenses may include the following types of items: reassigned time, travel, equipment, materials, supplies, services, and a variety of publication costs including the purchase of reprints.
- 3) The Committee will not review requests for the support of graduate course work or dissertation research, for the development of new courses or course materials, or for expenses augmenting Sweet Sabbatical funds.

An application for funds should be submitted to the chairperson of the Committee. This application should include a short but clear description of the activities and their significance, as well as a detailed account of the financial support requested. In some cases the Committee may request the applicant to be present at the review meeting so that questions may be answered.

#### b. Membership

The Committee will consist of three faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, a faculty member from each of the other major academic units appointed by the Dean of the respective academic units from those actively engaged in research or other scholarly pursuits, a member of the University Library faculty, a member of the Treasurer's office and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

#### c. Major Research Grants and the Review Committee

(For more details, see Appendix III.) A research fund for more extensive activities has been established to provide support for the research and scholarly activities of the full-time faculty of Washburn University. A Review Committee ~~functioning as a subcommittee of the Research Committee~~ will be appointed **by the deans of the academic units** to review proposals and to recommend to the Research Committee allocations from the research fund. **The membership will consist of one representative from each academic unit.** The Review Committee will then recommend allocations to **the Research Committee** ~~the Vice President for Academic Affairs who shall in turn make recommendations to the President.~~

~~In this capacity the Review Committee will review and evaluate two kinds of requests from the full-time faculty: (1) requests to support the development of ideas or projects that are to be submitted to other agencies for more extensive funding, and (2) requests for funds to support in full or in part original research and scholarly activity.~~

#### 1) Functions of the Review Committee

a) The Review Committee will provide application forms to full-time members of the Washburn faculty seeking financial support for their research or scholarly activity. These applications will require a clear description of the purpose, nature, method of evaluation, and significance of the activity to be supported, as well as a detailed account of the expenses to be incurred.

b) The Review Committee shall act on proposals twice annually: in October and in April. The spring meeting will review projects to commence during the following summer and fall semester, while the fall meeting will be concerned with projects planned for the following spring semester.

c) The Review Committee will develop and publish criteria for the evaluation of proposals.

d) The Review Committee will evaluate and rank as to merit all the requests received at each of its meetings.

## 2) Structure of the Review Committee

a) The Review Committee shall be composed of five full-time tenured Associate or Full Professors who shall serve staggered two-year terms. **One member will be appointed by each academic dean.** Members of the committee must have a documented history of research or scholarly activity. ~~Members shall not represent particular constituencies of the University nor shall their selection be based upon departmental, divisional, school, or college affiliation. However, no more than one member from a single department may serve at one time and no newly appointed member may be from the same department as any member whose term has expired that year.~~

b) The Vice President for Academic Affairs **or designee** will be an ex officio member without vote.

c) The Review Committee will **report to** the Research Committee.

~~d) Members of the Review Committee shall not be eligible for grants from the committee while serving on the committee.~~ **Members shall be required to recuse themselves from deliberations of any grant they are proposing.**

~~e) Members of the Review committee will be urged not to serve on other major university committees.~~

Financial Implications: None

Recommendation: Faculty Senate Approval

Date: October 12, 2009

Submitted by: Thomas Prasch

Faculty Senate President

## Faculty Senate Action Item

Item 09-15 Option #2

Subject: Clarification of the structure of the Major Research and Grant Review Subcommittee

Rationale: At present, the Major Research and Grant Review Subcommittee is defined as a subcommittee of the Research Committee, which would entail that its members also serve on the committee it is sub- to, but that is not how appointments to the committee have actually been made for several years; they have been appointed by the deans of the academic units when a committee member's term is expiring. According to the Faculty Handbook, members of the Grant Review Subcommittee "shall not be eligible for grants from the committee while serving on the committee"; however, there is no such restriction indicated for committee members of the overarching Research Committee. In addition, the Grant Review Subcommittee has only been reviewing internal grants and prioritizing them for the Research Committee which allocates the funds for all internal grants. Members of the Grant Review Subcommittee are "urged not to serve on other major university committees." This restriction does not appear to be necessary under the present circumstances. We need to decide whether 1) to let things operate as they currently do and have this committee report to the Research Committee; or 2) make this an actual subcommittee. We also need to determine 1) whether or not members of both the Research Committee and the Grant Review Subcommittee should be restricted from being eligible for receiving research grants and 2) whether the Grant Review Committee should take on the task of reviewing external grants, which it has not been doing. If the decision is made to retain the review of external grants by this committee, there could be serious repercussions with grant deadlines not being met due to the lack of timeliness of review by the Grant Review Committee since, according to the Faculty Handbook, "The Review Committee shall act on proposals twice annually: in October and in April. The spring meeting will review projects to commence during the following summer and fall semester, while the fall meeting will be concerned with projects planned for the following spring semester." Currently, external grants are reviewed by the department (if applicable), the academic dean, and the VPAA as well as the Grant Facilitator, the Grant Budget Manager, and the VPAT.

Recommended Change:

----1. Research Committee

a. Purpose and Function

The purpose of this Committee is to allocate funds for the support of scholarly activities of the full-time faculty of Washburn University.

In this capacity the Committee will review requests for funds to cover all reasonable expenses associated with scholarly activities.

- 1) Scholarly activity refers to original research that results in the advancement of the arts, humanities, sciences, social sciences, or professions.
- 2) Reasonable expenses may include the following types of items: reassigned time, travel, equipment, materials, supplies, services, and a variety of publication costs including the purchase of reprints.
- 3) The Committee will not review requests for the support of graduate course work or dissertation research, for the development of new courses or course materials, or for expenses augmenting Sweet Sabbatical funds.

An application for funds should be submitted to the chairperson of the Committee. This application should include a short but clear description of the activities and their significance, as well as a detailed account of the financial support requested. In some cases the Committee may request the applicant to be present at the review meeting so that questions may be answered.

#### b. Membership

The Committee will consist of **three faculty members** from the College of Arts and Sciences appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, a faculty member from each of the other major academic units appointed by the Dean of the respective academic units from those actively engaged in research or other scholarly pursuits, a member of the University Library faculty, a member of the Treasurer's office and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. ~~Members of the Review Committee shall not be eligible for grants from the committee while serving on the committee.~~

#### c. Major Research Grants and the Review Committee

(For more details, see Appendix III.) A research fund for more extensive activities has been established to provide support for the research and scholarly activities of the full-time faculty of Washburn University. A Review Committee functioning as a subcommittee of the Research Committee will be appointed to review proposals and to recommend to the Research Committee allocations from the research fund. ~~The Research Committee will then recommend allocations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who shall in turn make recommendations to the President.~~

~~In this capacity the Review Committee will review and evaluate two kinds of requests from the full time faculty: (1) requests to support the development of ideas or projects that are to be submitted to other agencies for more extensive funding, and (2) requests for funds to support in full or in part original research and scholarly activity.~~

#### 1) Functions of the Review Committee

- a) The Review Committee will provide application forms to full-time members of the Washburn faculty seeking financial support for their research or scholarly activity. These applications will require a clear description of the purpose, nature, method of evaluation, and significance of the activity to be supported, as well as a detailed account of the expenses to be incurred.



b) The Review Committee shall act on proposals twice annually: in October and in April. The spring meeting will review projects to commence during the following summer and fall semester, while the fall meeting will be concerned with projects planned for the following spring semester.

c) The Review Committee will develop and publish criteria for the evaluation of proposals.

d) The Review Committee will evaluate and rank as to merit all the requests received at each of its meetings.

## 2) Structure of the Review Committee

a) The Review Committee shall be composed of **five full-time tenured Associate or Full Professors** who shall serve staggered two-year terms. Members of the committee must have a documented history of research or scholarly activity. Members shall not represent particular constituencies of the University nor shall their selection be based upon departmental, divisional, school, or college affiliation. However, no more than one member from a single department may serve at one time and no newly appointed member may be from the same department as any member whose term has expired that year.

b) The Vice President for Academic Affairs **or designee** will be an ex officio member without vote.

c) The Review Committee will be a subcommittee of the Research Committee.

~~d) Members of the Review Committee shall not be eligible for grants from the committee while serving on the committee.~~ **Members of the review committee will reclude themselves from deliberations of any grant they are proposing.**

~~e) Members of the Review committee will be urged not to serve on other major university committees.~~

Financial Implications: None

Recommendation: Faculty Senate Approval

Date: October 12, 2009

Submitted by: Thomas Prasch

Faculty Senate President

*Meeting Minutes for Washburn Honors Advisory Board*

**Wednesday, September 16, 2009, 12:30 p.m.**

**Crane Room**

*Present: Jennifer Ball, Dean Corwin, Lisa Sharpe-Elles, Mo Godman, Rachel Goossen, Dannah Hartley, Keenan Hogan, Michael McGuire (Chair), Marguerite Perret, Bonnie Peterson, Carol Prim, and Angel Romero*

*Meeting was Called to Order*

*Opening Remarks and Introductions*

**The Chair welcomed all members to the meeting and briefly shared his vision for the University Honors Program (UHP)**

**The focus of this meeting is to provide an introduction to the topics needing immediate approval and discussion from the board while laying the groundwork for future goals and endeavours**

**Self-introductions by each member occurred**

*Business*

**Charge of Committee**

**A history of the advisory board was provided which included the make-up of committee members – ex officio, secretary, etc.**

**Request to meet biweekly was supported with the Chair offering to send a follow-up email requesting members' availability**

**The Faculty Handbook description of the board was reviewed**

**The Chair envisions this board becoming the brainstorming central for the UHP's organization and development**

*The Chair will maintain ties with upper administration and share our ideas with the VPAA for action approval*

*The issue of terms (both two- and three-year) was broached and supported by the board*

**Immediate Goals**

**The Chair shared several topics which will require immediate discussion and attention beginning at the next meeting**

*Establishing eligibility requirements for freshmen*

*The board was overwhelmingly supportive of reducing the ambiguity of the UHP*

*One potential eligibility scale proposed by the Chair is a 25 ACT composite score coupled with a 3.5 cumulative high school GPA – will discuss different eligibility requirements in more depth at next meeting.*

*Discussion about why articulating specific admissions criteria is crucial for the UHP touched on the following points – stabilizing the program’s numbers, creating a manageable and ideal population, recognizing the top 5-10% of students, targeting enrollment in HN courses to those who best fit the terms of the curriculum, and retention*

*Additional ideas and epiphanies should be sent via email to the Chair*

**Identifying students who are in the program**

*There is no official database of students who have applied to the program*

*The Chair has requested the Banner code of “UHON” to be utilized as the UHP attribute*

*It was mentioned that gathering a list of faculty who have taught an HN course would also be useful*

**Other Goals: Setting up scholarships; Organizing a student council ; and Developing official UHP materials for recruitment and campus education/use**

**Long-term Goals**

**The Chair briefly touched on his larger vision for this program on both an academic and social front**

**The list of future plans includes:**

*Designing an aspect of MyWashburn to be used a students and faculty/staff honors resource*

*Identifying a space or home for the UHP on campus*

*Identifying specific honors advisors and advising process*

*Creating an Associate or Assistant Dean/Director position*

*Attending regional and national conferences within the honors community – both on a faculty/staff and student level*

**Developing a social community, opportunities, and events for UHP students**

***Meeting Adjourned***

*Meeting Minutes for Washburn Honors Advisory Board*

**Wednesday, September 23, 2009, 12:00 p.m.**

**Crane Room**

*Present: Dean Corwin, Lisa Sharpe-Elles, Keenan Hogan, Michael McGuire (Chair), Marguerite Perret, Nan Palmer, and Angel Romero*

*Meeting was Called to Order*

*Opening Remarks and Introductions*

*Business*

**Freshman Eligibility Requirements**

Michael put forward explicit criteria for incoming freshmen wanting to apply to the Honors Program. The basic criteria include an ACT of 28 and a high school GPA of 3.5. A provision will be incorporated to inform applicants that their applications will still be reviewed even though they may not meet the basic criteria. There is currently a writing component which involves students writing what it means to be an honors student. It may be necessary to revise this in the future.

The committee was in agreement that deadlines should be established. December 1 will be the deadline for Spring 2010. A deadline for Fall 2010 has yet to be established.

**Retention**

To remain in the Honors Program, the committee accepted the following basic requirements of maintaining a cumulative GPA of 3.5 and an Honors GPA of 3.0.

Policy concerning what to do for Honors students not in good standing will be discussed at a later point in time.

Discussion of curricular issues related to retention was also brought up but tabled for a later date. Nan Palmer raised the issue of having 'nonacademic' criteria and will follow up with the committee later.

## **Transfer Students**

**At the present time, there is no policy for transfer students. The committee will discuss this at a later point in time.**

**Michael will look into what other schools do in terms of reciprocal articulation agreements.**

## **Student Meeting and Council**

**Michael will schedule a meeting with select Honors students to help plan a larger 'Informational/Organizational' meeting .**

**Another issue will be to discuss with the Honors students the formation of a Honors Student Council**

**Michael will plan on meeting with Honors students next week (week of Sept. 28). Therefore the next Honors Advisory Board will be slated for two to three weeks later.**

## **Progress Report**

**We have now met twice this year!**

**Dr. Robin Bowen has informed Michael that the Honors Program can use HC101.**

**Students accepted in the Honors Program can now be tracked in Banner. And, reports of students who enroll in Honors courses can be created.**

*Future Business*

*Meeting Adjourned*