

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate

November 12, 2012
3:30 pm Kansas Room Memorial Union

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 22 , 2012 (pp. 2-3)
- III. President's Opening Remarks
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents
- V. Report from the Units – Dr. Tim Peterson, Dean of Continuing Education
- VI. VPAA Update – Dr. Randy Pembroke
- VII. Faculty Senate Committee Reports
 - A. Academic Affairs Committee Minutes of October 15, 2012 (pp.4-5)
 - B. Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of October 5, 2012 (pp.7-13)
- VIII. University Committee Reports
 - A. Assessment Committee Minutes of October 4, 2012 (pg. 14)
 - B. Faculty Development Grant Committee Minutes of October 11, 2012 (pp. 15-16)
 - C. International Education Committee Minutes of September 13, 2012 (pg. 17)
 - D. International Education Committee Minutes of October 18, 2012 (pg. 18)
 - E. Library Committee Minutes of October 26, 2012 (pg. 19-20)
 - F. Assessment Committee Minutes of October 18, 2012 (pg. 21)
- IX. Old Business
 - A. 12-14 Change to Faculty Senate Constitution (pg. 22)
 - C. 12-15 Change in University Math Requirement (pg. 23)
- X. New Business
- XI. Information Items
 - A. Library Gate Counts (pg. 24)
- XII. Discussion Items
- XIII. Announcements

**Faculty Senate
Washburn University**

*Minutes of October 22, 2012
Kansas Room*

Present: Angel, Barker, Childers, Fry, Gonzalez-Abellas, Isaacson, Jackson, Kaufman, Kelly, Kitts, Mazachek, McMillen, Menzie, Mercader, Miller, Ockree, Pembrook (VPAA), Perret, Pilgram, Rich, Roach, Russell, Schmidt, Sheldon, Tate (AVPAA), Ubel, Wade, Wagner, Weigand, Wohl, Wynn

- I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:29 PM. Steve Angel presiding.
- II. The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of September 24, 2012 were approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks.
President Angel deferred opening remarks since there was a full agenda.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents: VP Roach reported that the BoR meeting approved business transactions. President Angel also remarked that each unit was presenting to the BoR; CAS Dean McQuere presented an overview. The Board also approved the benefits package and there is a slight increase in co-pay.
- V. Special Report - Mike Russell, IRB and WTE
Russell informed senators that there have been changes to the IRB format. There is a new application and in order to be approved, the applicant must be certified. There is a link on the Angel site to the IRB certification. There are modules to complete, including videos and a quiz.
Russell also reported that there have been many changes to WTE this year. International WTE faculty led proposals are being reviewed on a rolling basis so faculty will be aware very early how much funding is received and how much will have to be raised by the group. In the scholarly option, there is a new option, Exploring America, which will allow faculty to develop a course which will allow students to transform outside their comfort area. Russell gave examples such as exploring areas with other cultures, historical sites, large cities, etc. In the leadership option, the WTE has been designed for problem-solving. Students should identify a problem, develop a plan and work 1:1 with a faculty member to solve. This also has faculty compensation attached like the scholarly.
- VI. Report from the VPAA – Dr. Pembrook
VP Pembrook informed senators administration is looking at all the rooms with projectors, checking intensity, lighting problems, etc. Please contact the VP's office or Floyd Davenport with information. VP Pembrook attended the HLC update in Chicago last week and there were many sessions on the Quality Assurance and Quality Initiatives. He reminded senators that the faculty dinners on November 29 and December 6 will look at the proposals that have been submitted. There are currently four searches: SAS Dean, CAS Dean, Leadership Director, and Mulvane Director. He also reminded senators of the reception Tuesday, October 23 for Cindi Morrison.
Over 500 statewide faculty met at K-State on Friday, October 19 to cross-walk core curriculum. Two senators were in attendance, Miguel and Sarah. The University Press of Kansas, supported by multiple institutions and housed in Lawrence, has expressed interest in coming to campus to discuss research projects, books, etc with faculty; senators expressed an interest to have them come and present. The Tilford Conference on Diversity is next week. Pembrook also remarked that there has been a one-half day devoted by the legislature to doctoral research. It is being expanded to include Master's and undergraduate research and will be held on February 20 at the Capitol.

- VII. Faculty Senate Committee Reports –
- A. Academic Affairs Committee Minutes of March 26, 2012 were accepted.
 - B. Academic Affairs Committee Minutes of September 17, 2012 were accepted.
 - C. Academic Affairs Committee Minutes of October 1, 2012 were accepted.
 - D. The electoral committee reported that there have been no nominations for the at-large position. They are reopening the applications this week.
- VIII. University Committee Minutes
- A. Assessment Committee minutes from September 6, 2012 were accepted
 - B. Honors Advisory Committee Minutes of September 5, 2012 were accepted
 - C. Research Grants Committee Minutes of September 12, 2012 were accepted.
 - D. Interdisciplinary Committee Minutes of October 12, 2012 were accepted
- IX. Old Business. –
- A. 12-08 Approval of WU 101 for University Requirement – Alan Bearman provided an overview of the proposal. The proposal was approved and sent to General Faculty.
 - B. 12-09 Removal of KN 198 as a university requirement – Roy Wohl provided an overview of the proposal. The proposal was approved and sent to General Faculty
 - C. 12-10 Change of SAS Association Degree Offerings with Washburn Tech. Dan Petersen provided an overview. The proposal was approved and sent to General Faculty.
 - D. 12-11 Change of Human Services degree from AAS to AA. The proposal was approved and sent to General Faculty.
 - E. 12-12 Make-up of General Education Committee. Sarah Ubel and Dr. Pembroke provided an overview of the proposal. The proposal was approved and sent to General Faculty.
 - F. 12-13 Masters of Accountancy. David Sollars and Jim Martin provided an overview of the proposal. The proposal was approved and sent to General Faculty.
- X. New Business –
- A. 12-14 Change in Faculty Senate Constitution Item II-c. Steve Angel provided an overview. The motion was closed on first reading.
- XI. Discussion Items: none
- XII. Information Items: none
- XIII. Adjournment – the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 pm

**Academic Affairs Committee Meeting
October 15, 2012
Meeting Minutes**

Committee members in attendance

Debbie Isaacson
Vickie Kelly
Royce Kitts
Kandy Ockree
Tony Palbicke
Shaun Schmidt (Chair)
Nancy Tate (ex officio)
Danny Wade
Rob Weigand

Guests

Dan Petersen, Assoc. Dean School of Applied Studies
Roy Wohl, Chair, Department of Kinesiology

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Shaun Schmidt.

I. Minutes from October 1, 2012

The minutes were sent to the committee prior to the meeting for review. The minutes were approved as written and will be forwarded to Faculty Senate.

II. Proposal regarding KN198

Shaun asked if Roy Wohl would like to make comments regarding his proposal regarding KN 198. It was decided to have the committee asked questions of Roy in hopes to target what information they need in addition to what is in the proposal. The following questions were asked, with the answers noted:

- a. **Why the change of thought regarding KN 198, in that twice before this has come before General Faculty and it has been supported?**
Roy indicated that 5 years ago the majors for the department was 175, now the majors number around 340. The department has 2 less FTE and has less space to provide the services for the majors and the university requirement. In discussions, the department faculty determined it was of value to focus on the department's majors. Doing this will allow the faculty to utilize the space that hasn't been taken by other schools (SON and SAS) and the Athletics.
- b. **Will KN248 take the place of KN198?** *No, it is proposed to remove KN198 as a university requirement and offer KN248 as a gen ed credit. The department plans to offer 4 or 5 sections with 1 section online with the thought that students who really want to know about wellness will gain more value from the new course.*
- c. **Will KN198 and WU101 be combined at all.** *No, these are two separate courses. There will be one chapter in WU101 that will focus on wellness and the Department of Kinesiology is working with Alan Bearman to ensure the current chapter is enhanced. Otherwise, there isn't an overlap and WU101 is not replacing KN198.*
- d. **Does KN198 offer information that students need?** *Roy indicated yes, but so do other courses. This is the reason the department is offering KN248. KN198 was a good way of getting students to understand wellness but the question is does it need to be a university requirement.*
- e. **How many students will be impacted with this change?** *Roy indicated he has asked the*

Registrar's office to see if they can determine the number of students that will be transitioned if KN 198 is removed.

- f. **The proposal was straight forward and clear. It would be difficult for any department to be told they must continue to teach something if they don't have enough faculty and space.**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal to eliminate KN 198 as a University requirement. This was approved unanimously.

III. SAS Proposal regarding renaming of degrees in conjunction with WIT.

Dan Petersen was asked why the two proposals regarding the School of Applied Studies were being submitted separately. Dan indicated they are entirely separate as one deals with a degree name change in Human Services, and the other deals with programs that are connected with Washburn Tech.

Dan provided information regarding the proposal involving programs connecting with Tech.

- a. These courses were offered by WU through an articulation agreement and now will be offered soon by Tech.
- b. This move is in hope that we will attract those students who would like to have their Associates degree and then come to Washburn for the Bachelors degree.
- c. The advising office at Tech will ensure students are aware of this option.

After further discussion, a motion was made and seconded to accept both proposals as written. This was seconded and approved.

IV. Subcommittee Assignments

Shaun asked for updates regarding the assigned subcommittees:

- a. Phase II Gen Ed (KN 198/WU101): These are two separate courses and are not connected at all. There will be a small aspect of WU101 that focuses on Wellness.
- b. Graduate Committee: Nothing to report.
- c. Administrative Withdrawal: Nothing to report.
- d. Degree Plan: It was asked to report there is a meeting scheduled with Gail Palmer for later this month. There are also two degree plans: the academic degree plan and the financial aid degree plan.

The meeting was adjourned.

Meeting Schedule:

Monday, November 5, 2012 3 – 4:00 pm, Baker Room

F Faculty Affairs Committee (2012 – 2013)
Washburn University
October 5, 2012

Attendance:

Royce Kitts	Keith Mazachek	Diane McMillen	Marguerite Perret
Bill Roach	David Rubenstein	Sarah Ubel, Chair	Kerry Wynn

Call to Order: 1:00 pm - Crane Room (Union)

New Business:

- VPAA proposal: Change in the Faculty Handbook—General Education Committee
 - The Faculty Affairs Committee amended the proposal to indicate that the two ex-officio members of the General Education Committee would be non-voting members.
 - The proposal passed as amended. The approved wording is as follows:

The function of the General Education Committee is to assist faculty members to develop or modify courses that facilitate the acquisition of the student learning outcomes (SLOs) listed in the General Education Statement, and to approve courses for general education based on the criteria established by the General Faculty.

If a course is disapproved by the Committee, the rationale for such action will be written with reference to the adopted standards and communicated to the VPAA and the sponsor.

Once a course is approved by the Committee, it will be the responsibility of the sponsoring department to review its implementation and report assessment results to the Assessment Committee every year and to undergo a review by the General Education Committee at least every five years. The results of the review and assessment will be forwarded to the VPAA. Any change in the course's targeted SLO or in its general content or format must be submitted to the General Education Committee for approval.

Decisions of the Committee, including those concerning course approval, will be reported by the VPAA to the deans.

Decisions of the committee, including those concerning course approval, may be appealed to the Faculty Senate with further appeal to the General Faculty.

Members of the Committee are: the VPAA, one faculty member from each division of the College, one faculty member each from the Schools of Applied Studies, Business and Nursing, and one library faculty member. Faculty members are elected by their constituent units. Two members of the University Assessment Committee will be non-voting, ex-officio members and appointed by the VPAA with input from Faculty Senate and Assessment Committee. These non-voting, ex-officio members of the General Education Committee will provide expertise on assessment and facilitate communication between the General Education Committee and the Assessment Committee.

- A summary of the proposed changes is attached below.

- Faculty Handbook Revision Committee: Tenure and Promotions
 - It was decided to discuss each issue and then refer the issue back to the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee - Tenure and Promotions Issues
 - To maximize awareness and transparency of the Faculty Handbook Review process, The Faculty Affairs Committee determined it would be useful to create a means for communicating the development of these changes on the Washburn Website.
 - A summary of the discussion and requested action of the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee: Tenure and Promotions is attached below.

- Bill Roach volunteered to be the Faculty Affairs Committee representative to the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee.

Discussion Items:

- Creation and utilization of Angel Community Group

Announcements:

- Next meeting – Monday, October 29 at 3:45 pm

Adjournment: 2:30 by Sarah Ubel, Chair

FACULTY AFFAIRS AGENDA ITEM

Date: 11 September 2012

Submitted by: Dr. Randy Pembrook, VPAA, ext. 2546

SUBJECT: *Change in the Faculty Handbook—General Education Committee*

Description:

With the approval of the new student learning outcomes, the function and composition of the general education committee needs to be modified as well in the Faculty Handbook (Section One VII.B.6)

Current Wording:	Proposed Wording:	Faculty Affairs Committee Approved Wording:
The function of the General Education Committee is to assist faculty members to develop or modify courses that facilitate the acquisition of skills listed in the General Education Statement, and to approve courses for general education based on the criteria established by the General Faculty.	The function of the General Education Committee is to assist faculty members to develop or modify courses that facilitate the acquisition of the student learning outcomes (SLOs) listed in the General Education Statement, and to approve courses for general education based on the criteria established by the General Faculty.	The function of the General Education Committee is to assist faculty members to develop or modify courses that facilitate the acquisition of the student learning outcomes (SLOs) listed in the General Education Statement, and to approve courses for general education based on the criteria established by the General Faculty.
If a course is disapproved by the Committee, the rationale for such action will be written with reference to the adopted standards and communicated to the VPAA and the sponsor.	If a course is disapproved by the Committee, the rationale for such action will be written with reference to the adopted standards and communicated to the VPAA and the sponsor.	If a course is disapproved by the Committee, the rationale for such action will be written with reference to the adopted standards and communicated to the VPAA and the sponsor.
Once a course is approved by the Committee, it will be the responsibility of the sponsoring department to review its implementation and assess its effectiveness at least every five years. The results of the review and assessment will be forwarded to the VPAA. Any change in the course's targeted skills or in its general content or format must be submitted to the General Education Committee for approval.	Once a course is approved by the Committee, it will be the responsibility of the sponsoring department to review its implementation and report assessment results to the Assessment Committee every year and to undergo a review by the General Education Committee at least every five years. The results of the review and assessment will be forwarded to the VPAA. Any change in the course's targeted SLO or in its general content or format must be submitted to the General Education Committee for approval.	Once a course is approved by the Committee, it will be the responsibility of the sponsoring department to review its implementation and report assessment results to the Assessment Committee every year and to undergo a review by the General Education Committee at least every five years. The results of the review and assessment will be forwarded to the VPAA. Any change in the course's targeted SLO or in its general content or format must be submitted to the General Education Committee for approval.
Decisions of the Committee, including those concerning course approval, will be reported by the VPAA to the deans.	Decisions of the Committee, including those concerning course approval, will be reported by the VPAA to the deans.	Decisions of the Committee, including those concerning course approval, will be reported by the VPAA to the deans.

<p>Decisions of the committee, including those concerning course approval, may be appealed to the Faculty Senate with further appeal to the General Faculty.</p>	<p>Decisions of the committee, including those concerning course approval, may be appealed to the Faculty Senate with further appeal to the General Faculty.</p>	<p>Decisions of the committee, including those concerning course approval, may be appealed to the Faculty Senate with further appeal to the General Faculty.</p>
<p>Members of the Committee are: the VPAA, one faculty member from each division of the College, one faculty member each from the Schools of Applied Studies, Business and Nursing, and one library faculty member. Faculty members are elected by their constituent units.</p>	<p>Members of the Committee are: the VPAA, one faculty member from each division of the College, one faculty member each from the Schools of Applied Studies, Business and Nursing, and one library faculty member. Faculty members are elected by their constituent units. Two members of the University Assessment Committee will be ex-officio members and appointed by the VPAA with input from Faculty Senate and Assessment Committee. These ex-officio members of the General Education Committee will provide expertise on assessment and facilitate communication between the General Education Committee and the Assessment Committee.</p>	<p>Members of the Committee are: the VPAA, one faculty member from each division of the College, one faculty member each from the Schools of Applied Studies, Business and Nursing, and one library faculty member. Faculty members are elected by their constituent units. Two members of the University Assessment Committee will be non-voting, ex-officio members and appointed by the VPAA with input from Faculty Senate and Assessment Committee. These non-voting, ex-officio members of the General Education Committee will provide expertise on assessment and facilitate communication between the General Education Committee and the Assessment Committee.</p>

Financial Implications: *None*

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2012

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

Approved by: *AAC on date*

FAC on date

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments Yes No

**Faculty Handbook Revision Issues
Promotion and Tenure
Discussed by the Faculty Affairs Committee on 10-5-12**

Present:

Royce Kitts
Bill Roach

Keith Mazachek
David Rubenstein

Diane McMillen
Sarah Ubel, Chair

Marguerite Perret
Kerry Wynn

To maximize awareness and transparency of the Faculty Handbook Review process, The Faculty Affairs Committee determined it would be useful to create a means for communicating the development of these changes on the Washburn Website.

Issues Identified by Faculty Handbook Revision Committee Promotion and Tenure	Committee Discussion
<p>1. Issue: Clarity of P & T standards</p> <p>Units should</p> <p>A) review their standards for promotion and tenure rigor,</p> <p>B) clarify the role the committees have (i.e., determining if the candidate meets or doesn't meet the standard), and/or</p> <p>C) determine if the language around the promotion/tenure standard needs clearer articulation so that it is possible to clearly determine if the standard is met. (FYI, this may be most pertinent relating to the conversations of the CAS CCPT in comparison to the Department PT Committee)</p>	<p>The Faculty Affairs Committee requests language regarding this issue from the Faculty Handbook Review Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language should be clear regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How often the units required to review and approve their tenure and promotion standards (ex: every 5 years) ○ How changes in the standards would apply to faculty already at Washburn as opposed to new hires
<p>2. Required Chair Letter (even when the Chair is new)</p> <p>Units need to do one of the following:</p> <p>A) require a chair letter regardless of the circumstances or</p> <p>B) require a chair letter except for extenuating circumstances pre-approved by the</p>	<p>The Faculty Affairs Committee requests language regarding this standard from the Faculty Handbook Review Committee regarding option B).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language should be clear regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who would write letters and at what stages of the review those letters would be reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ department committee ▪ chair

Dean/VPAA. This might include a recent change in chairs, the absence of the chair (e.g., sabbatical, etc.).

- dean?
- vpaa?

- How the recommended outcome of the application would be communicated to the Washburn Board of Regents. (ex: spreadsheet regarding the decisions at each level of review or some other communication regarding a recommended outcome of the application.)

3. Issue: Early review of Candidates for Promotion and Tenure

Potential Direction for Discussion by Faculty Groups: Consider that though these exceptions should be extremely rare and must be approved by the Dean/VPAA,

- A) candidates CAN negotiate early review at any point after beginning employment at Washburn (Candidates must have COMPLETED a minimum of three years full time teaching at Washburn before being reviewed),
- B) candidates and the academic dean CAN negotiate a shorter than normal review period (e.g., less than the standard 6-year probationary review period) when drafting the first Washburn hiring contract,
- C) to candidates who ask for early review and are unsuccessful have the right for the full extension period (e.g., assistant professors are NOT given a terminal contract immediately after a failed application in year five but are “re-reviewed” during the sixth year),
- D) deans and WU have the right to end employment for tenure-track candidates at any juncture during the probationary period if we meet the notification deadlines, and
- E) units have the right to establish minimum thresholds for review (e.g., no Washburn faculty member will be considered for promotion/tenure without 3 years of full time teaching at the assistant level; No Washburn faculty member will be considered for promotion to Professor

The Faculty Affairs Committee requests language regarding this issue from the Faculty Handbook Review Committee.

- Language should be clear regarding:
 - The difference between a faculty member who is applying for tenure early as a result of an agreement negotiated at hiring versus a faculty member who is applying for tenure early as a result of “extraordinary” circumstances
 - The consequences or future employment of someone unsuccessfully applying for tenure early (either as a result of contractual negotiations or “extraordinary” circumstances)
 - What constitutes “extraordinary” circumstances

without 4 years at the Associate level.).

4. Issue: Communication with Candidates

Potential Direction for Discussion by Faculty Groups:

- A) At each point in the process, communication regarding the outcome will be shared with the applicant whether positive or negative.
1. In cases where a review or reviews are negative,
 - a. candidates are to be formally notified of the negative review (without specific vote totals) and
 - b. be given information pertaining to the cause of the negative review.
 2. Candidates would then have the option to respond within X (10 days?) by creating and including additional pertinent information for the file where applicable.
 - a. For example, if the committee felt the research publications were not at the national level, candidates could submit information about the specific journal questioned. This information would be available for the NEXT stage of the review.
 - b. In cases where the review is positive, candidates will still receive results of the review but will not add information to the file. While the application process is undergoing review, when additional events confirm information described in the application materials (e.g., receipt of a grant, actual publication of an in-press article), candidates would be allowed to submit information confirming such changes in status.

The Faculty Affairs Committee fully supported the inclusion of notification and explanation regarding unfavorable tenure and promotion review decisions.

The Faculty Affairs Committee requests language regarding this issue from the Faculty Handbook Review Committee.

- Language should be clear regarding:
 - How the communication takes place: orally or in writing
 - Who communicates a negative review
 - When the negative review is communicated
 - Will there be a required time period for communication after the completion of each phase of the review process?
- The candidate should have the following communicated:
 - How the applicant did not meet a minimum threshold for a particular area – teaching, research or service
 - If there is a possibility to remedy the problem, how the applicant might do this (ex: clarify or add materials)
- The Faculty Affairs Committee expressed concerns about the following:
 - What materials could be added to the application? Could materials be
 - clarifying already present materials (ex: providing explanation regarding student perception forms)
 - new information related to already present information (ex: acceptance letter of publication which was previously noted as a journal submission)
 - new information unrelated to already present information (ex: elected to new national office in scholarly organization)
 - Who would see the added materials?
 - Only the reviewer at the level at which there is a negative outcome and subsequent reviewers?
 - Would we allow or require a secondary review by reviewers who previously reviewed the materials? For example, if the Dean did not have a favorable review and the applicant submitted new information, would all previously completed levels of review have

to take place again because the outcome or strength of their review may have changed.

- The Faculty Affairs Committee also noted the importance of having this language reviewed by the University Counsel to identify what, if any, legal implications there may be in putting reviews in writing in light of possible litigation.

MINUTES
ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Thursday, October 4, 2012
Cottonwood Room – 2:30 p.m.

Present: Donna LaLonde (chair), Jane Carpenter, Melodie Christel, John Dahlstrand, Vickie Kelly, Kathy Menzie, Denise Ottinger, Susie Pryor, Michael Rettig, Jim Smith, Nancy Tate, Danny Wade, Kelley Weber, Margaret Wood, and CJ Crawford (administrative support). Absent: Gillian Gabelman and Eric Benedict.

The minutes from the September 6 Assessment Committee meeting were approved as distributed.

DISCUSSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT RUBRIC

A copy of the draft of the proposed revisions to the Annual Assessment Report Rubric was sent to all committee members prior to the meeting for review and comment. Donna thanked Vickie for her work on this project.

Donna commented that she liked the name changes for the rating categories (Highly Developed, Developed, Emerging, Initial, and Not Observed) and the committee agreed.

It was agreed that ratings should not be applied to the Mission Statement – it should either be Observed or Not Observed (with comments).

Donna again stated that Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) should be written with the student as the actor. SLOs should explicitly describe what the student should be able to do, know, or care about.

During the discussion, a few other recommendations were made. A copy of the draft will be put in the Assessment folder on the shared drive and additional comments/recommendations can be submitted prior to the next meeting on October 18.

Donna suggested that it might be a good idea at the next meeting to take a past report and re-score it using the new rubric to identify if there are any other changes/refinements that need to be made.

The meeting adjourned.

FUTURE COMMITTEE MEETINGS (all are scheduled for 2:30 p.m. in the Cottonwood Room)

2012

October 18
November 1
November 15
December 6

2013

February 7
February 21
March 14
April 4
April 18
May 2

**Faculty Development Grant Committee
October 11, 2012
Meeting Minutes**

Members Present:

Nancy Tate, Chair
Pat Munzer
Kelley Weber
Kevin Charlwood

Nancy Tate welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. She reminded the committee the group of applications currently under review was the second group for fiscal year 2013.

The committee received a total of twenty-two (22) grant applications for the upcoming fiscal year. A summary of the applications received and the committee decision regarding each application is as follows:

Altus, Deborah	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Scotland; present research	
Berry, Phyllis	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Dallas Texas; present research	
Dahl, Patricia	\$500.00	Deferred
Purpose:	Attended a conference in Chicago; presented research	
Frank, Zach	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in India; presenting two papers	
Friesen, Ross	\$475.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Jackson Hole, Wyoming; present research	
Kwon, Young Sub	\$500.00	Deferred
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Indiana	
Ladstaetter, Klaus	\$500.00	Deferred
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Storm Lake, IA; present research	
Lockwood, Park	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Indiana	
Manske, Michael	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Florida	
Marsh, Jennifer	\$405.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Texas	
Nam, Hee Seok	\$500.00	Deferred
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Korea	
Ogawa, Brian	\$500.00	Deferred
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Toyko; Presenting Morita information	
Park, Sangyoub	\$500.00	Deferred
Purpose:	Attended a conference in Denver; presented a paper	

Porta, Gaspar	\$500.00	Deferred
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Denmark; Presenting a paper	
Preuss, Greg	\$500.00	Deferred
Purpose:	Attend a conference in New Orleans; present research	
Quaney, Barb	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	To assist in paying registration fees for Leadership Greater Topeka	
Russell, Michael	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Minnesota; presenting research	
Schnoebelen, James	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Missouri; serving as Vice Chair for a national organization	
Sundal, Mary	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Pennsylvania; presenting research	
Wang, Ye	\$300.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a workshop in Topeka; to assist with registration fees	
Watts, Harrison	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Florida	
Weber, Kelley	\$500.00	Awarded fully
Purpose:	Attend a conference in Indiana	

Summary of funds disbursement

The total amount requested was \$10,680.00 however the total awarded for the award period: \$6,680.00. The total amount of funds available for FY2013 is \$9,400.00 with one \$500.00 grant funded in the spring 2012 semester. This left a total balance of \$8,900.00. The awarding of the spring 2012 grants affords a remaining balance of available funds of \$2,220.00 for the final meeting of the committee in spring 2013.

Additional meeting topics:

Nancy Tate explained to the committee if sufficient funds remained at the end of the year for all the internal grant funds, she would make announcement to all faculty about the availability of funds as she did last year. This determination will be made based on the amount of funds remaining, as well as the amount returned by faculty who were awarded grants but who were unable to use the funds. Dr. Tate said this determination is usually made to allow time for any unused funds to be expended before the end of the year.

**International Education /International WTE Committee
September 13, 2012, International House**

Present: Mary Sundal, Norma Juma, Brian Ogawa, Alex Glashausser, Karen Diaz Anchante, Judy McConnell-Farmer, Matt Arterburn, and Baili Zhang

Minutes of April 19 were approved.

Zhang reported that international student enrollment (headcount) is up 10% over last fall. Juma reported a brief visit by Dr. Anca Gata of Romania. Glashausser reported the inception of the LLM program, which is primarily geared toward international students.

The following funding requests were recommended unanimously for funding:

Brian Ogawa: \$1500, Japan

Gaspar Porta: \$1350, Prague

Cynthia Hornberger: \$1092, Hungary

Lee Boyd: \$961, Vienna

Deborah Altus: \$1318, Scotland

The following items were endorsed unanimously:

Increasing the study abroad fee for non-Washburn student participants to \$200 (from \$75).

Agreement of Cooperation between Washburn University and Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (Spain).

Respectfully submitted,

Baili Zhang

**International Education /International WTE Committee
October 18 2012, International House**

Present: Mary Sundal, Norma Juma, Brian Ogawa, Alex Glashausser, Karen Diaz Anchante, Nancy Tate, Matt Arterburn, and Baili Zhang

Minutes of Sept. 13 were approved as corrected.

Juma reported that SoBU is hosting a visiting scholar from China, Dr. Joan Pan, till late Nov.

The following funding requests were recommended for funding:

Tom Prasch: \$608.18, Toronto

Craig Martin: \$1500, Shanghai (contingent upon official notification of paper acceptance)

The following WTE proposals were reviewed and action taken:

“Washburn-Mikkeli Physical Therapy Internship Program” was approved.

“Documenting Art and History Abroad” was tabled for more details.

Brief discussion was held on the subject of how to determine the number of credit hours for a study-abroad course.

Respectfully submitted,

Baili Zhang

Library Committee Minutes
October 26th, 2012
3:00 p.m.
Room 105, Mabee Library

TO:

Dr. Seid Adem	Dr. Sophie Delehavy	Dr. Tony Palbicke	Dr. Brian Thomas
Dr. David Bainum	Dr. Shiao-Li Ding	Dr. JaeYoon Park	Dr. Kelly Watt
Dr. Alan Bearman	Mr. Keith Farwell	Dr. Gaspar Porta	Ms. Kelley Weber
Mr. Eric Benedict	Dr. Andrew Herbig	Dr. Michael Rettig	Ms. Penny Weiner
Mr. Sean Bird	Dr. Rob Hull	Dr. Leslie Reynard	Ms. Cassandra White
Dr. Jane Brown	Ms. Shelbie Konkel	Dr. Michael Russell	Dr. Iris Wilkinson
Dr. Erin Chamberlain	Dr. Donna LaLonde		Dr. Margaret Wood
Dr. Barry Crawford			

The Library Committee convened in Mabee Library, Room 105 at 3:00 p.m. The following members were present: Dr. Bearman, Mr. Bird, Dr. Chamberlain, Dr. Ding, Dr. Herbig, Mr. Farwell, Ms. Konkel, Dr. Miller, Dr. Palbicke, Dr. Reynard, Dr. Russell, Dr. Schmiedeler, Dr. Watt, Ms. Weber, Ms. Weiner, and Dr. Wood. Guest, Gwen Wilson the new Health Sciences Librarian. Dr. Park and Dr. Schbley sent word they would be unable to attend.

Sean Bird nominated Dr. Leslie Reynard for Library Committee Chair for 2012/2013. Motion passed by acclamation.

Introduction of Committee Members.

Dr. Bearman reported that the library received an “exceed expectations” recommendation from Program Review in spring 2012.

Congratulations to Sean Bird who was promoted to Assistant Dean of University Libraries. Within the last year the library units had a lot of new hires; Kaydee Emperley and Jennifer Jenkins, Academic Advisors, Gwen Wilson, Health Sciences Librarian, Elise Blas, Information Literacy Librarian; and Amber Dickinson, FYE Coordinator.

A library usage chart was distributed to members and shows the library gate count continues to be staggering. (attached) Dr. Bearman reported at the campus Open Meeting for Campus Planning, the library was highlighted as the place to study and is undersized.

In September, the 2014 Budget Request was submitted. The library requested a 4% increase to maintain journal maintenance and \$111,000 for new electronic resources. Additional problems have surfaced with all State Agencies being asked to prepare for a 10% cut. Since the State Library provides many resources that all state universities take advantage of, this could dramatically impact what the library does with electronic resources. Dr. Bearman requests faculty input and assistance to help identify and prioritize what resources to keep or streamline. Within the next few weeks the library will provide the departments with usage statistics and criteria to help make decisions regarding new purchases, cancellations, and the

reallocation of resources. The library will collect all the data and bring it back to the library committee for discussion before sending it the Faculty Senate with an explanation about how and why decisions about resources are being made.

Because of the Morgan Hall renovation the library had to move approximately 22,000 volumes from Morgan Hall Storage. The library will draft an off-site storage guidelines and procedures policy and bring it to the committee for discussion before sending it to the Faculty Senate; with the goal of ensuring all the faculty understand how and why the decisions about what items go to off-site storage were made.

Floyd Davenport, CIO/Director ITS, is working on a plan to better regulate student printing across campus. This is a conversation that the Library is actively participating in because usage statistics show that of the 596,241 copies printed to date this fall that 69% were printed in Mabee Library. The cost of free printing for students in Mabee Library continues to grow and, therefore, the Library supports Mr. Davenport's efforts to deal with this issue. Dr. Bearman will keep the committee informed on this issue as more information becomes available.

Meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Ginger D. Webber, Administrative Secretary



NEXT MEETING
THURSDAY
November 15, 2012
3:00 p.m.

MINUTES
ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Thursday, October 18, 2012
Cottonwood Room – 2:30 p.m.

Present: Donna LaLonde (chair), Donna Droge, Vickie Kelly, Denise Ottinger, Michael Rettig, Jim Smith, Kelley Weber, Margaret Wood, and CJ Crawford (administrative support). Absent: Jane Carpenter, Melodie Christel, John Dahlstrand, Gillian Gabelman, Kathy Menzie, Susie Pryor, Nancy Tate, Danny Wade, and Eric Benedict.

The minutes from the October 4 Assessment Committee meeting were approved as distributed via email.

Donna LaLonde introduced Donna Droge, the Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator at Washburn Tech, who will be joining the committee.

DISCUSSION OF REVISIONS TO NEW ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT RUBRIC

The changes that had been made to the new rubric since the October 4 meeting were discussed. It was decided to put back in the rating of Highly Developed and to leave the ratings of both Emerging and Initial. Some areas still have redundancy.

Donna LaLonde will work on final revisions and send to the committee for review prior to the next meeting. It was agreed that we would pick two reports to review using the new rubric to see if any additional changes needed to be made.

APPLICATION FOR ASSESSMENT GRANT

An Assessment Grant application was received from Kelley Weber with Mabee Library to attend a Library Assessment Conference. It was moved by Donna LaLonde and seconded by Margaret Wood to approve the request for \$1,037.75. The motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned.

FUTURE COMMITTEE MEETINGS (all are scheduled for 2:30 p.m. in the Cottonwood Room)

2012

November 15

December 6

2013

February 7

February 21

March 14

April 4

April 18

May 2

Date: *October 22, 2012*

Submitted by: *Stephen A. Angel*

SUBJECT: *Senate Constitution, Item II. C*

Description:

Change statement from:

C. In addition, five at-large members of the Faculty Senate will be elected by all eligible faculty. No more than two of these may come from any one School or the College.

to:

C. In addition, five at-large members of the Faculty Senate will be elected by all eligible faculty. No more than two of these may come from any major academic unit including the College, Schools, and Libraries.

Rationale: *Recognize library faculty as Faculty Senate participants.*

Financial Implications: *None*

Proposed Effective Date: *November 22, 2012*

Request for Action: *Approval by Faculty Senate*

Approved by: *AAC on date*

FAC on date

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments Yes No

Date: *October 24, 2012*

Submitted by: *Kevin Charlwood, ext.1491*

SUBJECT: *Change in University Mathematics Requirement*

Description: The Department of Mathematics and Statistics is proposing a university requirement change, MA 112 Essential Mathematics. *Successful completion of Math 112 with a "C" or better will satisfy the University mathematics requirement, in the future and retroactively.* The MA 112 course is being proposed as this course better meets the goals of the Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning student learning outcome we expect to pilot one section of MA 112 in Fall 2012 and one or two sections of it in Spring 2013.

Rationale: *MA112 better meets the goals of Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning student learning outcome than MA110. Mathematics offered MA112 as a pilot course for Fall 2012 and plans to offer one or two sections of it in Spring 2013.*

Catalog changes proposed:

Add MA 112 to listing "MA100 or MA116" to read "MA110, MA112 or MA116" in all occurrences
Page 90, Item 4 under University Requirements Common to all Bachelor degrees
Page 91, Item 4 under University Requirements Common to all Associate degrees
Page 92 Item 3 under General Education Requirements
Page 93, Item 6 under Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Statistics (2 occurrences)

Financial Implications: *None*

Proposed Effective Date: *Fall 2013*

Request for Action: *Approval by AAC/.FAC/FS/ Gen Fac, etc*

Approved by: *AAC on date on Noember 5, 2012*

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments Yes No

Library Gate Counts

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
January	5393	7009	8783	9801	15095
February	10170	13234	15221	17140	25640
March	10627	11867	15872	18243	22075
April	14441	15790	18421	24742	31796
May	10277	11559	13635	16396	17805
June	3943	5469	6285	6882	6310
July	3931	5301	5681	8051	5249
August	8354	12148	11119	14664	19052
September	14890	15321	22460	27817	34466
October	15587	16189	20411	27589	
November	13552	17661	20826	25838	
December	3961	10324	15059	17588	
Annual	115,126	141,872	173,773	214,751	

YTD 177,488

Percentage Changes

	2008 v. 2009	2009 v. 2010	2008 v. 2010	2010 v. 2011	2011 v. 2012
	30.0%	25.3%	62.9%	11.6%	54.00%
	30.1%	15.0%	49.7%	7.9%	49.6%
	11.7%	33.7%	49.4%	14.9%	21.0%
	9.3%	16.7%	27.6%	34.3%	28.5%
	12.5%	18.0%	32.7%	20.3%	8.6%
	38.7%	14.9%	59.4%	9.5%	-8.30%
	34.9%	7.2%	44.5%	41.7%	-34.8%
	45.4%	-8.5%	33.1%	31.9%	29.9%
	2.9%	46.6%	50.8%	23.9%	23.9%
	3.9%	26.1%	30.9%	35.2%	
	30.3%	17.9%	53.7%	24.1%	
	160.6%	45.9%	280.2%	16.8%	
	23.20%	22.50%	50.9%	23.6%	

