

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
February 2, 2015
3:00 PM Kansas Room, Memorial Union**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 1, 2014 (pp. 2-6)**
- III. President’s Opening Remarks**
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents**
- V. VPAA Update—Dr. Randy Pembrook**
- VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports**
- VII. University Committee Reports**
- VIII. Old Business**
 - **15-04 Constitutional Amendment 1 from Executive Committee (pp. 7-8)**
 - **15-05 Constitutional Amendment 2 from Executive Committee (pp. 9-10)**
- IX. New Business**
- X. Information Items**
- XI. Discussion Items**
 - **Follow-Up regarding Richard Liedtke visit; where should we go from here? (Dan Petersen)**
 - **Possible committee on teaching evaluation biases and implications for tenure, promotion, raises, etc. (Jennifer Ball)**
- XII. Announcements**
- XIII. Adjournment**

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
December 1, 2014
3:00 PM Kansas Room, Memorial Union

PRESENT: Alexander, Ball, Berry, Chamberlain, Childers, Fay, Florea, Francis, Friesen, Kwak, Mach, McConnell-Farmer, McHenry, Pembroke, Petersen, Routsong, Russell, Sadikot, Sanchez, Schbley, Schnoebelen, Stevens, Sun, Treinen, Weiner, Wisneski, Snook*, Altus*, Bayens*, Leditke*, Klima*
* = guests

ABSENT: Frank, Jackson, Lunte, Mapp, Modellmog, Palbicke, Perret, Porta, Rubenstein, Schmidt, Scofield, Smith, Sourgens, Stevenson

XIV. President Ball called the meeting to order at 3:03pm.

XV. Q & A with Richard Liedtke, Executive Director of Enrollment Management and Kris Klima, Director of Admissions (move this to II instead and everything in sequence behind it)

1. Liedtke provided an overview of Admission events (senior days, private visits, counselor visits within assigned territories, etc.). He noted we're traveling in all contiguous states, and all of these visits are done strategically in terms of serving solid bases of enrollment and admission as well as charting new territories. He also discussed our communication tactics with new students (including calls within 48 hours of inquiries by counselors and the use of social media). He then opened up the floor to questions and observations.
2. Russell asked what the goal for enrollment is for next year. Klima responded that the goal was 700 (the number is based on historical data, projected high school enrollment, and state graduation rates). Russell wondered admission/enrollment problems is based on scarcity of resources in terms of recruitment; Liedtke said that, overall, we're maintaining our share of the market.
3. Petersen wondered if the number of students we don't retain was based on previous year totals; Liedtke said that yes—the comparisons are done based on year-to-year rates. Liedtke also noted that we're seeing a change in our continuing students and not just new students.
4. Peterson also wondered about what the primary areas are that are decreasing (graduates, undergrads, etc.) to see if this is something that is a deficiency for us or if everyone (all area schools) are hurting.
5. Liedtke says that the primary populations we're losing are transfers, and notes specifically that 14 of 19 CC feeder schools are down in enrollment. Also, we have lost out on our "1 populations" (first time freshmen who are not direct from high school). We increased transfers last year (demonstrating that it's not a continual slide), and we should hopefully increase transfers this year. He also argued that we shouldn't compare ourselves directly with other institutions since there are numerous differences based on community, type of students, etc. The economy is crucial to consider; we're counter-cyclical with 4-year

institutions (more like a CC). We don't have big dips and big growths; we have steady decreases and increases.

6. Russell wondered what our goal is for the next five years; Liedtke said that they are a decentralized office and haven't sat down in a comprehensive way to establish this (though it will be happening in the near future).
7. Francis asked what we could do to help the office. Liedtke argued that faculty make the difference; in order to get students to understand that, they have to meet and be seen by our faculty. This was one of the reasons why we require the declaration of major on applications now. There is a weekly feed wherein applicants for specific majors are listed, so he encouraged faculty to reach out to these students (perhaps call them weekly or at least periodically). NOTE: These are student we don't know are coming yet—they're just interested. The next thing we can do is getting them to come in for a campus visit (the best way to improve our enrollment). Even if they come in for a group visit, he noted that we ask them to come in for an individual visit as well to foster a unique and personal connection.
8. Schbley asked about the format for the counselor visits to schools and wondered what the talking points were for WU. Klima said it's difficult to say, given that the visits may be with one student or an entire group. The counselors quickly identify these ideas immediately, though the common ones are emphasizing class size, Topeka, tailoring education to the student, etc.
9. Childers asked if we focus on direct-from-high-school or other populations? Liedtke said that we try not to, since we have a diverse population that has varying needs. Veterans, for instance, are looking for a somewhat different model of education than a traditional 16-week model for a semester and we can and should continue to work to cater to these students.
10. Ball wondered about what is the 'typical' Washburn student and if we should focus on them? Liedtke says that we're looking for students with a "good fit" (i.e. the student who feels intangible connections to the institution, but says that Washburn "feels right" to them). Klima added that sometimes even when students enroll and are set, they still might back out at the last minute; sometimes it's not predictable.
11. Treinen added that some students don't know we exist and/or think we're a private school. Is marketing the issue getting in the way of getting Washburn out there? Sadikot reinforced that Washburn doesn't have billboards like other schools do. Liedtke says that billboards often don't work (there's no call to action), and noted that we're revamping our commercials and markets. We're trying to do more of an individual outreach instead of commercials in major markets. He also indicated that we're about 100 applications up from this time last year. We will continue to do commercials (2 more new ones coming up), but we're cutting back due to lack of impact. Treinen wondered what our motto is—what's the one thing we're all unified on that we can pass on to new students. Liedtke reinforced the idea of an individual approach to students.

12. Schbley wondered if we have enough scholarships to offer new students. Liedtke said that by comparison to conference schools, we were lacking until 2012. We then changed to be more competitive. He argues it's akin to an arms race—these schools will eventually analyze the figures and up their offers over us, and the process will continue back and forth. Still, these changes have resulted in more students receiving scholarships.
 13. Snook wanted them to talk a bit about international students specifically. Pembroke noted that international student enrolment is projected to increase by 25 students per year, but we have shifted a bit focusing on different countries that we have in the past. Pembroke said that we should identify pipeline schools and countries and foster them. Liedtke stated that we would often use in-state tuition rates in markets (countries) with no students.
 14. Petersen commented that we should make it a point to get out information regarding our price (especially with regard to Master's programs). He also agreed with Treinen in that it was difficult to establish what the one resonant idea regarding Washburn is. Liedtke agreed, but noted that the focus group information that they have received is positive. Petersen also noted that the number of high school students intending to go to college is getting smaller, so can we improve this? Is it just a branding issue? Liedtke said that increases are projected to start in 2016, but that these individuals are also going to be less prepared for college. Other schools are also following our lead in terms of marketing, so we must be doing something right.
 15. Sadikot asked what key ideas she should feel free to mention in presentations when she visits other schools. Liedtke said that telling Washburn's story is helpful, or for more specific information, individuals can contact Klima. We should stress location, cost, and small class size.
 16. Liedtke closed by saying perhaps we should have open sessions or visits with faculty and staff to provide similar information to others not on the Senate.
- XVI. The Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 3, 2014 were approved.
- XVII. President's Opening Remarks: None
- XVIII. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents: None since there was no meeting in November.
- XIX. VPAA Update—Dr. Randy Pembroke:
1. Do senators have an opinion about having the 'friendly amendment' process for items at General Faculty meetings, or should we forgo these to move to make formal motions to amend so that all faculty can understand the implications of changing these items. It's a governance question. Ball said she liked minimizing the use of friendly amendments and felt that it was more appropriate for formal proposals. Petersen noted that it was difficult to keep track of the friendly amendments; if it's substantive, it shouldn't be made by friendly amendment. Pembroke said that grammar changes aren't substantial, but applicable dates etc. (things that will have larger consequences) should be done more deliberately.

2. Vision 2022 is in an interesting place; ask your Deans what's happening with it. We're identifying specific strategies and metrics and accountability to implement the vision. Pembroke said he would be happy to come and talk to units about the plans.
3. Some responses to Liedtke and Klima conversations:
 - a. Graduate advertising—we haven't done it.
 - b. Our re-recruiting efforts are important.
 - c. Relationships with high school faculty are important.
 - d. Veterans: we should be aggressive and establish a prior-learning testing center to help foster this.
 - e. Who are we? Pembroke asked the Deans to talk to the units to help establish the secondary strategy to help make up students minds when it's between Washburn and another school. We need to know these and stress them, and if you haven't had these conversations, Admissions needs this information.

XX. Faculty Senate Committee Reports

1. The Academic Affairs Minutes from 9-22-14 were approved.

XXI. University Committee Reports

1. The General Education Course Review Committee Minutes of 10-21-14 were received.
2. The Honors Advisory Board Minutes from 9-3-14 were received.

XXII. Old Business

1. 15-07 New CJ Major Emphasis in Forensic Investigation was presented by Alexander. Ball wondered if the requested tenure-track faculty member could pose a problem if the spot wasn't filled. It was noted that the program could be adjusted, though yes, a new program would require new faculty and resources. The motion was passed.
2. 15-08 New Gerontology Minor was presented by Deborah Altus. The motion was passed.
3. 15-09 Information Literacy Course Designation. Ball presented a brief rationale for this motion. The motion was passed.
4. 15-04 Constitutional Amendment 1 from Executive Committee was tabled due to lack of adequate attendance.
5. 15-05 Constitutional Amendment 2 from Executive Committee was tabled due to lack of adequate attendance.

XXIII. New Business: NONE

XXIV. Information Items

1. Ryan Alexander briefly presented information regarding graduate course numbers. The Graduate Council is putting forward a course proposal to move 500-level courses up to

600 and 700-level courses. Pembroke noted this likely won't be presented at the next meeting (perhaps mid- to late-spring).

XXV. Discussion Items: None

XXVI. Announcements: None

XXVII. President Ball adjourned the meeting at 4:12pm

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM NO 15-04

Date: September 18, 2014

Submitted by: Jennifer Ball, President of Faculty Senate, x1840

SUBJECT: Proposed Faculty Senate Constitutional Amendment

Description: *To make section VI. Committees, E. Academic Affairs, more clear, and to have a contingency plan for representation in the case there are not enough senators from a Major Academic Unit or Mabee Library/CRC.*

Current wording:

VI. E. (second paragraph)

The Academic Affairs Committee shall consist of two (2) Faculty Senate members from each Major Academic Unit other than the School of Law, and the Senate representative of Mabee Library/CRC. Each member will be elected to a one-year term by the Faculty Senate from its ranks. The committee selects its own chairperson. Decisions of the Academic Affairs Committee require the affirmative vote of six of the nine members; six members shall constitute a quorum to conduct business. The VPAA or his/her designate will serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Proposed wording:

The Academic Affairs Committee shall consist of two (2) Faculty Senate members from each Major Academic Unit other than the School of Law, and a Senate representative of Mabee Library/CRC. Each member will be elected to a one-year term by the Faculty Senate from its ranks. The committee selects its own chairperson. Decisions of the Academic Affairs Committee require the affirmative vote of six of the nine members; six members shall constitute a quorum to conduct business. The VPAA or his/her designee will serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

If possible, all faculty members of the Academic Affairs Committee should be senators. However, if a Major Academic Unit has three or fewer senators, or Mabee Library/CRC has only one senator, the Faculty Senate President may ask the relevant unit(s) to elect a non-senator to the Academic Affairs Committee or Faculty Affairs Committee to ensure adequate representation from this (these) unit(s). If appointments of non-senators must be made, the minimum proportion of the faculty members of the Academic Affairs Committee that will be senators is 2/3.

Rationale: This is being recommended because the constitutional requirement that the Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs Committees each have two representatives from each major academic unit and one from Mabee/CRC becomes impossible if the two committees meet on the same day and time (usually the “off-Senate” Monday afternoons) and there are three or fewer senators from each major academic unit, or only one senator from the Mabee/CRC. (For example, at the present time we have one senator from Mabee, who is on Academic Affairs. This person cannot also attend Faculty Affairs.) This will also ensure senators from smaller units will not become overwhelmed with their senatorial duties.

Financial Implications: *None*

Proposed Effective Date: *Immediate*

Request for Action: *Approval from Faculty Senate, then General Faculty*

Approved by: *Faculty Senate on date*

Attachments No

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM NO 15-05

Date: September 18, 2014

Submitted by: Jennifer Ball, President of Faculty Senate, x1840

SUBJECT: Proposed Faculty Senate Constitutional Amendment

Description: *To have a contingency plan for representation in the case there are not enough senators from a Major Academic Unit or Mabee Library/CRC to staff the Academic Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee*

Current wording:

VI. D. (second paragraph)

Membership of the committee consists of one Faculty Senate member from each Division within the College of Arts and Sciences, one from the School of Business, one from the School of Law, one from the School of Nursing, one from the School of Applied Studies, and one member from the University libraries, each elected for a one-year term by the Faculty Senate from its ranks. The committee selects its own chairperson.

Proposed wording:

Membership of the committee consists of one Faculty Senate member from each Division within the College of Arts and Sciences, one from the School of Business, one from the School of Law, one from the School of Nursing, one from the School of Applied Studies, and one member from the University libraries, each elected for a one-year term by the Faculty Senate from its ranks. The committee selects its own chairperson. If possible, all faculty members of the Faculty Affairs Committee should be senators. However, if a Major Academic Unit has three or fewer senators, or Mabee Library/CRC has only one senator, the Faculty Senate President may request the relevant unit(s) elect a non-senator to the Academic Affairs Committee or Faculty Affairs Committee to ensure adequate representation from this (these) unit(s). If appointments of non-senators must be made, the minimum proportion of the faculty members of the Faculty Affairs Committee that will be senators is 2/3.

Rationale: This is being recommended because the constitutional representation requirements of the Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs Committee become impossible to fulfill if the two committees meet on the same day and time (usually the "off-Senate" Monday afternoons) and there are two or fewer

senators from each major academic unit, or only one senator from the School of Law or Mabee/CRC. (For example, at the present time we have one senator from Mabee Library, who is on Academic Affairs. This person cannot also attend Faculty Affairs.) This will also ensure senators from smaller units will not become overwhelmed with their senatorial duties.

Financial Implications: *None*

Proposed Effective Date: *Immediate*

Request for Action: *Approval from Faculty Senate, then General Faculty*

Approved by: *Faculty Senate on date*

Attachments No