

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
April 1, 2019
3:00 PM – Forum Room, BTAC**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approve minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 4, 2019 (pp. 2-6)**
- III. President’s Opening Remarks**
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents**
- V. VPAA Update—Dr. JuliAnn Mazachek**
- VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports**
- VII. University Committee Reports**
Receive Faculty Constitution Task Force minutes of March 7, 2019 (pp. 7-8)
Receive Graduate Council minutes of January 28, 2019 (p. 9)
- VIII. Old Business**
- IX. New Business**
- X. Information Items**
- XI. Discussion Items**
FERPA (Tate)
Faculty Constitution Task Force Progress Report (Jackson)
Internal approval form for grants (Cook) (pp. 10-12)
Faculty Senate Task Force (Wasserstein)
Academic Diversity and Inclusion Committee (Erby)
Open Education Resources (Barker)
- XII. Announcements**
- XIII. Adjournment**

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
March 4, 2019
3:00 PM – Forum Room, BTAC**

Present:

Barker, Beatie, Byrne, Cook (Matthew), Cook (Sarah), Erby, Fredrickson, Grant (Emily), Grant (Erin), Hickman, Jones, Krug, Leahy, Mansfield, Mazachek, Morse, Prasch, Sheldon, Smith, Steffen, Thor, Todwong, Wasserstein,

Absent:

Jackson, Jolicoeur, Juma, Memmer Menager, Menninger-Corder, Pierce, Ricklefs, Tso, Wohl, Worsley

Guests: Ball, Desota, Grospitch

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 4, 2019 approved.**
- III. President's Opening Remarks**
Barker is still doing union lunches Friday before break.

Moddelmog brought it to his attention that the Henderson elevator broke on Friday and some faculty cannot get to where they need to be. The freight elevator could be used but requires steps.

WGSA is restarting their smoking resolution efforts with an ad hoc committee of all members of campus to become a smoke free campus. First effort is to move the Henderson spot. The resolution will be emailed out. Thor suggested that there may be safety issues to moving them to darker areas of campus.

Executive committee to have a short meeting after this one.

KBOR is revisiting an idea to move degree requirements from 60 to 45 hours upper division hours. It is not well supported by most academic members. They are using mostly anecdotal information. We would like to see data supporting their claims about transfers to universities from other institutions.

Next senate meeting is March 18th, right after spring break. Waiting to see whether university committees meet – if not we will likely cancel. Sheldon noted that the week of the 18th is the only week for advising so she would likely opt out.

- IV. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents**
Weather prevented many from attending (the university had been closed early) and the minutes are on not on the website. Sabbatical decisions were released, however including: Melanie Burdick, Vanessa Steinroetter, Marguerite Perret, Kayla Waters, Gerald Bayens, Louella Moore, Pamela Schmidt, Andrea Boyack, Emily Grant, and Jeffrey Jackson.

The next meeting will be April 3.

- V. VPAA Update—Dr. JuliAnn Mazachek**
We have started the first meeting regarding budgets.

- VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports:**
Krug from the electoral committee stated that there are no elections this year as there are at large people who started last year and they are two year members. They will go back through records to see how long the term is to make sure this is correct. Brie Jefferies, who used to make up the faculty census is not here anymore. Someone else is doing this now and will be sending it to the committee for calculations. Barker stated this needs to be completed shortly after spring break.

Thor convened faculty affairs once this year and plans to meet again to revise the language for non-reappointment for tenured faculty. They have taken votes on handbook related items. They are moving on to the children on campus policy and could not find something official. Need that asap so that they can make adjustments.

Byrne asked the status of freedom of expression materials – Juli was not yet in attendance to answer. The committee reported out and no one knows what happened to it as of yet. Wasserstein said there was something Friday about it returning to faculty senate for review.

Morse reported that Academic affairs met in January to discuss the BS in tech administration, but there was nothing else coming in. Plans to meet in April to hear from Bearman regarding the STAR program.

Barker asked why the Midterm grade changed from being on my an email progress report. Tate and Bearman decided to use this as the midterm grade check instead of the my.washburn to prevent being onerous. Barker suggested that progress reports are voluntary, while midterm reports are not and was concerned that it had not been addressed by the faculty. Jones likes having everything in one place rather than having multiple sources of grade checking. Cook (S) asked if there were due dates for these and if there is a way to make the schedule more public. Tate said there is a due date, and a way to distribute these days can be entertained.

VII. University Committee Reports

Faculty Handbook Committee Minutes of December 11, 2018 were received
Academic Diversity & Inclusion Committee Minutes of December 11, 2018 were received

Library Committee Minutes of February 12, 2019 were received

VIII. Old Business

IX. New Business

X. Information Items

XI. Discussion Items

Details for the HLC visit were presented by Tate. Wanted to make sure everyone knows about the next Q and A session which is tomorrow, in Convocation Hall at 3:30. Quest is the week after spring break. On the first day, the materials will cover history of Washburn. The second day there is a switch to harder questions. She is still waiting on a few people to sign up for the At Large group. There is not a timeline for HLC; they have not asked for anything other than one official piece of information. The timeline will be sent out as soon as possible. Not sure if they will want to talk to Senate. They will want to confirm, however, a shared governance process, that curricular decisions are made starting with the faculty, and the process is transparent. Encourages people to come to one of the open sessions.

Campus climate issues were brought up by Grant (Erin) who passed out a packet of anonymized tweets, facebook posts, and student text messages. There have been issues regarding racism, xenophobia, ableism, homophobia, and transphobia on campus, as well as issues regarding sexual harassment and assault being taken seriously. Has happened since she started and this is an example.

Jones has not talked to one student of color on campus who feels safe or seen on campus. He read a quote from Tovar (student) who is "tired and feels like they [admin and faculty] are not here to support us.... Does not feel safe... feels unwanted. I would like to see an official board" to address these issues. Classes he met with today were upset by it. Smith asked about the location of the snapchat, which was unknown but not on campus. Jones referenced the lower retention rates of POC and that perhaps this can provide some insight to that. He continued with a quote from Matthews (student) from BSU, suggesting that this "sets back as growing community, happens over and over with no consequences." A HALO student stated that they "love WU, but issues of culture belittled and not supported by administration, which hinders education, people have transferred because of this." An anonymous student who fears retaliation, stated that they feel "a lack of support which discourages attendance... environment of racism, not the video but the environment, student has a reputation of being a racist."

Barker stated that due to this not being on campus, the student cannot be expelled or face a legal repercussion. Cook asked about the values that we are trying to portray. Sheldon reported that they dismissed a student for black face on K state campus. Grospitch corrected this: student did not get expelled, but left due to peer pressure; there is a free speech conundrum, creating a negative environment for our students. While there is a harm, it is not a direct threat of physical harm or assault. Wasserstein stated that while not a person of color, she has a feeling that what we are hearing is probably just the tip of the iceberg. Barker referenced the campus environment post 9/11 in which the issue was addressed in all classes to avoid retaliation against those on campus. Krug asked if there was a judicial review board to talk about these things with a public response. Thor suggested a plan to deal with this rather than silence. Morse reported this has been a consistent student complaint that they want to be but are not heard. Something needs put together, a faculty and student body, with shared governance, to address these things. There needs to be a public space where something can happen. Jones asked if students would agree to a code of conduct as a public university – can we expect them to agree to a higher standard? Grospitch answered that this is not successful at a public institution. He would like some grace from faculty to address the issues that come up on campus, as they are working to address the climate issues on campus. A shared governance has some possibility and he would like to engage with faculty.

Barker asked whether a task force should be created consisting of senators who would reach out to students regarding their what may be done to address these issues in a crisis moving forward. There was agreement by many in attendance, and Wasserstein moved for creation of this task force. Prash seconded the motion. Barker appointed Grant (Erin), Jones, Prash, and Wasserstein to meet with concerned students, create a proposal for a response team consisting of faculty/staff/students, and come back with a proposal for first reading at the next senate meeting. Cook (S) stated that this was a good idea, that after the KState incident, some great things happened. Jones stated that Walter has proposed a panel regarding climate issues via BSU, they are tired of being the only ones on campus who are saying anything. Who are the white people who are allies?

Byrne referenced a survey by Morse from 2013 regarding the climate on campus regarding whether there is part of your identity that you have to hide, which found that some are hiding one way or another. Wasserstein said that the response thus far from the university included the student in the video being a part time student is harmful in that it minimized their relationship to WU and part time students in general which is bothersome. Jones reported a knowledge that student has this pattern of behavior. Morse question whether a pattern of behavior show something, or whether it was being drunk once or multiple times is when the issue comes up. Wasserstein would like to get more clarification regarding these issues. Mansfield mentioned it was not on their radar and this is not in line with their ethics. Grant (Emily) asked if there a mechanism by which faculty members might find out about

this; would like to see these issues out to all members. Could have had this discussion with students in class today.

Wasserstein wants to prevent bullying as a way to proceed. Jones explained that the WU Twitter responded – but not to faculty, consistency across outlets. Barker said that Early should be sure to make the announcements regarding official university statements. Erby announced a WUmester even with University Council and ACLU April 4 at 2 about hate speech on campus and social media, as well as an upcoming free speech panel. Jones said that students would be interested in knowing we are taking steps. Grant (Emily) in addition to not feeling safe, and there is no one speaking about it except for them. We need them to know we hear them.

Norma Juma added notes via email 3/4/2019

I hope they decided to bring down the video of the student using the n word. It does not matter the race of the student. The n word is deeply offensive and deeply rooted in the history of our nation. The younger generation may not fully appreciate the dangers of ignorance of some the historic connotations. That was the last word some African Americans heard at lynchings. It is our responsibility to educate. There must be a difference between a college educated individual and non-college educated individual. Nothing spells out that difference more than respect for all humans. I was surprised when a former colleague used a derogatory term in an email to me and justified it as something used on wiki. It is important that as an institution we send a clear message that that kind of language is totally unacceptable, and we should have zero tolerance for it.

XII. Announcements –

Prasch is showing Z, Ebert’s favorite movie of 1969, on the 50th Anniversary of its release.

Cook stated that this has been an awkward year with weather. We need a ready-made policy, as it seems sometimes full day or night closings are made too soon. JuliAnn wondered if we can open back up at 5pm? There were so many times we had to make decisions and we need to keep in mind the people at Tech and the main campus. There will be protocol made before the next time it happens.

Beattie announced open education week at the library. Stop by for related events 1130 – 130 every day this week.

XIII. Adjournment 4:09

Faculty Constitution Task Force
March 7, 2019
2:00-3:00
Martin Room--BTAC

Absent: JuliAnn Mazachek; Deb Rector; Melanie Worsley

Present: Aileen Ball (staff support); Zach Frank; Jeffrey Jackson; Norma Juma; Louella Moore; Shaun Schmidt (chair); Jim Schnoebelen; Bill Rich; Kerry Wynn

Schmidt called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm and began with introductions.

Schmidt distributed the charge and the group reviewed it together, noting that

- Since it was first convened in 2005, there has not been a composite review of the faculty senate constitution
- The Vice President of Academic Affairs also serves on this task force as a non-voting member.
- The task force will make recommendations for the consideration of Faculty Senate, likely in the form of agenda items.

The group then discussed their process going forward, in three basic stages: idea generation/information collection; triaging issues surfaced through the process; formulating recommendations.

The group discussed the value of evidence collection to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty senate in general with an attempt to drill down to root causes for areas of concern. There was particular interest in interviewing former senators and president in order to understand their experiences with the constitution, then performing a wider survey of all faculty to understand their concerns.

Schmidt indicated that he knows there is interest in establish standing rules for the Senate each year.

Schmidt also noted the issue that the Constitution is nearly duplicated within the Faculty Handbook, with the compounding issue that it requires a simple majority vote to change the Faculty Handbook and a 2/3 majority to change the Constitution. The group considered the possibility of appending the Constitution to Section 6 of the Handbook.

Rich suggested the best first course of action would be a close reading of the Constitution and the parts of the Handbook that nearly duplicate the Constitution and catalog any discrepancies. Jackson and Frank agreed to take on this task and the group approved by consensus.

The group then discussed how to gather evidence leadership and members of senate (past and present) as well as faculty in general. The discussed the benefits of emailed survey to a wider audience, such as all faculty (using Google forms), as well as the benefits of one-on-one

interviews with key people, such as past Senate presidents. Wynn and Schnoebelen agreed to work together on surveying the faculty at the appropriate time

The group generated sample questions for officers/senators, including

1. Did you change the constitution during your tenure?
2. How frequently did you use the constitution?
3. What do you think a senate should accomplish and in what ways do the rules/structure/constitution help or hinder? What is the impact of the current structure and is that impact desirable?
4. What is the impact of electing new officers every year? How do you feel about the onboarding/orientation process for new officers? What do you feel about the state of continuity in the midst of changing officers?
5. Is there anything that would have better prepared you to serve on senate or be an officer on the senate?

The group discussed examining structure and procedure in the faculty senates at other institutions. The group considered the potential benefits of adopting a past-president/president/president-elect term structure to assist in continuity and succession.

Groups with whom task force members will speak:

- Senate
- Full faculty (not immediately--holding off now)
- Past officers as individuals (Schnoebelen will locate and disseminate)
- Executive staff (VPAA/VPAT/VPSL/President)
- Presidents of WSGA

Schmidt requested that Jackson make this task force's work a discussion item for the Senate on April 1. Jackson agreed.

The group attempted to identify a regular meeting time--Ball stated she would inquire with those absent about what times would be feasible for them.

3:01 adjourned

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes

January 28, 2019

12:00-1:00 pm

Lincoln Room—Union

Members present: JuliAnn Mazachek (ex-officio); Erin Grant; Rhonda Peterson Dealey; David Pownell; Mary Pilgram; Vickie Kelly; Tom Hickman; Michael Guerrero; Kayla Waters (chair).

Guests: Melanie Worsley; Aileen Ball (staff)

- 1) The meeting was called to order at 12:03 pm.
- 2) Approval of October meeting minutes—moved and seconded. Motion carried.
- 3) Melanie Worsley (asst professor and chair of the Criminal Justice and Legal Studies department) presented the council with an information item about the Fast Track Criminal Justice program, an accelerated pathway in which a student can complete both the Bachelor of Criminal Justice and the Master of Criminal Justice in 5 years (as opposed to the 6 years typically required). The council inquired about the tuition rate for the 12 graduate level hours to be allowed to count towards the BCJ—those hours will be assessed at graduate tuition rates but are still eligible for undergraduate financial aid.
- 4) The council discussed the need for Banner attributes and labels to better identify students who are pursuing 3+2 programs, dual degrees, et al. Kayla Waters will be in contact with the Registrar (Steve Grenus) to understand what is possible and to invite him to a future meeting.
- 5) The council discussed that there are no HLC restrictions in terms of how many graduate hours may count toward an undergraduate degree—our only restrictions would be in how Washburn defines undergraduate degrees. Health Science is considering designing a 3+2 program.
- 6) The council discussed recruitment strategies. The council discussed that there is power in leveraging social media and the tepidness of results in more traditional recruitment activities (e.g., career fairs); the importance of recognizing the limitations of individual departments in marketing and recruiting activities; the particular challenges of recruiting adult learners. Juli Mazachek volunteered to make EAB research on adult learners available at the next meeting.
- 7) Meeting adjourned at 12:47 pm

Internal approval form for grants (Cook)

Washburn University Office of Sponsored Projects INTERNAL APPROVAL FORM						
1 TITLE OF PROJECT: _____						
SPONSORING AGENCY: _____						
AGENCY CONTACT NAME/TITLE: _____						
ADDRESS/PHONE/EMAIL: _____						
2 PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:		DEPARTMENT		EXTENSION		
CO-INVESTIGATOR:		DEPARTMENT		EXTENSION		
PI ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT:		CAS	SAS	SOBU	SOL	SON
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES		CCSCE/LINC	MULVANE	WU TECH	OTHER:	KTWU
3 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT PROPOSAL:						
PROJECT/AWARD PERIOD: From _____ To _____						
4 AGENCY DUE DATE: _____ Receipt Postmark						
SOURCE OF FUNDING:		Local Government	State Government	Federal Government		
		Private (non-profit)	Private (for-profit)	Other		
TYPE OF SUBMISSION:		Initial Proposal	Competitive Renewal	Non-Competitive Renewal		
		Letter of Inquiry/Intent	Required Draft or Preliminary Proposal			
		Sub-Award	Lead institution, if sub-award:			
CFDA OR AGENCY RFP NUMBER:		_____				
TYPE OF ACTIVITY:		Academic Support	Equipment	Facilities or Construction		
		Student Instruction	Professional Development	Public Service		
		Research	Scholarships	Collaboration with Other Entities		
5 PROJECT BUDGET:						
A. Amount of this request:		[]				
B. Total Washburn Funding Commitment:		[]				
Amount of cash match:		_____				
Amount of in-kind match:		_____				
C. Amount to request from other external sponsors:		_____				
D. Total Project Budget		[]				
Proposal Benefits to Washburn University:		F&A Cost Payments		Other Sources of Revenue		
		Other Tangibles		Other Intangibles		

6 ADMINISTRATIVE PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS:					
If the answer is YES to any of the statements below, the Principal Investigator is responsible for securing all required approvals for such activities. Please attach additional pages for documentation when necessary.					
A. Principal Investigator completed and passed the WU human subjects IRB training module.				Yes	No
B. New faculty hired with continuing commitments beyond project.				Yes	No
If yes, explain: _____					
C. Faculty will be off-campus for 3 months or longer for reasons unrelated to the project.				Yes	No
If yes, explain: _____					
D. Project is responding to or will result in faculty overloads in instruction.				Yes	No
E. Construction or alteration by Facilities Services required for project.					
If yes, explain: _____					
Estimated Cost: _____	Source of funding: _____		For capital improvements?	Yes	No
F. Project requires installation of additional equipment, including electrical modification.				Yes	No
If yes, explain: _____					
G. Project will impact/affect unit(s) within the university, other than the PI/co-PI's unit(s).				Yes	No
If yes, list each affected department/unit: _____ each corresponding college/school: _____					
Signature approvals are required in section 8 from all affected department chairs/unit leaders and corresponding college/school deans (attach additional pages if needed).					
H. Project will create a new organizational unit(s) within the University.				Yes	No
I. Project will require new space.					
If yes, explain: _____					
Estimated Cost: _____	Source of funding: _____				
J. Project includes conferences (regional or national), workshops, or off-campus courses.				Yes	No
If yes, explain: _____					
K. Project will result in intellectual property (e.g. publications, controlled data, or curriculum).				Yes	No
If yes, explain: _____					
L. Project includes research subjects (IRB approval required).				Yes	No
Human Subjects _____	Live Vertebrates or Animals _____	IRB Status:	Approved	Pending	
M. Project requires foreign travel or visitors.				Yes	No
N. Project requires external contracts and/or sub-awards.				Yes	No
7 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:					
8 REQUIRED SIGNATURES:					
Affected Units:					
By signing, I have reviewed this form and the appended documents. I am aware of the impact of this project on my unit and approve my unit's obligations therein. (Attach additional signature pages as needed.)					
Unit Chair/Director: _____				Date:	_____
Dean (if applicable): _____				Date:	_____
Principal Investigator's Unit:					
By signing, I affirm that I have consulted all affected units, provided them with documentation about their obligations to this project, and have collected signatures that signify their approval(s). I agree to abide with university policies and regulations, including but not limited to, those defining responsibilities, conditions of employment, outside financial interest, and all other research compliance matters. I also agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of the outside grant or contract which supports this proposed activity. I certify that I have a current Conflict of Interest disclosure statement on file with Vice President for Administration and Treasurer. I certify that I have not been debarred, suspended, or declared ineligible to receive federal funds, that I am aware of the Principal Investigator's responsibilities for handling grant contracts as outlined in the Washburn University Policies, Regulations, and Procedures Manual and that, to the best of my knowledge, no appropriated funds have been expended that would influence award of the grant contract.					
Principal Investigator: _____				Date:	_____
By signing, I have reviewed this form and the appended documents for all institutional commitments and approved the obligations therein. I also have reviewed the documents for any appearance of or potential for conflict of interest and hereby affirm that none exists or that any potential conflict is being managed.					
PI's Department Chair: _____				Date:	_____
PI's Dean: _____				Date:	_____

THIS SECTION FOR USE BY OSP ONLY. OSP WILL ACQUIRE VP APPROVAL & INFORM PI OF STATUS.

Risk Assessment _____	Current F&A Rate _____	Initials of OSP Director _____
Budget Variances _____	Proposal Allowed Rate _____	Initials of OSP Accountant _____
Vice President of Academic Affairs:	_____	Date: _____
Vice President for Administration and Treasurer:	_____	Date: _____