

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
November 16, 2015
3:00 PM – Kansas Room, Memorial Union**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 19, 2015 (p. 2-5)**
- III. President’s Opening Remarks**
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents**
- V. VPAA Update—Dr. Randy Pembroke**
- VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports**
- VII. University Committee Reports:**
 - **Receipt of the General Education Committee minutes from October 20, 2015. (p. 6)**
 - **Receipt of the Library Committee minutes from October 21, 2015 (p. 7)**
 - **Receipt of the Assessment Committee minutes from October 15, 2015 (p. 8-9)**
 - **Receipt of Honors Advisory Board minutes from September 2, 2015 (p. 10-11)**
- VIII. Old Business: None**
- IX. New Business: None**
- X. Information Items: None**
- XI. Discussion Items:**
 - **A proposal for a smoking ban on campus passed last spring by WSGA (language is on p. 12)**
 - **Faculty office door policy in Morgan Hall (Ball).**
- XII. Announcements**
- XIII. Adjournment**

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
October 19, 2015
3:00 PM – Kansas Room, Memorial Union**

PRESENT: Alexander (Rebecca), Ball, Childers, Farwell, Francis, Jackson, Kwak, Leung, Mansfield, Mastrosimone, McHenry, Memmer, Moddelmog, Pembrook, Petersen, Porta, Routsong, Russell, Sadikot, Sanchez, Schnoebelen, Smith, Sourgens, Stacey, Steinroetter, Stevens, Stevenson, Weiner, Wohl, Worsely, Zwikstra

ABSENT: Alexander (Ryan), Garritano, Mapp, Mechtly, Palbicke, Scofield, Treinen, Tutwiler,

GUESTS: Gonzalez-Abellas, Ogawa, Zhang

- I. President Ball called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.
- II. The minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 21, 2015 were approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks:
 - Ball met with the current WSGA President and Vice President this week. They asked to bring up the possible smoking ban (discussion reflected below).
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents:
 - Ball attended the Audit meeting and regular meeting on the 25th. The Audit meeting was standard. At the general meeting, there was a discussion of the Marketing firm for the University that has since been announced.
- V. VPAA Update—Dr. Randy Pembrook:
 - Survey regarding guns: The Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) has a group that is made up of student leadership (student body presidents) that gives feedback to the Board. This group wanted to find out what students in Kansas felt about this. They initiated a survey that will probably go out in the next week or two to the seven Regent schools. The question that came up among executive staff is if we're going to take the time to do this survey, should we also survey other constituencies on campus. The students felt (perhaps) that if there was strong students sentiment not in line with the policy, maybe they could act to present this data to people who could make a change. Moddelmog and Francis both argued that one would be useful. He noted that he will ask staff council about this as well.
 - The Frank agency: We are in the final stages of contract negotiations with them. We should, in our various areas, think about what information we can provide to this organization as they begin their work.
 - I commend everyone involved with the John Lewis visit.
 - Thanks to those involved with the announcement about the major gift from the Blitt family to the university.
 - For those who still want tickets to the homecoming week-Bow-Tie Bash, you can probably still get in.
- VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports: None

VII. Zhang answered questions about recent changes to faculty funding for overseas trips. He noted the funding can also cover unpaid teaching—not just research. He reported that the committee had discussed this topic a few times and, because they have seen other international trips funded by Grants, C-TEL, etc., they elected for the change. He also noted that the fund they operate is pretty small, so given the demand for funding of international travel by faculty, the committee felt that a change was necessary to make it more rigorous. Ball clarified that this was a resource issue and it helps decision-making. Zhang agreed that this clarification was appropriate. Petersen asked about faculty who may be in the fine arts and who don't produce conventional papers but who may miss out on opportunities to travel. Zhang said that such creative works were also considered just like scholarly papers. He then added that this fund has been running at a deficit for a few years and this can't continue. Zhang noted that two months into the semester, half of the funding is already gone. Moddelmog noted that the Social Science division has formally requested a change back to allow for other transformative-type activities (why help fund these types of activities for students through WTE funding when we won't any longer for faculty?). Zhang noted that the funds are limited to \$1500 per person, so it's not all encompassing. He also wondered what to do with this request. Ball noted that his isn't a Senate committee so we can't write policy, but it's helpful to know why these changes were made. The fund was created to help with some travel—not to pay for it entirely. Porta wondered how many proposals were in this "other" category that wouldn't get funded. Zhang responded that he didn't have those figures but when applications have been rejected, he is quick to point out other sources and to suggest talking to the Dean's office. Petersen wondered if the real question is a lack of knowing what committees fund what types of trips, suggesting that such a clarification could help make funding requests more efficient. This may also point out if we have a gap in funding for these trips that we may not know about. He suggested that perhaps a diagram of this process would help faculty make the most of these funding sources. Ball finished by asking them to reconsider; Zhang noted that there are representatives from every division and area on campus on this committee and noted that those concerned should talk to their representatives on the committee to ask for change.

VIII. University Committee Reports:

- The Assessment Committee Minutes from September 10, 2015 were received.
- The Graduate Council Minutes from August 24, 2015 were received.
- The Small Research Grant Committee Minutes from September 30, 2015 were received.
- The Faculty Development Grant Committee Minutes from September 30, 2015 were received.
- The Curriculum Grant Committee Minutes from September 29, 2015 were received.
- The International Education Committee Minutes from September 3, 2015 were received.

IX. Old Business: None

X. New Business: None

XI. Information Items: None

XII. Discussion Items:

- Ball asked for a vote to include the added topics from the ad hoc Faculty Handbook revision committee via Routsong. Those present voted to add both. (these are the last 2 items under discussion in these minutes)

- Accommodation for absences due to approved activities: do we need a policy?** Ball noted that there is a policy that we should encourage students to be excused for religious observances and that we should accommodate, but we don't have much communication about when the religious holidays are. She added that, in terms of sporting activities, some coaches are great about notification and some are not. Ball asked if we need guidance here or some sort of more visible policy for students. Pembroke added that his office will get a request every now and then regarding these notifications that led to this question. Do we need it once a year and you choose what's important to you? Do you want individual teams to send out announcements? Russell: Is this something we can add to the general syllabus? Some type of policy for recognized activity may be in order. Pembroke noted regarding religious holidays, Pam Foster has reported that the importance of the religious observance is defined by the student not the holiday, so it is difficult to establish parameters. Wohl noted that there is a distinction between those who are on scholarship for athletics and need to be excused and those who just belong to a club and want to go somewhere. Stevens noted that all faculty staff e-mails from coaches might help. Smith said that he prefers individual students to address it with the professors. Memmer would prefer to have the student contact faculty as well, but disagrees with the scholarship distinction since not all who are on the teams necessarily receive scholarships. Porta said the onus should be on coaches to contact the professors. Scofield said the e-mails could be overwhelming; perhaps if we could post it on a cloud or link on MyWashburn faculty could verify without all of the e-mail. On religious holidays perhaps we can work with Student Services to make accommodations. Ball clarified that these are still often opt-in accommodations made by professors (As in Student Services asks instructors to "Please try to accommodate"). Wohl: I have a syllabus note that asks for athletes to inform him regarding dates. Sadikot: Isn't there a rule regarding religious observances? With more and more international students attending, this could create a large demand for accommodation. Sanchez: the "please try to accommodate" perspective is appropriate given the varying conditions under which these absences may happen. Petersen: Is this a syllabus policy or a university policy? These types of things may be hard to define on a campus-wide level, but it may be easier to do as individual faculty members with the syllabus. Pembroke noted that awareness is a key issue and how we deal with it is up to the individual faculty members. Sadikot wondered how we discriminate between students who want to 'celebrate her or his holiday' or not. Childers preferred the student responsibility route but wanted to know these things as early as possible. Ball clarified that perhaps a clearinghouse of this information and these dates might be helpful. Pembroke wondered if a policy could be established.
- Faculty input needed on possible smoking ban on campus.** Modellmog said she didn't want a ban for the inconvenience of faculty and staff. Ball said that the WSGA was suggesting a ban on the entire campus and smokers would have to cross the streets. Pembroke wasn't sure about parking lots and there is a question about where city easements are that could complicate the restrictions of such a ban. He also noted this could be an issue for surrounding neighborhoods and safety. Ball reported that the a recent survey indicated a majority of students were in favor of it. Pembroke said national and state data is headed in this direction. Mastrosimone said this will likely be a key issue for law students who smoke. Ball noted a colleague of her suggested a designated entrance or 2 to each building be labeled smoke-free. Stevens said her experience with such bans at Stormont Vail Hospital indicates that people will adapt. She added that perceptually it can look bad when a lot of smokers hang outside of buildings. Routsong noted that those with windows have complained about second-hand

smoke getting in which may be a factor. Ball concluded that action from the WSGA would likely come up soon. Pembroke said Senate should prepare for how we want to have the discussion in the future. He also noted that enforcement will be an issue. Steinroetter asked if there was data on those who smoke in Topeka versus other areas. Sourgens noted that absolute bans will lead to the problems we've been talking about.

- Faculty input needed on what type of direction we want from administration regarding active shooters on campus. Ball has heard concerns about a lack of information about these other than iAlert systems. McHenry said that he invited one of the police officers to come and talk to his class about these types of situations and it was enlightening. Petersen noted that the protocols for a fire are much different than an active shooter; we need education (i.e. what to do in a classroom versus what to do in an office?). Moddelmog asked for a best practices list. Sanchez said that it may be expensive, but we should ask for training. Steinroetter always wondered about why classrooms can't be locked? McHenry said the police said to barricade them in an active shooter situation. We should also investigate the services that follow such shootings so that we're prepared with that information. Pembroke noted the literature indicates shooters shoot until they (police or bystanders) start shooting back, so we should focus on 1) getting police there as quickly as possible and 2) ensuring that that shooter can't get to other buildings. Ball asked if it would be appropriate to ask for forums for faculty about this issue; Pembroke said yes it would.
- Need for the Personnel Committee and the Grievance Hearing Committee (Tracy Routsong). Routsong said it had been suggested that perhaps the Personnel committee could move to faculty affairs. This committee would then be tasked with forming the Grievance Hearing Committee when there is a need. Wohl thought this Personnel committee used to be under Human Resources and became the Benefits committee that we know today. Petersen noted that the Grievance Hearing Committee could come under the Senate. It could also be a mix of faculty and staff. He also said this seems more of a Due Process issue. Ball said the rest of the policy works; the question is who appoints the Grievance Hearing Committee. Routsong noted that it is a fast-moving committee. Ball then said that since that is the case, perhaps the executive committee could be in charge of appointing members. Russell said to just make it appointed by the Benefits committee. Pembroke said that the senate is involved in appeals during the termination process; perhaps the "Grievance" process is similar and so it can go along with this. Jackson noted that the Benefits committee would be a better place. The Senate overwhelmingly expressed that the Benefits committee should be the body to oversee the Grievance Hearing Committee.
- Should the handbook include procedure for Performance Improvement Plans—and if so, what should these look like? (Tracy Routsong). Should there be standardization? Wohl said there is standardization for tenure-track individuals in order to terminate them. Pembroke argued this was a related but separate issue and said that we are being asked whether the plan should have specific dates attached to it and should the forms and methods of improvement be standardized. Mastrosimone argued that we would probably want it to be as standardized as possible for employment fairness. Routsong wondered if we should ask Chairs for their thoughts before the Senate acted in any way. Porta wondered who can initiate them; Pembroke said it was Chairs and Deans. Ball summarized that going to the Chairs at this point is key.

XIII. Announcements: None

XIV. President Ball adjourned the meeting at 4:43pm.

General Education New Course Review

Committee Meeting

October 20, 2015

Members Present: Kayla Carter, Vickie Kelly, Jean Marshall, Kara Kendall-Morwick, Dmitri Nizovtsev, Kelly Watt, Roy Wohl, Nancy Tate

Electronically: Cheryl Childers, Lori Edwards, Eric Matthews, Paul Wagner

10 new courses were submitted for General Education consideration. The committee members thoughtfully reviewed these courses prior to the committee meeting and then discussed their viewpoints at the meeting on October 20, 2015. The following decisions were made at the meeting:

EN 134, CCT	Classics of Western Literature	Conditionally Approved (Modifications to the course were requested)
EN 145, COM	Shakespeare in Action	Conditionally Approved (Modifications to the course were requested)
PO 255, CCT	Introduction to the Legal System	Approved
PY 212, ILT	Psychology of Adulthood and Aging	Conditionally Approved (Modifications to the course were requested)
HN 201, CCT	Seminar in the Humanities and Fine Arts	Conditionally Approved (Modifications to the course were requested)
HN 202, CCT	Seminar in the Social Sciences	Conditionally Approved (Modifications to the course were requested)
HN, 203, CCT	Seminar in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics	Conditionally Approved (Modifications to the course were requested)
HN 301, CCT	Seminar in the Humanities and Fine Arts	Course was placed in a pending status
HN 302, CCT	Seminar in the Social Sciences	Course was placed in a pending status
HN 303, CCT	Seminar in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics	Course was placed in a pending status

Library Committee Minutes

October 21st, 2015

Room 105

4:00 p.m.

The Library Committee convened in Mabee Library at 4:00 p.m. The following members were present: Sean Bird, Dr. Brown, Dr. Chamberlain, Dr. Grant, Dr. Hull, Dr. Ladstaetter, Dr. Messay, Dr. Park, Dr. Porta, Dr. Thomas, and Penny Weiner. Dr. Bearman, Keith Farwell, Dr. Schmalzried, and Dr. Wilkinson sent word they would be unable to attend.

Dr. Erin Grant agreed to Chair the Library Committee for 2015/2016. Motion passed by acclamation. The committee thanked Dr. Thomas for his service.

Mr. Bird introduced Amanda Luke, the new Public/Access Librarian. Discussion centered on Open Access Textbooks. At the last committee meeting in April 2015, Dr. Berman reported that the University of Kansas, led by their libraries, has become a leader in the open access movement with regard to research publications. He thought Washburn could play an interesting and important role in the conversation regarding open access textbooks and student success. The key to open access adoption is to incentivize the faculty to reconsider the books they use and provide them the time and resources necessary to redesign their courses to accommodate open access materials.

Mr. Bird reported that Dr. Bearman, like all Deans, was informed by the President that the need for budget frugality is necessary. No decisions about nor timelines for budget cuts was discussed. The University Libraries ability to reduce budgets is constrained by advance orders for a variety of materials. Therefore, the library faculty representatives were asked to have FY16 materials request turned into their library liaison no later than 5:00 p.m., November 13th. An updated liaison list is attached.

The librarians have been working on a draft to submit to the Faculty Handbook Committee and Faculty Affairs regarding tenure for academic librarians. Mr. Bird asked that if anyone is interested in reading the draft before it is submitted to contact him (x1550) or Dr. Bearman (x1855).

Meeting Adjourned at 4:35p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Ginger D. Webber

Administrative Specialist

MINUTES

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday, October 15, 2015

Lincoln Room – 2:30 p.m.

Present:, Vickie Kelly (Chair), Joel Bluml (for Denise Ottinger), Jane Carpenter, Kayla Carter, Sarah Cook, Emily Grant, Tom Hickman, Karen Kapusta-Pofahl, Elaine Lewis, Amy Memmer, Sean Stacey, Nancy Tate, Roy Wohl, Margaret Wood and CJ Crawford (administrative support). Absent: Melanie Burdick, Bob Handley, Maria Stover, Clayton Tatro and Nancy Tate.

STATUS OF PLANS AND REPORT REVIEW ~ FUTURE TIMELINE AND PROCESS FOR REVIEW

Ratings have been sent out for all reports/plans not requiring a meeting. The plan is to have the ratings for the remaining reports/plans that require a meeting out by the end of October. Vickie will notify interested committee members when meetings are scheduled in case anyone would like to accompany her.

Co-curricular plans will be added this year. A draft of a revised Assessment Plan and Rubric will be ready for committee review by the November meeting.

Still working on the plan to review the reports and updated plans in the future.

CO-CURRICULAR WEBINAR

The webinar in September was well attended and was a very good presentation. Vickie will see if there is a link she can provide to those who weren't able to view it.

ASSESSMENT EXTRAVAGANZA

The Assessment Extravaganza will be early in February and will focus on University Student Learning Outcomes. Volunteers to prepare posters are:

Creative Thinking (Torrance) – Jane

Critical Thinking – Melanie Burdick, Kayla Carter, Karen Kapusta-Pofahl

ETS – Vickie Kelly and Sarah Cook

MSL – Michael Gleason

CJ will send the poster template that Vickie created last year out to people working on the posters.

It was recommended that some type of follow-up event be held a few weeks later.

The planning subcommittee members are Vickie Kelly, Kayla Carter, Nancy Tate and CJ Crawford.

ASSESSMENT GRANTS

Funds were awarded for two out of the four grant submissions. Vickie asked committee members to encourage people to apply for the grants even if they have done so before.

OTHER

There are two more C-Tel Assessment Workshops – Monday, October 19 and October 26 in Garvey 231 from 3:15 p.m. to 4:15 p.m.

The meeting adjourned.

NEXT MEETING: Thursday, November 12 @ 2:30P – Lincoln Room

Honors Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 2, 2015

Crane Room – 12:00 p.m.

Call to Order

I. Review of Minutes from April 1, 2015 - Approved

II. Welcome to New Members of the Honors Advisory Board

III. Honors Student Council Report

- Emily informed the board members on developments with Honors Student Council.

IV. Unfinished Business – None

V. New Business

A. Revised wording on Website for course proposals was proposed:

Old: “Full-time, tenure-track faculty members interested in teaching an Honors Course are invited to complete the following forms (see links below).”

New: “Faculty members interested in teaching an Honors Course are invited to complete the following forms (see links below).”

Rationale: “As you know, many full-time faculty have terminal degrees in their fields and are (not without exception, of course) more than qualified to propose, and teach, engaging, rigorous, beneficial courses. I'd not want to see students miss out because of some unfortunate wording on a website. Proposals should be evaluated on merit, not on academic class distinctions.”

B. Course Proposals involving 300-level courses cross-listed with HN200-Level courses – should we require the 300-level course to be Gen Ed approved?

- Board members agreed that this should not be required.

C. Qualifications for being admitted into Honors – should we change? Currently, it's either GPA of 3.5 or ACT of 28.

- Tabled until data can be analyzed to determine if such a change should be required. Will return to this issue in the Spring to gather another semester's worth of data.

D. Review of Honors Advisory Board Subcommittees

1. Curriculum – purpose (Reviewed)
 - a. Major purpose was to assist with the review of Honors Course Proposals and to help with creation of new honors courses
 - b. Need to review process for proposing courses and, in general, curriculum for honors students
 - c. Current members: Jennifer Ball, Andrew Herbig, Debbie Isaacson, Vanessa Steinroetter, Kelly Erby, John Burns, Jean Sanchez, and Michael Hager. Student representatives include Malcolm and Whitney.
2. Admission – purpose
 - a. Major purpose to assist with reviewing applications
 - b. Need to schedule a meeting in which we discuss the application materials and process
 - o Board members agreed that students should be included on this committee so long as no identifying information
3. Scholarship – purpose
 - a. Major purpose is to assist with reviewing apps
 - b. Assist with decisions in awarding Brunt Scholarships as well as scholarships awarded at Spring Banquet
4. Appeals – purpose
 - a. For students who do not get into program with extenuating circumstances
 - b. For students who fail to meet requirements two consecutive semesters with extenuating circumstances
 - c. Both Jennifer and David agreed to forward information to me (Michael M.) to assist in the development of a policy.

VI. Announcements

A. Visiting Fink Professor – Dr. John Zubizarreta

1. Thursday, Sept. 10, 1:00 – 2:15 PM: Presentation in my HN101 course with Leadership students being invited
2. Thursday, Sept. 10, 3:15 – 4:45 PM: Workshop: Learning Portfolios for Students (Register on C-TEL)
3. Friday, Sept. 11, 10:00 – 11:30 AM: Workshop: Teaching and Administrative Portfolios (Register on C-TEL)
4. Friday, Sept. 11, 12:00 – 1:00 PM: Lunch with HAB Members and Other Stakeholders (W Room)
5. Friday, Sept. 11, 3:00 – 4:30 PM: Inspiring Exceptional Teaching and Learning (Kansas Room)

B. Next Meeting: Curriculum and Appeal Subcommittee on Wednesday, October 7, 12:00 – 12:50 (Crane)

SR 14-15 #002

TITLE: Smoking on Campus
ORIGINATOR: White/McAfee Administration
SPONSOR:
STATUS:

WHEREAS: A smoke-free policy is one that limits or eliminates the use of smoke-producing tobacco products and,

WHEREAS: 663 students were polled, which is 10% of all students and of those: 68% of students want smoke free campus, 62% have been bothered by smoke on campus and,

WHEREAS: Washburn Student Government Association supports students, and the students are in favor of a smoke free campus and, it is the duty of Washburn Student Government Association to protect the interests of students.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

SECTION ONE: Due to the health hazards associated with smoking, and the voices of students, Washburn Student Government Association will work with University administrators and campus police in order to become a smoke free campus by the Fall of 2015.

Cassandra White
WSGA President

Randi McAfee
WSGA Vice President

COMMITTEE VOTE

SENATE VOTE

00 Affirmative

00 Affirmative

00 Negative

00 Negative

00 Abstain

00 Abstain