

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
January 23, 2023 at 3pm
Meeting in Forum Room Hosted by FS Executive Committee

Present: Barraclough, Cook-Cunningham, Dahl, Ewert, Florea, Friesen, Ginzburg, Grant, Holt, Huff, Juma, Kay, Kendall-Morwick, Kimberly, McGuire, Modellmog, Noonan, Porta, Rivera, Sainato, Schmidt, Scofield, Smith, Toerber-Clark, Wagner, Zwikstra

Absent: Cassell, Lolley, Rossi, Sourgens, Wang, Wasserstein

Guests: Stephenson L, Ball J, Leffingwell Q, Hanes S, Broxterman H, Luoma S, Lanning S, Grospitch E, Erby K, Bailes J, Hutchinson L, Morse K

- I. Call to Order by Schmidt at 3:03 pm
- II. Approve minutes- Moved by McGuire and seconded by Kay. Motion passes.
 - November 28, 2022 (pages 2-8)
- III. President's Opening Remarks
 - Introduction of new people – Kim Morse, Joy Bailes, and Lori Hutchinson
 - Welcome back – We have a new president starting soon. Looking forward to working with JuliAnn Mazachek.
 - PLEASE make sure you fill out the HERI survey. (Link came out this morning, Jan 23, by email.) It is anonymous, please take time to give the feedback so that we can grow.
 - Constitution is nearing completion. We are going to act as if it will pass, so that we can take the faculty census this February following the guidelines given there. Hopefully we will bring it back next time (next meeting). There are still questions about graduate council that need to be answered. They are meeting next week so hopefully that will resolve some of the issues.
 - Old Business on the agenda – MACNLE was on WUBOR agenda earlier but was pulled because of concerns that it wasn't handled by the proper process. Schmidt read an email he sent earlier today about how to handle this item (based on confusion on process, not the merit of the item.) The question is whether or not this change in admission standards requires faculty senate approval. There are different opinions about interpretation of guidelines which are being used for this (FS, WUBOR). Below are the three options outlined by Schmidt in his email:
 - Assuming that this is a program of Communications Department within the College of Arts and Sciences, the College faculty should follow their process to make the recommendation (with the guidance of the CAS Dean) to the University President. The item

could be sent forward to Graduate Council and Faculty Senate, but would not be required. The MS is listed in the current graduate catalog as a degree offered within CAS.

- If this is a truly an interdisciplinary program it goes through the faculty governance structures of those units followed by the Graduate Council and Faculty Senate which makes the recommendation to the University President.
- Based on the practice of treating graduate programs differently, but not on existing language within the WUBOR ByLaws, Faculty Senate Constitution, and/or Faculty Handbook; accept the Graduate Council's passage of this item as the "Major Academic Unit" and move it to an information item for today's agenda as requested.
- After completion of reading of the email (including the options listed above), discussion followed. Ball reported that Jim Schnoebelen talked to her and was told to follow the College's process. There were conversations with individuals in the CAS office. While all conversations were not clearly recalled, Erby did state that she and Schnoebelen consulted the Graduate Council Charge and believed that it could go from department to Graduate Council which would recommend to WUBOR. This fits with Ball's understanding from Schnoebelen of what occurred. Ball believes that the discussions with CAS mean that this action item did go through the College process. Schmidt believes it should have gone through CFC as part of the process. Schmidt also mentions that the steps for handling changes in graduate programs are muddy right now. The main issue appears to be what type of change it is and the pathway that is appropriate for the approval to follow. Zwickstra comments that based on the conversation it seems reasonable for this item to go on and moves that we move it from Old Business to an Information Item on today's agenda as was requested by the VPAA's office. Modellmog seconds. Motion passes.

IV. WUBOR/KBOR Update- Shaun Schmidt/Erin Grant

- KBOR
- WUBOR – Grant reported that there were several items discussed at WUBOR: sabbaticals, WU Tech, increasing the value of items requiring approval of the Board from \$50,000 to \$100,000 due to inflation, discussion of costs for Ellucian (Degree Works, Banner) and other programs which are used by the University. There was also discussion of shifting costs of Bar Preparation for Law School to fees within the program which will allow students to use Financial Aid to cover these costs. Momentum 2027 has started (as part of Greater Topeka Partnership) and Washburn is part of this. There was a request to encourage everyone to complete the cybersecurity trainings that help keep the University and all

of us safe. As a side note, I'm the chair of the Graduate Council, so please talk to me if there is anything you would like the Council to know/do.

V. VPAA Update - Dr. Laura Stephenson

- Lots has happened since we last met. Thank you to those who participated in commencements, and turned in grades in a timely fashion. Now we have a new semester underway and a new president. Thank you to those who were on the search committee. It was a lot of work.
- We have finished compiling all the information from the sessions for the Academic Bridge Strategic Plan and that will be coming out soon. Also, the HERI survey is going out, so please fill it out. It is for faculty only, so if you have too much of an administrative portion to your load, you can't fill it out. Everyone will be able to participate in the next one. You will be hearing about the Climate Survey later today. This one goes out to faculty, staff, and students. The last time there was frustration over the questions on the survey and the delay in the results. I think this one will be better since we are using Hanover. We are refining the groups of questions to make sure they hit the areas people were concerned about last time. The last survey is the Basic Needs Survey which looks at food, transportation, child care, etc. PLEASE fill each of these out as they will help us decide what to prioritize.
- J Ball has been working hard on the HLC Desk Review and the General Education potential changes. Stephenson has asked her to report on these: The Academic Affairs Committee will get a report on these this Monday and we will move forward from there. The four General Education meetings for faculty went well and people were very engaged. The HLC desk review lock date is February 27th. Please send any information that has been requested as quickly as possible since this needs to be put together and we don't have much time to be following up multiple times. This affects all of us, so please get these materials in.
- There are many tasks happening in the VPAA's office. Thanks to Steve Luoma, Holly Broxterman, and Beth Matthews who are working tirelessly to keep everything going.
- JuliAnn Mazacheck starts February 1st, and will have meetings with various groups during the first few weeks, to help her connect with everyone in her new position.
- WUBOR meets February 2nd next week. On the agenda is a proposal to make Juneteenth a WU holiday, so we may have to look at summer school schedules. (Wagner: Will this take effect this summer or next? Stephenson: That is a good question. We will have to find that out.)
- Grant: Has Mazacheck suggested how soon she wants to get the ball rolling on a new VPAA or is that still up in the air? Stephenson: I think that's part of the listening tour, but it will depend on what she hears. She will probably not drag it out, but also won't post it the first day.

VI. Consent Agenda – Scofield moves to accept and Grant seconds. Motion passes.

- Faculty Senate Committee Reports- none
- University Committee Reports-

- Assessment Committee Minutes 20221117 (pages 9-10)
 - Graduate Council Minutes 20221003 (pages 11-12)
- VII. Old Business- Item under Old Business (23-2 MACNLE Admission Standards) was moved to Information Items earlier in the meeting.
- VIII. New Business- None
- IX. Information Items-
 - 23-2 MACNLE Admission Standards – Jennifer Ball (pages 13-14)
 - Climate Survey Data – Kelly Erby and Jennifer Ball (pages 15-100)
 - You can read the full Executive Report and there is a Technical report available upon request. The slides shown today will be added as an addendum to the minutes.
 - Company used last time already had a contract with Resident Life, so added on this at no cost, but got what we paid for. We revised questions which prevented us from comparing our data to other schools, but did allow us to compare to ourselves. Went over sample types of questions, etc. Loss of benchmarking and reporting due to changing the questions meant WU had to do its own data analysis (used 5-7 not 6-7 for agree, and 1-3 not 1-2 for not agree, and 4 is only neutral vs 3-5 for neutral). Porta: Why did you decide this, did the group explain why they did this (in terms of the numbering options)? Ball: No, we just talked about this and it seemed like this was better. Erby: All of this was also happening during COVID, so lots of delay. Wanting to be transparent about what happened to improve the next survey happening in 2023. Data was analyzed for WUstudents, WU fac/staff, WU administration, etc.
 - Good news: WU students agreed with most of the positive statements in the climate survey (80%) and agreed at lower levels (65-70%) for statements about administration and policies. The lowest agreement was about statements on diversity, lighting, Senior Leadership, etc.)
 - Bad news: students who are not in the Majority were less in agreement with the positive statements, and were much more likely to have considered leaving WU or transferring.
 - Good for Faculty/Staff: most agreed with positive statements about the University, Faculty, and Staff. Views on Administration were less positive (but still positive).
 - Bad for Faculty/Staff: diversity, senior leadership, lighting. More Faculty and Staff felt they needed to “hide” characteristics of their group to fit in.
 - Qualitative analysis – These are open ended questions analyzed using NVIVO for Student responses, but didn’t need to use for Faculty and Staff responses. Still had lots of comments, some “themes” came up but not a majority of people giving these themes. Felt like there is a lack of trust between Administration and

respondents. Many felt their requests were being ignored, especially in the area of Diversity and Inclusion. Also, high cost of attending WU came up. Many wanted more diversity training and diversity courses. Others felt there was too much diversity emphasis. Students felt disconnected from campus and felt student groups were segregated/cliquish. There were repeated calls for increased mental support. (Schmidt: this is before COVID, correct? Ball: Yes – many things we would have attributed to COVID, but that hadn't happened yet.). Repeated concern for lighting and safety on campus.

- Qualitative analysis for Faculty/Staff: most concerns related to Diversity and Inclusion issues. Comments recognized efforts had been made, but more needs to be done. Many also mentioned burnout among employees.
- Hanover Research is doing the Climate survey this time (Feb 13, 2023, HERI starts Jan 23, and Basic needs start Feb 27th. End dates are of less importance.) They will do all the analysis and will provide recommendations for improvement in late 2023. They may also conduct focus group interviews. They will manage incentives for student survey. This should allow for a better chance to follow our results and compare them to ourselves, but not with other groups. Moddelmog: Is this an issue to not compare ourselves to others? JB/KE: The group feels it's more important to compare to ourselves. Schmidt: Does HERI allow for comparative benchmarks? J Ball: Very few, but it does have some. Porta: Have we discussed with the statisticians in Mathematics department about any of the analysis? Ball: no, but using people in Strategic Analysis, Research, and Reporting. Moddelmog: Thinking about this as a student, would it be helpful to compare to others to see how one school compares to another. Erby: When we have done this, the benchmarking is not that helpful. Moddelmog: Gap (Gaspar) makes a good point, that maybe we should use people with expertise in our University. Ball: I'm thinking he isn't implying that Mathematics and Statistics write the survey. Porta: No, but I do think we have people who might be able to help see if the analysis was done well. Erby: We're looking forward to seeing what an outside company thinks. Ball: We should ask math, but hope that we stick with the same questions which will allow us to compare them with each other in future years. Kendall-Morwick: If burnout was already high, doing this internally would add more burden. Moddelmog: Just trying to see if we can do this ourselves, if we aren't getting the benefit of comparing to others. Grant: Looking at other data, and this (comparing between schools)

doesn't necessarily happen elsewhere. Need to make sure the work the Diversity Committee is doing gets out to others. Ewert: What have we done with this data in the past, and are we following the same process or is this changing? Erby: They have done town halls, other meetings across campus, etc in the past. This isn't really actionable since we think the data isn't as good, but will do this in the future. Morris: We did a "road show" in 2010 and 2013, and focus groups. The information was shared with all major constituencies. As flawed as this one was, it was still better than the last ones which were all in-house. LOTS of work to do, outside group is exciting to help us see what we need to change. Wording has remained the same on questions, but results have not really changed. Ewert: were the results provided to candidates for the Presidential Search and then were they asked about them? Erby: Not the specific data, but we did have questions about diversity. Juma – There was wording along these lines. Florea: Agree with Morse, it is not realistic to be all in-house. It is more beneficial to have a sense of how questions are formed, and the data analyzed so that we have a better understanding of what happened. Results may be influenced by the survey. This will help us understand better. Erby/Ball: ADIC did see the questions and gave feedback (35 members on ADIC). We can always ask more people, but this group is pretty representative of campus. Grant: I know I had good conversations with Beth O'Neil about the questions. This has been taken seriously.

○

- Banner Student "Back to Basics" Alan Bearman
 - We have some work to do with systems. We use Banner to run the University (release 9) and there are multiple modules. We have not compared current processes even though changes have occurred over 20 years. There are forty systems now that plug into Banner, and they depend on Banner working well. (The processes that help us know how many majors we have, etc are not correct, which lead to incorrect data. See attached diagram for the links to Banner.) EAB products pull data from Banner. First Generation data is stored in multiple tables, so don't know which one to pull from. Luminous platform/portal is going away in 6 months. One hundred people will meet on Feb 7th for Banner Back to Basics, which will focus on Student Module to help us get our processes corrected so that people will not avoid Banner anymore. We will keep meeting Feb 8th and 15th (not all 100 people, but those who need to give input.) We can't maximize value of other systems until we have correct data. The consultants will help us determine what

fixes/projects we can do to correct these issues. Won't see anything immediately, but may see changes over next year (Registration PINs vs Holds, building a schedule). We are very inefficient right now. Using our recruitment software at 25% capacity due to the communication between Banner and that software. (Quick fixes, long-term fixes, and maintaining alignment are the three levels of goals). Institutional memory resides with a person, so retirements/moves will make the next person learn for themselves. How do we make sure that doesn't happen and help everyone be more efficient? There are 100 moving parts, but I want everyone to know that we are working on this. This is to give everyone a heads up. Schmidt: What are some of the things in the Student Module? Bearman: Navigate, Handshake, iAlert, iCard, Courseleaf, D2L. Not too much financial. Luoma: We can send the Starburst image in the minutes. Grant: Are there students included in the 100? Bearman: No, but it does include people from across campus, all major areas and some other groups. WU Tech is involved as well. (Law school is not.) We are going to move WU Tech into Banner Environment since their software is no longer supported.

X. Discussion Items-

- Standing Rules Suggestions (Round II) – Izzy Wasserstein
 - Schmidt asks for any additional items that people would like to see added to Standing Rules. After a moment or two of silence, Wagner suggests that if anyone has any additional ideas they send them to one of the officers for Faculty Senate.
- Faculty Termination Procedures – Gaspar Porta
 - This process has a lot of steps to it and was looked into a number of years ago and changes were made. Some of those changes may have been moved from a committee of peers to an unique individual (University President), and the committee's recommendation is now just a suggestion. The rewriting may still be going on. The question is if this decision should be due to a committee of peers vs a single individual. I think this is an important topic for us to consider. I've distributed some of these documents to other senators (and want to coordinate with others) to make sure I know how these processes are perceived across campus. Stephenson: I'm not sure what document you are referring to and I've been on the Faculty Handbook Committee from a very long time. It (termination) is being reviewed again, and it will be coming to Faculty Affairs. Glad you are interested, but wouldn't want you to spend a long time on a draft that isn't correct. Porta: would love to see that (current documents), as I think there may be

some issues with how this process moves through committees. Stephenson: this process is currently being looked at on Handbook Committee. It was supposed to come up last year but didn't. I've been working with Mark Fried, but we won't have it for the meeting coming up in early February. It will go from Faculty Handbook, to Faculty Affairs, and then Faculty Senate. Scofield: so if Faculty Affairs doesn't pass this, what would happen? Stephenson: More conversations/renegotiation. Ewert: What is the time line? Stephenson: I would love to have a deadline. It's a complicated process, and it is very important. We have put quite a bit of work/effort into the wording, but don't know what will happen since Faculty Handbook Committee hasn't met in a long time. I hope it will come to you (Faculty Affairs/Faculty Senate) this spring. Grant: Will it come out before General Education comes into play? That might potentially affect Faculty Jobs (Thinking about Emporia... *Note from Secretary: reference is to several tenured faculty members at Emporia being terminated due to financial issues.) Stephenson: I don't really see them as related, since the termination we have been looking at is termination for cause, not due to financial reasons. Porta: I believe there are more safe guards, and there are some important differences in process and spirit in where the decision lies. I would like Faculty Senate to keep an eye on the process as this goes forward, especially on where the spirit lies for termination. Would like to make sure the concept of tenured-faculty is looked at. Schmidt: It can't be based on spirit, but what is written. Porta: Yes, but want to make sure what the words mean are what we think they mean, and the order of the decisions that are made. This is a first reading, so I'm not asking to move for anything. McGuire: Last Faculty Handbook Meeting was in 2021. Ball: This is still in Fac Handbook and has not moved on.

XI. Announcements

- None made

XII. Adjournment at 4:40 pm

- Moved by McGuire, seconded by Grant. Motion Passes.