I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of March 9, 2009. (pp. 2-3).

III. President’s Opening Remarks.

IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.

V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.

VI. University Committee Minutes.
   A. Minutes from the International Education Committee meeting of March 5, 2009. (pg. 4)
   B. Minutes from the Academic Integrity Committee. (pp 5-7)

VII. Old Business.
   A. Vote of no confidence in Mike Gunter as head of Information Systems and Services (ISS) (Action Item 09-01). (pg. 8)
   B. College of Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs Committee proposal (Action Item 09-03). (pg. 9)

VIII. New Business.
   A. Notification of Infraction—Academic Impropriety Form (Action Item 09-06). (pg. 10-11)

IX. Information Items.

X. Discussion Items.
   A. Taking roll after first week of class (VPAA Bowen).

XI. Announcements.

XII. Adjournment.
Faculty Senate
Washburn University

Minutes of March 9, 2009
Kansas Room, Memorial Union

Present: Berry, Bowen (VPAA), Byrne, Camarda, Chorba, Concannon, Croucher, Duncan, Jackson, Kaufman, Kerchner, Khan, Lunte, Manske, McGuire, Melick, Naylor, Patzel, Porta, Pownell, Prasch (President), Ray, Routson, Russell, C. Schmidt, S. Schmidt, Sharafy, Shipley, Sullivan, Unruh, Walker, Wynn

I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:33 PM.

II. The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of Jan. 26, 2009 were approved.

III. President’s Opening Remarks.
   A. Prasch reported that the final resolution of the issue of compensation for scholarly/creative WTEs is now posted on the Faculty Senate website. The policy resembles the plan VPAA Bowen outlined recently to the Senate.
   B. Prasch reported at the budget shortfall was recently discussed at two Town Hall meetings and that Wanda Hill’s budget is posted on President Farley’s website. Prasch said he imagines that the comments and discussions conducted at the meetings will soon be featured on the site as well.
   C. Prasch called senators’ attention to the recent (9 March) email from Russ Jacobs about the need for a new at-large senator. More information will be forwarded when nominations are in.

IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
   A. The President reported that the BOR has not met since the Senate’s Jan. 26 meeting. Prasch stated that he will attend the March 20th BOR meeting and will report back to the Senate with the proceedings on March 23.

V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
   A. The minutes from the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of Dec. 10, 2008 were approved.
   B. The minutes from the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of Feb. 9, 2009 were corrected (the sentence about “Old Business: under II was deleted) and approved.
   C. The minutes from the Academic Affairs Committee meeting of Feb. 9, 2009 were approved. The Proposed program changes and deletions in English (Action item 09-05 a), the proposed minor in Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino/a Studies (b), and the Changes for the Bachelor of Arts in Music Degree (c) were approved as well.

VI. University Committee Minutes.
   A. The minutes from the Library Committee meeting of Feb. 16, 2009 were accepted.
   B. The minutes from the Faculty Development Committee meeting of Feb. 6, 2009 were accepted.
   C. The minutes from the International Education Committee meeting of Feb. 5, 2009 were accepted.
D. The minutes from the Assessment Committee meeting of Dec. 9, 2008 were accepted.
E. The minutes from the Executive Committee of the University Graduate Council meeting of Jan. 7, 2009 were accepted. The Senate took up the Clinical Nurse Leader Proposal (Action Item 09-04) as a second reading since the Graduate Council had already discussed it and voted in support of it. The action item passed unanimously.

VII. Old Business.
A. The vote of no confidence in Mike Gunter as head of Information Systems and Services (ISS) (Action Item 09-01) will take place on March 23. Prasch reported that the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate met March 6 and agreed, in response to a request from VPAA Bowen, to allow a further delay of action on the No Confidence motion to allow Gunter ample time to formulate a response.
B. Several senators debated the pros and cons of the revision of the catalog language on repetition of courses (Action Item 09-02) document.
   1) As a friendly amendment, Prasch suggested adding “subject to departmental approval” to immediately follow “Undergraduate courses may be repeated.” Several senators raised new problems with the suggested language.
   2) S. Schmidt then made a motion to send the document to the AAC for tweaking. Eight senators voted in favor of the motion and 11 opposed it, so the motion failed.
   3) Prasch proposed the following alternative language: after the sentence “Undergraduate courses may be repeated,” this sentence was added: “Courses for which grades of Ds and Fs are recorded can be retaken without departmental approval; courses for which a grade of C, or pass, or higher are recorded will require departmental approval.”
   4) Some senators still had doubts about the language and someone made a motion to go back to “Undergraduate courses may be repeated, subject to departmental approval.” The motion failed.
   5) The Senate returned to the aforementioned alternative language “courses for which grades of Ds….” Sixteen senators voted in favor of the motion and 9 voted against it. The action item then passed.

VIII. New Business.
A. Senators discussed the College of Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs Committee proposal at length and the action item (09-03) closed on first reading.

IX. Information Items.

X. Discussion Items.
A. The FAC asked the Senate to discuss the Proposed Domestic Partner policy the Benefits Committee delivered to the President in 2003. Prasch expressed his support for the proposed policy, calling it long overdue. C. Schmidt raised the issue of missing dates in the document and another senator mentioned that if Washburn were to approve the policy that the State of Kansas might cut the university’s funding. It was mentioned that none of the other Regents institutions have adopted this document.

XI. Announcements. There were none.

XII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 PM.
International Education /International WTE Committee
March 5, 2009, International House

In attendance: Norma Juma, Brian Ogawa, Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas, Cecil Schmidt, Janice Dunwell, Rachel Goossen, Judy McConnell-Farmer, Ron Griffin, and Baili Zhang

1. Minutes of Feb. 5 meeting were approved.

2. Zhang reported that the Fukuoka study-tour group finish up their studies on campus and will go to Oklahoma City and Dallas for the tour portion and that there will be a PBD reception on March 6 to honor new international faculty and prospective inductees. Zhang also reported that two international faculty Norma Juma and Dmitri Nizovtsev have been awarded the Sweet Sabbatical.

Griffin reported that the Law School had just hosted The Honorable Joe Ghartey, Ghana’s Minister of Justice, who, as scholar in residence, lectured on oil and gas regulations.

3. Approving faculty travel requests:

   Sungkyu Kwak: $1,200 to Japan/Korea
   Yeqiang Wang: $1,200 to China
   Sharla Blank: $850 to Jamaica
   Park’s proposal was not funded.

4. The committee discussed “Type 2” study abroad programs (p. 39, University 08-09 Catalog) in relation to funding. Suggestions as a result of discussion included re-arranging the three types in the order of Type 3, 1 and 2, with Type 2 having a qualifying clause or a restrictive condition, such as “with the approval of the Director of International Programs or the Washburn Transformational Experience Committee’. Guidelines to base the decisions on were also suggested. No formal action was taken.

5. As an information item, Zhang informed the committee of the need to develop clear and consistent guidelines for the faculty-led WTE programs. A sub-committee may be appointed to develop the initial version.

Respectfully submitted,

Baili Zhang
Executive Summary:
The Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) was established in 2006 at the request of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Ron Wasserstein with the acquiescence of the Faculty Senate and with membership in the Center for Academic Integrity then located at Duke University. The AIC’s first task was to conduct an Academic Integrity Survey with both Washburn faculty and students; the survey used was created by the Center for Academic Integrity so that Washburn results can be compared with national aggregate data. Not surprisingly, the results of the study found that faculty perceived academic integrity to be a greater problem on this campus than did students; this finding is in accord with national aggregate results.

Next, the AIC conducted focus groups with both students and faculty. The student focus groups were conducted in English 101 and English 300 classes in order to reach a representative cross section of the student body. Faculty groups were assembled through volunteers identified by the deans of the schools and the division chairs in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), again aiming for a representative cross section. The focus groups were conducted by graduate students in the clinical psychology program who received training from Dave Provorse (Chair and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Psychology) and Vice President of Student Affairs, Denise Ottinger. The student groups revealed that students are unclear about the Academic Integrity Policy on campus, that there is a perception among students that rules regarding academic integrity are enforced unequally across campus, and that sanctions are not applied equally. Faculty focus groups revealed a lack of clarity about Academic Integrity Policy and doubts about administrative support of faculty who wish to sanction students found guilty of academic impropriety; this doubt about administrative support was perceived at the chair, dean, and VPAA levels.

Finally, the AIC studied all of these results, consulted their own experiences, and studied Academic Misconduct Policy at other institutions. Clearly ambiguity about Academic Integrity exists on all levels of the Washburn University community (students, faculty, and administration), and the following recommendations address those ambiguities. After two years of study and consultation, the AIC makes the following recommendations to the Faculty Senate and to the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

Academic Integrity Committee Recommendations:

I. The university must create a positive atmosphere in which academic growth and development can flourish, and academic integrity can become a priority for all members of the community. Faculty, students, and administration must realize that Academic Integrity applies to all and is a crucial part of an academic environment: Administration <> Faculty <> Students

A. Begin Fall semesters with a Roll out. An “Integrity Week”
B. Create an Integrity web page

C. Create a mandatory integrity quiz or tutorial

II. Academic Misconduct Policies (AMP) must be widely available

A. Create a direct Link to policy on Student and Faculty pages

III. AMP must be widely **Understood**

A. Recommend senate appointment of a committee to review and update the Academic Misconduct policy and write a supplemental policy in plain English

IV. Recommend a separate Academic Appeals Board for Academic Misconduct hearings. Train board members

V. Recommend Formal Discussions at:
   1. New faculty orientation
   2. Faculty development workshops (faculty development has asked us to offer a symposium this spring semester)
   3. In individual class rooms
   4. New Student orientation
   5. At campus forums
   6. Faculty Workshops at school and division level with case studies

VI. Need improved communication:

A. Faculty to
   1. Department chair
   2. Dean of Students (Notification Form)

B. Dean of Students to:

   1. Individual faculty (notify of results)
   2. Annual report in aggregate format to:
      Faculty Senate
      Student Senate
      Campus Newspaper
   3. Recommend a registry with names of violators of Academic Impropriety Policy in Dean of Students Office. After the
adjudication process is completed, names of specific students on the list could be made available to appropriate faculty on a need to know basis.

VII Recommend the assessment of the success of the recommendations (if implemented) in five years by conducting the Academic Integrity Survey again with both students and faculty.
Faculty Senate Action Item

Date: 18 January 2009

Subject: Vote of no confidence in Mike Gunter as head of Information Systems and Services (ISS)

Description:

Because, as head of ISS, Mike Gunter has repeatedly initiated policies and procedures, as detailed in the appended document, that interfere with faculty research and scholarship, academic computing, classroom teaching, library access, faculty privacy, academic freedom, and faculty and student rights to intellectual property;

because the Faculty Senate, members of the faculty, and other constituted committees of the faculty have repeatedly sought redress and changes in his patterns of behavior and have repeatedly been met with stonewalling, dishonesty, and a failure to amend such behaviors and policies;

the Faculty Senate declares that it has no confidence in Mike Gunter as head of ISS.

REQUESTED ACTION: Faculty Senate approval and transmission to Vice President for Administration Wanda Hill, Vice President for Academic Affairs Robin Bowen, and President Jerry Farley.

Date: Jan. 18, 2009

Originated by: Thomas Prasch in fulfillment of requested action by the FS President

Faculty Senate.
Faculty Senate Action Item

Date: 5 February 2009

Number: 09-03

Subject:

"The Academic Affairs Committee shall consist of two (2) Faculty Senate members from each of the School of Applied Studies, the School of Business, and the School of Nursing, and five (5) Faculty Senate members from the College of Arts and Sciences (1 per Division), 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 eight of the twelve members; eight members shall constitute a quorum to conduct business. The VPAA shall be a non-voting ex-officio member of the committee."

Approved by:

College of Arts and Sciences Faculty
February 5, 2009
Faculty Senate Action Item

Date: March 9, 2009
Number: 09-06

Subject: Notification of Infraction—Academic Impropriety Form

Description:
A proposed form for faculty to submit infractions of academic integrity policy to Dean of Students office.

To: Dean of Students
From: Name of Faculty making complaint
RE: Notification of Infraction—Academic Impropriety

I. Infraction?
   Name of student:
   Kind of infraction

II. Dispensation?
   A. Faculty
      a. Warning issued
      b. Grade on assignment lowered
      c. Failing Grade on assignment
      d. Course Grade Lowered
      e. Failing Grade for course
      f. Other
   B. Dean of Students
      a. Notification only; Matter taken care of at faculty level
      b. Adjudication requested
         1. Dean of Students
         2. Academic Review Board

III. Notification (checklist)
A. Faculty to Dean of Students
B. Dean of Students to Faculty filing report
C. Dean of Students to Student reported
D. Dean of Student’s Report to Senates (without names attached)
E. Infraction entered in Registry

Date: March 9, 2009   Originated by: J. Karen Ray
Chair, Academic Integrity Committee