

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate

Jan. 26, 2009
3:30 PM Kansas Room, Memorial Union

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of Dec. 8, 2008. (pp. 2-6).
- 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/ International WTE Committee meeting of Dec. 11, 2008. (pg. 7)
 - B. Minutes from the Assessment Committee meeting of Sept. 12, 2008. (pg 8)
 - C. Minutes from the Research Grants Committee meeting of Nov. 4, 2008. (pp. 9-10)
- VII. Old Business (revisted).
 - A. President Farley's objection to last year's Action Item 08-05a, Proposed changes to the currently existing Grievance Policy and Procedure (Appendix IX of the Faculty Handbook).
- VIII. New Business.
 - A. Vote of no confidence in Mike Gunter as head of Information Systems and Services (ISS) (Action Item 09-01). (pg. 11) Please see appendix (pp. 14-43).
 - B. Revision of the catalog language on repetition of courses (Action Item 09-02). (pp. 12-13)
- IX. Information Items.
- X. Discussion Items.
- XI. Announcements.
- XII. Adjournment.

**Faculty Senate
Washburn University**

*Minutes of Dec. 8, 2008
Kansas Room, Memorial Union*

Present: Arterburn, Berry, Bowen (VPAA), Byrne, Camarda, Chorba, Concannon, Croucher, Ding, Ginzburg, Jacobs, Kaufman, Kerchner, Khan, Lockwood, Manske, McGuire, Mechtly (sub for C. Schmidt) Melick, Naylor, Porta, Pownell, Prasch (President) , Ramirez, Ray, Routsong, Russell, S. Schmidt, Sharafy, Shipley, Sullivan, Unruh, Walker, Wunder, Wynn

- I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:32 PM.
- II. The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of Nov. 10, 2008 were approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks.
 - A. Prasch reported on the WTE Compensation Plan that President Farley presented to faculty members, deans, and VPAA administrators the morning of Dec. 8. Summarizing the plan Farley presented, Prasch said that the compensation in the form of a cash payment will be attached to credit courses (with tuition modeled on a 3-hour course). In many instances, the WTE will be factored into a faculty member's regular load, but in the event the member is doing a WTE independently, then the faculty member could be compensated. There could also be a division in compensation in the case where two faculty members divide the WTE advising. Prasch reported that this university-wide compensation plan referred specifically to the Scholarly and Creative TEs.
 - B. Prasch read a brief statement written by Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas, the chair of Modern Languages, who expressed dismay over the fact that Modern Language faculty often advise students who are going on semester- or year-long study abroad programs and that they must grade pre and post-departure papers. These papers often require revisions and thus a significant amount of a faculty member's time. While he knows that this work is significantly less than what is required of members advising Scholarly and Creative TEs, it is nonetheless more work and he hopes that the university will provide at least a little amount of compensation for this extra effort.
 - C. Bowen reported that it was not the intent to leave out the International Study Abroad TE and that should be addressed soon now that the plan for Scholarly and Creative TEs has been formulated.
 - D. Prasch also stated that Farley announced that advising TEs is still voluntary on the part of the faculty, though Unruh announced that it was not optional for SON faculty. Sharafy wondered if there was a back up plan for students who could not find a faculty member willing to work with them a particular semester and Walker wondered whether non-tenure-track faculty in SOB could oversee Scholarly and Creative TEs.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
 - A. Prasch reported that the Board of Regents would be meeting the week of Dec. 8 and said he would report on that meeting at the next Senate meeting.

- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
- A. Minutes from the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of Nov. 20, 2008 were approved (Schmidt's affiliation was corrected).
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
- A. Minutes from the General Education Review Committee meeting of Nov. 7, 2008 were accepted.
- B. Minutes from the General Education Review Committee meeting of Oct. 13, 2008 were accepted
- C. Minutes from the Faculty Development Committee meeting of Aug. 22, 2008 were accepted.
- D. Minutes from the Faculty Development Committee meeting of Nov. 14, 2008 were accepted.
- E. Minutes from the Library Committee meeting of Nov. 6, 2008 were accepted.
- F. Minutes from the Faculty Grants Committee of Oct. 17, 2008 were accepted.
- G. Minutes from the Curriculum Grants Committee of Oct. 21, 2008 were accepted.
- VII. Old Business.
- A. A motion for a friendly amendment to attach the following statement (which was approved by the General Faculty on May 9, 2002) to the end of Agenda Item 08-07 was made and passed:

“Each member of this joint appointment will receive an individual contract. Each member will receive half of the full-time compensation for the position. Both of the members sharing the full-time jointly-held appointment shall be entitled to benefits otherwise accruing to full-time faculty members. Among these are:

- Academic and Sweet Summer Sabbaticals (to be shared).
- Retirement (each receiving benefits based on their individual salary).
- Life insurance (each insured based on their individual salary).
- Group Health Insurance (each receiving full benefits; premium payments based upon salary, plan selected, and type of coverage elected).***
- Tuition waiver for children of either participant.

Note: The faculty benefit of short-term and long-term disability insurance will not be available to faculty members sharing jointly-held appointments due to insurance company regulations requiring full-time employment.”

***Indicates the section Deborah Moore reworded.**

B. A motion was then made to add a second friendly amendment to the document was made and approved. The following sentence will be added immediately after the sentence ending “that expected of a full-time faculty member”: “Responsibilities for teaching, research, and service should be balanced on an annual basis except by special agreement between the two members and the department.”

C. The motion for a third friendly amendment to add “in teaching, scholarship, and service” after “the accomplishments of each individual” was made and passed. The sentence now reads: “A joint petition may be prepared, but it should clearly state the accomplishments of each individual in teaching, scholarship, and service; each individual may choose to present his or her own petition.

- D. A fourth motion to correct the spelling of the word “petition” was made and passed.
- E. The Senate voted on the whole document (the entire action item 08-07) and it passed.

VIII. New Business.

There was none.

IX. Information Items.

There were none.

X. Discussion Items.

A. IT issues

a) Senators were asked to review the following documents before the senate meeting:

- 1) Russ Jacob’s memo to Robin Bowen about his concerns over Mike Gunter and IT issues at WU.
- 2) Alan Bearman’s emails outlining IT problems at the Mabee Library
- 3) The proposed *Electronic Information Security: Regulations and Procedures*
- 4) Minutes from the Faculty IT Advisory Council meeting of Oct. 22, 2008.
- 5) Resolutions regarding theISS electronic information security regulations from NS and SS divisions of CAS

b)President Prasch began with three points regarding IT issues at WU:

- 1) He pointed out the immediate and specific problem of the “alarming” *Electronic Information Security: Regulations and Procedures*
- 2) He claimed that the above mentioned document was “the straw that broke the camel’s back.”
- 3) He underscored two very specific issues:
 - i)The fact that the ISS director does no report to any academic unit causes difficulties.
 - ii) The specific problem of Mike Gunter and the frustrations faculty feel over the fact that he does not seem to listen to them.

c)Prasch raised the possibility of the Senate issuing a vote of no confidence in Gunter and then opened up the floor to comments from senators.

- i)Jacobs pointed out to Bowen the problem of lack of academic oversight of ISS.Bowen responded that this issue was one of the first she dealt with in July 2007. Bowen said she brought the two parties together and that progress on the issue seemed incremental, especially in regard to the fact that faculty gained two more spots on the steering committee. She acknowledged that issues remained and that faculty asked for a consultant to be brought to campus, but the one recommended had yet to respond to the request.
- ii) Sharafy said that he felt that the proposed regulations created rules that were being imposed on faculty who had never had the chance to offer feedback. He wondered who decided on the draft. Bowen responded that the document went to the IT Steering Committee and that she was incorrect in assuming that it had first gone to the Faculty Steering Committee.
- iii) Mechtly said that the academic side had been completely cut out .
- iv) Camarda stated that at a supercomputing conference, colleagues from other universities were surprised to learn that IT was not under academic oversight.

- v) Walker stated that the IT Advisory Committee saw pg 7-8 on the encryption of data, but did not see the rest of the document until a week before the Senate meeting.
- vi) Mechtly (sitting in for Senator C. Schmidt), stated that the document did not have to be so complex and claimed that if the document were passed the CIS would be derailed. He explained that CIS professors need administrative access because their students install thousands of pieces of software in order to test it. He added that as part of the CIS program, students are supposed to develop programs and asked: "How do you get permission for a piece of software that doesn't exist? This gives too much power to one person."
- vii) He claimed that 6.3.5 on pg 12 of the document would devastate computer classes.
- viii) Sharafy questioned whether Gunter would have time to give permission to an instructor every time that individual needed to download free software in order to test it to see whether it will work when teaching a class.
- ix) Concannon mentioned this could cause accreditation issues in the Law School and Law Library.
- x) Kaufman said that the FS needs to make a change in the director's reporting requirement.
- xi) Ray declared that IT problems in the library affect all of the CAS and that the library was mentioned as an issue in the accreditation report.
- xii) Jacobs said that the document requires the dept. head to carry an enormous amount of responsibility.
- xiii) Arteburn wondered aloud why the document, which requires so much of dept. heads, was never brought to their attention.
- xiv) Mechtly said that as department head, he would refuse to check his colleagues' cellphones or PDAs to see if they carried students' grades.
- xv) Bryne said that it seems as though Gunter had been making decisions that made his job easier.
- xvi) Jacobs called for a motion, citing the resolutions of Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. He suggested that the Senate adopt a similar resolution and have President Prasch forward it on to President Farley. Ray seconded the motion.
- xvii) Several senators expressed reservations about the "harsh" language of the wording of #4 in the NS and SS resolutions.
- xviii) Jacobs suggested pulling #4 (making the no confidence vote a separate issue), made a motion to do so and it passed.
- xix) McGuire suggested that the Senate include specific items to which it objects in the WUPRDM document and Prasch said that it would take at least a week to do so.

B. In the effort to save time, a motion was made to close the discussion of the resolution on first reading. The motion passed.

C) A motion was then made to suspend the rule requiring a second reading of the document. The motion passed unanimously.

D) A motion was then made to move the resolution to passage and the Senate voted unanimously to pass the resolution. Please find immediately below the resolution Prasch signed and sent to President Farley the evening of Dec. 8th:

Insofar as the proposed Regulations and Procedures for Electronic Information Security would impair the ability of faculty to engage in collaborative research, impede basic research by faculty and students, inhibit free flow of ideas, interfere with the normal operations of university libraries, ignore basic principles of academic freedom in classroom use of technology, eliminate

faculty and student rights to intellectual property, impose unreasonable requirements and oversight to a wide range of faculty and student academic activity, limit the ability of the university to engage with the wider community and its off-campus constituencies, and fundamentally undermine teaching practices,

The Faculty Senate resolves:

- 1) That the present proposals be immediately abandoned;
- 2) That any future such document be prepared with full involvement of academic units affected by such practices;
- 3) That clear academic faculty oversight be established for technology initiatives that directly affect academic programs and activities.

At the end of the meeting, Prasch asked the Senate to consider two issues: the pursuit of a vote of no-confidence in Gunter and the action of immediately composing a document that would outline the specifics the Senate would like to see vis à vis clear academic oversight of ISS. Senators affirmed that they would like to pursue both issues in the next FS meeting, though Unruh urged caution in the wording to be used in the vote of no-confidence, asking the senate not to use language that would be perceived as attacking Gunter's personality. Prasch requested that senators speak to their constituencies about the IT issues and report them to the executive committee which will soon begin work on a no-confidence document.

XI. Announcements.
There were none.

XII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by Courtney Sullivan, Secretary to the Faculty Senate.

**International Education /International WTE Committee
December 11, 2008, International House**

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

1. Zhang reminded the committee that Thomas' application for funding and "The Sport Traditions and Cultural History of Europe" WTE program proposal were accepted by the committee via email after additional information was submitted and reviewed. The Committee subsequently moved to approve the September 26, minutes.

2. Approving WTE proposal:

Routsong's WTE proposal "Intercultural Communication in China" was approved on condition that the author would address or clarify the grading system, reading content on China, the definition of "intercultural communication, and add an on-campus meeting session following the trip.

Sidlinger's proposal "Exploration of Nursing in China" was approved as a WTE program.

Perret's and Prece's "Art and Theatre in London" WTE proposal was tabled for more details on the academic and cultural interaction elements.

3. Approving faculty travel requests:

Lori Khan's request for \$1,200 was approved to present in India. Barb DeSanto's request for \$1,000 was approved to teach at Zeppelin University in Germany. Sharon Sullivan's request was approved pending evidence of presentation content, acceptance, and format.

Respectfully submitted,

Baili Zhang

MINUTES
ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Friday, September 12, 2008

Shawnee Room

1:30 p.m.

Present: Donna LaLonde (chair), Denise Ottinger, Melodie Christal, Joanne Altman, Cathy Hunt, Jim Hoogenakker, Mary Shoop, Lori Khan, Jay Memmott, Kandy Ockree, Heather Collins, and CJ Crawford (administrative support). Absent: Nancy Tate, Jane Carpenter, Whitney Philippi, and Don Vest.

Donna, Jay and Joanne met to plan the Assessment Liaison workshop on Friday, September 19. The Washburn University Assessment Wiki – Tools for Implementing and Maintaining a Successful Assessment Program – has been developed and they would like each member of the committee to add resources to one or more of the pages. Send information to Donna (articles, rubrics, URLs, etc.). The plan for the workshop is to introduce the Wiki, talk about qualitative assessment methods, break into groups to share information about successful tools, and recruit liaisons to act as group discussion leaders for the October workshop.

The minutes from August 5 were approved as submitted.

The university has decided to use MAPP instead of CLA, as it will fit into established class times and should give us a larger sampling.

OASIS – the assessment of common learning outcomes of the WTEs has made reasonably good progress. The next effort is to have each individual area develop an assessment process for each WTE's unique outcomes.

An ad hoc committee has been charged with looking at general education.

Donna asked about putting the writing rubric on the Wiki and asking the liaisons to help move it to the next level. It was recommended that other samples of writing rubrics also be put up and faculty could see which worked best. Donna said that the original idea behind a university-wide writing rubric was so that students would have consistency from class to class.

The meeting adjourned.

WALKER: Requested funds in the amount of \$2,500 for research project, "The Impact of Hedge Funds on Equity Offerings."
Application awarded fully in the amount of \$2,500.

ALTUS: Requested funds in the amount of \$2,307 for research project, "Understanding consumers' perception of the Green House model of elder care."
Application awarded fully in the amount of \$2,307.

McCONNELL-FARMER: Requested funds in the amount of \$2,986.80 for research project, "Nicodemus Pioneer School Teacher Lula Sadler Craig: In her Words Living the Historic African-American High Plains Exoduster Experience."
Application awarded fully in the amount of \$3,000 (The award amount is higher due to the increased mileage reimbursement rate)

SULLIVAN: Requested funds in the amount of \$3,000 for research project, "Women Changing the World: Feminist Activism in Guatemala."
Application awarded partially in the amount of \$2,000.

McKEE: Requested funds in the amount of \$300 for research project, "Assessment of teenage diaries for teaching concepts in adolescent psychology (Printing Charges)."
Application awarded fully in the amount of \$300.

PORTA: Requested funds in the amount of \$2,072.72 for research project, "Windmill Construction (for electrical energy generation)."
Application was conditionally approved for a partial amount of \$1,482 pending acceptable answers to questions regarding the project.

PRUITT/FAULKNER: Requested funds in the amount of \$400 or 642 for research project, "For Dear Life and Selected Short Stories by Belinda Jelliffe: A Woman's Struggle for Equal Rights at Home and Work (Printing Charges)."
Application awarded in the amount of \$400.

McGUIRE: Requested funds in the amount of \$540 for research project, "Relation of Early Testing and Incentive on Quiz Performance in Introductory Psychology: An Archival Analysis (Printing Charges)."
Application awarded fully in the amount of \$540.

Total amount of funds awarded was \$28,253. This leaves a balance of \$2,580.

Faculty Senate Action Item

Date: 18 January 2009

Number: 09-01

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: 18 January 2009

Number: 09-02

Subject: Revision of the catalog language on repetition of courses

Description: The revision will allow the VPAA's office to grant permission to retake courses in which the grade received was a C when special circumstances exist to justify such action. The following revises the catalog language on repetition of courses (p. 59 of the current catalog) accordingly, with the proposed added language underlined.

REPETITION OF COURSES

Undergraduate courses in which the student receives a D or an F may be repeated. When special circumstances exist to justify repeating a course for which a student receives a C, the student may appeal to the VPAA's office to permit that course to be repeated. The transcript will contain a complete record of all courses taken and grades earned. [etc.; no changes in the rest of the language is proposed.]

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: NONE.

REQUESTED ACTION: Faculty Senate approval and recommendation to the General Faculty

Date: Jan. 18, 2009

Originated by: Thomas Prash on behalf of student Will Ediger
FS President (see attached)

Ediger attachment

From: will.ediger@gmail.com

Date: Thursday, January 8, 2009 10:14 am

Subject: Course Repeating Policy

To: tom.prasch@washburn.edu, gene.wunder@washburn.edu, courtney.sullivan@washburn.edu, russ.jacobs@washburn.edu

Hello, my name is Will Ediger. I am an actuarial science major here at Washburn. I have somewhat of a dilemma on my hands.

To become an actuary, one has to pass rigorous exams as well as complete VEE (Verification by Educational Experience) credits on topics covering Economics, Business Finance, and Statistics. To get VEE credits, you take classes at schools that are accredited by the Society of Actuaries. One of the stipulations for the classes to count as VEE credits is that you have to get a grade of a B or higher in the class. This is where my problem arises. One of the classes that makes up the Statistics portion of the VEE credits is Regression Analysis. I took it two years ago here at Washburn and received a C in the course. At that time, neither me nor my adviser knew that the requirement for the VEE credit was a B or higher in the class.

I have looked into taking the class over again, and I have hit a brick wall. The person who makes the decision on whether or not I can retake the class, Nancy Tate, has said that it is not possible for me to retake the class. She told my adviser that the only way that I could retake the class was if the faculty senate would rewrite the policy to allow the exception.

If I am unable to retake Regression Analysis, I will be unable to become a full fledged actuary until I find another college that is accredited by the Society of Actuaries and offers the class. Needless to say, this will be difficult to do because I will be graduating in Spring 2010, and finding a school close to wherever my job will be that offers Regression analysis will be difficult.

I implore you to feel my predicament.

Thank you for your time.

Will Ediger