

Faculty Affairs Committee (2012 – 2013)
Washburn University
October 5, 2012

Attendance:

Royce Kitts	Keith Mazachek	Diane McMillen	Marguerite Perret
Bill Roach	David Rubenstein	Sarah Ubel, Chair	Kerry Wynn

Call to Order: 1:00 pm - Crane Room (Union)

New Business:

- VPAA proposal: Change in the Faculty Handbook—General Education Committee
 - The Faculty Affairs Committee amended the proposal to indicate that the two ex-officio members of the General Education Committee would be non-voting members.
 - The proposal passed as amended. The approved wording is as follows:

The function of the General Education Committee is to assist faculty members to develop or modify courses that facilitate the acquisition of the student learning outcomes (SLOs) listed in the General Education Statement, and to approve courses for general education based on the criteria established by the General Faculty.

If a course is disapproved by the Committee, the rationale for such action will be written with reference to the adopted standards and communicated to the VPAA and the sponsor.

Once a course is approved by the Committee, it will be the responsibility of the sponsoring department to review its implementation and report assessment results to the Assessment Committee every year and to undergo a review by the General Education Committee at least every five years. The results of the review and assessment will be forwarded to the VPAA. Any change in the course's targeted SLO or in its general content or format must be submitted to the General Education Committee for approval.

Decisions of the Committee, including those concerning course approval, will be reported by the VPAA to the deans.

Decisions of the committee, including those concerning course approval, may be appealed to the Faculty Senate with further appeal to the General Faculty.

Members of the Committee are: the VPAA, one faculty member from each division of the College, one faculty member each from the Schools of Applied Studies, Business and Nursing, and one library faculty member. Faculty members are elected by their constituent units. Two members of the University Assessment Committee will be non-voting, ex-officio members and appointed by the VPAA with input from Faculty Senate and Assessment Committee. These non-voting, ex-officio members of the General Education Committee will provide expertise on assessment and facilitate communication between the General Education Committee and the Assessment Committee.

- A summary of the proposed changes is attached below.
- Faculty Handbook Revision Committee: Tenure and Promotions
 - It was decided to discuss each issue and then refer the issue back to the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee - Tenure and Promotions Issues

- To maximize awareness and transparency of the Faculty Handbook Review process, The Faculty Affairs Committee determined it would be useful to create a means for communicating the development of these changes on the Washburn Website.
 - A summary of the discussion and requested action of the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee: Tenure and Promotions is attached below.
- Bill Roach volunteered to be the Faculty Affairs Committee representative to the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee.

Discussion Items:

- Creation and utilization of Angel Community Group

Announcements:

- Next meeting – Monday, October 29 at 3:45 pm

Adjournment: 2:30 by Sarah Ubel, Chair

FACULTY AFFAIRS AGENDA ITEM

Date: 11 September 2012

Submitted by: Dr. Randy Pembroke, VPAA, ext. 2546

SUBJECT: *Change in the Faculty Handbook—General Education Committee*

Description:

With the approval of the new student learning outcomes, the function and composition of the general education committee needs to be modified as well in the Faculty Handbook (Section One VII.B.6)

Current Wording:	Proposed Wording:	Faculty Affairs Committee Approved Wording:
The function of the General Education Committee is to assist faculty members to develop or modify courses that facilitate the acquisition of skills listed in the General Education Statement, and to approve courses for general education based on the criteria established by the General Faculty.	The function of the General Education Committee is to assist faculty members to develop or modify courses that facilitate the acquisition of the student learning outcomes (SLOs) listed in the General Education Statement, and to approve courses for general education based on the criteria established by the General Faculty.	The function of the General Education Committee is to assist faculty members to develop or modify courses that facilitate the acquisition of the student learning outcomes (SLOs) listed in the General Education Statement, and to approve courses for general education based on the criteria established by the General Faculty.
If a course is disapproved by the Committee, the rationale for such action will be written with reference to the adopted standards and communicated to the VPAA and the sponsor.	If a course is disapproved by the Committee, the rationale for such action will be written with reference to the adopted standards and communicated to the VPAA and the sponsor.	If a course is disapproved by the Committee, the rationale for such action will be written with reference to the adopted standards and communicated to the VPAA and the sponsor.
Once a course is approved by the Committee, it will be the responsibility of the sponsoring department to review its implementation and assess its effectiveness at least every five years. The results of the review and assessment will be forwarded to the VPAA. Any change in the course's targeted skills or in its general content or format must be submitted to the General Education Committee for approval.	Once a course is approved by the Committee, it will be the responsibility of the sponsoring department to review its implementation and report assessment results to the Assessment Committee every year and to undergo a review by the General Education Committee at least every five years. The results of the review and assessment will be forwarded to the VPAA. Any change in the course's targeted SLO or in its general content or format must be submitted to the General Education Committee for approval.	Once a course is approved by the Committee, it will be the responsibility of the sponsoring department to review its implementation and report assessment results to the Assessment Committee every year and to undergo a review by the General Education Committee at least every five years. The results of the review and assessment will be forwarded to the VPAA. Any change in the course's targeted SLO or in its general content or format must be submitted to the General Education Committee for approval.
Decisions of the Committee, including those concerning course approval, will be reported by the VPAA to the deans.	Decisions of the Committee, including those concerning course approval, will be reported by the VPAA to the deans.	Decisions of the Committee, including those concerning course approval, will be reported by the VPAA to the deans.
Decisions of the committee, including those concerning course approval, may be appealed to the Faculty Senate with further appeal to the General Faculty.	Decisions of the committee, including those concerning course approval, may be appealed to the Faculty Senate with further appeal to the General Faculty.	Decisions of the committee, including those concerning course approval, may be appealed to the Faculty Senate with further appeal to the General Faculty.
Members of the Committee are: the	Members of the Committee are: the	Members of the Committee are: the

VPAA, one faculty member from each division of the College, one faculty member each from the Schools of Applied Studies, Business and Nursing, and one library faculty member. Faculty members are elected by their constituent units.

VPAA, one faculty member from each division of the College, one faculty member each from the Schools of Applied Studies, Business and Nursing, and one library faculty member. Faculty members are elected by their constituent units. **Two members of the University Assessment Committee will be ex-officio members and appointed by the VPAA with input from Faculty Senate and Assessment Committee. These ex-officio members of the General Education Committee will provide expertise on assessment and facilitate communication between the General Education Committee and the Assessment Committee.**

VPAA, one faculty member from each division of the College, one faculty member each from the Schools of Applied Studies, Business and Nursing, and one library faculty member. Faculty members are elected by their constituent units. Two members of the University Assessment Committee will be **non-voting**, ex-officio members and appointed by the VPAA with input from Faculty Senate and Assessment Committee. These **non-voting**, ex-officio members of the General Education Committee will provide expertise on assessment and facilitate communication between the General Education Committee and the Assessment Committee.

Financial Implications: *None*

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2012

Request for Action: *Approval by FAC/FS/ Gen Fac/BOR*

Approved by: *AAC on date*

FAC on date

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments Yes No

**Faculty Handbook Revision Issues
Promotion and Tenure
Discussed by the Faculty Affairs Committee on 10-5-12**

Present:

Royce Kitts
Bill Roach

Keith Mazachek
David Rubenstein

Diane McMillen
Sarah Ubel, Chair

Marguerite Perret
Kerry Wynn

To maximize awareness and transparency of the Faculty Handbook Review process, The Faculty Affairs Committee determined it would be useful to create a means for communicating the development of these changes on the Washburn Website.

Issues Identified by Faculty Handbook Revision Committee Promotion and Tenure	Committee Discussion
<p>1. Issue: Clarity of P & T standards</p> <p>Units should</p> <p>A) review their standards for promotion and tenure rigor,</p> <p>B) clarify the role the committees have (i.e., determining if the candidate meets or doesn't meet the standard), and/or</p> <p>C) determine if the language around the promotion/tenure standard needs clearer articulation so that it is possible to clearly determine if the standard is met. (FYI, this may be most pertinent relating to the conversations of the CAS CCPT in comparison to the Department PT Committee)</p>	<p>The Faculty Affairs Committee requests language regarding this issue from the Faculty Handbook Review Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language should be clear regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How often the units required to review and approve their tenure and promotion standards (ex: every 5 years) ○ How changes in the standards would apply to faculty already at Washburn as opposed to new hires
<p>2. Required Chair Letter (even when the Chair is new)</p> <p>Units need to do one of the following:</p> <p>A) require a chair letter regardless of the circumstances or</p> <p>B) require a chair letter except for extenuating circumstances pre-approved by the Dean/VPAA. This might include a recent change in chairs, the absence of the chair (e.g., sabbatical, etc.).</p>	<p>The Faculty Affairs Committee requests language regarding this standard from the Faculty Handbook Review Committee regarding option B).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language should be clear regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who would write letters and at what stages of the review those letters would be reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ department committee ▪ chair ▪ dean? ▪ vpaa? ○ How the recommended outcome of the application would be communicated to the Washburn Board of Regents. (ex: spreadsheet regarding the decisions at each level of

review or some other communication regarding a recommended outcome of the application.)

3. Issue: Early review of Candidates for Promotion and Tenure

Potential Direction for Discussion by Faculty Groups: Consider that though these exceptions should be extremely rare and must be approved by the Dean/VPAA,

- A) candidates CAN negotiate early review at any point after beginning employment at Washburn (Candidates must have COMPLETED a minimum of three years full time teaching at Washburn before being reviewed),
- B) candidates and the academic dean CAN negotiate a shorter than normal review period (e.g., less than the standard 6-year probationary review period) when drafting the first Washburn hiring contract,
- C) to candidates who ask for early review and are unsuccessful have the right for the full extension period (e.g., assistant professors are NOT given a terminal contract immediately after a failed application in year five but are “re-reviewed” during the sixth year),
- D) deans and WU have the right to end employment for tenure-track candidates at any juncture during the probationary period if we meet the notification deadlines, and
- E) units have the right to establish minimum thresholds for review (e.g., no Washburn faculty member will be considered for promotion/tenure without 3 years of full time teaching at the assistant level; No Washburn faculty member will be considered for promotion to Professor without 4 years at the Associate level.).

The Faculty Affairs Committee requests language regarding this issue from the Faculty Handbook Review Committee.

- Language should be clear regarding:
 - The difference between a faculty member who is applying for tenure early as a result of an agreement negotiated at hiring versus a faculty member who is applying for tenure early as a result of “extraordinary” circumstances
 - The consequences or future employment of someone unsuccessfully applying for tenure early (either as a result of contractual negotiations or “extraordinary” circumstances)
 - What constitutes “extraordinary” circumstances

4. Issue: Communication with Candidates

Potential Direction for Discussion by Faculty Groups:

- A) At each point in the process, communication regarding the outcome will be shared with the applicant whether positive or negative.
 - 1. In cases where a review or reviews are

The Faculty Affairs Committee fully supported the inclusion of notification and explanation regarding unfavorable tenure and promotion review decisions.

The Faculty Affairs Committee requests language regarding this issue from the Faculty Handbook Review Committee.

- Language should be clear regarding:

negative,

- a. candidates are to be formally notified of the negative review (without specific vote totals) and
 - b. be given information pertaining to the cause of the negative review.
2. Candidates would then have the option to respond within X (10 days?) by creating and including additional pertinent information for the file where applicable.
- a. For example, if the committee felt the research publications were not at the national level, candidates could submit information about the specific journal questioned. This information would be available for the NEXT stage of the review.
 - b. In cases where the review is positive, candidates will still receive results of the review but will not add information to the file. While the application process is undergoing review, when additional events confirm information described in the application materials (e.g., receipt of a grant, actual publication of an in-press article), candidates would be allowed to submit information confirming such changes in status.

- How the communication takes place: orally or in writing
- Who communicates a negative review
- When the negative review is communicated
 - Will there be a required time period for communication after the completion of each phase of the review process?
- The candidate should have the following communicated:
 - How the applicant did not meet a minimum threshold for a particular area – teaching, research or service
 - If there is a possibility to remedy the problem, how the applicant might do this (ex: clarify or add materials)
- The Faculty Affairs Committee expressed concerns about the following:
 - What materials could be added to the application? Could materials be
 - clarifying already present materials (ex: providing explanation regarding student perception forms)
 - new information related to already present information (ex: acceptance letter of publication which was previously noted as a journal submission)
 - new information unrelated to already present information (ex: elected to new national office in scholarly organization)
 - Who would see the added materials?
 - Only the reviewer at the level at which there is a negative outcome and subsequent reviewers?
 - Would we allow or require a secondary review by reviewers who previously reviewed the materials? For example, if the Dean did not have a favorable review and the applicant submitted new information, would all previously completed levels of review have to take place again because the outcome or strength of their review may have changed.
- The Faculty Affairs Committee also noted the importance of having this language reviewed by the University Counsel to identify what, if any, legal implications there may be in putting reviews in writing in light of possible litigation.