

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate

November 30, 2009
3:30 pm Kansas Room, Memorial Union

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 16, 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
 - A. Minutes from the Academic Affairs Committee meeting of November 11, 2009 (pp. 4-7)
- VI. University Committee Reports
 - A. Minutes from the Library Committee Meeting of November 5, 2009 (pg. 8)
 - B. Minutes from Faculty Development Grant Committee Meeting of September 21, 2009 (pg. 9)
 - C. Minutes from Program Review Committee Meeting of October 27, 2009 (pp. 10-12)
 - D. Minutes from Curriculum Development Committee Meeting of September 16, 2009 (pg. 13)
 - E. Minutes from Research Development Grant Committee Meeting of October 30, 2009 (pg. 14)
- VII. Old Business
 - A. (09-16) Joint Appointments (pp. 15-17)
- VIII. New Business
 - A. Occupational Therapy Assistant Program Proposal Addendum (Separate PDF)
 - B. Transfer Committee Recommendations (pp. 18-19)
 - C. 09-18 Status of No Confidence Motion (pg. 20)
- IX. Information Items
- X. Discussion Items
- XI. Announcements
- XII. Adjournment

**Faculty Senate
Washburn University**

*Minutes of November 16, 2009
Kansas Room, Memorial Union*

Present: Arterburn, Barker, Berry, Bowen (VPAA), Childers, Croucher, Faulkner, Fry, Isaacson, Kelly, Kaufman, Manske, Mazachek., Melick, Menzie, Ockree, Porta , Quinn, Ramirez, Rich, Sharafy, Shaver, Sullivan, Walker, Love (WSGA), Onek (WSGA)

- I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:31 PM. Howard Faulker (VP) presiding.

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

- III. President's Opening Remarks.
 - A. Faulkner offered congratulations to Garrett Love, President of WSGA for his nomination as a Rhodes Scholar. Thanks were offered to Garret, Caley and the WSGA Leadership for the hard work putting together the Dead Week proposals. The Strategic Planning Ad Hoc committee was urged to arrange a meeting as soon as possible. The senators were also urged to keep track of the rapid movement by the administration on transfers, gen ed, and strategic planning and to be alert to the developments.

- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
 - A. Faulkner reported from President Prasch on the BOR meeting. The major business was the quarterly financial report, which was predictably dismal in overall outline. Two bits of business that relate to Faculty Senate: the Board approved the motion, lost from last semester, on the mechanics of faculty meetings (08-08), but sent back the action on joint appointments (08-07) due to Regent Marquardt's concern about the language of the resolution. That, in a revision with input from her, appears today under new business.

- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
 - A. Minutes from the Academic Affairs Committee meeting of October 26, 2009 were approved with the following correction: The item should be Occupational Therapy Assistant Program not Occupational Therapy Program.

- VI. University Committee Minutes
 - A. Minutes from the Assessment Committee meeting of October 14, 2009 were accepted.
 - B. Minutes from the Assessment Committee meeting of October 28, 2009 were accepted.

- VII. Old Business
 - A. Faculty Senate Resolution on the Washburn Technology Crisis (09-10)
The motion was passed with modifications.

- VIII. New Business
 - A. (Action Item 09-16) Joint Appointments: The item was approved for first reading with changes of typographical errors.
 - B. (Action Item 09-17) Success Week Proposal: The item was approved with modifications.
 - C. Transfer Committee Recommendations: Two of the transfer committee recommendations were brought forward by the Academic Affairs committee: EN 300 and PE 198
EN 300: Faculty Senate approved the EN 300 proposal
PE 198: After discussion, the vote was postponed until the next meeting.
 - D. Occupational Therapy Assistant Program – postponed until 11/30/09
 - E. Status of the No Confidence Motion - postponed until 11/30/09

- IX. Information Items. There were none.

- X. Discussion Items. There were none

- XI. Announcements. There were none.

- XII. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 PM.

- XIII. The next meeting is scheduled for **Monday, November 30 at 3:30 pm** in the Kansas Room, Memorial Union.

**Academic Affairs Committee
November 11, 2009
Minutes**

Committee members in attendance:

Kathy Menzie (chair)
Keith Mazachek
Lori Khan
Paul Byrne
Kanalis Ockree
Jeanne Catanzaro
Debbie Isaacson
Cal Melick
Robin Bowen (ex officio)

Guests:

Mike Russell and Rob Weigand, representing the General Education Task Force
Nancy Tate, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs
Howard Faulkner

Kathy Menzie called the meeting to order.

Rob Weigand presented the report of the General Education Task Force to the committee by first reviewing the entire report and explaining the General Education Advising Worksheet. The Advising worksheet prototypes are included in the report beginning on page 7, with examples on pages 8 – 10. Learning assessment rubrics are provided in Appendix 2, pages 11-16.

ITEM 1

Section1: Proposals Close to Being Ready for a Decision by Full Faculty

Proposal 1: General Education Statement

Summary: Recommended change in General Education Statement.

Discussion: The committee reviewed the Gen Ed Proposal for a change in the General Education Statement.

Action: No action taken

ITEM 2

Section1: Proposals Close to Being Ready for a Decision by Full Faculty

Proposal 2: – General Education Learning Outcomes

Summary: General Education skills in WU General Education program be replaced with five Learning Outcomes:

1. Communication
2. Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning and Literacy
3. Information Literacy and Technology
4. Critical and Creative Thinking
5. Global Citizenship and Diversity

Students would be required to complete a minimum number of credit hours (yet to be specified) in each of the five Learning Outcomes categories.

Discussion: Each Gen Ed course would have one learning outcome identified by the faculty member or department (further discussion under the next item).

Action: No action taken

ITEM 3

Section1: Proposals Close to Being Ready for a Decision by Full Faculty

Proposal 3: Learning Outcome Descriptions

Summary: Descriptions of the learning outcomes in each of the five categories are provided in the Gen Ed Proposal. Examples of learning assessment rubrics are provided in Appendix 2, page 11.

Discussion:

Faculty members would identify the learning outcomes for the course they are teaching. The Gen Ed Committee then would become more of a “friendly helper” to help with the assessment plans of the faculty.

The Learning Outcomes don’t have to be completely met by CAS distribution hours; a maximum of 3 hours per Learning Outcome could be from different schools. The Gen Ed Task force is trying to establish the general guidelines for learning outcomes.

If EN 300 is no longer a requirement, would this mean possible loss of money to the university? This would depend on how many major programs will be moving away from the university requirement. If EN 300 becomes a requirement for a major or degree you don’t necessarily remove it, but it would make it easier for transfer students.

If there is a course the faculty determines meets a specific learning objective (only one learning objective per course), would this be identified in the course catalog, and if so how would it be changed? Perhaps this would be a better department decision. Careful writing of learning outcomes determines the effectiveness of the assessment processes

Action: No action taken

ITEM 4

Section1: Proposals Close to Being Ready for a Decision by Full Faculty

Proposal 4: General Education Distribution Requirements (Breadth of Knowledge)

Summary: The General Education program is designed to provide all students with a breadth of knowledge in the traditional areas of 1) Arts and Humanities; 2) Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Statistics; and 3) Social Sciences. In the Gen Ed Report, these areas are referred to as the Liberal Studies Distribution Requirement. It is recommended the total number of credit hours required to complete each category be determined by the individual’s specific degree programs

and majors, although establishing some minimum number of credit hours for all students may also be appropriate.

Discussion: The committee discussed whether current Gen Ed courses should also meet these requirements and how this would be addressed. Further discussion was needed in this area.

Action: No action taken.

ITEM 5

Section 2: Proposals for Additional Campus-Wide Conversation (*Gen Ed Task Force is still working on these*)

Proposal 5: Courses Satisfying Learning Outcomes

The committee recommended adding one sentence for clarification to Proposal 5. "It is recommended that instructors engage in a collaborative process with their individual departments to reach consensus regarding the appropriate Learning Outcome for each course offered by the discipline."

Proposal 6: Using Major Courses to Satisfy General Ed Learning Outcomes

Proposal 7: University Requirements

Proposal 8: Core Courses

Proposal 9: Transferring Gen Ed Credit Hours from Other Institutions

Discussion of Proposals 5-9:

Q: Would AA degree transfer students be required to satisfy all 5 learning outcomes? Rob Weigand said this is under discussion and requires additional conversation. He said most of the work was with the 4-year degree in mind. This appendix needs to be further expanded and clarified.

Q: Could a course have more than one learning outcome? Perhaps a student is trying to fit the matrix and may have one course classified in a couple of categories. This needs additional conversation. If one exception is made, it would be hard to stay where this stops and could make the process very complex.

Q: Are the worksheet grids filled out by degree or by major? The school/college would need to determine this. CAS could have many different sheets. There was discussion regarding the best approach (degree vs. major) as some majors may require different gen eds.

Additional faculty meetings would be required to determine the minimum requirements to go forward to the first meeting in January to the Faculty Senate.

Discussion of Committee Action on the Gen Ed Proposal

The committee discussed the advantages of taking action on the first half of the proposals (1-5). They noted it may be difficult to get approval by faculty if the second half is still under debate.

The committee had already voted on recommendation regarding PE198 and EN300. The transfer committee dealt with specific courses, not the overall policy, which is not in conflict with the Gen Ed Proposal.

In the previous meeting, the Academic Affairs committee decided not to send forward the Transfer Committee's recommendation regarding Gen Ed requirements until the discussion at this meeting.

Nancy Tate pointed out that if the first part of the Gen Ed went forward this year, it could create problems with banner due to all the changes that would be required, and especially if the changes are being made for only one year. The way Gen Ed courses are identified would have to be changed in Banner to eliminate overlap etc. If Gen Ed courses remained non-course specific, it would not make as much difference.

The committee decided more discussion was necessary before they could make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

No action would be taken on the Gen Ed Proposal until further discussion.

Transfer Committee recommendations

There was consensus to send forth the two recommendations from the Transfer committee as written in the proposal presented at the last meeting as there may be some benefit to students now if this first part of the proposal is approved.

No action required on this item as it was already voted on last meeting.

Next Meeting will be:

Thursday, December 3rd
8:30 – 9:30 am
Baker Room (BTAC)

Library Faculty Committee Meeting

November 5, 2009

3:30 p.m.

Room 105, Mabee Library

TO:

***Dr. David Bainum
Dr. Alan Bearman
Dr. Cheryl Childers
Dr. Frank Chorba
Dr. Barry Crawford
Ms. Linda Croucher
Mrs. Judy Druse***

***Dr. Andrew Herbig
Dr. Rob Hull
Dr. Reinhild Janzen
Mr. Terry Knowles
Dr. Sam Leung
Dr. Park Lockwood
Dr. Meredith McKee***

***Mrs. Marilyn Masterson
Dr. Jay Memmott
Ms. Caley Onek
Dr. Karen Ray
Dr. Karen Diaz Reategui
Dr. Michael Rettig
Dr. Leslie Reynard***

***Dr. Tom Schmiedeler
Mrs. Heather Smith-Collins
Dr. Lee Snook
Dr. Sharon Sullivan
Dr. Brian Thomas
Dr. Jennifer Wagner
Mrs. Kelley Weber
Dr. Iris Wilkinson***

The Library Committee convened in the Mabee Library, Room 105 at 3:30 p.m. The following members were present: Dr. Childers, Dr. Chorba, Ms. Smith-Collins, Ms. Croucher, Ms. Druse, Dr. Herbig, Dr. Janzen, Dr. Leung, Dr. McKee, Dr. Ray, Dr. Reynard, Dr. Sullivan, Dr. Wagner, Ms. Weber, and guest Tammy Baker. Dr. Bearman, Dr. Hull, Dr. Masterson, and Dr. Thomas sent word they would be unable to attend.

Kelley Weber, Reference/Instruction Librarian introduced faculty members to the new interface of Blackwell's Collection Manager so faculty can request Blackwell titles and set up eNotifications in their subject areas. The faculty can also ask their liaisons to set this up for them. If you have any questions, please contact your library liaison. URL:<http://cm7.blackwell.com/cm>

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Ginger D. Webber, Administrative Secretary

**THERE WILL BE
NO
DECEMBER MEETING**

Notes
Faculty Development Grant Committee
September 21, 2009

Members Present:

Nancy Tate, Chair
Kevin Charlwood
Kelley Weber
Pat Munzer
Janice Schrum
Lori McMillan
Nora Clark

Nancy Tate welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. She informed the committee that, at the present time, there are no anticipated reductions in the budget for FY10 internal grants.

Nancy explained to the committee that there has been some confusion about committee membership. After some discussion, the committee members recommended the membership include the Faculty Development Coordinator, the New Faculty Mentor Coordinator, one representative from each academic unit not represented by the two coordinators, and one librarian. They recommended the librarian and the additional representatives be appointed annually by their respective academic deans. Nancy will forward this recommendation to the President of the Faculty Senate to determine how to proceed.

The applications submitted for consideration by the committee are for the FY2010 fiscal year, and no other applications were received this past Spring. The committee received a total of 17 faculty development grant applications, for a total of \$7,830 in requested funds. A summary of the applications received and the committee decision regarding each application follow:

Baker, Tammy Requested \$500
Load Profile Workshop for training to work with library files on integrated library system
Application awarded fully.

Bayens, Gerald Requested \$500
Present at Annual ACAD OF Criminal Justice Sciences conf and write article about experience
Application awarded fully.

Charlwood, Kevin Requested \$500
Joint winter math meeting (Natl Conf sponsored by Am Math Soc. And Math Assoc of America)
Application awarded fully.

Corwin, Dean Requested \$295
Brick & Click Libraries Symposium
Application awarded fully.

**Program Review
October 27, 2009**

Attendance:

Angel Romero
Bill Roach
Chris Leach
David Winchester
Denise Ottinger
Jim Smith
Josh Maples
Robin Bowen
Sandy Tutwiler
Wanda Hill

Dr. Bowen opened the meeting. She explained to the committee there would be changes in the Program Review procedures this year. While the committee will still receive updates, those programs on a five-year review who are due for evaluation will not be evaluated this year. Instead, the policy and procedures related to program review are going to be evaluated and revised as needed. As a result, the five-year program review schedule would be pushed back one year (e.g., areas scheduled for review in 2009-2010 would be rescheduled for 2010-2011).

Included in this revision, the committee would need to address differences in the review process between the administrative and academic units. Dr. Bowen indicated there was some concern that some programs were not in the evaluation cycle. Josh Maples volunteered to assist with the process of identifying areas which were not being reviewed. The committee would then need to establish criteria for determining whether a unit or department qualified for the review process.

Another question related to the review process is whether graduate programs should be reviewed separately from undergraduate programs. The committee agreed that while there may be some overlap, the graduate and undergraduate programs should be evaluated separately, but simultaneously, to recognize the programs for their work individually.

All Allied Health programs were combined into one report this past year. The committee discussed whether these areas should be separate, since they have difference accrediting agencies. It would be difficult to separate some of these areas in the budget, but the financial information provided to the accreditation agencies could be used. Vice Pres. Hill said these could be separated out as subcategories under the budget and allocated to the specific areas in the future, if this was what the committee decided to do.

The committee approved scheduling half the Allied Health departments for program review in 2012 -2013 and the second half to 2013-2014, if Allied Health agrees. Vice Pres. Ottinger volunteered to reschedule Residential Living for 2013.

Dr. Bowen asked for volunteers to serve on a subcommittee to look at the review process and draft document revisions. The following individuals agreed serve on this committee: Chris Leach, David Winchester, Jim Smith, Josh Maples, Sandy Tutwiler, Denise Ottinger, Robin Bowen, and Wanda Hill. The review subcommittee will meet at the next meeting, rather than the entire committee.

The committee agreed to ask Dr. Rood to return as a member of the Program Review Committee due to his many years of experience serving on the committee. The committee agreed his input and historical perspective would be valuable when they began making changes to the review process.

The committee discussed the progress reports for Leadership Institute, Center for Diversity, and Student Activities and Greek Life would be presented in early March 2010. The following individuals volunteered to write these reports:

- Leadership Institute – Tracy Wagner
- Center for Diversity – Sandy Tutwiler
- Student Activities and Greek Life – Bill Roach

Nancy Tate reviewed the rubric provided by the Assessment Committee prior to the meeting. She explained the rubric would be used by each department/unit for their annual review. When it was time for the department's program review, the Assessment Committee would compile the rubric data from each year and write a summary for the program review report. The summary would go to the department to review prior to submission to the Program Review Committee, which would give the department an opportunity to comment on the Assessment Committee's report.

The committee asked if the rubric would replace #12 on the assessment section of the report. Dr. Tate said she thought it would be in addition to #12.

Vice Pres. Ottinger noted the current areas covered in the program review were patterned after HLC program review and it would be important to keep pieces in place so the final HLC self-study information would be readily available.

Vice Pres. Ottinger requested the committee review the previous version of the Program Review (Dr. Tate will obtain and this information will be sent out to the committee members.)

In addition, a document exists from KBOR pertaining to the program review document (8-year cycle), which will also be made available to the committee.

Vice Pres. Ottinger commented that the rubric is geared toward academic units and some work is being done to find a way to apply this to administrative units.

The Assessment Committee report would be retrospective, where as the unit/dept report for #12 would be more forward looking (e.g., future goals and plan to achieve these goals, etc), whereas Section 3 & 5 are a summary and historical.

Variability of data was a concern to the committee; however Dr. Tate said that because this is based on data the department submits for their annual review, it should be stable. The committee will have an opportunity to review and respond to any questions raised.

The Subcommittee will evaluate the program review process. In the past the evaluation process was concentrated into long meetings in the spring. Dr. Bowen said she would like to see these meetings spread out throughout the year. Reviews could start in the fall rather than waiting until spring.

Dr. Bowen asked those not on the program revision subcommittee look at the document by Nov 10th and provide feedback for the subcommittee's consideration. The subcommittee will review the comments and documents provided on Nov 12.

CURRICULUM GRANTS COMMITTEE

Minutes

September 16, 2009

Members Present:

Nancy Tate, Chair
David Pownell
Don Kellogg
Janice Schrum
Ellen Carson

Nancy Tate welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. Nancy informed the committee this is the second meeting to award funds for Fiscal Year 2010. The applications received and the committee decision regarding each application follow:

Sarah Cook Requested \$1,800

Proposal: Access codes for the ALeKS System for use with developmental algebra courses.
Application awarded fully.

Norman Gamboa Requested \$1,616

Proposal: Rental of Wagner instruments to enhance orchestra performance.
Application denied.

Sam Leung/ Sue Salem Requested \$1,067

Proposal: Enhancement of data collection of the GOW-MAC gas chromatograph in the Chemistry Department.
Application awarded fully.

Jeff Mott Requested \$2,000

Proposal: Leadership Simulation Curriculum Development.
Application denied.

Margaret Wood Requested \$910

Proposal: Curriculum Development Project for Classical Archaeology.
Application awarded fully.

Summary

The total amount awarded during this meeting: \$3,777.00. The total amount awarded for FY 2010: \$7,777.97. The total funds available for FY2010 is \$14,000.00, which leaves the balance of available funds: \$6,222.03

RESEARCH GRANTS COMMITTEE
Minutes
October 30, 2009

Members Present:

Nancy Tate, Chair
Kerry Wynn
Andrew Herbig
Harrison Watts
Norma Juma
John Francis

Nancy Tate welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. Nancy informed the committee this was the second and final meeting to award funds for Fiscal Year 2010.

Small Research Grants

The applications for small research grants received and the committee decision regarding each application follow:

Stephanie Lanter Requested \$3,000
Proposal: *A Waiting Room of our Own: Project Document 2010*, a multi-media art installation.
Application awarded fully.

Leslie Reynard Requested \$3,000
Proposal: *The "Civil" War: Savannah Georgia*.
Application awarded fully.

Judith McConnell-Farmer Requested \$2,996.08
Proposal: *Adventures, Fantasy, and Dreams in Children's Literature*. Grant application request was for 2,986.80; however, the spreadsheet indicated the cost would be \$2,996.80. The committee awarded the latter as it was from the budgeted spreadsheet of estimated expenses and most likely represented the more accurate amount.
Application awarded fully.

Faculty Senate Agenda Item

No. 09-16

Note: Regent Marquardt's suggested changes appear in italics. Revisions of those suggestions appear as tracked changes.

Faculty Handbook Revision in regard to Joint Appointments

DESCRIPTION:

In order to make the Faculty Handbook consistent with the intent of the original action of the Washburn *University* faculty *for* joint appointments, the Faculty Senate approves the following revisions of the Faculty Handbook, Section III.2, paragraph I.

I. When deemed appropriate by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, a full-time track faculty position may *be* split into two half-time positions and faculty individuals otherwise qualified to fill such a position may be appointed to share it as a joint faculty appointment. The two *faculty members* will share the teaching, research, and service components of the appointment. On an individual basis, the quantity of teaching, research, and service will be less than what is expected of a full-time faculty member; however, the quality of the work performed by each *faculty member* must be comparable to 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 *faculty members* and the department.

Beginning with *the* appointment to instructor, or a higher ranking in a joint faculty position, the probationary period at Washburn University shall not exceed seven years. Such probationary period for each of the two *faculty members serving* in a joint position shall be identical and stated in their respective initial employment contracts with Washburn University. At least four of the seven years of *the* probationary service must be at Washburn *University* at the rank of instructor or higher. Up to three years credit may be granted to both *faculty members* by written agreement, for full-time service by each as teaching faculty at other institutions of higher learning.

Faculty members appointed to joint tenure track positions may be eligible for tenure and promotion in *accord* with the procedures for full-time faculty members outlined in Article V sections 6-7 of the Washburn University Bylaws, and in section III below. A joint petition may be *presented by the two faculty members appointed to a joint position*, but it should clearly state the accomplishments of each *faculty member* in teaching, scholarship, and service; *however*, each [*delete individual*] may choose to present his or her own petition. The evaluation and recommendation will be applied to each *faculty member* individually, and both must be deemed deserving in order to be promoted or receive merit. In the evaluation for tenure, the same consideration should occur, so that each of the two *faculty members* will be considered separately. Separate tenure decisions will be reached, but in the context of the joint appointment. Tenure or promotion will only be awarded to the *faculty member* sharing a joint faculty

appointment in the event that *both*: (a) (delete unnecessary words) petition for tenure and/or promotion in the same year of review; and, (b) (delete unnecessary words) are deemed to fulfill all of the requirements for tenure and/or promotion in rank. In the event that one of the *faculty members* does not petition for tenure, or one of the two is deemed not to fulfill all of the requirements for tenure, both will be given notice of non-reappointment and their employment will terminate upon the expiration of their probationary period.

The property right granted by the award of tenure is the continuation of employment as a half-time faculty member which may be terminated for cause under Article V, section 8 of the *Washburn* University Bylaws, or as provided in subsection K below. Each *faculty* member *servicing* a joint appointment position will receive an individual contract. Each *faculty* member will receive half of the full-time compensation for the position.

~~[delete Both of]~~ The *faculty* 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 *that* individual's salary).

Group Health Insurance (~~each will receiveing~~ full benefits; premium payments will be based upon *the individual's* 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 joint appointments due to insurance company regulations.

~~The rest of the document is unchanged.~~

Faculty Senate Agenda Item Number: **_08-07__** **SUBJECT: Joint Appointments** In order to make the Faculty Handbook consistent with the intent of the original action of the Washburn faculty in regard to joint appointments, the Faculty Senate approves the following revision of the Faculty Handbook, Section III:2, paragraph I. I. When deemed appropriate by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, a full-time tenure track faculty position may split into two half-time positions and persons otherwise qualified to fill such a position may be appointed to share it as a joint faculty appointment. The two members will

share the teaching, research, and service components of the appointment. On an individual basis, the quantity of teaching, research, and service will be less than what is expected of a full-time faculty member; however, the quality of the work performed by each member must be comparable to 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. Beginning with appointment to instructor or a higher rank in a joint faculty position, the probationary period at Washburn University shall not exceed seven years. Such probationary period for each of the two persons in a joint faculty position shall be identical and stated in their respective initial employment contracts with the University. At least four of the seven years probationary service must be at Washburn at the rank of instructor or higher. Up to three years credit may be granted to both appointees, by written agreement, for full-time service by each as teaching faculty at other institutions of higher learning. Joint faculty appointees in a tenure track position may be eligible for petition for tenure and promotion in accordance with the procedures for full-time faculty members outlined in Article V sections 6-7 of the Washburn University Bylaws and in section III below. 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. The evaluation and recommendation will be applied to each member individually, and both must be deemed deserving in order to be promoted or receive merit. In evaluation for tenure, the same consideration should occur, so that each of the two individuals will be considered separately. Separate tenure decisions will be reached, but in the context of the joint appointment. Tenure or promotion will only be awarded to any person sharing a joint faculty appointment in the event that (a) both individuals in such a joint faculty position petition for tenure and/or promotion in the same year of review; and, (b) both individuals are deemed to fulfill all of the requirements for tenure and/or promotion in rank. In the event that one of the individuals does not petition for tenure or one of the two is deemed not to fulfill all of the requirements for tenure, both will be given notice of non-reappointment and their employment will terminate upon the expiration of their probationary period. The property right granted by the award of tenure is the continuation of employment as a half-time faculty member which may be terminated for cause under Article V, section 8 of the University Bylaws or as provided in subsection K below. 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

Original Date: Nov. 3, 2008

Tom Prasch FS President
Robin Bowen VPAA
Originated by Lee Boyd, NSD
representative to the Faculty Senate in
May 2008

Requested Action: Faculty Senate Approval

DATE: November 12, 2009

Transfer Committee Recommendations

To fulfill its charge to identify ways to make Washburn University more “transfer friendly,” the Transfer Committee has considered both procedural and substantive issues.

Procedural issues:

To expedite the posting of transcripts from other schools, Washburn will now accept electronic transcripts when sent through official channels.

To facilitate decisions about transfer credits, including those for general education,

The general education committee now considers requests on a “rolling” schedule rather than twice a year and students are no longer required to write an essay with their application;

The university is using transfer equivalency software (the TES system) to handle as many applications as possible electronically;

Department chairs will review and update their departments’ listings on the transfer guide so that they are current and accurate;

The transfer guide will be made available on the faculty tab of my.washburn.

To advance cooperation between community colleges and Washburn, all programs with more than 60 hours of required courses for the degree are strongly encouraged to set up individualized consortium agreements with each of the local community colleges. Students in these highly prescriptive programs should be receiving advice during the first two years that will help them avoid hours that do not satisfy degree requirements. Such arrangements will not only help students but will also improve our image as the advisors at these schools will be able to encourage students to attend Washburn.

Substantive issues:

The Transfer Committee makes the following recommendations (to be considered individually) to the Academic Affairs Committee:

EN 300

The committee endorses the elimination of the 200/300 placement examination.

The second semester of freshman composition taken by students transferring into Washburn will be accepted as satisfying general education hours in the Humanities Division. This recommendation will take effect immediately upon approval.

The English Department will work with the various schools and majors to develop more major-specific sections of EN 300, especially with the SON.

PE 198

The committee recommends that the university requirement of PE 198 be eliminated.

WTE

The committee recommends that the Washburn Transformational Experience be changed from a requirement to an option.

General Education courses

The committee recommends that the general education requirement be made non-course specific, i.e., any course in any department of the CAS qualifies for general education credit. [possible addition, depending on outcome of ad hoc general education committee recommendations: “provided the course syllabus demonstrates a clear emphasis on at least one of the General Education Learning Objectives and the instructor can adequately assess student learning regarding that objective”].

The committee sites the following advantages of such a change:

All transfer issues involving general education credit are eliminated;

The cumbersome paperwork for general education course approval is eliminated;

The discrepancy in transfer credit acceptance between transfer students with a completed associate’s degree and those who do not have one is eliminated;

Interdisciplinary and special topics courses are encouraged since they would not need to go through general education committee approval;

Upper-division courses will be available for general education credit and therefore appeal to a broader base of students.

FACULTY SENATE AGENDA ITEM

No. 09-18

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Resolution on the Michael Gunter **No Confidence Vote** taken April 13, 2009 with a vote of 27for – 3against – 3abstain which is an 82% majority voting no confidence in Michael Gunter’s ability to perform his job.

Whereas there has been no response from the Administration to the Faculty Senate about the **No Confidence Vote** after 7+ months;

Whereas the 82% vote was misrepresented to the Board of Regents as a few disgruntled faculty;

Whereas during the past 7+ months problems have continued to surface in ISS:
the ill-timed and executed update of Washburn University technology systems over the weekend of August 8-9
followed by the full-scale meltdown of email systems from August 20 forward
followed by the proposed plan to upgrade the email server over the weekend of Nov 14 in the middle of the semester and online registration
Michael Gunter not posting nor presenting minutes to be approved by the Faculty IT Advisory Committees he chairs
no minutes posted since the May 11, 2009 meeting for the Technology Steering Committee
the sending of an email memo exonerating Michael Gunter over the signature of the Technology Steering Committee, when not even a draft of the memo had been presented to the committee, let alone a final copy being approved by the committee

The faculty senate requests an acknowledgment of the **No Confidence Vote** from the president and would appreciate some response by the president concerning the vote.

Date: November 9, 2009

Proposed By: Rick Barker