

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate

October 26, 2009
3:30 pm Kansas Room, Memorial Union

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 12, 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. Academic Affairs Items
- VI. University Committee Reports
 - A. Assessment Committee Minutes of September 9, 2009 (pg.4)
 - B. Assessment Committee Minutes of September 23, 2009 (pp. 5-6)
 - C. International Education/International WTE Committee Minutes of September 17, 2009 (pg. 7)
 - D. Faculty Library Committee Minutes from October 15, 2009
 - E. Honors Advisory Committee Minutes from October 7, 2009
- VII. Old Business
 - A. Change to Appendix IV (Human Subjects Research Policy) of the Faculty Handbook (09-14) pp. 8-9
 - B. (1) Clarification of the structure of the Major Research and Grant Review Subcommittee Option 1 (09-15) pp. 10-12
 - (2) Clarification of the structure of the Major Research and Grant Review Subcommittee Option 2 (09-15) pp. 13-15
- VIII. New Business
 - A. Faculty Senate Resolution on the Washburn Technology Crisis (09-10) pp. 16-17
- IX. Information Items
- X. Discussion Items
- XI. Announcements
- XII. Adjournment

**Faculty Senate
Washburn University**

*Minutes of October 12, 2009
Kansas Room, Memorial Union*

Present: Arterburn, Averett, Barker, Berry, Byrne, Croucher, Faulkner, Fry, Isaacson, Janzen, Kelly, Khan, Lunte, Manske, Mazachek,,McGuire, Melick, Menzie, Ockree, Prasch (President), Quinn, Routsong, Sharafy, Shaver, 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 September 14, 2009 were approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks.
 - A. Prasch introduced Harold Rood, Chair of the Benefits committee and open the floor to his remarks.

Rood provided background on the benefits committee and answered questions concerning the make-up of the committee. Four members are appointed at the direction of the faculty senate and four are appointed from the staff council. Questions from Senators included how the deductible was set, how the tiers were developed, and whether other organizations besides BCBS had been contacted to administer the policy. Rood invited new members from the Senate to take up these issues for the next cycle (November 2010). Rood also commented that the Benefits committee had very little time to make corrections this year, but did so based on consultation with an outside insurance consultant and the HR director.
 - B. Prasch reported on his follow-up conversation with President Farley after the Senate tabled the technology resolution. He felt hewas given a more detailed mapping out of the difficulties, including acknowledgement that there were local problems. On September 18, an e-mail was sent without the Tech Steering committee's knowledge but under their signature generally placing all blame on Sungard. Both the Technology Steering committee and the Faculty Technology committee were informed that issues are already resolved. Since that time, ISS has asked for \$100,000 for a back-up e-mail server. Prasch will follow-up prior to the next meeting.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
 - A. Prasch stated that the Board has not met since the last meeting.
- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
 - A. Minutes from the Academic Affairs Committee meeting of September 9, 2009 were approved.
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
 - A. Minutes from the Library Committee meeting of September 27, 2009 were accepted.
 - B. Minutes from the Curriculum Development Grant Committee meeting of September 16, 2009 were accepted.

- C. Minutes from the Faculty Development Grant Committee meeting of September 21, 2009 were accepted.
 - D. Minutes from the Honors Advisory Committee meeting of Sept 16, 2009 were accepted.
 - E. Minutes from the Honors Advisory Committee meeting of September 23, 2009 were accepted.
- VII. Old Business.
- A. Appointments to the Benefit Committee: the following were appointed to the committee
Rosemary Walker
Mary Ramirez
Russ Jacobs
Tracy Routsong
 - B. (Action Item 09-09). Amendment to the Faculty Constitution Clarifying Faculty Representation The item was approved.
 - C. (Action Item 09-11) Revision of the Composition of the Graduate Committee. The item was approved.
 - D. (Action Item 09-12) Revision of the Faculty Handbook Language on the Student Financial Aid Committee. The item was approved.
 - E. (Action Item 09-13) Board of Student Publication and Faculty Handbook Discrepancies. The item was approved
- VIII. New Business.
- A. (Action Item 09-14) Proposed Revision to Appendix IV – Human Subjects Research Policy. The item was amended and moved to second reading.
 - B. (Action Item 09-15) Clarification of the structure of the Major Research and Grand Review Subcommittee.
Two options were presented to the committee. Both items were approved on first reading and it was the consensus of the senate to allow both to go to second reading at the next meeting.
 - C. Appointments to the Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Subcommittee
The following members were asked to serve based on the approved composition:
Karen Ray (Humanities)
Kerry Wynn (Social Sciences)
Gaspar Porta (Natural Sciences)
Azyz Sharafy (Arts/Theater/Music)
Tim Fry (Ed/HPEES)
Lori Edwards (SON)
Jim Martin (SOBU)
Mark Kauffman (SAS)
Bill Rich (SOL)
- IX. Information Items. There were none.
- X. Discussion Items. There were none
- XI. Announcements. There were none.
- XII. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 PM

- XIII. The next meeting is scheduled for **Monday, October 26 at 3:30 pm** in the Kansas Room, Memorial Union.

**MINUTES
ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**

Wednesday, September 9, 2009
Cottonwood Room
3:00 p.m.

Present: Donna LaLonde (chair), Nancy Tate, Melodie Christal, Joanne Altman, Danny Wade, Cathy Hunt, Mary Shoop, Jane Carpenter, Heather Collins, Lucas Mullin, Diany Conny (student guest) and CJ Crawford (administrative support). Absent: Denise Ottinger, Lori Khan, Kandy Ockree, Jay Memmott, and Don Vest.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The committee minutes from August 26, 2009 were approved as submitted.

REPORTS ON VISITS WITH ASSESSMENT LIAISONS

Areas like the idea of the report rubric. They appreciate that the Assessment process is being aligned with the Program Review process. We will use the rubric this year and request feedback from the liaisons on the wiki after the June 30 annual report due date. Final recommendations from the committee for changes are due to CJ by September 11.

A question did come up about the difference between direct and indirect measures. Maybe it would be a good idea to show examples of both at the workshop.

Another question has been asked about Matrix 1 – is it to be done by department or degree program? It makes sense to do it by degree since the Student Learning Outcomes may differ. What do they do with unexpected outcomes – awards, etc? These should be in their report. Right now, Matrix 1 should just be used for courses to keep it simple.

ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP – SEPTEMBER 25

- 1) Introduce rubric – linking of Program Review process to Assessment process
- 2) Look for an area to use as a good example – ask Kandy Ockree if it's okay to use SoBu report
- 3) Need to find another area that just needs a few modifications – possibly Allied Health?
- 4) Liaisons should bring Matrix 1 on a flash drive – post on wiki when completed
- 5) Hand out rubric for self-analysis
- 6) Show how to post the matrix on the wiki

Next Committee Meeting

The committee will meet again on September 23 from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the Cottonwood Room in Memorial Union.

Future Fall Meetings (all in the Cottonwood Room from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.):

October 14
October 28
November 11
December 2

The meeting adjourned.

MINUTES
ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 23, 2009
Cottonwood Room
3:00 p.m.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The committee minutes from September 9, 2009 were approved as amended.

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS

Annual assessment reports for the 5 years preceding Program Review will be what are expected for the Student Learning Outcomes portion of each area's review (both in report format and data). The analysis of data and feedback will be the same from both the Program Review Committee and the Assessment Committee.

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE AREA REVIEWS

The committee will begin with Math on October 28. CJ will schedule International Programs and BIS for November; both of these programs are at the beginning of the reporting process. The School of Nursing and Social Work will be scheduled in January or February.

Donna said she had a conversation with Heidi Staerke about whether assessment should be done on International Programs or on Intensive English. After discussion, the committee agreed that it should include both and that Bobbie Anderson should be a co-liaison. It was recommended to suggest to Heidi that a faculty committee could be utilized to help identify the student learning outcomes for study abroad. A question was also asked if there is overlap between study abroad and the International WTE.

ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP – SEPTEMBER 25

It was agreed to use the School of Business and the HPEES reports as examples for the individual groups rubric practice.

It was agreed to move the deadline for posting Matrix 1 on the wiki to November 20.

ASSESSMENT RECORD

Donna passed out copies of the Assessment Record to be used as the report format on the wiki. It was recommended to add two missing items – frequency of outcome assessment and how information is disseminated to faculty and stakeholders – to agree with the items on the rubric.

Deadline for committee member's review of the annual report will be by August 1 each year so that areas have the feedback prior to initial faculty meetings. Each area's rejoinder and comments will be due back

to the committee liaison by the first Friday of September for discussion at the committee's September meeting.

The Assessment calendar and timeline will be on the wiki. The committee's August meeting will be used to plan for the upcoming academic year and the September meeting will be to review the rubrics and comments.

Next Committee Meeting

The committee will meet again on October 14 from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the Cottonwood Room in Memorial Union.

Future Fall Meetings (all in the Cottonwood Room from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.):

October 28 – Math Department Assessment Review

November 11

December 2

The meeting adjourned.

International Education /International WTE Committee
September 17, 2009, International House

In attendance: Norma Juma, Brian Ogawa, Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas, Matt Arterburn, Janice Dunwell, Judy McConnell-Farmer, Alex Glashausser, Caley Onek, and Baili Zhang

Zhang welcomed new members and returning members back.

Zhang reported that the state of international programs is sound. All areas (international students enrollment, IE enrollment, and study abroad participation) saw significant growth. In particular, the number of new international students reached 90, a record high. Other programming such as Brown Bag series, international student activities are all in full swing.

Onek suggested strategies to integrate international students into the main campus culture and inquire about the WuBuddy program, which is a club of study abroad returnees to help international students adjust to the new living and learning environment.

The basic criteria for approving a faculty-led WTE program were revisited. It was voted to base future proposals on these criteria with the need to include a viable and realistic budget. Zhang will revise the information and incorporated into the Faculty Development Guide.

The “European Cultures and Societies” program was discussed. The committee voted to require a re- submission, which should further address the following issues: content of course, grading requirement, additional accompanying staff, and cultural/human interaction.

The following faculty travel requests were approved:

Judy McConnell-Farmer: \$1,200 to Belize

Mark Norman: \$1,170 to England

Respectfully submitted,

Faculty Senate Agenda Item

Number: 09-14

SUBJECT: Change to Appendix IV (Human Subjects Research Policy) of the Faculty Handbook.

DESCRIPTION: The Institutional Review Board (IRB) is a committee established according to federal regulations and charged with the protection of human research subjects. The purpose of an IRB review is to assure that appropriate steps are taken to protect the rights and welfare of humans participating as subjects in the research. All research involving human participants conducted by Washburn University students, faculty, and staff must be reviewed and approved prior to the initiation of research.

Between 2001 and 2005, the IRB received and reviewed an annual average of 53 applications. In 2006, 2007, and 2008, the IRB received 98, 113, and 107 applications, respectively, with approximately 93% of the applications being reviewed during the Fall and Spring semesters. The amount of work is burdensome for everyone including the external reviewer (an individual with no affiliations with Washburn University). In response to the increased number of submissions, it is requested that the size of the IRB be increased. Increasing the number of IRB members would result in a decrease in member workload. Increasing IRB membership will also provide researchers with additional sources of information about the IRB process and policies.

In the Fall of 2008, the IRB moved to an electronic submission and review process. Using the Washburn University email system, IRB applications were submitted and distributed for review. This move was expected to make the application and review process easier for applicants and reviewers. It was also expected to decrease the amount of time needed to review applications.

Increasing the membership of the IRB and the acceptance of electronic submissions of IRB applications requires modification of certain sections of Appendix IV (Human Subjects Research Policy) of the Faculty Handbook (see attachment).

Finally, according to the Faculty Handbook (IV.D.2.d.), IRB membership is term limited. The ability to accurately review an IRB application requires extensive experience. For this reason, it is requested that this section be deleted.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: None.

RECOMMENDATION: It is requested that Faculty Senate approve the following modifications of Appendix IV of the Faculty Handbook.

Appendix IV: Human Subject Research Policy

D. Institutional Review Board (IRB); Establishment and Membership

1. The Institutional Review Board shall consist of at least seven appointed members. The President and VPAA ~~Provost~~ will serve as ex officio members.

2. Membership

c. Membership shall include the following:

1. **At least one** member shall be appointed from each of the five major academic areas. **The number of members from one academic area may not vary by more than one from any other area.**
2. **At least one** member shall be appointed who is not affiliated with the University, nor is related to anyone affiliated with the University.
3. **At least one** member shall be appointed who is a full-time upper-division or graduate student with a 3.0 grade point average or better.

~~d. Members shall serve for a term of two (2) years; except for three initial appointees to the Board who shall have one (1) year appointments so that membership will be staggered.~~

F. Institutional Review Board; Reports and Documentation

The Institutional Review Board shall prepare and maintain adequate documentation of its activities including:

~~2. Minutes of IRB meetings reflecting attendance at the meetings;~~ **Records (written or electronic) of** actions taken; the vote on actions approving or disapproving research proposals, including the number of members voting for, against, and abstaining; the basis for requiring changes in, or disapproving, research; and a ~~written summary~~ **record** of the discussion of controversial issues and a resolution;

H. IRB Review of Application and Approval

2. Normal review process.

~~The IRB meets the first Monday of each month. The Investigator is to submit nine (9) hard copies or one (1) electronic copy of the application to the Chairperson of the IRB. Proposals should be sent to the IRB two (2) weeks before the regular monthly meeting for review. Proposals received less than two weeks before a regular meeting may be subject to delay, however, every effort will be made to accommodate the Investigator.~~ The application will be assigned a number, recorded and distributed to IRB members for review. The application will be evaluated, recorded and an "IRB PROPOSAL EVALUATION" form will be returned to the Principle Investigator or the Faculty Supervisor. The IRB keeps the original application on file along with a copy of the IRB PROPOSAL EVALUATION.

3. Expedited review process.

If the Investigator requests an expedited review, he/she must submit three (3) hard copies or one (1) electronic copy of the application. The Chairperson of the IRB and one other committee member will make the evaluation and return the IRB PROPOSAL EVALUATION. If either one or both decide that the proposal requires full committee review then the Investigator is notified with a request for six (6) more hard copies of the proposal (assuming hard copies of the application were originally submitted) and it will follow the normal review procedure.

Originated by: Mike Russell, IRB Chair

Date: October 12, 2009

Faculty Senate Action Item

Item 09-15 Option 1

Subject: Clarification of the structure of the Major Research and Grant Review Subcommittee

Rationale: At present, the Major Research and Grant Review Subcommittee is defined as a subcommittee of the Research Committee, which would entail that its members also serve on the committee it is sub- to, but that is not how appointments to the committee have actually been made for several years; they have been appointed by the deans of the academic units when a committee member's term is expiring.

According to the Faculty Handbook, members of the Grant Review Subcommittee "shall not be eligible for grants from the committee while serving on the committee"; however, there is no such restriction indicated for committee members of the overarching Research Committee. In addition, the Grant Review Subcommittee has only been reviewing internal grants and prioritizing them for the Research Committee which allocates the funds for all internal grants. Members of the Grant Review Subcommittee are "urged not to serve on other major university committees." This restriction does not appear to be necessary under the present circumstances. We need to decide whether 1) to let things operate as they currently do and have this committee report to the Research Committee; or 2) make this an actual subcommittee. We also need to determine 1) whether or not members of both the Research Committee and the Grant Review Subcommittee should be restricted from being eligible for receiving research grants and 2) whether the Grant Review Committee should take on the task of reviewing external grants, which it has not been doing. If the decision is made to retain the review of external grants by this committee, there could be serious repercussions with grant deadlines not being met due to the lack of timeliness of review by the Grant Review Committee since, according to the Faculty Handbook, "The Review Committee shall act on proposals twice annually: in October and in April. The spring meeting will review projects to commence during the following summer and fall semester, while the fall meeting will be concerned with projects planned for the following spring semester." Currently, external grants are reviewed by the department (if applicable), the academic dean, and the VPAA as well as the Grant Facilitator, the Grant Budget Manager, and the VPAT.

Recommended Change:

-----1. Research Committee

a. Purpose and Function

The purpose of this Committee is to allocate funds for the support of scholarly activities of the full-time faculty of Washburn University.

In this capacity the Committee will review requests for funds to cover all reasonable expenses associated with scholarly activities.

1) Scholarly activity refers to original research that results in the advancement of the arts, humanities, sciences, social sciences, or professions.

2) Reasonable expenses may include the following types of items: reassigned time, travel, equipment, materials, supplies, services, and a variety of publication costs including the purchase of reprints.

3) The Committee will not review requests for the support of graduate course work or dissertation research, for the development of new courses or course materials, or for expenses augmenting Sweet Sabbatical funds.

An application for funds should be submitted to the chairperson of the Committee. This application should include a short but clear description of the activities and their significance, as well as a detailed account of the financial support requested. In some cases the Committee may request the applicant to be present at the review meeting so that questions may be answered.

b. Membership

The Committee will consist of three faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, a faculty member from each of the other major academic units appointed by the Dean of the respective academic units from those actively engaged in research or other scholarly pursuits, a member of the University Library faculty, a member of the Treasurer's office and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

c. Major Research Grants and the Review Committee

(For more details, see Appendix III.) A research fund for more extensive activities has been established to provide support for the research and scholarly activities of the full-time faculty of Washburn University. A Review Committee ~~functioning as a subcommittee of the Research Committee~~ will be appointed **by the deans of the academic units** to review proposals and to recommend to the Research Committee allocations from the research fund. **The membership will consist of one representative from each academic unit.** The Review Committee will then recommend allocations to **the Research Committee** ~~the Vice President for Academic Affairs who shall in turn make recommendations to the President.~~

~~In this capacity the Review Committee will review and evaluate two kinds of requests from the full time faculty: (1) requests to support the development of ideas or projects that are to be submitted to other agencies for more extensive funding, and (2) requests for funds to support in full or in part original research and scholarly activity.~~

1) Functions of the Review Committee

a) The Review Committee will provide application forms to full-time members of the Washburn faculty seeking financial support for their research or scholarly activity. These applications will require a clear description of the purpose, nature, method of evaluation, and significance of the activity to be supported, as well as a detailed account of the expenses to be incurred.

b) The Review Committee shall act on proposals twice annually: in October and in April. The spring meeting will review projects to commence during the following summer and fall semester, while the fall meeting will be concerned with projects planned for the following spring semester.

- c) The Review Committee will develop and publish criteria for the evaluation of proposals.
- d) The Review Committee will evaluate and rank as to merit all the requests received at each of its meetings.

2) Structure of the Review Committee

a) The Review Committee shall be composed of five full-time tenured Associate or Full Professors who shall serve staggered two-year terms. **One member will be appointed by each academic dean.** Members of the committee must have a documented history of research or scholarly activity. ~~Members shall not represent particular constituencies of the University nor shall their selection be based upon departmental, divisional, school, or college affiliation. However, no more than one member from a single department may serve at one time and no newly appointed member may be from the same department as any member whose term has expired that year.~~

b) The Vice President for Academic Affairs **or designee** will be an ex officio member without vote.

c) The Review Committee will **report to** the Research Committee.

~~d) Members of the Review Committee shall not be eligible for grants from the committee while serving on the committee.~~ **Members shall be required to recuse themselves from deliberations of any grant they are proposing.**

~~e) Members of the Review committee will be urged not to serve on other major university committees.~~

Financial Implications: None

Recommendation: Faculty Senate Approval

Date: October 12, 2009

Submitted by: Thomas Prasch
Faculty Senate President

Faculty Senate Action Item

Item **09-15** Option #2

Subject: Clarification of the structure of the Major Research and Grant Review Subcommittee

Rationale: At present, the Major Research and Grant Review Subcommittee is defined as a subcommittee of the Research Committee, which would entail that its members also serve on the committee it is sub- to, but that is not how appointments to the committee have actually been made for several years; they have been appointed by the deans of the academic units when a committee member's term is expiring. According to the Faculty Handbook, members of the Grant Review Subcommittee "shall not be eligible for grants from the committee while serving on the committee"; however, there is no such restriction indicated for committee members of the overarching Research Committee. In addition, the Grant Review Subcommittee has only been reviewing internal grants and prioritizing them for the Research Committee which allocates the funds for all internal grants. Members of the Grant Review Subcommittee are "urged not to serve on other major university committees." This restriction does not appear to be necessary under the present circumstances. We need to decide whether 1) to let things operate as they currently do and have this committee report to the Research Committee; or 2) make this an actual subcommittee. We also need to determine 1) whether or not members of both the Research Committee and the Grant Review Subcommittee should be restricted from being eligible for receiving research grants and 2) whether the Grant Review Committee should take on the task of reviewing external grants, which it has not been doing. If the decision is made to retain the review of external grants by this committee, there could be serious repercussions with grant deadlines not being met due to the lack of timeliness of review by the Grant Review Committee since, according to the Faculty Handbook, "The Review Committee shall act on proposals twice annually: in October and in April. The spring meeting will review projects to commence during the following summer and fall semester, while the fall meeting will be concerned with projects planned for the following spring semester." Currently, external grants are reviewed by the department (if applicable), the academic dean, and the VPAA as well as the Grant Facilitator, the Grant Budget Manager, and the VPAT.

Recommended Change:

-----1. Research Committee

a. Purpose and Function

The purpose of this Committee is to allocate funds for the support of scholarly activities of the full-time faculty of Washburn University.

In this capacity the Committee will review requests for funds to cover all reasonable expenses associated with scholarly activities.

1) Scholarly activity refers to original research that results in the advancement of the arts, humanities, sciences, social sciences, or professions.

2) Reasonable expenses may include the following types of items: reassigned time, travel, equipment, materials, supplies, services, and a variety of publication costs including the purchase of reprints.

3) The Committee will not review requests for the support of graduate course work or dissertation research, for the development of new courses or course materials, or for expenses augmenting Sweet Sabbatical funds.

An application for funds should be submitted to the chairperson of the Committee. This application should include a short but clear description of the activities and their significance, as well as a detailed account of the financial support requested. In some cases the Committee may request the applicant to be present at the review meeting so that questions may be answered.

b. Membership

The Committee will consist of **three faculty members** from the College of Arts and Sciences appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, a faculty member from each of the other major academic units appointed by the Dean of the respective academic units from those actively engaged in research or other scholarly pursuits, a member of the University Library faculty, a member of the Treasurer's office and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. **~~Members of the Review Committee shall not be eligible for grants from the committee while serving on the committee.~~**

c. Major Research Grants and the Review Committee

(For more details, see Appendix III.) A research fund for more extensive activities has been established to provide support for the research and scholarly activities of the full-time faculty of Washburn University. A Review Committee functioning as a subcommittee of the Research Committee will be appointed to review proposals and to recommend to the Research Committee allocations from the research fund. ~~The Research Committee will then recommend allocations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who shall in turn make recommendations to the President.~~

~~In this capacity the Review Committee will review and evaluate two kinds of requests from the full-time faculty: (1) requests to support the development of ideas or projects that are to be submitted to other agencies for more extensive funding, and (2) requests for funds to support in full or in part original research and scholarly activity.~~

1) Functions of the Review Committee

a) The Review Committee will provide application forms to full-time members of the Washburn faculty seeking financial support for their research or scholarly activity. These applications will require a clear description of the purpose, nature, method of evaluation, and significance of the activity to be supported, as well as a detailed account of the expenses to be incurred.

b) The Review Committee shall act on proposals twice annually: in October and in April. The spring meeting will review projects to commence during the following summer and fall semester, while the fall meeting will be concerned with projects planned for the following spring semester.

c) The Review Committee will develop and publish criteria for the evaluation of proposals.

d) The Review Committee will evaluate and rank as to merit all the requests received at each of its meetings.

2) Structure of the Review Committee

a) The Review Committee shall be composed of **five full-time tenured Associate or Full Professors** who shall serve staggered two-year terms. Members of the committee must have a documented history of research or scholarly activity. Members shall not represent particular constituencies of the University nor shall their selection be based upon departmental, divisional, school, or college affiliation. However, no more than one member from a single department may serve at one time and no newly appointed member may be from the same department as any member whose term has expired that year.

b) The Vice President for Academic Affairs **or designee** will be an ex officio member without vote.

c) The Review Committee will be a subcommittee of the Research Committee.

~~d) Members of the Review Committee shall not be eligible for grants from the committee while serving on the committee.~~ **Members of the review committee will reclude themselves from deliberations of any grant they are proposing.**

~~e) Members of the Review committee will be urged not to serve on other major university committees.~~

Financial Implications: None

Recommendation: Faculty Senate Approval

Date: October 12, 2009

Submitted by: Thomas Prasch
Faculty Senate President

Faculty Senate Agenda Item

No. 09-10

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Resolution on the Washburn Technology Crisis

DESCRIPTION: Whereas the disastrously 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, has had a wide range of negative consequences for Washburn students, faculty, and administrative systems, including:

- At a time when enrollment and retention issues are especially important to Washburn's bottom line, the disruption of on-line classes, enrollment systems, and ability to email faculty at the very start of a semester, leading a number of students to withdraw from classes;
- Significant interference with students' abilities to interact with their professors and professors' abilities to communicate with students, significantly complicating basic processes of instruction;
- Catastrophic impairment of the ability of faculty to maintain their professional development, in an era when conference calls for papers, article submissions, invitations to speak, letters of recommendation, and basic communication with colleagues outside of Washburn fundamentally depend on functional email systems and access to email address books;
- The loss of email folders as an organizational system, resulting in loss of data and complicating all aspects of university life, including teaching, service, and the arrangement of special events;
- Significant interference with the ongoing work of Washburn libraries, in particular the ability to facilitate interlibrary loans, to manage faculty book orders, and to maintain connections with the Washburn community;
- Massive disruption of basic inter-campus communications, with deep consequent disruption to campus life, the ability of faculty to perform their service duties, the operation of campus committees, advising and enrollment management, and the added expense of the retreat to photocopying and hand delivery of messages;
- The loss of faith by Washburn students, faculty, and staff in the ability of ISS to provide reliable service and the perception that the administration of Washburn University lacks clear answers to the technology crisis; and

- The embarrassing taint on the public image of Washburn University and its ability to project an image of basic competence and ability to carry out advanced education in a computer-driven age, revealed in media ranging from negative television coverage to mocking Facebook pages,
- and whereas neither the vaguely worded updates posted on MyWashburn by ISS nor any statement by the administrators to whom ISS is responsible have done anything to address the fundamental character of this breakdown; the deep level of disruption in student, faculty, and Washburn community lives; where responsibility for this crisis lies; or what will be done to ensure no further disruptions of this sort in the future.

MOTION: the Faculty Senate calls for the establishment by the President of Washburn University of an investigative panel, including faculty and student participants, commissioned to explore, at minimum, the following issues:

1. What was known in advance of the upgrade of potential difficulties or system incompatibilities, and why nothing of this knowledge, if it existed, was communicated to the Technology Steering Committee and the Faculty Instructional Technology Committee;
2. What led to the disastrous decision to carry out such a fundamental shift in systems one week before the beginning of a semester, and why the Technology Steering Committee and Faculty Instructional Technology Committee were not alerted to the fact that this upgrade could be less than routine;
3. Why no back-up systems were in place, and why there seems to have been no effort to create any sort of fail-safe mechanism, any workable restore point, or even, at the bare minimum, some sort of bounce-back message for email so that colleagues outside of Washburn would know that messages were not being received;
4. Who at Washburn University is taking responsibility for the decisions that led to this crisis, and what consequences that responsibility entails;
5. What the cost of this crisis has been to Washburn University , in terms of lost student enrollment, retreat to paper copies, disruption of faculty and student life, and wasted staff time;
6. What mechanisms are being put in place to ensure that meltdowns of this scale do not take place in the future;
7. Whether, in light of the crisis, it has become critical to engage the services of an outside consultant on technology issues on campus;
8. And what mechanisms will be put into place to ensure that ISS is directly answerable in some real way to academic programs, since the timing of this crisis clearly suggests their costly indifference to the academic mission of the university, as reflected in the failure to consider academic schedules and needs.
9. The commission should deliver at least a preliminary report of its findings to the full faculty of the university by no later than November 1.

Date: September 14, 2009

Originated By: Thomas Prasch
Faculty Senate President