

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
March 7, 2016
3:00 PM – Kansas Room, Memorial Union**

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 1, 2016 (p. 2-4)**
- III. **President’s Opening Remarks**
- IV. **Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents**
- V. **VPAA Update—Dr. Randy Pembroke**
- VI. **Faculty Senate Committee Reports: NONE**
- VII. **University Committee Reports:**
 - **Receipt of the Graduate Council minutes from November 23, 2015 (p. 5-6)**
 - **Receipt of the Honors Advisory Board minutes from November 4, 2015 (p. 7-8)**
 - **Receipt of the International Education minutes from January 21, 2016 (p. 9).**
 - **Receipt of the Assessment Committee minutes from February 11, 2016 (p. 10-11).**
 - **Receipt of Graduate Council minutes from January 25, 2016 (p. 12-14).**
- VIII. **Old Business:**
 - **16-6 Victim Advocate Proposal (2nd reading) (p. 15-17)**
- IX. **New Business: NONE**
- X. **Information Items: NONE**
- XI. **Discussion Items: NONE**
- XII. **Announcements**
- XIII. **Adjournment**

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
February 1, 2016
3:00 PM – Kansas Room, Memorial Union**

PRESENT:

Alexander (Rebecca), Alexander (Ryan), Ball, Farwell, Jackson, Sungkyu, Mastrosimone, McHenry, Memmer, Modellmog, Pembrook, Petersen, Porta, Routsong, Russell, Sadikot, Sanchez, Schnoebelen, Scofield, Sourgens, Stacey, Steinroetter, Stevens, Stevenson, Tutwiler, Weiner, Wohl, Worsely, Zwikstra

ABSENT:

Childers, Francis, Garritano, Mansfield, Mapp, Mechtly, Palbicke, Schmidt, Smith, Treinen

GUESTS:

Kelly Erby, Blake Porter

- I. **President Ball called the meeting to order at 3:01pm.**
- II. **The Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 7, 2015 were approved.**
- III. **President’s Opening Remarks: None**
- IV. **Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents: None**
- V. **VPAA Update—Dr. Randy Pembrook:**
 - **Voluntary Retirement Incentive Program: Pembrook noted that he was sorry that some heard about it first from the newspaper; he had thought a communication plan was in place to notify faculty first, but it fell through.**
 - **General Faculty Meeting Cancelled: Pembrook wants the faculty to feel that when we have a meeting of the general faculty, it matters. It seemed to make sense to cancel the meeting last week when there was only one agenda item.**
 - **The Graduate Council has approved the interdisciplinary classes required for the new Leadership/Communication MA program (since it is an inter-disciplinary program, the graduate council took the place of the department or academic unit for initial approval of courses). This program plan is working through the rest of the proper channels and will likely come before the Senate for approval in April.**
 - **Please plan on attending the Harmon Lincoln Lecture this Wednesday at 7:00pm.**
- VI. **Faculty Senate Committee Reports: NONE**
- VII. **University Committee Reports:**
 - **The Graduate Council minutes from October 26, 2015 were received.**
 - **The International Education Committee minutes from November 5, 2015 were received.**
- VIII. **Old Business:**

- **16-4 Office Door Proposal (2nd reading) (Presented by Ball):** Russell wondered if we need a formal policy statement and asked about how it would be disseminated? Ball responded that there is no policy; we're just seeking clarification about the issue from the Administration. Pembroke noted that he talked to Anderson about this and suggested 3 possible ways to go: 1) small bulletin boards could be placed on each door for any items faculty wanted to post; OR 2) a bulletin board could be placed next to doors for items; OR 3) faculty could just be taped to the glass in or around doors. Petersen wondered if we should expect to receive the policy back or if this was a one-way request (FS transmitting the policy clarification request to administrator); Ball said she did not see this as an interactive process, that it is simply a request for clarification of the policy. Stevenson asked if this was just a policy clarification for Morgan Hall; Ball said that we should ask for clarification for all buildings. The motion was approved and will be sent on to General Faculty.

IX. New Business: (NOTE: Those present voted 26 to 28 to include 16-6 though it was not included on the original agenda for this meeting).

- **16-5 Campus Smoking Policy Proposal (1st reading) was presented by Ball:** If it passes FS, it will go to the committee that is forming on this question (made up of faculty and staff) rather than going to Gen Fac. Mastrosimone noted that it might make more sense to give individual buildings a say in how they enforce the policy. Wohl said that allowing individual buildings choice in the matter could be confusing; the message should be clear and consistent. Pembroke: from a process standpoint, we'll have many different versions of opinions out there (Faculty, Staff, Students); we are just one part of this discussion. Ultimately, the Regents will decide campus policy. Porta noted that of the few Math faculty members he's talked to, most favor all out banning felt that they wanted the University to be more forward thinking in terms of protecting campus individuals. Ball reminded everyone that anyone could propose a policy. Petersen reminded everyone that a ban could still happen regardless of what FS does with this policy. Ball asked for feedback on this proposal or a new proposal. Pembroke noted that Ball will likely be asked how the faculty en masse feel about this issue, so we should do our homework by (at least informally) surveying our units/departments.
- **16-6 Victim Advocate Proposal (1st reading) was introduced by Erby:** Scofield: How is this different than campus counseling? Erby (and Petersen) responded that they offer different services—the advocate does things on or off of campus in various contexts versus therapeutic on-campus short-term services provided by counseling. Petersen also noted that this could help the University in terms of student retention and enhanced grade performance, as well. Mastrosimone wondered if this person would be truly confidential, despite potential conflict of interest with University employment. Erby hopes that faculty input in the process will help here, and Petersen noted that they might be forced to disclose rates and numbers but not names of victims. Sadikot wondered whom this individual would report to; could this authority be subverted? Petersen said this was clearly a concern, and that if this position is listed, it will need to be considered. Porta wanted to clarify the nature of the victimization; Erby noted that it was any kind of victimizing event (as defined by those asked). Porta wondered what type of victimization was included; Petersen clarified that it was most often crime-based and crimes/complaints would be prioritized appropriately. Ball asked people to pass on question and comments to Erby for the next reading.

X. Information Items: None

XI. Discussion Items:

- **Ball will form a working group to look at the use of student evaluations of teaching at Washburn; if you're interested in it, please contact Ball.**
- **Possible constitutional amendment providing ex-officio student, staff, and adjunct representatives on Faculty Senate (Presented by Pembroke): HLC is strongly suggesting that campuses review and revise governance processes to ensure that student voices are heard; adding a student to faculty senate (at least for a voice) could be a way to incorporate this. Ball noted that we have had students sit in on meetings before, but have not actually served on Senate. Petersen said there's a difference between a faculty senate and an academic senate, and that students are usually on the latter and not the former. Steinroetter wondered if adding some of these groups might set them up for "second class status" (a voice without a vote). Ball wondered if we could just add a student to Academic Affairs instead of the actual full Senate? Petersen wondered what the HLC goal was for the suggestion. Pembroke noted that student voices on Program Review have been helpful.**

XII. Announcements: NONE

XIII. President Ball adjourned the meeting at 4:09pm.

Graduate Council Agenda

November 23, 2015

12:00 – 1:00 p.m.

Lincoln room/Union

Graduate Committee members Present: Bob Boncella (MBA), Julie Boydston (PY), Patricia Dahl (CJ), Shirley Dinkel (DNP), Vickie Kelly (MHS), Bruce Mactavish (MLS), Bobbe Mansfield (SON), Brenda Patzel, (SON), Tim Peterson (ex-officio), Randy Pembroke (ex-officio), Blake Porter (WSGA), Michael Rettig, Bassima Schbley (MSW), Kayla Waters (HS), Kelley Weber (Mabee)

1. The October 26, 2015 minutes were submitted to the committee previously with a request committee members review these prior to the meeting. A motion and second to approve the minutes were made. All approved said minutes.

2. Update on the Incomplete backlog:

Kelly Russell continued the discussion of the incomplete backlog with the council members. She stated again there are 524 incompletes on the records dating back to 1968. She asked again if the Registrar's office could resolve some of these by using the "catalog timeframe" of 7 years. Kelly proposed that the incomplete be moved to a non-credit status.

After lengthy discussion, the council approved a recommendation that was made to have a University wide policy that allows each program flexibility to deal with incompletes. The standard, most members felt, should be that one year limit for an incomplete with a follow up from the program coordinator.

However, after more discussion, this recommendation was tabled. All members were asked to discuss this situation with faculty and then bring input back to the next council meeting.

Kelly then asked should the programs or the registrar's office communicate with the students regarding their graduate requirements? It was decided by the members the Registrar's office would sent a letter to the students who haven't met the required graduation requirements.

3. Update from Continuous Enrollment subcommittee:

Members were asked to complete the spreadsheet so the subcommittee could meet, review the information and come back to the council on Jan. 25 with data and a proposal.

4. Policy regarding students going through graduation if they still have course work to complete.

Council members were asked for policies/recommendations regarding graduate students participating in commencement without having all course work completed. After discussion, it was determined there isn't a University policy and most programs are a bit different. A draft policy will be developed for review at the January meeting.

5. Graduate Showcase:

At the last council meeting, Bruce asked about the having opportunities to showcase graduate work much like Apeiron or Day of Transformation. There isn't a funding stream for graduate students to do research, WTE's, etc. and most graduate students spend their own money when they travel to conferences to fulfill some of the capstone requirements (presentations). The idea is to have a Graduate Showcase event in April 2016. More details to come.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Honors Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, November 4, 2015

Crane Room ~ 12:00 – 12:50 p.m.

Members Present: Andrew Herbig, Brad Turnbull, Denise Ottinger, Emily Engler, Jean Sanchez, Jennifer Ball, Jennifer Jenkins, Kelly Erby, Martha Imparato, Meghan Salsbury, Michael McGuire (Chair), and Whitney Earnest

Call to Order

- I. Review and Approval of Minutes from September 2, 2015
- II. Welcome Two New Members: Meghan Salsbury and Dmitri Nizovtsev (will be assisting in the Spring)
- III. Honors Student Council Report (Emily and/or Whitney and/or Malcolm)
 - A. Etiquette Dinner is coming up on November 10 @ 6:00 – 8:30; business professional attire
- IV. Unfinished Business:
 - A. Qualifications for being admitted into Honors
 1. Michael M. discussed the possibility of changing criteria for being admitted into honors citing low performance on behalf of some honors students as a rationale. Members pointed out that when considering ACT scores, we should keep in mind that ACT may be prohibitive
 2. All agreed that motivation should be a key factor to consider. But, how to assess? Jean Sanchez will follow up with admission criteria from?
 - B. Course Proposals Revisited (See New Business)
 - C. Appeals Policy (Tabled for February's meeting)
- V. New Business
 - A. Curriculum's Role in Course Proposals
 1. Summary of statement from Dr. Nancy Tate on behalf of the General education Committee.
 2. Implications – Gen Ed Rep (ex officio) and submission of currently accepted course.

More reviewers?
 - B. Establishing process for reviewing students' applications for membership
 1. Recommended number of reviewees (3?)

2. Rubric or weighting of application materials

GPA and ACT straightforward

Service

Scholarship

Perception of Essay and CV (1 – 5)

Benchmark – Individual websites from Jean Sanchez

Include Michael Gleason, Jennifer Jenkins, Brad Turnbull, Denise, Martha, Meghan, Scholarship no vote, Admission yes vote

Returning students to discuss.

VII. Announcements

- A. Etiquette Dinner: Tuesday, November 10, BTC Ruth Garvey Fink Hall @ 6:30 p.m.
- B. Quest Super Saturday, December 5, 2015
- C. Next Meetings:
 - a. Admission/Scholarship
 - b. Wednesday, February 3, 12:00 – 12:50 (Crane)

International Education /International WTE Committee

January 21, 2016, 4-5 pm, International House

Present: Liviu Florea, Zach Frank, Kelly Watt, Miguel Gonzalez –Abellas, Sangyoub Park, Seid Adem, and Baili Zhang. (Brian Ogawa voted by email prior to the meeting.)

November 5 meeting minutes were approved.

Zhang reported to the committee that the spring class of 42 new international students had a good orientation week and uneventful transition to campus. He further noted that five different groups would come to WU for short-term studies during the spring semester.

The following funding requests were approved:

Deborah Altus - Portugal

Bob Beatty – Japan

Linda Elrod – England

Louella Moore – England

Judy McConnell’s application was deferred to a later meeting for review.

Respectfully submitted,

Baili Zhang

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, February 11, 2016
Lincoln Room, Memorial Union
2:30-3:30

In attendance:

Vickie Kelly, Elaine Lewis, Shawn Stacey, Kayla Carter, Sarah Cook, Jane Carpenter, Denise Ottinger, Joel Blume, Nancy Tate, Amy Memmer, Gloria Dye

1) Assessment Extravaganza Follow-Up

Thanks to Nancy, Kayla, Sarah, Jane, Melanie, Karen, Mary Pilgrim, and Michael Gleason for all the help! We had 97 registered participants. The posters and handouts are up on the assessment website, and the video (after editing and closed-captioning) will also be posted to the website as soon as it's ready. Joan is scheduling follow-up visits with each school/division in which Nancy, Vickie, and Kayla will discuss the assessment results, what meaning/impact have for each school or division and "close the loop." Sue will get Melanie the feedback that might be collected on the CTEL registration. Many individuals claimed they heard good questions, discussions, and that the handout packets were extremely helpful.

2) Update on Assessment Plans and Next Steps

All assessment reports and plans have been finished/reviewed and feedback has been provided. The plans are posted to the website (but not the rubrics and reports). Most academic programs have assessment plans, but now focus is on co-curricular programs. Vickie has list of who is re-doing/editing their assessment plans, and is scheduling meetings with co-curricular programs to start working on their assessment plans.

For those who will be on Assessment Committee next year:

Timeline for Reviewing Assessment Reports and/or Re-Done Assessment Plans

- Short training on assessment plans, reports, & rubrics for reviews at next meeting (how to read and rate).
- Plans due June 30th; small groups of 2-3 will receive sets of plans in July to review and rate over the summer.
- Saturday meeting in Aug/Sept for small groups to discuss their assigned sets of plans and rubric scores for rater consistency and group consensus.

3) Assessment Committee Re-Structuring

Nancy provided a handout that outlines the transition from the 2-yr to 3-yr committee membership (extending the appointment), so that eventually only 1/3 of committee members each year instead of half- keeping more institutional knowledge. The schedule on the document is a work in progress.....

4) Co-Curricular Program Assessment Plans

A Co-Curricular Program is anything that impacts students but does not provide a degree/certificate.

Vickie and Jean gave workshop/presentations to groups of co-curricular staff/faculty- very good turn out and led to good discussions; they wanted to gather feedback from others associated with the programs.

Vickie handed out sample draft of the co-curricular assessment plan template (still in progress). Mentioned that the form really is going to need an instructions page with definitions and examples. Once template is ready, a couple of programs are ready to start trying it.

Not just numbers of participants or participant satisfaction (although still important because not everything will be associated with an SLO), but how contribute/impact student learning?

Three types of Outcomes: Learning Outcomes, Life Outcomes, and Administrative Outcomes

5) Administrative Support

CJ Crawford not at Washburn anymore. Vickie and Melanie trying to get a full-time position split between assessment and CTEL; stuck in logistical details but Nancy will sort out.

NEXT GOALS:

- Getting assessment reports ready to go out to departments for next year
- Update website with different rubrics, checklists, examples of measurement instruments used

NEXT MEETING:

Thursday, March 10, 2016

2:30-3:30, Lincoln Room Memorial Union

Graduate Council Minutes

January 25, 2016

12:00 – 1:00 p.m.

Lincoln room/Union

Graduate Committee members Present: Bob Boncella (MBA), Julie Boydston (PY), Patricia Dahl (CJ), Shirley Dinkel (DNP), Vickie Kelly (MHS), Bruce Mactavish (MLS), Brenda Patzel, (SON), Tim Peterson (ex-officio), Randy Pembrook (ex-officio), Blake Porter (WSGA), Michael Rettig (ED), Bassima Schbley (MSW), Jim Schnoebelen (FS), Kayla Waters (HS), Kelley Weber (Mabee)

Guests Present: Michael Gleason, Cindy Hornberger, Tom Underwood, Kathy Menzie

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 23, 2015

The November 23, 2015 minutes were submitted to the committee previously with a request committee members review these prior to the meeting. A motion and second to approve the minutes were made. All approved said minutes.

2. Action Item:

a. Leadership Courses

Dr. Gleason provided an overview of the proposed courses. These six courses are proposed through the Interdisciplinary Studies committee and will be available to many graduate students (e.g., MBA, MLS, DNP, CNL, MCJ and CEP). The hope is these courses will be part of a Master degree proposal that will come through the Communication department (30 hours).

The council members discussed the courses, and asked several questions. A request was made of the presenters to consider “consent of instructor” as a prerequisite.

Discussion occurred regarding the governance path for these courses. Dr. Pembrook asked the committee to remember the charge was to review these courses only, and that a Master degree should come through the College governance process and then to the Graduate Council for a full review. Discussions regarding the degree pro forma, a curriculum map for assessment,

and other concerns about the degree can be discussed when reviewed, hopefully in March 2016.

A motion was made to approve all six courses, and seconded. The vote was unanimous.

3. Update from Continuous Enrollment subcommittee

Vickie Kelly provided an overview of the subcommittee's work. This work was documented through the handout submitted to council prior to meeting. Vickie indicated their recommendation was students enrolled in graduate programs who have completed all degree requirements except for capstone/practicum/thesis will be required to maintain continuous enrollment at Washburn University. Vickie noted there were a few details that needed to be worked through (i.e. with the registrar, do departments or the University indicate how long a student can be continuously enrolled, the reapplication process)

Discussion regarding the timeline for program completion ended with the council members agreeing the following statement could be catalog language:

Each program will designate a timeline for completion of degree. Students must complete their graduate degree within the timeline designated by the program.

Each graduate degree program will be able to answer within the next two months the following questions:

What will the timeline for completion be per program?

How long can a student be continuously enrolled? The program will need to indicate a) students will not continuously enroll, b) a semester/a year, or c) the student can enroll for a maximum of _____ semesters/years.

Further discussion involved the continuous enrollment recommendation. Council members discussed changing the proposed recommendation to afford departments the opportunity to have (or not have) continuous enrollment. The recommendation would read, "*Effective Fall 2016, students enrolled in graduate programs who have completed all degree requirements except for capstone/practicum/thesis **may** (instead of **will**) be required to maintain continuous enrollment at Washburn University*".

After lengthy discussions, it was determined more philosophical discussions were needed.

4. Update on Incompletes—

Issuing incompletes and the timeline an incomplete stays on the student record was discussed. This item, and continuous enrollment are closely tied. Michael Rettig, Shirley Dinkel and Bob Boncella indicated their graduate students have one year from the end of the semester to complete. Most council members agreed and no one opposed to having this as a timeline for incompletes.

A policy proposal will be presented to the council members indicating incompletes would be one year in length with a grade being issued on the final product. The proposal will also provide a list of possible exceptions to the one year timeline.

Chair Rettig indicated we had many other items that needed discussing and council members were asked if they would agree to have additional meetings throughout the semester. The decision was made to have other meetings set on Mondays.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m. January 25, 2016.

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM NO 16-6

Date: February 1, 2016

Submitted by: Kelly Erby, et al., kelly.erby@washburn.edu x2018

SUBJECT: Statement of Support for Washburn University to provide Victim Advocate Services at Washburn and Washburn Tech

Description: We ask the faculty senate and general faculty to petition the administration:

- A) to create a confidential victim advocate position capable of providing Victim Advocacy Services for students and employees at Washburn University and Washburn Tech.
- B) to request that faculty and staff with expertise in victim advocacy be significantly represented in the hiring process to select a person(s) for the provision of victim advocate services
- C) to request that faculty be given a prominent voice in the determination of how confidential victim advocacy services will fit within the institutional structure complying with federal reporting policy and best practice in victim advocacy on college campuses. At this time, faculty requests of this position include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - We request that the confidential victim advocate be an entity distinct and independent from the Title IX Coordinator/EEOC officer.
 - We request that the confidential victim advocate be specially designated and trained to fulfill the roles outlined above, with a demonstrated ability to effectively provide confidential sexual assault victim/survivor services, as recommended by the Association of Title IX Administrators (ATIXA), the nation's leading provider of Title IX training and certification.
 - It is our position that members of the faculty cannot adequately provide victim advocate services, as **faculty members' job descriptions include evaluation of student performance. The roles of evaluation and advocacy will directly contradict one another in some cases.** Moreover, faculty who are licensed helping professionals and who are requested to engage in dual relationships that go against their profession's code of ethics are putting their licenses in jeopardy. Finally, the advocacy support a student may need is likely to exceed the capacity of a faculty member.
 - It is our position that the victim advocate must be a confidential resource on campus.

- We request that the advocate offset Title IX restrictions pertaining to reporting for faculty.

Rationale: It is our position that Washburn University should begin to provide victim advocacy services to students and employees of Washburn and Washburn Tech immediately.

A confidential victim's advocate would be available to assist victims/survivors in understanding and navigating university policies and procedures related to victimization and promote their academic and professional success and personal wellness. This professional position requires knowledge and competence in providing confidential, victim-centered, trauma-informed services in order to meet best-practice standards in responding to victims/survivors of sexual violence and harassment as well as all types of victimization.¹ A confidential victim advocate is knowledgeable in crisis management, community referral services, and the criminal justice system. No other position on campus, including the Sexual Assault Education and Prevention Project Coordinator, currently provides these services, or has this cross-discipline professional development and competency. A confidential victim's advocate would further be available to collaboratively develop (e.g., with Sexual Assault Education and Prevention Coordinator, WU Police, WU counseling, Multi-Cultural Affairs, etc.) and continuously implement and update training to prevent victimization at Washburn, especially sexual assault, in an effort to ensure the University remains Title IX compliant even after the conclusion of the Office on Violence Against Women grant in 2018.

Recent federal regulations regarding the reporting of students who experience incidents of sexual assault and harassment have intensified discussions at Washburn regarding appropriate responses to victims/survivors of sexual discrimination and abuse. Providing confidential victim-advocate services to students and employees who have experienced such victimization, as well as to those who have experienced other types of discrimination, including racial and ethnic bias, is not only organizationally ethical, it may also positively affect admissions and retention. In addition, this position would strengthen the effectiveness of the Title IX officer at Washburn, and assist Washburn in living up to both its mission as an open-admission, municipally funded

¹ "ATIXA Position Statement on the Need for Victim Advocates on College Campuses." Available at <https://atixa.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/2015-ATIXA-Victim-Advocates-Position-Statement-FINAL.pdf>

university and its legacy as Lincoln College. Finally, providing victim-advocate services would help to protect the University in the event of an U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) investigation.

Failure to provide confidential advocacy resources as an early step in the reporting process increases risk to students and to the University. Students who begin the reporting process without fully understanding the limitations to confidentiality are at risk of feeling disempowered by having personal information shared against their will. To the extent that personal information becomes public, they may be at risk of emotional, social, and/or practical harm should their peer group, family, home community, or professional network respond negatively to the information. This is particularly important in light of Washburn's active efforts to recruit students from diverse global communities, where reports of sexual victimization may have especially devastating effects. A confidential advocate can fully explain the limits of confidentiality at each step of the reporting process, allowing students to make informed decisions and reducing the likelihood that a student will regret seeking help.

Please see attachment for further explanation of rationale.

Financial Implications: salary in the range of \$40,000 + benefits for full-time staff person

Proposed Effective Date: As soon as possible.

Request for Action: Approval by Faculty Senate/General Faculty

Approved by: AAC on date

FAC on date

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments Yes No