

**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. Pembrook 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. Pembrook: 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. Pembrook 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.