

**Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
March 6, 2017
3:00 PM – Kansas Room, Memorial Union**

PRESENT:

Ball, Barker, Erby, Farwell, Francis, Kapusta-Pofahl, Kwak, Mansfield, Mazachek, Memmer, Moddelmog, Ockree, Petersen, Prash, Sadikot, Schmidt, Schnoebelen, Scofield, Siemens, Smith, Sourgens, Stacey, Steinroetter, Stevens, Tutwiler, Wasserstein, Wohl, Worsely, and Zwikstra

ABSENT:

Alexander, Garritano, Mastrosimone, Matthews, Treinen, and Weiner

GUESTS:

Bearman, Dohrman, Holthaus, Liedtke, Tate, and Wynn

- I. President Schmidt called the meeting to order at 3:02pm.**
- II. The Faculty Senate meeting minutes of February 20, 2017 were approved.**
- III. President’s Opening Remarks:**
 - With regard to the information item from our last meeting regarding the Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) standards: Schmidt indicated that he had been under the impression that it was an option to adopt them. He has since learned that adoption is not optional.**
 - Schmidt expressed his congratulations to the debate team for their recent national tournament win.**
 - Schmidt also indicated that the VPAA search continues. At presented, he said there is one final candidate set to visit campus tomorrow and Wednesday. He encouraged everyone to attend the open forums. Schmidt also noted that recordings of the open forums and the CVs for all candidates will be available online shortly and indicated that all should send comments to Dr. Farley.**
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents: NONE**
- V. VPAA Update—Dr. JuliAnn Mazachek:**
 - Mazachek indicated that revision the Faculty Appeal Process is still underway. She noted this was one part of a comprehensive effort to revise the bylaws of the Faculty Handbook—a process that is ongoing.**
- VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports:**
 - The Academic Affairs Committee meeting minutes from September 12, 2016 were approved.**
 - The Academic Affairs Committee meeting minutes from January 20, 2017 were approved.**
 - The Faculty Affairs Committee meeting minutes from November 14, 2016 were approved.**
- VII. University Committee Reports:**
 - The International Education/International WTE meeting minutes from November 10, 2016 were received.**

- The Library Committee meeting minutes from February 15, 2017 were received.

VIII. Old Business:

- **17-2 Update of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Policies** was presented by Alan Bearman. Schmidt noted that the one major addition to this draft was the second part that deals with how we go about adopting these standards (it will be done on a department/unit basis). Prasch wondered if that specific language was sufficient; perhaps it should be changed to “consider aligning” to the standards rather than mandating it. Bearman noted that you can choose to increase these standards but it would have to be voted on by the Regent schools. Mazachek noted that the alignment will happen, so changing the language is unnecessary. Petersen wondered what would happen if a department said no to adopting these policies? He added the question, shouldn’t we make the departments feel involved and that we welcome their feedback? Worsely wondered if note 1 would help to assuage this concern. Prasch offered a friendly amendment to add the word “consider.” Barker moved to make this an amendment rather than a friendly amendment. Mazachek noted that if the Senate chose to depart from the language as is, it requires following an official process to address the change. The amended motion passed.
- **17-5 Faculty Handbook Committee** was presented by Stevens. Mazachek passed around hard copies of a slightly amended version of this proposal. The amended motion passed.

IX. New Business:

- **17-3 Graduate Council Wording and Membership Changes** was presented by Mazachek. (NOTE: the Senate voted to move this proposal to New Business to allow for a second reading) For clarity, the language had been amended prior to today; Mazachek passed around copies of the amended proposal. Barker said he was disappointed that the language allowed for proxy voting, asserting that votes might be cast without hearing the debate at the actual meeting. Mazachek said this was the decision of the committee and only applied to administrative decisions affecting all programs and not curriculum changes. In terms of the advance voting option, Mazachek asserted this is not a traditional proxy as views could be expressed via e-mail before hand and that if significant policy changes occurred at the meeting, the vote would not be counted. Ockree wondered what the rest of the Senate felt about the advance voting option. Moddelmog said she wasn’t familiar with the inner-workings of the Graduate Council but indicated she was sympathetic to the idea of being present and fully informed in order to vote. Petersen asked how often administrative versus curriculum issues come up? Mazachek said it is a mix. Petersen wondered if there was a demonstrable problem that required the change. Mazachek said that often the curriculum problems are less problematic as these go through multiple levels of approval before they come before the Council; it’s the administrative matters that apply to all different areas and units with graduate programs that are somewhat problematic. Moddelmog wondered if this might affect meeting attendance. Mazachek said this concern had come up, but that most indicated it wouldn’t. Prasch indicated his support of being present to vote. Mansfield, a member of the Graduate Council, said the intent was to accommodate those who, for whatever reason, couldn’t attend a meeting to still be heard—it wasn’t really meant to take away discussion. Prasch moved to remove the e-mail/advance voting portion of the proposal. Mazachek worried that removal of the two sentences allowing for e-mail voting might confuse that paragraph of the proposal. Ockree wondered if it was appropriate for the Senate to revise the language to control what the Graduate Council does. Ockree asserts that given the nature of the council and the diverse interests they try to serve, voting via e-mail should be allowed so that the members voice may

be heard. Sadikot said that information presented at a meeting might be problematic. Prasch said that voice and vote are different; there's nothing to stop someone from contacting other Council members and expressing ideas before a meeting they miss. Scofield said the paragraph should be considered as a whole and not just the last 2 sentences—the entire paragraph makes less sense if these sentences are omitted. Smith wondered if other University committees allowed for this, and if so, why are we coming down so hard on the Graduate Council? Mazachek added that most of the programs act pretty independently and have accreditation standards they must follow, so the Council's job is to standardize what we can and simplify the processes involved in graduate education at Washburn. She added the super majority (2/3 of voting members) is very important to council members in relation to administrative policy/procedure changes. Ball said it seems that this is the best way for the Graduate Council to conduct business. The amendment was not adopted. The motion was closed on first reading.

- 17-4 Conceal Carry Exemption (first reading) was presented by Prasch and Wynn. Wynn noted that the evidentiary footnotes were left off of this version but she would be happy to add them back in for the second reading. Ball revealed some concerns shared by a colleague in Business—that the 3rd paragraph was a better focus than the 2nd paragraph. Ball noted she wasn't making a suggestion for change—just sharing an idea presented by a colleague. Ball said this same colleague also indicated we may want to choose a different phrase than “stand with us” to avoid offending some conservative politicians. Prasch said taking out the second phrase is fine; he takes issue with removing the second paragraph, though, as he feels it is essential to the argument. Sadikot said that Universities are some of the few places where we are able to express ourselves freely, so paragraph 2 should stay. Mansfield recommended removing the budget phrase at the end of paragraph 2. Prasch said that this could be an issue with recruiting and retaining faculty in addition to the logistical demands to ban guns on campus as mandated by the current policy, and thus, the budget concerns should likely stay. Wasserstein said he saw little risk with toning down the language. Scofield said she would prefer evidence to be added to paragraph 2. Wynn wondered if the previously noted footnotes would be sufficient or if something else was necessary. Scofield said that the footnotes would probably work. Modellmog said that even if Washburn had an unlimited budget, she wouldn't support the budget comment. Prasch noted he would add back in the footnotes for the second reading. He will also amend the ‘stand with us’ language. Mansfield suggested explaining the budgetary concerns, as well, in advance of a second reading. Schmidt wondered where this should go after the final Senate vote. Ball said it doesn't need to go to the General Faculty—once approved, we should simply publicize it. Prasch said the thinking was that we wanted to make a public statement in a timely manner, so it would just start and end with the Senate. Barker recommended asking a legislator who is friendly with Washburn to carry our message to the legislature. Mazachek cautioned that anything that might indicate an official Washburn stance would have to go through Dr. Farley's office. The motion closed on first reading.

X. Information Items: NONE

XI. Discussion Items:

- Updating Undergraduate Student Classification to match new Academic Probation of Reinstatement Policy (presented by Richard Liedtke): NOTE: This item will be going to the Academic Affairs Committee for review soon, but if there are things that are missed, please let Liedtke know. Ockree indicated that the hour-based versus status-base issue might create a

hardship for some students. Tate noted that the classification (not the hours) is the issue and it requires an override in the system. Barker wondered about why we are changing something that has been working well for years in order to satisfy a policy adopted recently. Bearman said that research indicates this will improve student success and on-time graduation particularly for those students that experience classification-based financial aid issues. Liedtke said the reason for the policy that we made last year (that Barker referred to) was passed to because Washburn's standards were the strictest in the state. Ball said the reinstatement policy would have to be revised if this isn't addressed in order for students to get to the 2.0 GPA for graduation. Wasserstein wondered if this hourly change might delay students taking EN 300. Barker wondered if this policy change might negatively affect some students attaining upper-division credits. Petersen wondered if this might alter the registration schedule, as well; Liedtke said that it would. Smith wondered if there would be a problem with seniors taking 100-level classes as a result of the re-classification system. Schmidt said that AAC would take these items in to account.

XII. Announcements:

- **Erby: please attend the advocate candidate forums on Thursday and Friday of this week.**
- **Prasch invited colleagues to attend the 20th anniversary celebration of Buffy: The Vampire Slayer that will take place on March 15th!**
- **Schmidt reminded those present that Apeiron registration is due by March 30th and that the actual event will be on April 28th.**

XIII. President Schmidt adjourned the meeting at 4:22pm.