

Washburn University  
Meeting of the Faculty Senate  
April 21, 2025 at 3pm  
Meeting in Kansas Room Hosted by FS Executive Committee

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approve minutes-
  - April 7<sup>th</sup> Minutes (pages 2-8)
- III. President's Opening Remarks
- IV. WUBOR/KBOR Update- Tonya Ricklefs
  - KBOR
  - WUBOR
- V. VPAA Update - Dr. John Fritch
- VI. Consent Agenda –
  - Faculty Senate Committee Reports-
    - Academic Affairs Minutes 3-31-25 (pgs 9-11)
    - Academic Affairs Minutes 4-14-25 (pg 12)
    - Faculty Affairs Minutes 3-3-25 (pgs 13-14)
  - University Committee Reports-
    - Faculty Handbook Minutes 12-4-24 (pgs 15-17)
    - Faculty Handbook Minutes 1-13-25 (pgs 18-19)
    - Graduate Council Minutes 2-3-25 (pgs 20-21)
    - Graduate Council Minutes 3-3-25 (pg 22)
- VII. Old Business
  - 25-16 Social Work Healthcare BSW Inactivation (Rhonda Peterson Dealy) (pgs 23-24)
  - 25-15 Amendment to Faculty Handbook for Not Tenured Faculty (Wagner) (pgs (25-35)
- VIII. New Business-
- IX. Information Items-
  - Introduction of New WSGA President
- X. Discussion Items-
- XI. Announcements
- XII. Adjournment

Washburn University  
Meeting of the Faculty Senate  
April 7, 2025 at 3pm  
Meeting in Kansas Room Hosted by FS Executive Committee

**Present:** Cook, Dahl, Davies, Dickinson, Francis, Fritch, Hartman, Holt, Hu, Kay, Kendall-Morwick, Lambing, Lolley, Maxwell, McHenry, Miller, Mosier, Perret, Ricklefs, Schmidt, Schnoebelen, Scofield, Sellak, Smith, Stevens, Toerber-Clark, Wagner, Williams

**Absent:** DeSota, Hansen, Heusi, Sneed, Steffen

**Guests:** Bailes, Broxterman, Grospitch, Holthaus, Wood, Worsley, Camarda, Erby, Lockwood, Sun,

- I. Call to Order at 3:03 pm
- II. Approve minutes- Moved to approve by Cook, seconded by Kay. Motion passed unanimously
  - February 24, 2025 (pages 2-6)
- III. President's Opening Remarks
  - First meeting since February, but doesn't mean things weren't happening. Many valuable discussions/meetings since then. Several meetings about Academic Freedom statements
  - Meeting with Dr. Mazacheck – still having discussions about Shared Governance Committee. Hopefully will have discussions about this soon.
  - Lots of changes each week, just trying to get to end of semester.
  - One more meeting and then the transition meeting. Come forward if you have questions about being an officer. We have 3 nominees for the At-Large positions on Faculty Senate.
- IV. WUBOR/KBOR Update- Tonya Ricklefs
  - KBOR – Tenure bill is dead this year, but almost 100% certain it will come back next year. Reps will try to recruit more support for it next year (ie want to get rid of tenure). They are looking at other states and their language that will help get it to pass. Some of it may make tenure look different. Dickenson – crafted after Alex Shell Bill. If we can get a hold of it, that will help us learn the language. I won't be able to access it, but maybe someone can. (Many of us can't access it, as they are keeping it quiet)
  - WUBOR – Good meeting with celebrations about retirements, promotions and tenure.
- V. VPAA Update - Dr. John Fritch
  - Would like to announce the new Interim Dean of Nursing – Crystal Stevens.
  - Now in the sprint to the finish. Lots of things going on, "one-off" events that are fun, but can create stress. We like celebrating our students and

each other. (April 16<sup>th</sup> Employee Celebration, Commencement lasts Wednesday to Saturday starting with Washburn Tech.)

- Enrollment looks really good for the fall, impressed with how many continuing students are enrolled already. Not sure if it will lead to higher retention rates yet.
- Grospitch – Had Student Government Elections – Wood : Kate Coulter and Ryan Durst were elected as President and Vice-President. Kate will be here next meeting. Very close to solidifying cabinet, our group is almost done. New officers love listening. Fritch – There was a high voter participation this year.
- T&P recognition – Many are Fac Senators, please raise your hand. Congrats to all of you. This is an important part of the University.
- Lots of moving going on and communication about it. It will feel like a headache, but will likely end up being better long term. Will have to trust us that it will be worth it. (Law School Experience – enjoying new space, enrollment is up).
  - Campus Master Plan is available through [my.washburn.edu](http://my.washburn.edu) on a SharePoint site. Will use emails, Deans, SharePoint to communicate. Would like the first point of contact to be your Dean rather than Eric Just. Will also talk during Town Halls (*April 22 3:30-4:30 and April 23 12-1 pm, both in Washburn B*) and at General Faculty. Will work hard on signage this summer. Make sure students know they will not have classes in Henderson, as it's easy to forget. Can have tables out at start of semester to direct people. Start packing early if you are moving. It takes longer than you think and you may not have the space you have right now. Movers will handle University Property, personal items/fragile move yourself. Really focus on how this will get us to a better place during the struggles. We will try to make things as good as we can going forward. Benton also moving. Benton will not be completely back to green space in the Fall, but there will be progress. Will start tearing down after they clear out everything shortly after semester is over.

VI. Consent Agenda – Moved by Miller, seconded by Stevens. (Need to look for minutes from Jan 13<sup>th</sup> meeting for Faculty Handbook since we may not have had those brought forward for the consent agenda.) Motion passes unanimously

- Faculty Senate Committee Reports-
  - AAC Minutes 2-17-25 (pg 7)
  - FAC Minutes 11-11-24 (pgs 8-9)
- University Committee Reports-
  - Gen Ed Committee 11-21-24 (pgs 10-12)
  - International Education Committee 2-5-25 (pgs 13-14)
  - Faculty Handbook Committee 2-3-25 (pgs 15-16)
  - Faculty Handbook Committee 2-26-25 (pgs 17-19)

## VII. Old Business

- 25-10 Inactivation of Computational Physics, BS (Karen Camarda) (pgs 20-22) Moved by Cook, seconded by Hu. Motion passes unanimously. This does not need to go to General Faculty for a vote.
  - Camarda – This option was introduced several years ago, very few majors choosing this option, so we are choosing to delete it as part of cleaning up the course offerings. (Ricklefs – side note: Good job on the interview.)
- 25-11 Inactivation of Bachelor of Musical Arts, BMA (Craig Treinen) (pgs 23-25) Moved to approve by Kay, seconded by Lolley. Motion passes and will go forward automatically to General Faculty for a vote (since Music clearly sees this as a degree program)
  - Erby - presenting on behalf of Music Dept. Accrediting body recommended it be inactivated.
- 25-8 New Minor, Great TEXTS (Kelly Erby) (pgs 26-27) Moved by Smith, seconded by Cook. Motion passes unanimously. Does not need to go to General Faculty for a vote.
  - Erby – Started a couple of years ago. CAS Did not have a clarification of “certificate” vs “minor”. It is now a true certificate, but would also like to have a minor (a little bigger, has a capstone).
- 25-13 New Minor in Kinesiology (Park Lockwood) (pgs 28-29) Moved by Lolley, seconded by Stevens. Motion passes unanimously. Does not need to go forward to General Faculty for a vote.
  - Lockwood – Something we have been talking about for a couple of years. Changes in General Education have allowed us to get a general minor that will work well with other departments majors. Students can choose the direction since 12 of the credits are very flexible.
- 25-12 New Certificate in Intensive English (Kelly McClendon) (pgs 30-35) Moved by Kay, seconded by Lolley. Motion passes unanimously, and does not need to go forward to General Faculty for a vote.
  - McClendon – No new curriculum, but currently students finish this and there is nothing on the transcript. This could also be available for community members. It would allow people with degrees from other countries to get some certification. Schnoebelen – Is this a common program? McClendon – No.
- 25-9 New Certificate in Cybersecurity (Nan Sun) (pgs 36-38) Moved by Miller, seconded by Schmidt. Motion passes unanimously, does not need to go to General Faculty for a vote.
  - Kendall-Morwick- Seeking to meet demand from students to have a credential for their studies in cybersecurity. Also hoping to help people who already have degrees. It will include a cybersecurity introduction course, legal course, and specialization for the exam in cybersecurity. Cook – It has enough credits, is there a thought about a Minor? Kendall-Morwick- Looking at some other options, but this will be good for a wider group.

- 25-14 New Certificate in Artificial Intelligence Literacy and Application (Nan Sun) (pgs 39-41) Moved by Kay, seconded by Schmidt. Motion passes unanimously. Does not need to go to General Faculty for a vote.
  - Sun – CIS has courses in AI, and a degree program that orients towards AI, but those classes are for majors. Would like to have AI programs for non-CIS majors. Worked with faculty from a range of departments (EN, MM, CN) – AI108 (Fundamentals), 208 (Concepts – applications), a Philosophy class. This is interdisciplinary. Because this is a certificate, anyone can earn it (students or community). Cook- Are these courses ones we currently offer. Will there be a rotation? Sun – All are new, hope to offer 108 first, then see how enrollment goes. Plan to run at least one section of each course every semester. (Cook – or at least one per year).
  - Fritch – We are currently in a midst of a search for this position. I think this is where we need to be as a University. Got to present that we are having an interdisciplinary degree at a gathering with other universities. People are jealous – thanks for working so well together and letting me brag. Trying to figure out what other schools are doing to support faculty with AI. We don't want to start from scratch, especially since everyone is so busy.

#### VIII. New Business-

- 25-15 Amendment to Faculty Handbook for Not Tenured Faculty (Tracy Wagner) (pgs 42-44) Move to open on first reading. Moved by Lolley, second by Miller.
  - Tracy Wagner provided an overview because she is on senate and Faculty Handbook. She is also not connected to administration and is representing the broader faculty. A couple of things she wanted to share. Make-up of the committee is the Deans and another representative from each division. Administrative heavy possibly (if assistant deans are the other representative) and have legal counsel to keep it legal. This motion came forward because Maddy had come forth with an amendment on the removal for cause changes to Faculty Handbook. The Tenure portion moved forward without the changes for not-tenured. The Faculty Handbook committee was charged with looking at the amendment. Everyone discussed this and read it carefully. In the course of the discussion, the definition of “not-tenured” referred to a broad category of people. Wanted to make sure people were valued and did not want to offer false protection? At the end of the day, many people felt if cases had happened “for cause” they would have cases where someone was dragging something out. Is this a balanced amendment? Any Dean would not use this unless it was an egregious case. We are trying to look forward at what might happen. This vote was 7-2 where it was defeated. Several people asked to make sure it was possible to go to senate and if the

language that was crafted would go forward as well. Faculty Senate has broader representation vs a smaller group of administrators. You do not want to appear to give protection that does not actually give protection. We don't want to do something that was not discussed transparently to through senate. We put forward the language that was written by the handbook committee.

- Sarah Cook- At our first meeting we basically met and asked what our charge was and what is ok. What was to begin with and what wording went through is why we shared this.
- Smith – What was final rationale for voting down? Wagner – False sense of security vs potential harm to university. Miller – Why? Cook – The way contracts are written annually, it's often easier to that instead of for-cause.
- Schmidt – I did vote against this. It is an extra step, more people at university will know what is going on, which may not be good for University. Doesn't add the kind of protection since there is no real Faculty Oversight in the process.
- Lolley – When I listened to Tracy describe the point of looking futuristically, would that have switched the vote. Schmidt – In terms of can a Dean make a “poor” decision? Hopefully administrators above the Dean would correct that.
- Miller – Just want to address real vs false protection. If someone does something that Dean feels should be fired for. If contract is not renewed, they continue to work for the remainder. If fired for cause, they don't work any more. If they are not renewed, they may have benefits (unemployment). If fired, then there is no support from faculty (no one other than Dean knows about it.) As a not-tenured member, would like to bring my case forward to someone other than the Dean. (Fritch – They can appeal to Provost). I would like for faculty to have some chance to make a case for other faculty in this case. Tenured faculty had a number of protections that are not in place for Not-Tenured. I think having the amended policy will at least change the “divisiveness” that exists if there is no chance to have faculty input. That counts for something.
- Cook – There are so many balls up in the air now, and I totally understand your discussion, but that (the protection) is tenure (for now.)
- Ricklefs – a reminder that this is the first reading, but there will be time to make amendments. The vote is on 21<sup>st</sup> of April.
- Lambing – Not a legal scholar, not claiming to be. Thinking about contracts and how does this dovetail with “right to work” state? Does it even work?
- Miller – This is NOT legal advice, I can't give legal advice. Right to Work is the minimum. Employers can provide greater protection. They can be “nicer” than the law, but they have to at least follow the law.
- Kay – Can we get clarification of what we are allowed to do? Lolley – we can approve and choose to send on to General Faculty, or it passes here. Holthaus – We have not been in this situation before, so we need to clarify this. Fritch – At most this is a recommendation to the president. Kay –

Hypothetically, if we recommend this go forward, would any sort of structure we craft have any power and do we as Faculty Senate have the ability to recommend they (a faculty committee) have power in this situation? Lolley – My interpretation is that the committee would make a recommendation to the Provost. (General agreement.)

- Ricklefs – Ultimately trying to have transparency, have two readings at Faculty Senate. This will pave some new pathways, so helpful for the future.
- Scofield – Would it be a stronger proposal if it had a written report in addition to just talking to everybody. Schmidt – Problem is this committee is outside the chain of command. Provost makes final decision. Scofield – Except we do think faculty have a different perspective than administrators. (Schmidt – maybe not...)
- Schnoebelen – If we let the contract run out (which is not a contract any more, but letter of reappointment.) All letters say in a situation of financial exigence we can all be let go. Also, I have a couple of typos. (Send to Tracy) , Also section B is referenced – Can we have a comment about that.
- Smith – AAUP says there should be a faculty role, and this seems consistent. BUT it may not be enough. Can we get more, or if we can't this may be good enough.
- Miller – I do not see how anyone who reads Faculty Handbook if this policy is adopted would have any misconception. I don't think the "not real protection" if valid to not adopt. It may be a reason to amend the policy. Can anyone say more about why the faculty handbook committee would feel this way. Ricklefs – I don't think anyone can read their minds. Sometimes I have personally reached out to people to get their thoughts. That may be helpful.
- Wagner – It is important to note that administrators were worried about how this might affect the faculty member as more people learned about it. The Faculty Member can stop the process at any time.
- Beth O'Neill – Faculty member can't say they don't want to have a Faculty Committee if it goes to the Provost (as policy is written now). May want to keep that in mind.
- Williams – Faculty are required to be involved, perhaps some faculty might not want to be on the committee. (Say the person was dangerous, would not want to be on the committee. Also, potential power differential. )
- Miller – would be very supportive of an amendment that Fac Member can stop process at any point. It is true someone could be fired for a terrible reason, but this is also true for tenured faculty. They would have more protections and we didn't worry about it for their policy. Second consideration, just how uncommon these things are. More often it's for not getting along, behaviors outside, (ie not violence against students). I don't want the rare issue to affect our reason to put in this protection.

- Schnoebelen – Dovetail off Williams – There are service obligations, how do we determine these committees, lots of ways of intimidating people on the committee.
- Cook – I do think Williams has a legitimate concern. We talked a lot about these concerns. Also, we debated a long time about the composition of the committee (tenured, not tenured). Tried to balance having a not tenured person (since the individual is not tenured), vs tenured (who might feel more protection).
- Kendall-Morwick- Thinking about Smith's comment about AAUP. Do they provide more specific language or an example. Smith – I will check that out and get back to this body.
- Cook – Reiterate what Lambing said. Can we have what was passed at General Faculty meeting in the agenda for the next meeting? (Wagner and if Smith finds anything, please send that in as well.)
- Fritch- Lots of work done by the committee, there was unanimous support for the language. As Wagner said, I'm very confident the committee voted with what they believed. (I don't vote by the way.) I thought it was a tough decision for folks. I hope you will take away that people did come to what they thought was best (even if you disagree with the decision.)
- Smith – How do we find the members? The list on website may be outdated (Wagner – look at members who were at the meeting in the minutes.)
- Move to close the first reading by Schmidt, seconded by Stevens. Motion passes unanimously.

IX. Information Items-

- At-Large FS Nominations (Amanda Hartman) –
  - We have three open at-large positions and no reason all three can't be elected. They are all placed in Gen Fac Voting Shell. Opens on 4-21 at 12:01 am and closes at 4-24 at 5:30 pm. Schnoebelen – Do we need to vote? (Since there are three positions open?) Wagner – everyone could vote against someone...

X. Discussion Items- none

XI. Announcements

- General Faculty Meeting on April 30, 2025 (Need to elect a new General Faculty Secretary)

XII. Adjournment Move to adjourn at 4:38 from several people.



# **Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes Monday, March 31, 2025 at 3:00pm In-person, Memorial Union – Lincoln Room**

Attendees: Beth O'Neill (ex-officio), Tracy Davies (chair), Michelle Heusi, Sarah Holt, Jim Schnoebelen, Barbara Scofield, Hillary Lolley, Cherry Steffen

Guests: Kelly Erby, John Burns, Nan Sun, Kelly McClendon, Craig Treinen

The meeting was called to order by the committee at 3:03 pm.

- I. Approvals
  - a. Minutes from the Academic Affairs meeting held on February 17, 2025, were presented.
    - i. A motion for approval was made by Jim Schnoebelen and seconded by Hillary Lolley.
    - ii. The motion was passed unanimously.
- II. Action Items
  - a. To accommodate visitor timing, Jim Schnoebelen moved to review new minors first, followed by a discussion on program inactivations. The motion was seconded by Hillary Lolley and passed unanimously.
  - b. Curriculum Proposal – New Minors
    - i. Great TEXTS, Minor
      - 1. A motion for approval was made by Jim Schnoebelen and seconded by Hillary Lolley.
      - 2. Kelly Erby provided an overview of proposal. She noted that when the Great TEXTS certificate program was originally approved, the College did not have clear credit hour requirements. The college has since defined certificates as at least 9 credit hours and minors as at least 15. Due to the now-adopted definitions, and general education changes limiting elective space for some students, the program has reduced the certificate requirement from 15 to 9 credits and is introducing a 15-credit minor with a capstone. This allows students to choose between a certificate or a minor.
      - 3. Discussion occurred.
      - 4. The motion was passed unanimously.
    - ii. Minor in Kinesiology
      - 1. A motion for approval was made by Jim Schnoebelen and seconded by Barbara Scofield.
      - 2. John Burns provided an overview of the proposal, noting that many majors now require a minor. There is student interest in a Kinesiology (KN) minor, though a previous KN fitness minor was eliminated due to its complexity. The proposed minor also offers an option for students who decide KN is not a fit or for athletes transferring credits.
      - 3. Discussion occurred.
      - 4. The motion was passed unanimously.

- c. Curriculum Proposal – Inactivations
  - i. Bachelor of Musical Arts, BMA
    - 1. A motion for approval was made by Jim Schnoebelen and seconded by Barbara Scofield.
    - 2. Craig Treinen provided an overview of the proposal, noting that no students have enrolled in the past three years and that the NASM association recommended inactivation.
    - 3. Discussion occurred.
    - 4. The motion was passed unanimously.
  - ii. Computational Physics, BS
    - 1. A motion for approval was made by Jim Schnoebelen and seconded by Barbara Scofield
    - 2. Kelly Erby provided an overview. Karen Camarda, who was unable to attend, sent an email stating that no students were enrolled in the program.
    - 3. Discussion occurred.
    - 4. The motion was passed unanimously.
- d. Curriculum Proposal – New certificates
  - i. Artificial Intelligence Literacy and Application Certificate
    - 1. A motion for approval was made by Jim Schnoebelen and seconded by Barbara Scofield.
    - 2. Nan Sun provided an overview of proposal. She noted the certificate provides foundational AI knowledge for both degree-seeking and non-degree-seeking individuals, with no programming experience required, making it accessible to diverse academic backgrounds.
    - 3. Discussion occurred.
    - 4. The motion was passed unanimously.
  - ii. Cybersecurity Certificate
    - 1. Nan provided an overview of proposal. The Cybersecurity Certificate program provides interdisciplinary coursework to expand technical knowledge and skills. With 15-16 credit hours, it exceeds the typical CAS certificate length. However, offering it as a certificate, rather than a minor, allows non-degree-seeking students to participate.
    - 2. Discussion occurred.
    - 3. The motion was passed unanimously.
  - iii. Intensive English Program Certificate
    - 1. A motion for approval was made Sarah Holt and seconded by Jim Schnoebelen.
    - 2. Kelly McClendon provided an overview of proposal. She noted that Washburn will be one of a small number of universities offering an official certificate for intensive English language coursework. This is one more way to strengthen our reach to the local community.
    - 3. Discussion occurred.
    - 4. The motion was passed unanimously.

- III. The committee discussed the AAC upcoming meeting schedule – April 14<sup>th</sup>.
- IV. There being no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Sarah Holt and seconded by Jim Schnoebelen to conclude the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.
- V. The meeting ended at 3:44 pm. Minutes taken by Holly Broxterman.

# **Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes Monday, April 14, 2025 at 3:00pm In-person, Memorial Union – Lincoln Room**

Attendees: Tracy Davies (chair), Jim Schnoebelen, Sarah Cook, Sarah Holt, Barbara Scofield, Manaf Selleck, Cherry Steffen

Guest: Rhonda Peterson Dealy

The meeting was called to order by the committee at 3:01 pm.

- I. Approvals
  - a. Minutes from the Academic Affairs meeting held on March 31, 2025, were presented.
    - i. A motion for approval was made by Sarah Cook and seconded by Jim Schnoebelen.
    - ii. The motion was passed unanimously.
- II. Action Items
  - a. Curriculum Proposal – Inactivation
    - i. Bachelor of Social Work Healthcare Concentration
      - 1. A motion for approval was made by Jim Schnoebelen and seconded by Sarah Cook.
      - 2. Rhonda Peterson Dealy provided an overview of proposal. She noted that there are no students affected by this inactivation.
      - 3. Discussion occurred.
      - 4. The motion was passed unanimously.
- III. The committee discussed how to handle the minutes' approval from this meeting. Once ready, Holly will email them to the committee members and give everyone three days to approve. It was noted that the vote will need quorum.
- IV. There being no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Sarah Cook and seconded by Sarah Holt to conclude the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.
- V. The meeting ended at 3:08 pm. Minutes taken by Holly Broxterman.

## **Faculty Affairs Committee - Minutes**

Monday, March 3, 2025

4:00pm – 5:00pm

Lincoln Room – Memorial Union

**Members Present:** Danny Wade (ex-officio), Eric McHenry, Ashley Maxwell, Shaun Schmidt, Eric Mosier, Barbara Scofield, Thomas Sneed, Jody Toerber-Clark, Von Hansen, Madeline Lambing

**Absent:** Tonya Ricklefs

**Guest:** Kim Morse

1. Call to Order at 4:00pm by Shaun Schmidt
2. Approval of Minutes – November 11, 2024
  - a. Madeline Lambing made a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting held on November 11, 2024, as presented. Jody Toerber-Clark seconded motion. Motion carried.
3. Old Business – None
4. New Business
  - a. Academic Freedom policy (proposed draft attached)
  - b. Jody Toerber-Clark made a motion to approve the proposal as presented. Eric McHenry seconded the motion. Committee discussion followed.
    - i. Kim Morse shared the background rationale and research used to compile proposed draft and reviews done by the local and national chapters of AAUP
    - ii. Primary changes included
      1. Explicit language related to tenured and non-tenured faculty
      2. Expanded definitions of intermural and extramural speech
      3. Includes librarians and museum staff
    - iii. Shaun Schmidt explained that the President's office advised that the process for this proposed revision should have come directly through the President's office since it is a proposed change to the WUBOR policy. Certain faculty will meet with President Mazachek on Monday, March 10 to discuss the process.
    - iv. FAC committee has reviewed the proposal and had discussion with regard to process and language identifying the following areas:
      1. Academic Freedom Language is a living document
      2. Current language is inclusive but not robust
      3. Faculty need to feel secure in Academic Freedom policy
      4. Further discussion needs to happen as policy and processes are equally important
  - c. Eric McHenry made a motion to postpone any action on the Academic Freedom proposal until after the meeting with President Mazachek on March 10. Ashley Maxwell seconded the motion. Motion carried.
5. Announcements
  - a. Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 31, 2025, at 4:00pm in the Lincoln Room.

Approved: April 14, 2025

6. Adjournment

- a. With no further business to discuss, Eric McHenry made a motion to conclude the meeting which was seconded by Madeline Lambing. Shaun Schmidt adjourned the meeting at 4:35pm.

Notes taken by Beth Mathews

Approved: April 14, 2025

Faculty Handbook Committee  
Washburn University  
Minutes  
December 4, 2024  
2 p.m.

**Committee Members**

John Fritch (Ex-Officio), Melanie Worsley (Ex-Officio), Marc Fried (Ex-Officio), Sean Bird (for Alan Bearman), David Sollars, Zach Frank, Kelly Erby, Jane Carpenter, Jeff Jackson, Sarah Cook, Sungkyu Kwak, Debbie Isaacson, Patricia Judd, Shaun Schmidt, Tracy Wagner, Cynthia Holthaus

Absent: Jenny Lamb

Guests: Beth O'Neill

- I. The meeting was called to order at 2:04 pm by John Fritch.  
Fritch stated the purpose of the meeting was to review and set items for the spring agenda.
- II. Minutes
  - a. No previous minutes were available to review and approve.
- III. New Business
  - a. Faculty Handbook Review  
Fritch stated the current website has the 2020 version of the handbook. Melanie Worsley reviewed previous minutes of the committee starting with the fall of 2018 and presented a list of minutes and changes previously voted on and passed. Worsley will send an email with a link to the handbook in SharePoint for everyone to review and email her with any discrepancies, prior to the first committee meeting in January.
  - b. Not-Tenured Termination Procedure Amendment  
A copy of the amendment to the Not-Tenured Termination Procedure proposed and considered at the General Faculty Meeting on November 13, 2024, was provided to the committee. Fritch stated that

the proposed language and membership review is with the deans. The purpose is to examine the nature of the procedure for termination of cause for not tenured faculty.

c. Program Review

Revisions to the Program Review Committee section of the handbook are recommended. A draft for revisions was provided to the committee, and John Fritch and Beth O'Neill discussed the goals/purposes of program review, and the rationale for the proposed revisions: the institutional decision to only include academic programs, Deans and Provost Office participation in a program review workshop hosted by HLC, and mismatch between practice and policy. Beth O'Neill shared that there are parts of the proposed revisions that would benefit from further discussion by the committee, and these are reflected in comments left on the document. The committee will plan to review and discuss this section of the handbook in Spring 2025.

d. Amendment and Revision of Processes for Lecturer Promotion

The amendment and revision of process for the Senior Lecture was submitted on behalf of the Faculty Affair Committee. The call is to add a second level of promotion for lecturers; multiple year contracts, and a self-nomination process. The proposed change establishes the amount of time in a position and the assigned workload before are promotion eligibility. Shaun Schmidt mentioned the possibility of a short packet from lecturer requesting the promotion.

IV. Old Business

a. Termination Process Discussion

Fritch discussed his experience with the amendment process while working on the Not Tenured Termination Amendment. He requested feedback and he asked if anyone could share anything he could learn from the creation of the process. Jane Carpenter recommended feedback be requested from the Faculty Senate.



Tracy Wagner, Faculty Senate Secretary, stated the staff appreciated the ability to communicate between the staff and Academic Affairs office and discuss the process.

Other feedback shared included:

- Feedback should come from Faculty Senate.
- Committee members should have feedback after submitting it to Faculty Senate.
- Would it be beneficial to have others at key Faculty Senate meetings?
- Be cognizant of academic freedom.

## V. Discussion

### a. Spring Semester Meetings

There was a discussion of the Spring 2025 meetings for the committee. Fritch asked that all members update their outlook calendars by Monday, December 9<sup>th</sup>, and Ann Treinen will schedule all the meetings for the Spring semester.

The committee decided to schedule one meeting in the months of January and March, and two meetings scheduled in the months of February and April. The January meeting will be scheduled the week before Spring classes start.

### b. Committee Priorities in Order

Fritch determined the priorities for the committee after discussion with all in agreement. The priorities are as follows.

1. Faculty Handbook Review
2. Not-Tenured Termination Procedure Amendment
3. Program Review
4. Amendment and Revision of Processes for Lecturer Promotion

## VI. Adjournment, 3 pm.

Faculty Handbook Committee  
Washburn University  
Minutes  
January 13, 2025  
3 p.m.

**Committee Members Present:**

John Fritch (Ex-Officio), Melanie Worsley (Ex-Officio), Marc Fried (Ex-Officio), Sean Bird (for Alan Bearman), David Sollars, Zach Frank, Kelly Erby, Jane Carpenter, Jeff Jackson, Sarah Cook, Debbie Isaacson, Shaun Schmidt, Tracy Wagner, Cynthia Holthaus, Jenny Lamb

**Committee Members Absent:** Patricia Judd, Sungkyu Kwak

**I. Call to Order**

- a. The meeting was called to order by Chair John Fritch at 3 pm.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

- a. Zach Frank moved to approve the minutes of the December 24, 2024, meeting. Sarah Cook seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

**III. New Business**

- a. None

**IV. Old Business**

- a. Faculty Handbook Review

Melanie Worsley asked the committee if they noticed any errors in the updated faculty handbook. A SharePoint link to the updated handbook was emailed to members following the December 4, 2024, meeting. All the committee members agreed the updated handbook was accurate.

Worsley explained that she would work with Cynthia Holthaus to include the newly approved (fall 2025) termination procedure. Worsley noted that she would also work with faculty senate on the graduate council item that had been previously approved by faculty handbook and the faculty affairs committee but was not voted on by faculty senate.

Cook moved to accept the handbook as updated, Frank seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously approved.

- b. Not Tenured Termination Procedure Amendment

Fritch opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. The discussion points included:

- The separation of the process between tenure and non-tenure.
- The structure of the committee. Whether the committee should include a mix of non-tenured and tenured staff.
- Termination by Dean in writing and with cause.
- Faculty not having input on a not-tenured person being terminated.

- The liability of having a committee involved in the termination process. Per Fried, the committee serves as an advisory group and would not add to the liability.
- For those in the process they can opt out of a committee review and accept the termination.

Fried will review and “clean up” the amendment, then present it at the next Faculty Handbook Committee (FHC) meeting on February 3, 2025.

**V. Adjournment**

- a. Motion to Adjourn by Cook seconded and motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Approved: February 3, 2025

# **Graduate Council Minutes**

## **Monday, February 3, 2025**

### **Via Zoom**

**Attendees:** Emily Grant (ex-officio), Leah Brown (ex-officio), Barbara Scofield, Danny Funk, Jim Schnoebelen, Pat Dahl, Michael Rettig, Becky Dodge, Zenova Williams, Michele Reisinger, Tracy Davies, Jenny Lamb, Tracy Routsong, Sarah Holt, Michael McGuire

**Not present:** Melanie Worsley (ex-officio)

**Guest:** Amy Memmer

**Notes taken by:** Beth Mathews

- I. Call to Order - The meeting was called to order by Barbara Scofield at 12:01pm.
- II. Approval of Minutes
  - a. The Chair calls for approval of the minutes from the meeting held on November 4, 2024. There being no discussion, Jim Schnoebelen moved to accept the minutes as present. Emily Grant seconded the motion. Minutes were approved.
- III. Old Business – none
- IV. New Business - none
- V. Discussion
  - a. MCJ proposal (information item only) – Pat Dahl
    - i. Changing credit hour requirements from 36 to 30 which was eliminating two elective courses
    - ii. The change allow would allow WU to be more competitive with other programs
  - b. Graduate Fairs – Leah Brown
    - i. Suggesting a virtual fair sometime in April through Slate
    - ii. Question and discussion included signups, registration, marketing, departments would present their own program presentation in break out rooms, contact lists
    - iii. Sarah Holt shared the library would be willing to help if programs needed anything from them
  - c. Slate Updates – Leah Brown
    - i. Follow up training is still available
    - ii. Issue with “started” applications was addressed

- iii. Question and discussion included deferring applications to the following semester by submitting a new application and term change in comment box
  - iv. Anyone with questions regarding graduate admissions should email: [graduateadmissions@washburn.edu](mailto:graduateadmissions@washburn.edu)
- d. Returning student process (Leah)
  - i. Issues with students who are returning after a semester break are still declared by the department but not admissions.
  - ii. Most likely an issue with the checklist not being completed so programs should email admissions directly.
- VI. Announcements – Next meeting will be held on Monday, March 3, 2025, at 12:00pm via Zoom.
- VII. Adjournment – there being no further business to discuss, Tracy Davies moved to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Jim Schnoebelen. Motion was approved and Barbara Scofield concluded the meeting at 12:30pm.

# **Graduate Council Minutes**

## **Monday, March 3, 2025**

### **Via Zoom**

**Attendees:** Jenny Lamb, Pat Dahl, Sarah Holt, Leah Brown (ex-officio), Jim Schnoebelen, Becky Dodge, Tracy Davies, Michele Reisinger, Emily Grant (ex-officio), Danny Funk, Michael Rettig, Zenova Williams, Melanie Worsley (ex-officio),

**Not present:** Michael McGuire, Tracy Routsong, Barbara Scofield

**Notes taken by:** Beth Mathews

- I. Call to Order - The meeting was called to order by Melanie Worsley at 12:04pm.
- II. Approval of Minutes
  - a. Minutes will be held for approval at the April 7 meeting
- III. Old Business – none
- IV. New Business - none
- V. Discussion
  - a. Graduate fair update – Leah Brown
    - i. Spring Graduate Fair will be held on Wednesday, April 2 from 10-2pm in BTAC
    - ii. A pilot virtual fair through Slate will be held on Wednesday, April 23 over the lunch hour and evening. Leah will be online with attendees and provide general information about WU and the programs. She will share potential candidate information with the respective departments afterwards.
- VI. Announcements – Next meeting will be held on Monday, April 7, 2025, at 12:00pm via Zoom.
- VII. Adjournment –meeting concluded at 12:14pm.

# Program Change Request

A deleted record cannot be edited

## Program Inactivation Proposal

Date Submitted: 03/04/25 11:16 am

Viewing: **SHW-BSW : SW: Social Work Healthcare/BSW**

Last approved: 06/27/24 8:07 am

Last edit: 04/14/25 4:33 pm

Changes proposed by: Jenny Lamb (jennifer.lamb)

Final Catalog	2024-2025
Rationale for Inactivation	<u>The social work department is seeking to inactivate the BSW Healthcare concentration due to limited opportunities for students at the BSW level to complete a practicum in a healthcare setting and low interest in this concentration.</u>

### Proposal Information

Effective Catalog Edition	2024-2025	All proposals with the 2025-2026 catalog edition date will be effective Fall 2025.
Subject		
Description of Proposal		
Reason(s) for Proposal		
Describe in detail the reasons for the proposal		
Will this proposal require additional faculty or impact faculty load?		
Will this proposal require additional infrastructure support?		
Is there supporting documentation attached to this proposal?	Attach your supplemental files below	

### Program Information

Program Title	SW: Social Work Healthcare/BSW	
Department	Social Work	
College	School of Applied Studies	
Degree Level	Undergraduate	
Degree to be Offered	Bachelor of Social Work (BSW)	
Related Degree		
Concentration		
CIP Code	440701 - Social Work.	
Program Code	SHW-BSW	Program codes are managed by the Registrar team. For new programs, codes will be assigned after final approval.
Is this program an interdisciplinary program?	No	
Is this program offered completely online?		

#### In Workflow

1. Acad Ops
2. SW Chair
3. Library
4. SAS Curr Policy Chair
5. SAS Dean
6. SAS Fac Council Chair
7. Governance Check
8. AA Committee
9. Faculty Senate - Governance Check
10. Final Acad Ops
11. Registrar

#### Approval Path

1. 03/04/25 11:40 am  
Beth O'Neill  
(beth.oneill):  
Approved for Acad Ops
2. 03/04/25 12:48 pm  
Rhonda Peterson  
Dealey  
(rhonda.petersonde):  
Approved for SW Chair
3. 03/04/25 1:00 pm  
Sean Bird  
(sean.bird):  
Approved for Library
4. 03/14/25 9:06 am  
Michelle Shipley  
(michelle.shipley):  
Approved for SAS Curr Policy Chair
5. 03/16/25 7:23 pm  
Zach Frank  
(zach.frank):  
Approved for SAS Dean
6. 03/31/25 9:39 am  
Michelle Shipley  
(michelle.shipley):  
Approved for SAS Fac Council Chair
7. 03/31/25 11:49 am  
Holly Broxterman  
(holly.broxterman):  
Approved for Governance Check
8. 04/14/25 4:33 pm  
Holly Broxterman  
(holly.broxterman):  
Approved for AA Committee

#### History

1. Apr 21, 2022 by  
clmig-jwillging
2. Aug 2, 2022 by

Does this program lead to a teaching certification? No

Steve Luoma (steven.luoma)  
3. May 25, 2023 by Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman)  
4. Jun 27, 2024 by Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman)

Admission and Curriculum

Does the program have specialized admission requirements?  
Total Number of Credit Hours for the Degree  
Curriculum

Healthcare Social Work Concentration

Within the BSW program, students may choose to receive specialty training in healthcare social work. The concentration consists of three undergraduate electives (9 hours) plus a generalist practicum in an approved healthcare setting. Students selecting the healthcare concentration should notify their advisor of their intentions in order to ensure appropriate academic advising to meet the requirements.

<a href="#">SW 356</a>	Social Work Practice in Healthcare	3
Select two of the following:		6
<a href="#">SW 357</a>	Inclusive and Competent Social Work Practice in Healthcare	
<a href="#">SW 358</a>	Family Decisions in Healthcare	
<a href="#">SW 359</a>	Human Sexuality and Social Work Practice	
<a href="#">SW 360</a>	Geriatric Social Work Practice	
Total Hours		9

Supplemental Files

Reviewer: Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman) (04/14/25 4:33 pm): Approved in 4/14/2025 Academic Affairs Committee Meeting. ❌



## 25-15 FACULTY AGENDA ITEM

**Origination Date:** April 7, 2025

**Current Date:** April 7, 2025

**Submitted by:** Faculty Senate Executive Committee; Tonya Ricklefs President (x 1618) or Tracy Wagner Secretary (x1752)

**SUBJECT:** Amendment to Faculty Handbook for Termination Procedure for Not-Tenured Faculty

**Description:** The termination policy for faculty was recently updated in the Faculty Handbook, including changes in language to clarify tenured vs not tenured (not yet tenured or those who are in positions not eligible for tenure) faculty. This amendment addressed the process for those who are not tenured, as the process for those who are tenured was previously passed by Faculty Senate and General Faculty.

**Rationale:** Concerns were raised about the changes made to the wording of Termination of Faculty for Cause during several Faculty Senate Meetings and the General Faculty Meeting on November 13, 2024. During discussion at the General Faculty meeting, the Faculty Handbook Committee was charged with making sure the proposed amendment for Not Tenured Faculty was written with input from legal counsel and Faculty Handbook Committee Members to make sure it was sound legally and was aligned with the rest of the handbook. The purpose of this amendment is to guarantee some input from the Faculty in the Termination for Cause of a not tenured member of the Faculty, with the intent of providing an additional layer of protection for not tenured faculty members. The Faculty Handbook Committee did this work, but then voted not to send it forward to the Faculty Senate. As a result, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is presenting the wording that came out of Faculty Handbook Committee as an Action Item directly from the Faculty Senate.

**Financial Implications:** The costs would increase in the termination for cause IF the individual being terminated utilized all the options afforded in this process. However, since this is only adding one additional step, and this process is rarely used, it is unlikely to be excessive.

**Proposed Effective Date:** This policy will become effective immediately after completion of the approval of all required parties.

**Request for Action:** Approval by Faculty Senate and by General Faculty (Faculty Senate would need to vote to have it approved by General Faculty, but this is what the Faculty Senate Executive Committee recommends)

**Approved by:** Faculty Senate on date

General Faculty on date

**Attachments** Yes ☒ No ☐

Language written and voted on by Faculty Handbook Committee (2 pgs)

E. FORMAL TERMINATION PROCEDURE FOR ALL FACULTY WHO ARE NOT TENURED (See Attachment A for flowchart of process.)

STEP 1: If the Pre-termination Resolution Process does not result in immediate resolution of the problem(s) and no PIP is implemented, or if the Dean determines that the Pre-termination Resolution Process should be disregarded per Section B above, the Dean, after consultation with the Provost, shall notify the faculty member that he/she is terminated from his/her faculty position effective immediately. The notification shall be in writing and shall state the cause(s) that are the basis for the Dean's decision.

STEP 2: The faculty member shall have seven (7) days to file a written request for appeal with the Provost. The written appeal need only state the faculty member appeals the decision of the Dean and requests a meeting with the Provost. If no appeal of the Dean's decision is timely made, then the termination of the faculty member becomes final and not subject to further review by the University.

STEP 3: If the faculty member does submit a written appeal with the Provost, the Provost shall arrange to meet with the faculty member within seven (7) days from the date the written appeal is received by the Provost. The Provost may choose to have the Dean be present during the meeting with the faculty member. The faculty member may present any information to the Provost in advance of the meeting to assist the Provost's preparation for the meeting. The faculty member, however, is not required to do so, nor is the faculty member restricted from raising any other issues in opposition to the Dean's termination during the meeting with the Provost that were not addressed in any information provided by the faculty member prior to the meeting.

STEP 4: After the meeting in Step 3, the Provost will appoint a Faculty Advisory Council ("FAC") within three (3) business days with whom to confer before making any further determination in the matter. The purpose of the FAC is to provide the Provost with a faculty perspective to assist the Provost in considering appropriate next steps in the process. ~~The FAC will consist of two tenured faculty and one non-tenured faculty~~ selected by the Provost none of whom shall be in the faculty member's department or unit if the faculty member is not in a department and the FAC member's duties do not involve interaction with the faculty member. The meeting between the Provost and the FAC shall occur no later than seven (7) days after the appointment of the FAC absent compelling circumstances. The FAC may, but is not required to, request a meeting with the faculty member within seven (7) days after the FAC meets with the Provost. The FAC shall then meet with the Provost no later than three (3) business days after meeting with the faculty member. Meetings of the FAC shall be

Formatted: Font: 9 pt

Commented [TW1]: This line was changed in the February 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting (voted and passed) but was not reflected in the copy that came out of committee since the committee ended up not voting to move it on to the Faculty Senate. As a result, I have added it back in since it was originally passed by FHC. TW

Deleted: The FAC will consist of three tenured faculty

Formatted: Font: 9 pt

confidential to the extent practicable.

STEP 5: After meeting with the FAC, if the Provost, in his or her sole discretion, believes another meeting with the faculty member would be beneficial, then the Provost may schedule another meeting with the faculty member. That meeting shall occur within seven (7) days of the Provost extending the invitation. If the Provost and faculty member are able to agree in writing to a resolution regarding the matter, then no further action will be required.

STEP 6: After the meeting with the FAC, or the faculty member, whichever occurs last, the Provost shall have seven (7) business days to issue the decision on the appeal.

The Provost may uphold the termination of the faculty member, grant the appeal, or determine an alternative resolution to the matter. The decision of the Provost shall be final and not subject to further review by the University.

## **V. Procedures for Termination for Cause**

### **A. General Statement**

A faculty member may be disciplined, or dismissed, for cause on grounds including but not limited to (1) academic dishonesty; (2) acts of discrimination, including harassment, prohibited by law or University policy; (3) acts of moral turpitude substantially related to the fitness of faculty members to engage in teaching, research, service/outreach and/or administration; (4) theft or misuse of University property; (5) incompetence in the performance of material assigned duties in teaching, research and/or service; (6) refusal to perform reasonable assigned duties in teaching, research and/or service; (7) engaging in or substantially contributing to actions materially disruptive to the effective operations of the faculty member's academic unit, division, or University; (8) use of professional authority to exploit others; (9) violation of University policy substantially related to performance of faculty responsibilities (including University internet); and (10) violation of law(s) substantially related to the fitness of faculty members to engage in teaching, research, service/outreach and/or administration. The procedure that will be followed when terminating the employment of a faculty member for cause is discussed below.

### **B. Pre-termination Resolution Process**

Before a recommendation for termination or a decision to terminate for cause is made, certain interactions, at a minimum, should have already occurred. For units that have department chairs, there should have been communication between the department chair and the faculty member who has one or more problematic issues that would suffice as grounds for termination for cause as set out above. If that communication does not result in prompt resolution of the problem or a Performance Improvement Plan ("PIP"), then the department chair (or analogous position) shall arrange for a Pre-termination Resolution Process meeting between the faculty member, the department chair (or analogous position), and the Dean. For units without department chairs, the initial meeting shall be between the faculty member and the Dean. Notice of the meeting shall be in writing and shall indicate that the meeting is for a pre-termination resolution process pursuant to the Faculty Termination processes in the faculty handbook. If there is no intent by the Dean to make a recommendation for termination or suspension at the conclusion of the meeting, regardless of the outcome, then the meeting is not considered a pretermination resolution process meeting, and this written notice is not required. For all units, if the meeting with the Dean results in immediate resolution of the issue(s) or if a PIP is implemented, then the matter would not proceed further towards termination at that time. However, IF THE CONDUCT OF THE FACULTY MEMBER IN THE JUDGMENT OF THE PROVOST/VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS ("Provost"), AFTER CONSULTING WITH THE DEAN, POSES A SUBSTANTIAL RISK TO THE SAFETY OF OTHERS, then the Pre-termination Resolution Process described in this paragraph may be disregarded and the Dean may move directly to the Formal Termination Process.

C. Employment status pending completion of University processes

1. The title, compensation and benefits of the faculty member shall continue through the process until the President's determination is issued. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean, may reassign the faculty member to other duties or no duties at any time pending the resolution of University's process as the Provost deems appropriate, however, such reassignment is not intended and shall not be used to create any undue hardship on the faculty member's ability to fully participate in the Procedures for Termination for Cause.
2. The Provost may suspend the faculty member without pay, at any time during the pendency of the University's process, if the conduct of the faculty member in the judgment of the Provost poses a substantial risk to the safety of others, or that there is a substantial disruption to the operations of the academic unit, division, or University. This decision shall be provided in writing to the faculty member. Such suspension without pay is not intended and shall not be used to create any undue hardship on the faculty member's ability to fully participate in the Procedures for Termination. This action is considered an extraordinary sanction and should be used only when there is no other option available to fully protect the interests of the University.
  - a. The faculty member may request, within three business days of the written notice of suspension without pay, a meeting with the Provost to review the suspension without pay. This meeting shall occur as soon as practicable but no later than five business days from the date of the request for meeting unless agreed to by the Provost and faculty member. If the faculty member requests a review of the suspension without pay, the faculty member shall continue to be paid until the Provost's decision after review is issued.
  - b. The faculty member may present any information to the Provost that the faculty member believes is relevant to show why the faculty member should not be suspended without pay pending resolution of the matter.
  - c. The Provost, after considering the information presented by the faculty member, shall notify the faculty member within two business days if the suspension without pay remains in place. The Provost's decision shall be final and not subject to further review by the University.
  - d. If the faculty member is not terminated at the end of the process, then the faculty member shall receive compensation for pay lost during the period of suspension without pay.

D. Definitions and information:

- Calculation of Time:

- All time periods referenced in this process are stated in calendar days unless otherwise indicated.
- “business day” shall mean any day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or a day that the University offices are closed.
- If the last day of a time period occurs on a Saturday, Sunday or day that the University offices are closed, then the time period shall continue to the next business day.
- If University offices are closed three or more consecutive weekdays, such as winter break or due to weather, then those weekdays and any intervening weekends and holidays shall not be included in the calculation of the time period.
- The term “meeting” (other than for the hearing before the Faculty Discipline Review Committee) is intended to be a meeting between the named individuals in the same room. Meetings are intended and preferred to be in-person. If, however, the individuals cannot meet in-person, meeting by virtual platform, such as Zoom, is acceptable. If the faculty member requests the meeting occur by virtual platform, as long as such meeting can occur with the technology available to all of the parties, the request shall be granted.
- If at any time during the process, the Provost or the President are unable or otherwise unavailable to complete their obligations in a timely fashion, they may designate another person employed at the University to perform the duties described in this process.
- Any time period set out in this process may be extended by agreement of the parties. This agreement shall be in writing, which can be satisfied by email communications between the parties.
- If the faculty member is unavailable for a period of time due to Family Medical Leave Act as reviewed and approved by the Department of Human Resources, then any pending time period in this process shall be stayed until such time the faculty member becomes available to participate in the process.
- The term “termination” when terminating a tenured faculty member shall mean terminating the faculty member’s employment with the University and revoking the faculty member’s tenure.

#### E. FORMAL TERMINATION PROCEDURE FOR ALL FACULTY WHO ARE NOT TENURED

STEP 1: If the Pre-termination Resolution Process does not result in immediate resolution of the problem(s) and no PIP is implemented, or if the Dean determined that the Pre-termination Resolution Process should be disregarded per Section B above, the Dean, after consultation with the Provost, shall notify the faculty member that he/she is terminated from his/her faculty position effective immediately. The notification shall be in writing and shall state the cause(s) that are the basis for the Dean’s decision.

STEP 2: The faculty member shall have seven (7) days to file a written request for appeal with the Provost. The written appeal need only state the faculty member appeals the decision of the Dean and requests a meeting with the Provost. If no appeal of the Dean's decision is timely made, then the termination of the faculty member becomes final and not subject to further review by the University.

STEP 3: If the faculty member does submit a written appeal with the Provost, the Provost shall arrange to meet with the faculty member within seven (7) days from the date the written appeal is received by the Provost. The Provost may choose to have the Dean be present during the meeting with the faculty member. The faculty member may present any information to the Provost in advance of the meeting to assist the Provost's preparation for the meeting. The faculty member, however, is not required to do so, nor is the faculty member restricted from raising any other issues in opposition to the Dean's termination during the meeting with the Provost that were not addressed in any information provided by the faculty member prior to the meeting.

STEP 4: After the meeting, the Provost shall have seven (7) business days to issue the decision on the appeal. The Provost may uphold the termination of the faculty member, grant the appeal, or determine an alternative resolution to the matter.

STEP 5: The faculty member shall have seven (7) days to file a written appeal of the Provost's decision with the President. The written appeal need only state the faculty member appeals the decision of the Provost to uphold the termination of the faculty member and requests a meeting with the President. If no appeal of the Provost's decision is timely made, the termination of the faculty member becomes final and not subject to further review by the University.

STEP 6: If the faculty member does submit a written appeal with the President, the President shall arrange to meet with the faculty member within seven (7) days from the date of the written appeal is received by the President. The faculty member may present any information to the President in advance of the meeting to assist the President's preparation for the meeting. The faculty member, however, is not required to do so, nor is the faculty member restricted from raising any other issues in opposition to the Dean's termination during the meeting with the President that were not addressed in any information provided by the faculty member prior to the meeting.

STEP 7: After the meeting, the President shall have seven (7) business days to issue the decision on the appeal. The President may uphold the termination of the faculty member, grant the appeal, or determine an alternative resolution to the matter. The decision of the President shall be final and not subject to further review by the University.

#### F. FORMAL TERMINATION PROCESS FOR TENURED FACULTY

STEP 1: If the Pre-termination Resolution Process does not result in immediate resolution of the problem(s) and no PIP is implemented, the Dean shall make a recommendation to the Provost that the faculty member be terminated from his/her faculty position effective immediately. If the Provost previously determined that the Pre-termination Resolution Process should be disregarded per Section B above, the process moves to Step 2.

STEP 2: The Provost shall meet with the faculty member regarding the concerns(s) raised by the Dean. This meeting should occur as soon as reasonably possible after receiving the Dean's recommendation but no later than seven (7) days after receiving the Dean's recommendation. If the Provost and faculty member are able to agree in writing to a resolution regarding the matter, then no further action will be required. The written notice by the Provost to the faculty member regarding this meeting shall indicate the Dean is recommending termination and the meeting is Step 2 of the Formal Termination Process for Tenured Faculty. If the Pre-termination Resolution Process was not utilized per Section \_\_V.B. above, the written notice shall also include the causes provided by the Dean for such termination.

STEP 3: If no resolution is reached after the meeting in Step 2, the Provost may, but is not required to, appoint a Faculty Advisory Council ("FAC") within three (3) business days with whom to confer before making any further determination in the matter. The purpose of the FAC is to provide the Provost with a faculty perspective to assist the Provost in considering appropriate next steps in the process. The FAC will consist of three tenured faculty selected by the Provost none of whom shall be in the faculty member's department or unit if the faculty member is not in a department and the FAC member's duties do not involve interaction with the faculty member. The meeting between the Provost and the FAC shall occur no later than seven (7) days after the appointment of the FAC absent compelling circumstances. The FAC may, but is not required to, request a meeting with the faculty member within seven (7) days after the FAC meets with the Provost. The FAC shall then meet with the Provost no later than three (3) business days after meeting with the faculty member. Meetings of the FAC shall be confidential to the extent practicable. The faculty member, the members of the FAC, and the Provost may not be called as witnesses at the hearing of the Faculty Discipline Review Committee ("FDR") (as described in Section \_\_\_\_ below) to testify about any communications between the FAC and the Provost in any meetings with or held by the FAC. Members of the FAC may be called to testify about other matters if relevant to the proceeding.

- After meeting with the FAC, if the Provost, in his or her sole discretion, believes another meeting with the faculty member would be beneficial, then the Provost may schedule another meeting with the faculty member. That meeting shall occur within seven (7) days of the Provost extending the invitation.



- If the Provost and faculty member are able to agree in writing to a resolution regarding the matter, then no further action will be required.

STEP 4: If after meeting with the FAC (and if no resolution is reached after an additional meeting with the faculty member) or if the FAC is not utilized (and Step 3 is skipped), the Provost shall then determine if the faculty member should be placed on a PIP, impose additional conditions on an existing PIP, or recommend to the President that the faculty member be suspended or terminated and have . The Provost shall make this decision within seven (7) days from the last meeting with the FAC, or meeting with the faculty member, whichever occurs later. If the Provost decides to take action other than to proceed with suspension or termination of the faculty member, the process shall end with the Provost's decision and it shall not be subject to further review by the University.

- The written decision of the Provost should be delivered in person to the faculty member when practicable. The Dean (and department chair, if applicable) may be present at the discretion of the Provost. If an in-person meeting is not possible or is conducted by virtual platform, then the decision shall be delivered by mail and/or by email to the faculty member.
- If the Provost's decision is to recommend termination or suspension of the faculty member to the President, the written notification shall include the cause(s) set out in Section V.A above that the Provost relied upon in making the recommendation.
- A copy of any recommendation for termination or suspension by the Provost shall be provided to the President at the time it is provided to the faculty member.

STEP 5: If the Provost's recommendation is to suspend and/or terminate the faculty member, the faculty member shall have seven (7) days to make a written request to the Provost for review by the FDRC. (There is no review process if the Provost recommends a PIP or some other form of resolution not including suspension or termination.)

- If the faculty member does not make a written request for review by the FDRC of the Provost's recommendation in a timely fashion, the President shall review the recommendation. Unless the President determines that the Provost's recommendation lacks a reasonable basis, the President shall follow the recommendation and suspend and/or terminate the faculty member. There shall be no further review of the President's decision by the University.

STEP 6: If the faculty member does make a written request for review with the FDRC, the FDRC shall be appointed as set out in Section G below. After the FDRC is appointed, the Provost, absent compelling circumstances, shall provide a description of the charges stated with reasonable particularity (hereafter "Charges") within twenty-one (21) days after receiving the faculty member's written request for review (but in all events as soon as practicable), to the Chair of the FDRC stating the cause(s) relied upon by the

Provost in making the recommendation along with a summary of the evidence upon which the Charges are based.

STEP 7: The faculty member shall file a written response to the Charges no later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the Charges from the Provost.

NOTE: If one of the Charges to be presented to the FDRC is for incompetence in teaching, research or service, then two outside evaluators shall be identified, one by the faculty member and one by the Provost to provide objective evaluations of the faculty member's competence or lack thereof in teaching and/or research. The evaluations shall be conducted by outside evaluators in the faculty member's field. The evaluators shall provide written reports within twenty-one (21) days of being appointed by the Dean and the reports shall be made available to the FDRC for their consideration.

STEP 8: The FDRC shall follow the procedures set out in Section \_\_\_\_ below and then provide its recommendation, in writing, to the President stating whether the Provost's recommendation should be followed, rejected, or modified, including what modifications it would recommend. The FDRC shall simultaneously provide a copy of its recommendations to the Provost and the faculty member.

STEP 9: The faculty member, after being advised of the FDRC's recommendation in Step 7 above, shall have seven (7) days to notify the President in writing if the faculty member agrees or disagrees with the FDRC's recommendation. This is an opportunity for the faculty member to make any relevant statement to the President that the faculty member wishes the President to consider relating to the FDRC's recommendation before the President makes his/her decision. The Provost shall also have seven (7) days to notify the President in writing if the Provost agrees or disagrees with the FDRC's recommendation.

STEP 10: The President shall review the Provost's Charges (as amended if applicable), the faculty member's response to the Provost's Charges (as amended, if applicable), any post-hearing submissions as allowed by the FDRC, the recommendation by the FDRC, and any statement provided by the faculty member and Provost in Step 9. Within fourteen (14) days of receipt of the FDRC's recommendation, the President shall provide his/her written decision to the faculty member and Provost as to whether the faculty member should be dismissed, suspended, or other lesser action shall be taken, which includes taking no action at all against the faculty member. If the President's determination is different than the FDRC's recommendation, the President shall address the reasons for the difference in his/her decision. If the President's decision is something other than termination or suspension, the President's decision is final and no further review of the President's decision shall occur.

STEP 11: If the President determines that the faculty member shall be terminated, the faculty member shall have seven (7) days to make a written request for appeal to the Washburn University Board of

Regents (“WUBOR”). If the faculty member does not request an appeal to WUBOR, then the President’s decision is final and no further review of the President’s decision shall occur. The faculty member’s written request for appeal shall be made to the Chair of the WUBOR, the President, and the Provost. The faculty member’s written request for appeal shall include any response the faculty member wishes to make regarding the President’s written decision. The Provost shall have seven (7) days after receipt of the faculty member’s written request for appeal to respond in writing, which response will be provided to the Chair of the WUBOR, the President, and the faculty member.

STEP 12: If the faculty member timely makes a written request for appeal to the Chair of the WUBOR, the WUBOR shall review a) the Charges (as amended, if applicable), b) the faculty member’s response to Charges (as amended, if applicable), c) any post-hearing briefs filed by the parties as allowed by the FDRC, d) the recommendation of the FDRC, e) the faculty member’s statement of disagreement with the FDRC recommendation, f) the decision of the President, g) the written appeal of the faculty member, h) the Provost’s response to the faculty member’s appeal, and i) the transcript of the proceedings before the FDRC. WUBOR shall *not* consider any information not listed above. After reviewing the above documentation, WUBOR may accept, reject, or modify the decision of the President. WUBOR shall issue its decision, in writing, within twenty-eight (28) days from receipt of the faculty member’s written request for appeal. The decision of the WUBOR is final and not subject to any further appeal or University process.