

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate

April 14th, 2008
3:30 PM Kansas Room, Memorial Union

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of March 10, 2008. (pp. 2 – 3)
- III. President’s Opening Remarks.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
 - A. Minutes from the Academic Affairs Committee meetings of March 3, 2008. (pp. 4 – 10)
 - B. Minutes from the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of March 12, 2008 (p. 11)
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
 - A. Minutes from the International Education Committee meeting of February 14, 2008 and March 13, 2008. (pp. 12 - 13)
- VII. Old Business.
 - A. Action item #08-01, entitled “Change in Composition of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)” (p. 14)
 - B. Action item #08-05, entitled, “Proposed changes to the currently existing Grievance Policy and Procedure (Appendix IX of the Faculty Handbook).” (pp. 15 - 21)
- IX. New Business.
 - A. Three year review cycle for the Washburn Transformational Experience (#08-02) (p. 22)
 - B. Proposed Change in the Faculty Senate Constitution (#08-03) (p. 23)
- X. Information Items.
 - A. WTE Faculty Compensation Committee
- XI. Discussion Items.
- XII. Announcements.
- XIII. Adjournment.

**Faculty Senate
Washburn University**

*Minutes of March 10, 2008 Meeting
Kansas Room, Memorial Union*

Present: Baker, Bowen (VPAA), Boyd, Camarda, Chorba, DePue, Dinkel, Jackson, Jacobs (President), Liang, Lunte, Martin, Munzer, Nobo, Ockree, Patzel, Petersen (visitor), Peterson, Pownell, Prash, Renn-Scanlan, Roach, Rodriquez, Russell, C. Schmidt, S. Schmidt, Sharafy, Shipley, C. Sullivan, S. Sullivan, Walker

- I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:32 PM.
- II. The minutes of the February 11th, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks.
 - A. President Jacobs announced that he has met with VPAA Bowen in an attempt to mitigate some problems involving ITS.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
 - A. There has been no Board of Regents meeting since the last Faculty Senate meeting.
- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
 - A. The minutes of the Academic Affairs Committee meetings of 12/03/2007 and 02/04/2008 were accepted.
 - B. The minutes of the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of 02/18/2008 were accepted.
 - C. A report was given by Gary Baker, Chair of the Electoral Committee. In short, spring elections were moving along perfectly.
 - D. It was announced that a report from the Academic Integrity Committee will be given later this semester.
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
 - A. The minutes of the International Education Committee meeting of 01/31/2008 were accepted.
- VII. Old Business. There was no old business.
- VIII. New Business.
 - A. Discussion was given to action item #08-01, entitled "Change in Composition of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)." The motion to close the first reading was seconded and approved.
- IX. Information Items.
 - A. It was announced that a survey relating to faculty compensation for supervising WTE projects would soon be released. Those in attendance were asked to complete the survey and were also asked to encourage as many of their colleagues to complete the survey.

X. Discussion Items.

- A. In the wake of recent college shootings, information was sought relating to Washburn University's emergency response system. VPAA Bowen announced that campus police have received training to deal with such events. VPAA Bowen also announced that an emergency response system has been purchased and will be installed in the near future.
- B. It was noted that renovations to the Stoffer Science Hall are lacking in numerous, and often substantial, ways (e.g., no countertops in research laboratories, poor and excessively loud ventilation). President Jacobs agreed to draft a response that will be sent to President Farley in the hope that faculty comments and concerns will be addressed prior to the alumni open house scheduled for April.

XI. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Mike Russell, Secretary to the Faculty Senate

Academic Affairs, 3 March 2008

In attendance: Bill Roach, Frank Chorba, Karen Camarda, Patricia Renn-Scanlan, Jorge Nobo, Pat Munzer, Tom Prasch, Robin Bowen. Guest: Nancy Tate

Minutes of the 4 February meeting were approved.

The first order of business was the discussion of the process for catalog changes. Discussion began with a recap by Tom Prasch of the reason the issue arose, in the migration within the catalog from CAS material to university requirement of current catalog language about course numbering. Nancy Tate explained the shift in terms of university history: that the university had once only had a College of Arts and Sciences, and other units had been added later; course numbering rules had always been university-wide, just not in the catalog, and that had changed with the reorganization of the catalog supervised by Tate.

Jorge Nobo noted that the assignment of course numbering to the section on university requirements occurred by default, without any vote by the faculty. Bill Roach pointed out that 900 numbers had been put in place by John Green during his tenure as University President, and that the MBA program had been in place for some 25 years without anyone raising an objection to the system of numbering there. Nobo pointed out that the problem only came to light with the CAS proposal on course numbering in 2006. Tate suggested that the problem was, at root, that no one read the catalog. She insisted that no substantive changes occurred without approval, only cosmetic changes, and that she had gotten then-VPAA Ron Wasserstein's approval for the reorganization and clarification of content when the catalog was revised.

After some further discussion, Tate distributed a flow chart (appendix 1) outlining the process for administrative policy changes and university catalog updates. She noted that the secondary issue was keeping Banner updates in synch, but that that was handled by maintaining a spreadsheet of changes. She noted that the processes were clearer for curricular changes than for administrative changes. Nobo noted that the flow chart for academic policy changes should include faculty approval; Tate agreed, and said that had just been omitted in preparing the current document.

After some further discussion of copyediting and the possibility that editing changes could affect meaning, Nobo suggested that all schools be advised about the flowchart and the rationale for the migration of course numbering language to university requirements. Prasch suggested that distribution of committee minutes would accomplish that end.

The committee then returned to General Education, and to the proposals drafted by Prasch for changes in the system of general education (appendix 2). After some discussion of the mechanics of implementing proposals, the logic of piecemeal change, and the approval sequence that would be required for any changes, focused on opportunities to engage the broader faculty and get feedback at each stage, Prasch reiterated the logic behind the three proposals before the committee: first, in terms of a revised skill set, that skills would most likely be an aspect of any general education program, whatever final shape it took, but that to be properly assessable they needed to be defined, and that faculty opinion suggested they needed to be simplified as well; second, that given a range of pressures for more upper-level general education, as against the broadly established norm that only introductory courses be designated as general education, it was imperative to establish definitions for what might constitute upper-level general education; third, that thematically organized general-

education courses might present an alternative to an undifferentiated smorgasbord approach on the one hand and more difficult-to-implement core courses on the other.

Discussion then turned to mechanics for implementing general-education changes. Bowen asked if there was a need for a new committee, and whether it should be a subcommittee or an autonomous ad-hoc committee. Munzer reiterated the need for a wide range of distribution of ideas for feedback, and insisted that three dimensions must be considered: representation of programs with associate degrees, involvement of those involved in distance education, and consideration for transfer students. Nobo suggested that open meetings and solid two-way communication between the committee and the broader faculty would ensure good feedback. Munzer suggested calling for a committee with three members from Arts and Sciences, and three from the schools. The question was raised whether the committee could establish a committee, or whether it would have to go through Faculty Senate; Munzer suggested that it needed to go to Faculty Senate, and Nobo suggested that she draw up a proposal.

Discussion then returned to revision of the skill sets. Chorba pointed out the difficulties of meddling with the present system, given that the present system was politically acceptable and changes would open the door to departmental politics. Prasch noted faculty discontent with the existing system, nationwide trends favoring developmental approaches to general education, and the need to address upper-level general education because of the needs of transfer students. Nobo proposed a variant version of skill 4, “interpretive and analytic skills,” which, after some discussion and a bit of tweaking of language, read:

“4) Critical, analytic, normative, and interpretive reasoning.

“Students must demonstrate a variety of interconnected reasoning skills in the construction and critique of both factual and value judgments. They must know how to establish or corroborate factual claims and to analyze and assess the soundness of deductive arguments and the strength of inductive arguments built on those claims. They must know how to analyze and assess arguments establishing or using normative principles in ethics, aesthetics, jurisprudence, statesmanship, and other normative or value-laden human concerns. They must know how to assess the form, and interpret the content, of the creative expression of ideas in art, architecture, literature, music, and performing arts.

“Reasoning in these terms can be assessed by evaluating how well students, in their written or oral presentations, assess the information presented to them or construct their own arguments, positions, or theses.

“All general education courses in the humanities and social sciences should include this aim.”

Camarda noted that the definition of “mathematical and scientific reasoning” might need similar revision; Prasch acknowledged that he had anticipated as much. Camarda volunteered to work on an alternate version of that skill.

Chorba raised the issue that the proposed set of skills eliminated “listening sensitively,” but that listening was fundamental to his field of media studies. Prasch pointed out that “processing information” necessarily entailed listening.

Nobo proposed that anyone with further suggestions for changes in the phrasing of the skill sets bring such proposed changes to the next meeting, scheduled on 31 March. Munzer volunteered to write up a proposal to develop a new subcommittee. The meeting was adjourned.

Appendix 1:

Procedures for Implementing Curriculum, Academic, and Administrative Changes

Curriculum Changes

Department Approval (If applicable)

Division Approval (If applicable)

Unit-Level Curriculum Committee Approval

Unit-Level General Faculty Approval

Approval Notification to AVPAA by Unit via Curriculum Change spreadsheet (Course and Program Changes/Additions/Deletions). AVPAA makes course changes to Banner Catalog and files spreadsheet of changes for printed catalog updates.

For Program Changes/Deletions/Additions – Additional Steps

Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee Approval

Faculty Senate Approval

General Faculty Approval

Board of Regents Approval

(AVPAA reviews BOR minutes to determine approval of program changes/deletions/additions)

Academic Policy Changes

Can be submitted through curricular channels or by individuals directly to Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Approval

General Faculty Approval

Board of Regents Approval

(AVPAA reviews BOR minutes to determine approval of academic policy)

Administrative Policy Changes

Generally submitted by individuals to VPAT, VPAA, VPSL, or Dean of Enrollment Management

Policy Developed

Policy Discussed by Executive Staff

Policies Affecting Faculty Shared Through VPAA with Faculty Senate for Review and Comments

Comments Shared with Executive Staff

Final Policy Drafted

Submitted to BOR for Approval

(AVPAA reviews BOR minutes to determine approval of administrative policy)

University Catalog Updates

Organization and accuracy of University Catalog is the responsibility of the AVPAA

Sections of University Catalog are sent electronically to the unit responsible for it (e.g., Student Life sections to Student Life, Student Records sections to University Registrar, Academic sections to Academic Units, etc.)

Units make changes (turning on track changes feature) and return sections electronically

AVPAA checks proposed changes to ensure unit-level changes have been approved at appropriate level

AVPAA adds/changes/deletes approved academic/administrative policies.

Curricular/academic/administrative changes which have been approved at all levels except the BOR by the time of catalog printing are included in the University Catalog (with those items still requiring BOR approval including notation "Pending Board of Regents Approval"). Any changes approved after the printing of the catalog but before the end of the fiscal year (June 30) can still be effective the upcoming fiscal year and are noted in an online section of the University Catalog entitled "Addendums to XX Catalog."

Appendix 2:

Three suggestions on general education

[ok, I'm technically only supposed to be doing something about skills, but just back from this gened conference, I wanted to throw out some other ideas as well. We don't, of course, need to take all of them on at once—or any of them on, I guess. tp]

I. Revised skill sets

Background: Faculty surveys suggest significant dissatisfaction with the existing nine designated general-education skills, with particular discontent about the “listen sensitively” and “interpret and assess human values” skills. In addition, it has been suggested (but not empirically demonstrated)

that students can complete general-education requirements without fulfilling all nine skills. And in addition, as the university moves toward more rigorous standards of assessment, that the existing nine skills lack any clear definitions has become problematic.

Proposal: In revising skills, the aim is to provide a simplified and clear system with measurable student-learning outcomes to facilitate assessment. The proposed alternative consists of five groups of skills; any general-education course should fulfill the requirements of at least two (although many will cover more); courses within selected divisions or departments, as noted below, necessarily must fulfill at least one of the listed skills to ensure comprehensive coverage of all for any student completing general-education requirements.

1) Processing information

Processing information entails understanding and demonstrating comprehension of written texts, oral communications, visual information, and/or mediated presentations (film, websites, etc.) that combine several of the above. When presented with such materials, the student must be able to demonstrate an understanding of the basic argument of the materials, their core content, their intended audience, and their evident biases or subjective perspectives (or, to put it more neutrally perhaps, students must be able to identify the point of view of the material).

It can, I presume, safely be assumed that all general-education courses will fulfill this goal.

2) Communicative skills

Communicative skills involve the ability of the student to communicate clearly his or her ideas in written and/or oral form, and embrace as well the expression of creativity by students in the visual, written, or performing arts. In written and/or oral communication, students must demonstrate the ability to shape a central thesis, to organize an argument, to cite references properly, and to follow the rules of basic grammar and usage. In creative projects, students must be able to demonstrate the ways in which their creative work expresses ideas, an understanding of the form(s) employed, and an ability to employ the basic rules of their chosen expressive form(s).

Again, most or all general-education courses will likely fulfill this goal. It could be made a required element in any course approved for general education in the humanities and social sciences.

3) Mathematical and scientific reasoning

Students must be able to reason mathematically and understand numerical data, to understand scientific method, and to devise and interpret experiments that follow the rules and procedures of the science being studied. Standardized testing can provide an assessment measure for mathematical reasoning; performance in courses with laboratory components provide a mechanism for assessing a student's understanding of scientific method and experimental procedures.

All general-education courses in the natural sciences and mathematics must fulfill the appropriate portion of this goal; that students must take courses in both mathematics and natural science to fulfill degree requirements ensures that the entirety of this goal will be comprehended in any student's progress toward a degree.

4) Interpretive and analytic skills (aka normative reasoning, or critical thinking)

Students must be able to demonstrate their interpretive and analytic skills by evaluating arguments in terms of their clarity, coherence, and content, by developing counter-arguments and marshalling evidence for the positions they take, by assessing the values that underpin arguments they are presented with or which they develop, and by synthesizing information from a range of primary and secondary sources. Critical thinking in these terms can be assessed in written or oral presentations by students, evaluating the extent to which they can critically assess information presented to them, shape their own arguments, and provide suitable evidence for multiple positions.

All general-education courses in the humanities and social sciences should include this aim.

5) Global citizenship

Students should understand, in political, historical, economic, and cultural terms, the nature and structure of the United States; its place both within a global community of nations and in the context of a globalized economic, political, and cultural sphere; and their own role as citizens within this national and international framework.

Establishing global citizenship as a general-education skill recognizes the growing importance of both a citizenship component in general education and a sense of the need to train students to perform in a world increasingly shaped by processes of globalization. Courses in United States and world history, anthropology and sociology, political science, geography, and economics contribute components to this understanding of global citizenship, and can be required to address such components to be counted toward general education. Requiring students, either in general-education courses or in courses in their chosen major, to have courses in at least three of these fields should ensure relatively comprehensive understanding of this aim (and is not unlike the present requirement in the natural sciences that general education requires coursework in at least two disciplines).

II. Criteria for upper-level general education

Background: There is increasing pressure for upper-level general education for at least two reasons: first, in the realm of ideas about how best to pursue general education, that pressure comes from the notion that general education ought to be pursued throughout an undergraduate career, often culminating in some sort of capstone, rather than be concentrated in out-of-major coursework in the first years (and this idea is consistent, clearly, with the direction of the WTE here at Washburn); second, and more narrowly, at least according to Nancy Tate, the new requirement for upper-level credit (45 hours) has increased pressure for general-education upper-level credits, and, as presently constituted, the General Education Committee is looking with more favor on such proposals (of course, this is just what Nancy Tate said, and perhaps it needs verification). At present, general-education options at the 300 or 400 level are very limited: one English course, one Philosophy course, half a dozen Art courses (all art history), a couple Modern Languages, one theatre, and none in the natural or social sciences. The problem is how to designate upper-level general-education courses, without just saying that any course counts (which seems to me to abandon the idea of general education, as opposed to specific disciplinary education, entirely).

Proposal: To be accepted as a general-education course, an upper-level course must, in the view of the General Education Committee, fulfill one of the following requirements:

1. It must have a strong interdisciplinary component, bridging the methods and approaches of multiple disciplines.
2. It must have a broadly foundational content, covering material of wide interest in the liberal arts.

No more than 50% of the courses listed in the catalog for any one discipline may be considered as fulfilling general-education requirements.

III. Thematic clustering for general education

Background: In discussions of alternatives to our present, semi-smorgasboard approach to general education, the usual suggestion has been core courses taken by all students. But core courses present difficulties of their own, in terms of delivery, staffing, disciplinary orientation, and possible turf battles. Thematic clusters suggest to me a less problematic alternative to the present approach, and one that can function alongside instead of entirely supplanting existing general-education courses.

Proposal: In addition to (and building upon) existing general-education offerings, students can be encouraged to take thematically linked groups of general-education courses, coordinating with their chosen Transformation Experience (and possibly recognized with some certificate upon completion). These can either be permanent clusters of courses for themes that have significant staying power, or more limited-term offerings with immediate resonance.

Examples of possible permanent clusters: Contemporary World (could include courses in geography, history, anthropology/sociology, political science, English, art history, among possible others, with scholarly or international travel WTEs); Our Environment (geography, biology, chemistry, history, sociology, etc.).

Examples of possible shorter term clusters: Electoral Politics in '08 (too soon, I know, it's just an example; courses in poli sci, history, communications, mass media, WTEs in scholarship or leadership); Understanding Evolution in '09 (*Origin's* 150th anniversary; biology, history, philosophy, etc.; scholarly WTE)

Washburn University
Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes of March 12, 2008 Meeting
11:00pm Rice Room, Memorial Union

Present: Brenda Patzel (Chair), Lee Boyd, Linda Croucher, Barbara Ginzburg, Park Lockwood, Mike Russell, and Sharon Sullivan.

- I. The meeting was called to order.
- II. Sabbatical application procedures and guidelines were briefly discussed.
 - a. The revised sabbatical criteria and document have been sent to the VPAA office in order to be placed on the VPAA website.
 - b. There are older versions and duplicates of sabbatical documents and procedures currently accessible via the Washburn website. The VPAA office is in the process of deleting these outdated, duplicated, and / or unnecessary documents.
 - c. The term “eligible” when referring to eligible applicants for a sabbatical has been found to be ambiguous within the sabbatical document. The FAC will discuss this with the VPAA office prior to the next meeting in an attempt to resolve the ambiguity.
- III. Conflict of Interest and Grievance policies. The FAC continues to discuss and revise the current Grievance Policy and Procedures. Final revisions will be made via email and during the next FAC meeting in order to submit these changes as an agenda item at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- IV. Meeting was adjourned at 12:10pm.
- V. Next meeting will be Monday, April 7, at 2:15pm.

Submitted by Park Lockwood, Secretary of the Faculty Affairs Committee

**International Education /International WTE Committee
Feb. 14, 2008, International House**

In attendance: Dmitri Nizovtsev, Brian Ogawa, Shirley Dinkel, Matt Arterburn, Mary Sheldon, Alex Glashausser, Azyz Sharafy, and Baili Zhang

1. Minutes of Jan. 31 were approved.
2. Hornberger's request for funding was approved based on verification of paper acceptance.
3. Zhang reported that the 27th Student Group from Fukuoka University will arrive on Feb. 20 for a three-week cultural study tour.
4. Faculty travel requests were discussed.
 - a. Proposal from the following individuals were recommended for funding: Raicheva: \$608, Ball: \$1,200, pending final acceptance of the paper
 - b. Proposals from the following individuals were not recommended for funding: Elisha, Ray, Kwak, Juma.
5. It was suggested that a meeting be dedicated to the discussion of funding policies and filing instructions.

Respectfully submitted,

Baili Zhang

**International Education /International WTE Committee
March 13, 2008, International House**

In attendance: Dmitri Nizovtsev, Brian Ogawa, Miguel Gonzalez-Abbellas, Matt Arterburn, Mary Sheldon, Alex Glashausser, and Baili Zhang; Tina Williams and Karen Ray as guests

6. Minutes of Feb. 14 were approved.
7. Zhang introduced Williams and Ray as guests; members of the Committee also introduced themselves.
8. Zhang reported that the 29th group (reported mistakenly as 27th in last minutes) from Fukuoka University has concluded their studies and that next year marks the 30th year of this great relationship. Special activities will be planned for the anniversary.
9. Zhang introduced Ray and explained that she had concerns and questions about her international travel funding request denied. There was a lively exchange of opinions.

Ray contended that the committee lacked grounds for rejecting her proposal based on published rules, that her proposal met every criterion, and that if the rules had been changed, they should have been made public.

Members of the committee had voted unanimously to deny funding for Ray's proposal. At this meeting, they informed Ray that, given the number of proposals and the limit on funds, not every proposal could be funded, and thus the committee had in its discretion weighed the various criteria in a manner that gave preference to faculty requests that involved presenting scholarly and creative papers, teaching/conducting master classes/seminars/workshops, and/or engaging in other collaborative international scholarly work. The requests also had to convince them of their broader impact on the internationalization of the campus, which Ray's proposal, a solo site-research project, did not do.

The committee confirmed their decision. No further action was taken on the matter.

10. The committee commented on the document with proposed rules governing student study abroad. The committee also discussed the need to clarify certain rules in the current faculty international travel fund guidelines. Revisions were subsequently discussed by email and approved unanimously through email voting.

Respectfully submitted,

Baili Zhang

Faculty Senate Agenda ItemNumber: 08-01

SUBJECT: Change in Composition of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)

DESCRIPTION: After review of the Faculty Senate Bylaws approved by the Board of Regents, it was suggested that the composition of the AAC be changed to more accurately reflect the original intent and language.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: NONE.

RECOMMENDATION: Members of Faculty Senate requests that the composition of the AAC be as follows:

“The Academic Affairs Committee shall be chaired by the Vice President of the Senate. Other members shall include one Senate member from each Major Academic Unit (CAS, SOB, SON, SAS), and the Senate representative of Mabee Library/CRC. The Deans from the Major Academic Units, or their designates, and the VPAA or his/her designate, will serve as ex officio, non-voting members.”

Date: January 15, 2008

Shirley Dinkel (Electronic Signature)
FS member

Faculty Senate Agenda Item

Number: 08-05

Subject: Proposed changes to the currently existing Grievance Policy and Procedure (Appendix IX of the Faculty Handbook)

Description: Currently, Washburn University Conflict of Interest policy does not include a description of the grievance process and procedures when one or more individuals are accused of a conflict of interest. Given that Washburn University already has a process and procedure for grievances, it seems pragmatic to alter the currently existing Grievance Policy to allow for charges of Conflict of Interest.

The proposed changes to the Grievance Policy are as follows:

1. Throughout the document, replacement of “Chair/chairperson of the Personnel” with “President of the Faculty Senate”: Considering that the Personnel Committee is no longer in existence, it seemed prudent that the President of the Faculty Senate would be the appropriate replacement for the Chair of the Personnel Committee.
2. Addition of section A.6. (“*Days*” refer to calendar days.): Throughout the document, the word “day” is used. In some instances, it is preceded by the word “calendar.” Section A.6. serves to clarify that in all instances, “days” refers to calendar days.
3. Amendment to Section E: According to the Conflict of Interest policy, the accused individual(s) may be subject to “disciplinary sanctions which may include, but is not limited to, suspension from or termination of employment.” Because a conflict of interest may result in termination, Section E must be modified to be consistent with the current Conflict of Interest policy.
4. Amendment to Section 3.a.: A grievance should allow insights from a diverse group of individuals; thus, all of the major academic units should have a voice. While it could be argued that the inclusion of an individual from the same major academic unit as the accused or accuser may be biased, it is highly unlikely that that individual would affect the outcome of the grievance process. This amendment also makes it explicit how many individuals will serve on the grievance committee.
5. Deletion of section 3.a.i. and 3.a.iv.: The amendment to Section 3.a. is in contradiction to section 3.a.i. and thus 3.a.i. would need to be deleted.
6. Amendment to Section G.: In those instances when a faculty member is either the grievant or respondent, it would seem fair that an appeal would move from a small group of faculty to a larger one. Moreover, allowing the Faculty Senate to review the decision of the Grievance Committee would allow for an additional level of faculty involvement in the grievance process. Adoption of the amendment would allow, if circumstances resulted in appeals to the highest level possible, two faculty and two non-faculty groups to review the grievance. As it stands presently, a grievance involving a faculty member is reviewed by one group of faculty and two non-faculty groups.

Financial Implications: None.

Recommendation: The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) of the Faculty Senate recommends that the proposed changes be approved by the Faculty Senate, the General Faculty, President Farley, and the Washburn University Board of Regents.

Date: _____04-07-2008_____

Brenda Patzel, Chair of the FAC

Appendix IX: **Grievance Policy & Procedure**

[A. Terminology](#)

[B. Access](#)

[C. Termination of the grievance](#)

[D. Advice and counsel](#)

[E. Scope](#)

[F. Grievance procedure](#)

[F.1. Written complaint](#)

[F.2. Administrative resolution of the written grievance](#)

[F.3. Grievance Hearing Committee](#)

[F.4. Grievance Hearing](#)

[G. Miscellaneous provisions](#)

It is the policy of Washburn University of Topeka that disputes concerning the terms and conditions of employment of faculty members be resolved, if possible, within the University community and in the best interests of the grievant and the University. A procedure providing a mechanism for the resolution of complaints concerning the terms and conditions of a faculty member's employment is hereby adopted. It shall be the responsibility of all concerned in the grievance process to exercise good faith efforts to resolve grievances in the best interests of the grievant and the University.

A. Terminology

1. "Faculty member" includes any member of the General Faculty as defined in the University Bylaws.
2. "Grievant" refers to a faculty member who files a grievance.
3. "Respondent" refers to a University employee whose perceived actions or omissions gave rise to the grievance or to a university employee designated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs to respond to the grievance.
4. "Parties" refers to grievants and respondents (and no others).
5. "Unit" refers to each of the School of Law, School of Business, School of Applied Studies, Division of Continuing Education, School of Nursing, the Library, Social Science Division, Humanities Division, Natural Sciences Division, Creative and Performing Arts Division, and Education-HPED Division.
6. *"Days" refer to calendar days.*

B. Access

Access to the grievance process is a faculty right. Any faculty member may file a grievance. No person shall be penalized for submitting or proceeding with a grievance. No restraining, coercive, discriminatory, or retaliatory action will be taken against a faculty member because of the faculty member's initiation or participation in a grievance.

C. Termination of the grievance

The grievant may terminate the grievance process at any time by withdrawing the petition. All parties may jointly terminate the grievance by mutual consent. Withdrawal or termination will be in writing and sent to the grievant's immediate administrative supervisor with copies to all parties.

D. Advice and counsel

Each party to a grievance may designate one consenting faculty member to act as an advisor and to assist in the preparation of a grievance or response. Each party may also be represented by counsel.

E. Scope

The grievance procedure provided may be used for any complaint, *including Conflict of Interest, regarding all* terms and conditions of a faculty member's employment; ~~provided, however, (a) the policy and procedure shall not extend to complaints concerning petitions for promotion, tenure, termination or non-reappointment and (b) the policy and procedure shall not be applicable to complaints under the jurisdiction of the university's Affirmative Action Policy~~

F. Grievance procedure

1. Written Complaint

A faculty member who has a grievance will file a written complaint with the immediate administrative supervisor 1) within 30 calendar days of the date the faculty member knew, or should have known through due diligence, of the situation giving rise to the grievance or 2) as extended by timely attempts to exhaust available informal administrative remedies. The written complaint will include:

- a. Name of the grievant;
- b. Statement of facts giving rise to grievance;
- c. Identification of individuals (if known) whose actions or commissions resulted in the situation giving rise to the grievance;
- d. Identification of provisions of written policies involved;
- e. Date on which the act or omission occurred and the date on which the grievant first gained knowledge of act or omission;
- f. The date of the initial submission of the grievance;
- g. The relief sought.

Once a grievance is filed, it may not be amended.

2. Administrative Resolution of the Written Grievance

A faculty member who has a grievance must attempt to resolve the matter through University administrative channels. This attempt should start with the faculty member's

immediate administrative supervisor. (This supervisor may or may not be a party to the grievance.) If the grievance remains unsettled, relief shall be sought at the next higher level in the administrative structure, ending with the grievant's Vice President. At each administrative level, the administrator will notify all parties in writing of actions taken. This notification will be given within 14 days of the administrator's receipt of the grievance. If at any administrative level, the grievant considers the matter resolved, the grievant and the administrator will sign a memorandum outlining the complaint and its resolution. A copy of the memorandum will be sent to each party and to each previous administrative level. If the grievant does not consider the matter resolved or if the administrator fails to respond within 14 days, the grievant will, within seven days, notify the administrator and will forward the grievance to the next higher administrative level. The administrator will forward a summary of his/her action to the next high next higher administrative level. Should the grievant fail to notify the administrator within seven days, the grievant is deemed to have accepted the administrator's action (if any) as a final resolution of the grievance. In such a case, the administrator will notify in writing each party and each previous administrative level. Should the matter remain unresolved at the Vice President's level, the Vice President will refer the grievance to the ~~chairperson~~ President of the ~~Personnel Committee~~ Faculty Senate, who shall convene a grievance hearing as indicated below. The Vice President will also send the grievance, with a summary of actions taken, to the President.

3. Grievance Hearing Committee

a. Committee Selection

Grievance Hearing Committees will be established to hear individual grievances. A representative will be selected by random draw from the tenured members of ~~the General Faculty and librarians with more than six years service~~ each Major Academic Unit (School of Business, School of Nursing, School of Law, School of Applied Studies, College of Arts and Science, and Library). The President, Vice Presidents and individuals reporting directly to a vice president shall not be eligible for selection. The members of the committee will be informed of the nature of the grievance and the parties named. Members may remove themselves from the committee for bias or conflict of interest. Should any member remove him/herself, the ~~Chair~~ President of the ~~Personnel Committee~~ Faculty Senate shall draw additional name(s).

Each party, beginning with the most senior ~~in terms of administrative rank~~, shall exercise one challenge thereby reducing the committee to four members. Should any party not exercise its challenge within three days, the ~~Chair~~ President of the ~~Personnel Committee~~ Faculty Senate will exercise that challenge without further consultation.

~~In selecting~~ Criteria for selection of committee members:

i. ~~No member will be from the same unit as any party and, in the event that a Dean is a party, no member will be from the Dean's School or College.~~

ii. No member will be on a committee currently hearing another grievance.

iii. No more than one member will be from a single unit.

~~iv. The Chair of the Personnel Committee will randomly select three more names than the number of parties to the grievance.~~

b. Committee Chair

Each Grievance Hearing Committee will elect a chairperson from among its members.

c. Committee Responsibilities

The Grievance Hearing Committee has the following responsibilities:

- i. To attend all meetings called by the Chair of the Grievance Hearing Committee;
- ii. To ensure that fair and proper procedures are followed;
- iii. To consider all pertinent and relevant evidence in the case;
- iv. To determine matters of fact, to interpret policies and procedures, and to recommend actions to the President.

4. Grievance Hearing

Within fourteen (14) days of receipt of an unresolved grievance from the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the ~~Personnel Committee~~ *Faculty Senate* will arrange for the Grievance Hearing. The purpose of the hearing shall be to receive evidence concerning the act complained of by the grievant and to recommend to the President a just resolution of the grievance. The Grievance Hearing Committee shall not be found to follow the rules of evidence governing trials in the state and federal courts but shall take steps to ensure the hearing is conducted in an impartial and fair manner. The Committee Chairperson shall rule upon all procedural matters subject to the objection of a majority of the committee.

All parties to the grievance shall have the right to be represented by counsel and to present evidence and testimony of witnesses. Witnesses may be cross-examined by the parties and the Hearing Committee members. Upon completion of the testimony and submission of the evidence, both parties shall have the right to make a closing statement.

If a member of the Grievance Hearing Committee is unable to continue because of illness or for other good and sufficient reasons, a replacement will be randomly drawn from the tenured members of the general faculty by the ~~Chair~~ *President* of the ~~Personnel Committee~~ *Faculty Senate*, or the Grievance Hearing Committee may continue to operate with fewer than three members if agreeable to all parties. The Grievance Hearing Committee shall deliberate in private in order to review the information presented and arrive at its recommendation.

Within 14 calendar days of the close of the hearing, the Grievance Hearing Committee Shall formulate a recommendation based upon the evidence adduced at the hearing. The opinion of the Grievance Hearing Committee shall be reduced to writing and shall include,

at a minimum:

- a. Findings of fact on the issues presented in the grievance;
- b. The University policies and procedures applicable to resolution of the grievance and including the committee's interpretation of the policies and procedures; and
- c. Its conclusions as to the allegations of the grievant.

Any member of the Grievance Hearing Committee may submit a minority opinion. The recommendation of the committee and all minority opinions will be forwarded to all parties, and to the President. The President will render the final decision within 14 calendar days. The decision from the President shall be in writing and shall state the reasons for the decision. The President's decision shall be sent to all parties and to all administrators who had previously received the grievance.

G. Miscellaneous provisions

Grievance hearings will not be started after the beginning of final exams of the Spring Semester in the College of Arts and Sciences until the date of registration of the College for the Fall Semester, unless all parties agree otherwise. Grievances filed during that period will be processed after the date of registration of the Fall Semester.

Following grievance any party can appeal *within 30 days to the Faculty Senate and then* within 30 days to the President of the University and then within 30 days to the Board of Regents. The *Faculty Senate*, President, and Board of Regents each will respond within 30 days. The appeal to the Board of Regents will constitute the final step in the internal remedies available to the faculty.

Faculty Senate Action Item

Date: March 12, 2008 Number: 08-02

Subject: Three year review cycle for the Washburn Transformational Experience

Description: The Division of Creative and Performing Arts proposes that the faculty senate set in place a three-year review cycle for the WTE program with the first review to take place by the end of the spring semester 2010. Issues to be reviewed should include optional vs. required student participation, faculty compensation, the viability of the existing four; track system, and future program goals and assessment tools.

Financial Implications: None.

Requested Action: Faculty senate approval (as outlined above)

Originated by: Creative and Performing Arts Division

Faculty Senate Action Item

Date: March 12, 2008

Number: 08-03

Subject: Proposed Change in the Faculty Senate Constitution

Current Faculty Senate Wording

V.E. Each matter considered as new business shall be presented to the Faculty Senate as an agenda item in the form of two readings and may not occur on the same date. The first presentation of the matter shall be considered its first reading. Items coming to the Faculty Senate from the Graduate, Faculty Affairs, Academic Affairs, Electoral, or All-University Committees will be taken up as second reading.

Proposed Faculty Senate Wording

V.E. Each matter considered as new business shall be presented to the Faculty Senate as an agenda item in the form of two readings and may not occur on the same date. The first presentation of the matter shall be considered its first reading. Items coming to the Faculty Senate from the Graduate, Faculty Affairs, Academic Affairs, Electoral, or All-University Committees will be taken up as second reading, except for constitutional changes.

Reason for the Needed Change

- Less than ½ of the faculty senators are on the committee that had the first reading.
- For those not on the committee the faculty members are hearing most of the arguments for and against the proposed change in the constitution for the first time at the faculty meeting and are not in a position to adequately represent their constituents.
- The faculty need time to get opinions from the faculty they represent before making a constitutional change.
- So all due diligence will be used in decisions to change the constitution.

Financial Implications: None.

Requested Action:

Approval by Faculty Senate and General Faculty

Originated by:

Rosemary Walker, School of Business