

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate

April 28th, 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 31, 2008. (pp. 4 – 8)
 - B. Minutes from the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of April 7, 2008 (p. 9)
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
 - A. Minutes from the April 10, 2008 meeting of the International Education/International WTE Committee (pp. 10)
- VII. Old Business.
 - A. ED CIS PS HPE new programs and program changes and deletions (#08-04)
 - B. Course numbering (#08-06)
 - C. Three year review cycle for the Washburn Transformational Experience (#08-02) (p. 11)
 - D. Proposed Change in the Faculty Senate Constitution (#08-03) (p. 12)
- IX. New Business.
- X. Information Items.
 - A. WTE Faculty Compensation Committee
- XI. Discussion Items.
- XII. Announcements.
- XIII. Adjournment.

Faculty Senate
Washburn University

Minutes of April 14, 2008 Meeting
Kansas Room, Memorial Union

Present: Baker, Boyd, Camarda, Chorba, Concannon, Croucher, DePue, Dinkel, Jacobs (President), Liang, Lockwood, Lunte, Martin, Munzer, Nobo, Ockree, Patzel, Peterson, Pownell, Prash, Roach, Russell, C. Schmidt, S. Schmidt, Shipley, C. Sullivan, S. Sullivan, Walker

- I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:35 PM.
- II. The minutes of the March 10th, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting were amended and approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks.
 - A. President Jacobs reported that the administration has made attempts to respond to faculty concerns about Stoffer construction issues identified by faculty.
 - B. It was also reported that the next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be next month (May). One purpose of that meeting will be the election of Faculty Senate officers.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
 - A. It was reported that recommendations for tenure and/or promotion were discussed at the Board of Regents meeting of March 21, 2008. It was further noted that the risk management policies, which were discussed at a previous Faculty Senate meeting, were approved by the Board with little, if any, change.
- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.
 - A. The minutes of the Academic Affairs Committee meeting of 03/03/2008 were accepted.
 - B. The minutes of the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of 03/12/2008 were accepted.
 - C. A report was given by Gary Baker, Chair of the Electoral Committee. It was reported that the following individuals were elected At-Large members for the 2008 – 2010 term: Mark Kaufman (SAS), Michael McGuire (CAS), Gordon Crews (SAS), and Gene Wunder (SoB).
- VI. University Committee Minutes.
 - A. The minutes of the International Education Committee meetings of 02/14/2008 and 03/13/2008 were accepted.
- VII. Old Business.
 - A. Much discussion was given to action item #08-01, entitled "Change in Composition of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)." A motion to approve the item was made, seconded and failed. The vote was 13 in favor, 12 against. While the majority of those voting were in favor of the item, the minimum two-thirds support for a Faculty Senate Constitution amendment was not achieved.
 - B. Discussion was also given to action item #08-05, entitled, "Proposed changes to the currently existing Grievance Policy and Procedure (Appendix IX of the Faculty Handbook)." The motion to approve the item was seconded and passed.

VIII. New Business.

- A. The action item entitled, “Three-year review cycle for the Washburn Transformational Experience” (#08-02) was discussed. The issue of whether a cyclical review process was needed as well as the issue of the frequency of the review process (3-year, as proposed, or 5-year, like program review) was discussed. A friendly amendment was made to succeed the phrase “faculty senate” with the words “create and” in the first sentence of the action item. The motion to close the first reading was approved.
- B. Brief discussion was given to the “Proposed Change in the Faculty Senate Constitution” (#08-03) action item. Those in attendance were largely in favor of the action item. The motion to close the first reading was approved.

IX. Information Items.

- A. It was announced that a faculty compensation plan for the supervision of Creative & Scholarly WTE projects should be proposed in the near future.

X. Discussion Items.

- A. It was mentioned that it is disturbing that the administration essentially ignored faculty comments and concerns about the recently approved risk management policies.

XI. The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Mike Russell, Secretary to the Faculty Senate

Academic Affairs Committee, 31 March 2008

In attendance: Frank Chorba, Karen Camarda, Patricia Renn-Scanlan, Jorge Nobo, Pat Munzer, Bill Roach, Tom Prasch, David Pownell

Minutes of the meeting of the meeting of 3 March 2008 were approved.

Returning to the discussion of Tom Prasch's proposal for revised general-education skills, the committee took up Karen Camarda's proposed revision of the write-up of mathematical and scientific reasoning. With some minor revisions in committee, the following alternative wording was developed and approved:

“Students must be able to reason mathematically, and be able to interpret and analyze numerical data. Students must also understand the scientific method, and be able to distinguish between scientific and non-scientific theories. Within this framework, students should be able, employing the standard methods and procedures of the science being studied, to devise hypotheses, construct experiments to test these hypotheses, and interpret the results of experiments. Standardized testing can provide an assessment method for mathematical reasoning; performance on other written work can provide a mechanism for assessing a student's understanding of the scientific method and experimental design.”

After some discussion of timelines, the need to ensure adequate comment, and appropriate recipients, it was moved that the proposed revision of general-education skills (incorporating Jorge Nobo's suggestions for “critical, analytic, normative, and interpretive reasoning” and Camarda's revision of “mathematical and scientific reasoning”) be forwarded to deans for circulation to divisions, curriculum committees, and other interested parties for comment, to be returned to Prasch as secretary of the committee by 2 May. The document forwarded for comment appears as Appendix 1.

Prasch and Nobo commented that the request for feedback on the VPAA's proposed course numbering system had as of yet produced very little response, with comment only by the Department of History and the Social Sciences Division received so far.

The committee then took up Pat Munzer's proposal to establish a General Education Ad Hoc Committee. That proposal reads:

“Request: The Academic Affairs Committee request permission from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to create an ad-hoc committee on General Education which will report to the Academic Affairs Committee.

“Rationale: Numerous ideas for changing the University-wide general education requirements are being discussed in separate groups. Some of the proposed changes can have an unintended negative consequence on subsets of the WU student population: distance education students, transfer students, students pursuing associate degrees, and programs accredited by an outside agency. In order to provide for more thorough and thoughtful consideration of this complex issue, the Academic Affairs Committee requests permission from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to establish a committee to do just that.

“The ad-hoc committee would be charged with obtaining all relevant information, discussing any ramifications of proposed changes, and developing recommendations as part of its Final Report to be submitted to the ACC by April 1, 2009, with written interim reports September 1, 2008 and December 1, 2008. This committee will report to the ACC committee and would attend at least one ACC meeting every month to give a verbal update as to where the committee is.

“Committee Makeup: Recommended makeup of the fifteen-member Committee:

“6 from College of Arts and Sciences
 2 from School of Business
 2 from School of Applied Studies
 2 from School of Nursing
 2 from Dean of Enrollment (possible someone from admissions and registrar)
 1 from Student Senate.”

Munzer introduced the proposal by arguing that a subcommittee was necessary because of the amount of other work the Academic Affairs Committee was responsible for, because of the need for a committee specifically focused on General Education, and because of the need to include Admissions in the discussion because of the possible impact of changes on transfer students and others.

Nobo opposed the proposal, insisting that General Education was part of the charge of action for the Academic Affairs Committee. He suggested as an alternative getting specialized input where needed.

Bill Roach proposed scheduling hearings rather than requiring the long-term commitment of more committee work. Separate meetings could deal with specific constituencies, and should take place before any action is proposed so that the committee understands the constraints.

The proposal to request an ad-hoc committee was not enacted. It was decided instead to invite particular interested groups to specific meetings of the committee, beginning with Al Dickes and anyone he chose to bring from Admissions for the next scheduled meeting. The committee would continue to bring in representatives from other units and with particular concerns (about, for example, transfer students, distance education, and associate programs) in later meetings.

The committee then turned to Prasch’s proposal to establish criteria for upper-level general education. Prasch introduced the proposal by noting the pressures that were likely to lead to increasing numbers of upper-level general education courses, including the needs of transfer students, the raised 45-hour upper-level requirement, and the trend toward developmental models of general education. He suggested it was important to establish clear criteria for what would make an upper-level course “general education” rather than specific education within a discipline.

Munzer asked that it be made clear with any proposal that this did not change general-education requirements or necessitate any particular student taking upper-level general-education courses. Prasch concurred, saying the proposal aimed only to address criteria for counting proposed courses as general education.

Frank Chorba defended the traditional understanding of general education as taking place in the first couple years of a college career, and suggested that trends in the other direction might be passing

fads. Chorba suggested that higher course numbers usually meant that courses were intended for majors, had more specific and sophisticated content, and often had prerequisites.

Prasch insisted that a course could be both sophisticated and suited for general education. He used the example of an English course in Shakespeare (and Nobo suggested a parallel in a philosophy course on Plato) as having enough significantly broad cultural currency to be considered general education. Prasch also insisted that upper-level general education was coming; the question here was how to manage it. The proposal simply provided a mechanism for evaluating such proposed upper-level courses.

Munzer noted that an additional push for upper-level general education was coming from the demands of students in the 2+2 program and in demand for other online courses.

Nobo noted that many upper-level courses have prerequisites; Prasch noted that the proposal would not change that.

The committee approved a motion to approve the proposal (appendix 2) for circulation to deans with instructions to send on to divisions, curriculum committees, and other interested parties for comment, to be returned to Prasch as secretary of the committee by May 2. Following Munzer's suggestion, it would be noted with the circulation of the proposal that it merely established criteria, and did not change courses required for general education. It was agreed that the proposal would be sent separately from the proposal on general-education skills.

The meeting was adjourned.

Appendix 1

Revised skill sets for general education

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 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 be able to interpret and analyze numerical data. Students must also understand the scientific method, and be able to distinguish between scientific and non-scientific theories. Within this framework, students should be able, employing the standard methods and procedures of the science being studied, to devise hypotheses, construct experiments to test these hypotheses, and interpret the results of experiments. Standardized testing can provide an assessment method for mathematical reasoning; performance on other written work can provide a mechanism for assessing a student's understanding of the scientific method and experimental design.

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) 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.

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).

Appendix 2:

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 upper-level courses listed in the catalog for any one discipline may be considered as fulfilling general-education requirements.

Washburn University
Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes of April 7, 2008 Meeting
Rice Room, Memorial Union

Present: Brenda Patzel (Chair), Lee Boyd, 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. The term “eligible” when referring to eligible applicants for a sabbatical has been found to be ambiguous within the sabbatical document. It has been suggested that the word “eligible” be removed from the document. The FAC continues to discuss this with the VPAA office and will suggest appropriate changes to this document at the next meeting.
 - c. The sweet sabbatical document requires a few minor changes in wording. Further information and clarifications are needed from the VPAA office regarding this issue. Suggestions for changes to this document will be presented at the next FAC meeting.
- III. Conflict of Interest and Grievance policies. The FAC completed discussions and revisions of this policy. These revisions will be noted in the agenda item presented at the next FS meeting.
- IV. Insurance Benefits for Partners. Common criteria used to define domestic partnership were examined and discussed. The FAC will review past domestic partnership documents generated from faculty and / or committees at Washburn prior to the formation of the Faculty Senate. Information from these documents will be reviewed and used to generate an up-to-date domestic partnership policy for Washburn. It is the goal of the FAC to complete this document and present it at the May FS meeting.
- V. The role of librarians at Washburn University was briefly discussed. The FAC will gather information from librarians regarding their interest in tenure-track positions.
- VI. The Intellectual Property Policy was briefly discussed. Continued discussions regarding this policy are scheduled for the May meeting and will continue into the fall semester.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:20pm.

Next meeting will be Monday, April 28, at 3:30pm.

Submitted by Park Lockwood, Secretary of the Faculty Affairs Committee

International Education /International WTE Committee
April 10, 2008, International House

In attendance: Dmitri Nizovtsev, Brian Ogawa, Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas, Matt Arterburn, Mary Sheldon, Alex Glashausser, Azyz Sharafy, Caren Dick for Shirley Dinkel, Baili Zhang; and Tina Williams as guest

1. Minutes of March 13 were approved by email prior to the meeting and with Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas name corrected as noted.
2. Zhang reported that the Study Abroad Scholarship Award Ceremony will be held on April 11. Over 180 participants will be awarded. Members were invited and encouraged to attend. Nizovtsev gave a preliminary report on an incoming scholar from Finland and a potential lecturer from Scotland to teach in the School of Business next year. Glashausser reported that the School of Law has added a 7th program to its certificate programs—International and Comparative Law.
3. Additional rule of requiring students to be “enrolled in full-time to qualify for study abroad scholarships” was discussed. The committee felt that existing rules are sufficient and voted unanimously against adding the additional requirement of full-time enrollment.
4. Zhang informed the terms for all members except one will expire by the end of the year. He will start contacting the deans for new nominations.
5. Zhang informed the committee that there were two funding requests that were submitted shortly after the deadline. The committee voted 4-3 with one abstaining, to include them in this review cycle. The committee subsequently voted to recommend the following funding requests for the VPAA for her final approval:
David Freeman: \$1,200: Finland, pending a more complete budget
Brian Ogawa: \$1,200: China
Iris Wilkinson: \$1,200: Scotland
Bruce Young: \$1,200: Germany
The Committee, however, was unable to approve Sharla Blank’s request.

Respectfully submitted,

Baili Zhang

