

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
February 7th, 2022 at 3pm
Zoom Meeting Hosted by FS Executive Committee

Present: Byrne, Daniels, Farkas, Florea, Friesen, Ginzburg, Griggs, K Huff, Juma, Kay, Kimberly, Klales, Kohls, Lockwood, Lolley, Moore, Morse, Noonan, Ricklefs, Sainato, Schmidt C, Schmidt S, Smith D, Smith M, Thor, Toerber-Clark J, Wagner, Wang, Wasserstein, Woody, Wynn, Zwikstra

Absent: Ewert, Rivera,

Guest(s): DeSota J, Luoma S, Wisneski M, Grospitch E, Ball J, Stephenson L, Cook S, Holthaus C, Erby K, Barker R, Bearman A, Maxwell A, Fried M, Lanning S, Burdick M, Haverty J, Williams Z, Manila H, Enos C, Sollars D, Stover M, McNamee B, Martin C, Carpenter J, Mastro Simone J, Rubenstein D, Steffen C

- I. Call to Order at 3pm by Morse
- II. Approve minutes- Moved by Lockwood, 2nd Byrne, Motion passed
 - November 29, 2021 (pages 2-7).
- III. President's Opening Remarks
 - This has been a long January – Fac Service committee met first time on the 27th of January and will meet again this Thursday (Feb 10) and will meet with Faculty Affairs. This semester is just information gathering (made a long list).
 - Constitution revisions continue
 - KBOR Gen Ed package progress, will affect us more next year in all likelihood.
 - Time for officers for next year – Kim and Tonya are off next year, but Tracy and Shaun are still on. Officers can be current senators or ones who are elected in April. If you know someone who would be good at this, contact Kim/connect them with Kim. Conversations need to begin sooner vs later.
- IV. WUBOR/KBOR Update- Kim Morse, Tonya Ricklefs
 - KBOR Updates –
 - Ricklefs – Not much, since Ball is talking about Gen Ed, lots of KBOR Tenure extensions talk. Also lots of discussion about programs putting people in the field (placement sites) and difficulties they are having. March is deadline for Tech transfer classes. (We will know which ones they are talking about soon.)
 - General Education – J Ball: This is moving more slowly than they thought. Implementation Committee is mostly registrars across the state (looking at it now), and will try to get framework out by end of

year, but can't be implemented by Fall, so likely another year before it is put into place.

- WUBOR – K Morse: Quite short and uneventful. Mazachek recommended Eugene Williams for Eminentis Universitatis – This is well deserved because of all the work he put into KTWU.
- Dr. Farley said the State (Kansas) is in better shape financially; State included a 5% salary improvement, doesn't apply to WU, but he said we will have a 2+% salary increase plan so that we don't fall further behind (which would make it difficult to hire faculty.)

V. VPAA Update - Dr. JuliAnn Mazachek (not here today due to family duties), but not major updates.

VI. Consent Agenda

- Faculty Senate Committee Reports-
 - None
- University Committee Reports-
 - None

VII. Old Business

- 22-5 Math University Requirement Revision (pgs 8-9) S Schmidt moved and P Lockwood seconded this revision.
- S. Cook – trying to encourage students to take MA112, and make the minimum more clear (MA112), but can satisfy it with a higher numbered course or ACT of 28 (Math score).
- Motion passes (but not unanimously)

VIII. New Business-

-

IX. Information Items-

- IT protections for students against phishing and other cybercrimes - John Haverty, Homer Manila, and Chris Enos
 - Current issues: monetary/bank account scams (dog walking, gift card, etc) gets students information. Text communication also occurs if student responds with cell. If you hear of a student whom this has happened to (ie information compromised), try to involve C Enos on this.
 - Phone calls are being received on cell/landline phone. Sometimes it is legitimate (financial aid – I3, will ask for last four of SS#), but there are others that are not legitimate. If a student is unsure, then information should not be given until the group is confirmed.
 - If you see these threats, use the pfish alert button. Mostly it's students who are falling for these, but some faculty as well. The "Pfish" button gets data to our IT people which is very useful.
 - C Enos – most of these have a financial tie in, ask students to cash a check (which is fake. The bank refunds the amount by removing it from the student account). Can sometimes recover the amount but

sometimes it can't be reversed. May also use threats/fear (posing as law enforcement) to get students to pay to avoid being arrested. This is even worse for foreign students. Work with Heidi Staerkel and Baili Zhang with students coming in (before they get here). Also seeing sexploitation. Use coercion over social media and pressure for explicit photos, then pressure for money once they have the photos. Encourage students to reach out to Counseling Services/Campus Advocate if they don't want to go to the police at first. These are criminal offenses (even compromising an email account), so they can be prosecuted (along with any theft/blackmail).

- Protection for students is Dual Factor Identification. This is a phased in process (3.5K currently protected). Also need to sunset the "365 Office legacy authentication" with basic authentication. This is done more with Faculty and Staff (simulations monthly, and online training annually) than students. Social Media is the best channel for that. Also trying to work with New Student Orientation and cyber safety connection page (trends could show here). ID Protection looking at logins from students (behaving abnormally if logins aren't lining up with "routine" patterns.) Need everyone's help – Pfish Alert is very helpful! Gives the security department everything it needs to trace the threat and see how wide-spread it is. Need to do more training, but some of the options require more money. We may be able to get money from Governor's office. We can deploy it quickly once the funds are available. Also getting information in one place so that information is all going one place to block attacks when then happen. Want to collaborate with student workers to get the information out to the rest of the students (speak the student's language). Non-computer Science Majors can work in ITS, so encourage all majors to apply to ITS (to broaden outreach).
- J Haverty – if a student account is compromised, it is automatically switched to the multifactor authentication to prevent further issues.
- Chat questions – Is the increase just on our campus? The increases in all cyber attacks at all campuses, etc are happening. Any suspect in the world can potentially reach our students (or anyone).

X. Discussion Items-

- Proposed new policy in the WUPRPM on Media Communications – Marc Fried and Cynthia Holthaus (pgs 10-11)
 - M. Fried – Cynthia Holthaus is going to do remarks. CH: Today I have more of an attorney hat on with writing WUPRPM. Last semester we had a draft which drew some attention (and it's good when people pay attention) and got some good feedback. It's good to know when there is a difference between what was intended and how it is being perceived. Attorneys like things in writing, written

materials allow for consistency and being able to find information that guides people. We have received good feedback. We are happy to receive more feedback.

- Most comments already (M. Fried) on sections 16.5 and 16.7
- 16.7 Concern with “When speaking or writing...” This comes from the Faculty Handbook, which comes from AAUP manual. K Wynn, missing the sentence before from the manual (which should not block free speech) vs 1st sentence here – what are you allowed to do. C Zwickstra – this makes it seem like we couldn’t do this without the university’s permission. C Holthaus, we are not planning on changing the Faculty Handbook. WUPRPM applies to everyone, but Faculty Handbook is just Faculty. D Rubenstein – “Do we have to say we are not acting on the part of WU?” Is it default to assume we are NOT speaking on behalf of the organization, or do we have to make it clear that we are NOT. M Fried – can’t tell you that every single time it will be perceived that you aren’t (by default), but if it seems like there would be confusion, then it would be needed to be clarified. This is language drafted from Handbook/AAUP. D. Rubenstien: So better to play it safe? Is that what you are saying? MF – Be aware of the context to make sure it’s not confusing. DR – Is this policy intended to change anything? Do I have to think about everything I’ve done in the past? MF – Trying to create a policy to match what the practice has been. This is to make sure that the good guidance applies to everyone, not just the faculty. CZ – If this has always been there, then maybe we can just keep going... Is there any middle ground (can only speak as an individual OR for the whole university), but you could be speaking about something you are an expert in (not a private individual OR for the U). What is the penalty if someone speaks out before going through Public Relations. MF – The PR Dept will consult with the faculty (all subject matter aspects must consult with PR depts before talking – will revise this so that one doesn’t have to consult with PR before speaking as an expert.) In the past, people have testified and questions come back to Dr. Farley/Board Chair and they are caught off guard. Trying to figure out how to balance practicality with keeping WU connected (for subject matter experts). C. Martin – May be repetitive, but this will indicate the level of concern. Worried about the ambiguity in this policy. Particularly concerning about 16.2 – definition of Media (including social media). Every time I express an opinion on something I’m an expert on, do I need to consult PR dept. The intent is to prevent people from appearing to represent WU without checking first, but not prevent having input on debates in the public domain and using credentials to support my knowledge basis in the area. This should not be included in need to consult with PR. If I write an OpEd, there have been incidents in the past when Faculty

have been advised not to include their credentials (which is unclear in 16.7). Is someone excluded from including their affiliation? MF – Thanks for comments. One of the things about Social Media importance – WU is using social media to send out official announcements, there are now “papers” that are only Social Media and not actual papers. I can see why that might be ambiguous. The affiliation has been requested not to happen before and we can go back and visit that. T Ricklefs – lots of comments about conferences, testifying at the legislature... P Byrne – I echo almost everything CM said. This policy isn’t practical in terms of the way news works – get an email at 1 and want to run the story at 5. This makes it seem like we shouldn’t do them anymore. We can’t give these interviews quickly enough (which decreases good PR). More recently the requests have come through from Patrick Early. We aren’t able to put into writing what we are doing in practice (because the practice isn’t happening this way.) Can’t answer questions in real time (if a reporter comes up at a meeting). I wonder if Patrick Early is engaging in some sort of discretion in sorting requests right now, or just forwarding them on? MFried – That last question is really good. After talking with Bob Beatty, this is important for someone new who hadn’t done this before and would like some help. This was never intended to imply you can’t answer before contacting PR. The notification part was not that you have to funnel everything through before even responding. Statehouse stuff is just to make sure we are aware it is going on. Not trying to tell you you can’t do it. We will definitely go back and revisit it. We will make sure it says what we intend for it to say vs how it is being interpreted.

- Chat – (compilation) 1) Several people saying worried about it could be interpreted down the road (10-15 years from now) as admin changes. 2) Only pertaining this to news media, but not conferences. Is that correct? Yes – not trying to stop you from communicating at conferences. 3) What would happen if a news story at a conference if a story is picked up (beyond our control) and is reported on. 4) Maybe we need to write a policy that reflects what people are actually doing (small vs big issues)? 5) Do we think people should NOT try to speak for the University. Most people don’t want to, but don’t want to appear to accidentally do that. MF – Two pieces here: This is trying to deal with multiple things (official statements by WU) and the second is statements being made as subject matter experts (especially legislature) where someone may mention it to Dr. Farley. It sounds like we need to subdivide so that there is more clarity here. K Morse – noting things being said about Academic Freedom/Freedom of Expression – is this trying to distance WU from a plurality of perspectives. L Moore – Are we allowed to refute something the President says (ie

all family are happy, can we refute?) MF That is an interesting question. There are different sets of rights/protections depending on the situation. Would have to think about. TRicklefs – Chat is going back to how news is defined and the inclusion of Social Media. J Mastrosimone – Do they want us to contact them every time we respond to everything on Social Media? TR- What is the timeline for turn-around from PR if you get a request? What about advocacy for a group/issue on my personal time. MFried – Not sure I understand about turn-around time. The term “will” is probably not going to stay. I don’t think the intent was to get input from PR before responding. The time would depend on what you are seeking – would need to let PR know what time they have asked you to respond. In terms of the protests, since this language is already in the Fac Handbook, I don’t know what it would change. The idea is not to restrict expression, but to “express restraint and respect for opinions of others”. We thought that using language already there (in the handbook) would mean that people would be comfortable with it, but obviously that is not the case. L Moore – what is my “area of expertise” since I write about areas outside of my PhD? Also, how will it affect the Dean’s in communication with HS students. MF – I don’t think your PhD limits your area of expertise. K Morse – lots of repetition in chat, so I think we have most of the ground covered. TR -Social media, conferences/what is news media, how does PR function? MGriggs – If the underlying policy is to prevent embarrassment to the University, then this is not headed in that direction (expressed on a colleague’s behalf who had already left). CZ – Just need to pay attention to the tone – will vs may. “Will” makes it seem like it must happen and that faculty may not be able to communicate effectively without help from the PR group. Maybe there is another problem than what the writing makes it seem to be, then that needs to be reflected in the writing. MF – Communicating with media is different than the classroom, but this was not intended to insult, just recognize that there are differences. Also, we will subdivide into two areas (vs combined). C Martin – really problematic word is “should” vs you can/may use PR as a resource. Something of concern that has not been articulated – Faculty will speak on a hot-button issue and then the Administration gets embarrassed because they didn’t know. This should be put into a separate issue (not combined). On 16.5, there is increasing blurriness between news media/blogs that are still scholarly. There should be clarity on whether you can identify oneself (and not being able to do so seems to limit Academic Freedom). 16.4 Could be interpreted that someone can’t send something out on a page/media platform without consulting PR. K Wynn, 16.6 – There is confusion created by wording here Faculty & Staff may speak with Washburn Review for Professional/Scholarly

opinion, but for any official statement need to go to PR. What if they have a question about faculty being happy with retirement plans....? Some of the confusion seems to come from the fact that we don't know what everyone is having to do/everyday life and how it can be impacted by these statements. M Stover 16.6 – The way I interpret this I would think it applies to external media (why just for Washburn Student Media). These typically address external media. It is hard to recruit student reporters/get them to talk to sources/etc. Adding this additional barrier, will make this job unfeasible. MF – Can I ask if you're having trouble with 1st or 2nd sentence. MS – I don't think there should be a whole separate paragraph / category of its own (just for WU media). MF – This may be due the fact that it was initially (whole writing) was termed "External Communication". J Mastrosimone – Think it is an infringement of freedom to not be able to mention their title. It seems like this would be a loss to the University if we can't mention that (ie we are decreasing PR that could attract students and get WU's name in the public. P Byrne – Where is this in the Faculty Handbook (2.1.c)? MF just 16.7 second line, not 16.5. C Zwikstra – The Fac Handbook comment seems to apply to Administration making these statements, not the Faculty and Staff. MF – We will take the comments we have received today and from others and use them to revise the statement and then will put it back out for people (certain folks or FS, not sure) to see if the changes address the concerns raised. K Morse – Think it would be a good idea to bring it back to Fac Sen again, given all the comments from today. (TR from Chat – who from Senate is on Fac Handbook Comm – Kim, Shaun) C Zwikstra – do we have any ability to veto/cancel this policy. MF: Policy is approved by the Board and would normally go through a WUPRPM committee since it doesn't usually affect Faculty, but we probably did it with this since it seems to involve faculty as employees more (and there is not much faculty input). We will keep this in mind in the future. C. Martin: it seems odd that it's not going through Fac Handbook. Going through WUPRPM could be interpreted as a move to cut the Faculty out. Why don't we have a separate policy for Faculty (separate from WUPRPM)? MF – We were trying to be efficient, but perhaps that wasn't the best way because there are two different pieces. This is still campus wide (people other than faculty can have areas of expertise). We need to pay attention to who will be affected and make sure we have a different track if Faculty will be highly affected. (May not need separate statement in Fac Handbook, but still have Faculty input.) K Morse, at the end of the day, all we can do in this context is advise, but we can't make any decisions. MF Only the WU Board of Regents can make the decision. We sometimes get feedback informally, but it may be more appropriate to follow more

formal channels (Faculty Senate). There was no attempt to prevent people from speaking out or curtail Academic Freedom. Obviously, that didn't get across. Chat – There seems to be a note that PR will look at department output. TR – What if students get asked questions by the media? Where is that managed? MF – That is a good question. I wasn't really aware of the student thing. Chat – is there a faculty member on WUPRPM? MF Yes, there has been. We haven't met in a while. CZ -another language point in Chat should be checked.

- KM – Thank you for engaging with us on this (Faculty, Senators, Marc Fried, Cynthia Holthaus.)

XI. Announcements

- E Grospitch – Counseling services is now accepting new clients (made it)
- Religion Forum is tonight
- S. Schmidt – The Math Revision is going through to Gen Faculty automatically since it is a change in University Requirements

XII. Adjournment – Adjourned at 4:53 pm