

Washburn University  
Meeting of the Faculty Senate  
September 12, 2022 at 3pm  
Meeting in Forum Room Hosted by FS Executive Committee

Present: Barraclough, Cook-Cunningham, Dahl, DeSota, Ewert, Florea, Friesen, Ginzburg, Grant, Holt, Huff, Juma, Kay, Kendall-Morwick, Kimberly, Lolley, McGuire, Modellmog, Noonan, Porta, Rivera, Rossi, Sainato, Schmidt, Scofield, Smith, Sourgens, Toerber-Clark, Wagner, Wasserstein, Zwikstra

Absent: Lockwood,

Guests: Lanning S, Grospitch E, Holthaus C, Burdick M, Stephenson L, Leffingwell Q, Hanes S, Broxterman H, Siebold R, Luoma S

- I. Call to Order at 3:02 pm by Shaun Schmidt
- II. Approve minutes- Moved by Kendall-Morwick, seconded by Friesen. Approved unanimously (with minor clerical modifications)
  - August 29, 2022 (pages 2-7)
- III. President's Opening Remarks –
  - Introduction of new people (only those who were not here last time).
  - Assume everyone saw the message from Regent Buhler which contains profile for presidential search (put together from comments). Highlighting some expectations for president and qualifications. It appears that they listened to comments from faculty and staff.
  - Committee will be fairly closed at this point, but please nominate anyone that you think might fit this. E Grospitch – just need to give the search committee the name and contact information.
  - Next meeting is September 26<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 pm, which is the same day as Dr. Farley's retirement party (3:30pm). This will be short – conversation with Marshall Meek and no business so that it will be done.
  - During the talking about Constitution, Shaun will pass the gavel during this since he did quite a bit of work on it.
- IV. WUBOR/KBOR Update- Shaun Schmidt/Erin Grant
  - KBOR – SS – Emporia is undergoing lots of change, including a new president and is taking advantage of a rule that allows them to make changes as part of their “modernization” including removing tenured faculty and others. There is concern that they are not following processes already in place. Sourgens – Was their president from outside academia? (Yes) A member of WUBOR where this was brought up seemed to think it wasn't a major issue, and that the new president at Emporia had “won over” those with concerns. C Holthaus: that person who made the comment that this was not an issue was a KBOR rep, so he had a different perspective, and that person is no longer on our board. The request to have a terminal degree in their field should help with this issue.

- Zwikstra- Do we know if KBORs COVID policy will be sticking around for a while? (Since that appears to be part of the way they are able to cut people so quickly.) (There did not appear to be a clear answer to this question.)
  - WUBOR – Next meeting on Thursday
- V. VPAA Update - Dr. Laura Stephenson
- Got good press about being a top Regional University in the US.
  - For Public Regionals in Midwest, we were #5 in Low Debt and # 29 for being a Veteran Friendly campus. This is due to hard work done by faculty for the past several years. (low-cost texts, helping students be successful, etc). Glad we are getting positive press from that.
  - Holly Broxterman will be providing support for Faculty Senate this year. She is new to VPAA office.
  - Meetings next week for Bridge of Strategic Plan (Tues and Wed next week for Faculty, Thursday for Staff). There will be other opportunities to weigh in if you can't make them.
    - Barraclough: Who is facilitating them? Stephenson: Riley Siebold
    - M. Burdick – Concerns that there is an overlap of CAS meeting and the Wednesday Bridge meeting, which will limit who can come to the meeting. Stephenson: My thought is that many of the issues are campus wide, not specific to groups, so it's less of an issue if CAS ends up going mostly on one day. Wasserstein – There is interest in another session since some people can't make it to the Tuesday session and feel like they need to go to the CAS session.\*
      - I. Note that after this meeting it was announced that there would be a third session on September 28<sup>th</sup> 3-5 pm.  
Register here: [Academic Bridge Strategic Planning Tickets, Multiple Dates | Eventbrite](#)
  - Wasserstein – last time you mentioned the EAB group was “optimizing” scholarships. What does “Optimization” mean? L Stephenson: don't know the answer yet, but trying to be strategic, what are the ways we can optimize. We are trying to move away from ACT scores and grade grid, but don't have a good system for looking at need based.
- VI. Consent Agenda –
- Faculty Senate Committee Reports- none
  - University Committee Reports- none
- VII. Old Business-
- Action Item 22-4 Faculty Senate Constitution Replacement (Amended) (pages 8-30)
    - The initial reading was in November of 2021 (on pg 8), and it was modified since then. This modified proposal is listed on page 10.
    - E. Grant now has the gavel since S Schmidt was heavily involved in these changes.
    - S Schmidt – move to open the issue (Wasserstein seconds).
      - I. Scofield would like a change made to graduate committee, to say that those on the committee would be involved in

graduate programs. Schmidt: Scofield is talking about section on pg 20. Currently this committee is across the university and doesn't have a good home. The point was to move it to Faculty Senate to make sure the academic aspects would be covered by The Faculty. Scofield – I have language that I would like to see included\* (attached as an addendum below). Would like to see some limitation removed since others are being added to make sure the council will be able to function.

II. Schmidt – I foresee this committee taking on the role of the Graduate committee.

III. Scofield – I move we amend the constitution as read, Wasserstein seconds. Holt: Would this affect librarian's ability to serve on the committee. Schofield: no because librarians serve all students. Wasserstein: Graduate Council will still exist, regardless of what we do here, correct? B Scofield: It would change their group to make the recommendation to (Grad Council to Grad Comm of FS). Schmidt: Could you repeat the composition about who would be included? Does it include a university wide representation? (yes) Motion to amend the constitution as read is passed. Sourgens: Question about things fall into the seams (perhaps undergraduate programs that affect the graduate programs. Who would have jurisdiction over that (where the two meet)? Schmidt: This body. Scofield: presumably the program bringing it up would be aware of any overlap. Wagner: not always. It's good to have a backup on oversight.

IV. Zwikstra: Why does the AAC need 2/3 rather than majority? Schmidt – Based on making sure there is a super majority for anything that would affect the whole university.

V. Ginzburg – Looking at removing "librarians" as a category. Who else does this include? How would this change our representation? Wasserstein – We are still working through to make sure we know exactly what it looks like. As it currently stands we have 2 from SOL and 1 Lib from SOL. This would be switched to 3 total, but I'm amenable to saying at least one rep had to be from the library (and could do that for the rest of WU as well.) Barraclough – For my clarification, who else falls into the category besides Library and Center for Student Success? (Schmidt – Leadership, LINK, etc. A total of 5 groups who may not have a unit.) Wasserstein- this is to make sure that eligible individuals have a chance to have representation. Scofield – Small Business Development Center has a closer tie to School of Business than the broader faculty. Wasserstein – It would

be counted within the School of Business, and either method of counting this position didn't change the representation numbers. Other similar positions (like Math lab head), don't really affect numbers. We could make sure the Standing Rules clarify where a person stands. Schmidt – This clarification in the Constitution seems to do it by exclusion, rather than whom they report to. Perhaps adding language in Part C may clarify this. Wasserstein – we should look into this specifically because it may not be included in the Census, so we need to make sure we can get this information from Administration.

- VI. Zwikstra – Does anyone else find the sentence saying who can vote ambiguous (based on faculty status.) – ie full time, excluding those who are serving MORE than ½ time in administrative capacity. (Wasserstein – They cannot vote if more than ½ admin). Ewert – yes, clean up the language so that it is very clear who can/cannot vote.
- VII. Schmidt- move to postpone action to a future meeting, seconded by Wasserstein. Motion passes
- VIII. Gavel passed back to Schmidt from Grant.

VIII. New Business-

IX. Information Items-

- Emeritus work moving to Faculty Handbook Committee before coming to Faculty Senate.
- Rules of Order Recording for Faculty Senate was made on Tuesday, Sept 6. (Wasserstein will post this.)
- Ye Wang on sabbatical, Joey DeSota voted by C&P division to replace.

X. Discussion Items-

- Faculty Discussion of Farley Retirement Package
  - Ewert – What is the purpose of this part of the meeting – to air grievances or to create an action? Schmidt – there were questions raised at the last meeting, so this is a chance to give people the chance to discuss them.
  - Rossi – What are the details? Ewert – pulling up the information. Kay – This article indicates Dr. Farley's pay will increase from 283,000 to 327,000 and he will help recruit students (while working from Washburn office. Then he will be on year-long sabbatical (making 360,000) and have a statue in his honor. Ewert – this article also mentions country club membership.
  - Moddelmog – How does this impact WU going forward? Does this impact search, given the current president is still on campus and in the presidential house? What about giving to the University? (Perception might be that WU has enough money.) Is there a role that Faculty Senate might be able to advise the Board about future retirement packages?

- Scofield – His new office is in this building (BTAC), so he will not be in the same building, and he will be closer to alumni.
- Kay – What would be a comparable settlement plan at another institution of our size? Is this surprising or are we not familiar with it (these types of packages)?
- Friessen – Was he asked to leave or did he retire? Kendall-Morwick – He was approached about retiring by the board. Grant – many students frustrated with the amount of the retirement package, so this may affect future alumni.
- Modellmog – Division meeting announced that we would be discussing this at Faculty Senate, but no emails were received from faculty (at least none sent to her). McGuire – One question that was raised was “Is this right?” and “Should one be making more money in retirement than working?” Rossi: Is this set in stone? Schmidt: Yes, was set in March.
- Ginzburg: Hard to make a clear break/find a new president if the prior one is still around. This is a concern. Lolley- Do we have a clear reporting structure? (What will Farley be able to do as President Emeritus?) Schmidt– Don’t know, but assume President Emeritus would work for the current President. There are a couple of pieces – BOR only employs the president, so they are in charge of the package. President Farley is loved by the community and WUAAF might want to utilize that to benefit the University. Over totality of his time, he was a good president and has done a number of good things.
- Porta – Are we sure the board only hires one person since we are promoted/hired by the board? Holthaus – kind of both correct. WUBOR is responsible for running university, being financially sound, and hiring president. He has always had an annual contract which was renewed. WUBOR does approve tenure, but not employment. Sourgens – There are two ways this could go – a separation agreement, or an employment agreement (as Pres. Emeritus). I find it difficult to understand how it is slotted. Holthaus– any contract would be subject to open records act, according to Kansas Law. Porta – we either have two people hired by the board, or all of us are hired as well.
- Wasserstein - I may be wrong, but I suspect we will not know much more than what was in the open record act. It does seem that we can ask what the reporting structure is since it is relevant to operations of WU.
- Porta – Can we still consider what is happening to see if it is happening correctly? Was this done in a way that reflects the interests of the University?
- Sourgens – I think people could ask for their own open records request, or do we as a body want to do this? What is the role of a President. Emeritus, given that the position is being created to a

degree? Could we have someone from the board come answer questions?

- Schmidt – There is no role in the Faculty Handbook (Holthaus: I agree, this is at the board’s discretion.)
- Scofield- Is the next step having a list of questions for Marshall?
- Schmidt– To me, we could ask WUBOR, but not sure what that would do. Can ask Dr. Farley, but he does not routinely come to meetings. Asking Marshall seems like logical step since he will set the tone.
- Wagner – there may be a benefit to letting the board know what some of the concerns were (as they move forward).
- Sourgens – maybe letting the campus/Faculty Senate know in advance which could allow for clear communication?
- Schmidt – How do you want to proceed? What do you want out of this?
- Wasserstein – I think it’s best to visit with Marshall first and then we can change things if needed.
- Ginzburg – Best to try to set a relationship building meeting. Ewert – I agree. Ginzburg – This is new to everyone since most weren’t here 25 years ago when Dr. Farley started.
- Schmidt – How many people were here 25 years ago? (Only 2)
- Sourgens -I think we should send questions in advance. It would give him (Marshall) a chance to answer in a well thought out way.
- Send questions to Shaun and Tracy. Exec Committee will compile questions and get them to Marshall Meek 4-5 days in advance.
- Grant – Will there be any committee business that has to happen next meeting? Wagner -Committees will just have first meeting this week, so it’s unlikely there will be any.

XI. Announcements

- Grospitch and Barraclough– Grad and Career fair is Wednesday 10 -2
- McGuire - Write-on-Site is happening in MO 210 on Mondays from 1-2:30 and HC 225 on Fridays from 3:00 – 5:00. Write-on-Site is basically a dedicated space to allow interested faculty to write at the same time with others. By participating in this “group” faculty will have dedicated time to work on their scholarly or other writing pursuits.
- Philosophy lecture for Free Speech is next Tuesday
- KBOR will consider John Dicus to be the representative to WUBOR

XII. Adjournment: Wasserstein moves and Kendall-Morwick seconds to adjourn at 4:25 pm. Motion passes.

\*Addendum to Minutes (Scofield presentation on proposed amendments to Constitution)

ISSUE: Faculty Senate Constitution as proposed does not ensure that graduate faculty oversee graduate curriculum.

1. Eliminate Graduate Academic Affairs Committee section in Faculty Senate Constitution
  - a. Change Graduate Council so that the Faculty Senate Representative Chairs the committee instead of having Graduate Council elect its own chair.
  - b. Change Graduate Council so that it reports to the Academic Affairs Committee of the faculty senate, rather than to the Faculty Senate as a whole

DISCUSSION: This alternative keeps the Graduate Council that already includes a representative for every graduate program, which is not a realistic membership for a Faculty Senate Committee. Changes can be made to increase the Faculty Senate oversight of Graduate Curriculum by having its recommendations go to the Academic Affairs Committee and by having its chair be appointed by the Faculty Senate. Graduate Council changes would be made by the Graduate Council and need approval up the chain of command. Coordination should be possible.

2. Change the Faculty Senate Constitution
  - a. Add a requirement that members of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee have a role in a graduate program.

#### CURRENTLY PROPOSED

3. Graduate Academic Affairs Committee membership will include one Faculty Senator from University-Wide Faculty, and one faculty member from each School and College that offers at least one graduate program.

The VPAA or their designee will serve as ex-officio, non-voting member.

If possible, all faculty members of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee should be senators. However, if a Major Academic Unit has three or fewer senators, or University-Wide Faculty has only one senator, the Executive Committee may ask the relevant unit(s) to elect a non-senator to the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee to ensure adequate representation. If elections of non-senators must be made, the minimum proportion of the faculty members of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee who will be senators is one half.

#### ALTERNATIVE

3. Graduate Academic Affairs Committee membership will include one Faculty Senator from University-Wide Faculty, and one faculty member from each School and College that offers at least one graduate program. **The faculty members from each School and College must have a role in a graduate program to qualify to serve on this committee.**

The VPAA or their designee will serve as ex-officio, non-voting member.

If possible, all faculty members of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee should be senators. However, if a Major Academic Unit has three or fewer senators, or University-Wide Faculty has only one senator, **or there are insufficient faculty senate members with a role in graduate programs**, the Executive Committee may ask the relevant unit(s) to elect a non-senator to the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee to ensure adequate representation. ~~If elections of non-senators must be made, the minimum proportion of the faculty members of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee who will be senators is one half.~~

- b. Let Graduate Council figure out what it wants to do now that graduate curriculum is in the hands of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee

DISCUSSION: This alternative transfers responsibility from the Graduate Council to the Faculty Senate. My expectation is that the Graduate Council will continue to be the originating body for graduate curriculum and will then send their recommendation to the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee. Since the faculty senate includes plenty of faculty with no role in a graduate program, it seems likely that non-senators will be needed in this committee. As long as there is a chair from the faculty senate, the participation of non-senator faculty can represent an additional service opportunity for faculty. Setting a limit on non-senators seems unnecessary since non-senators will only be used when no senator is suitable and the limit may set a difficult constraint to meet in some possible situations.

Graduate Council from website: <https://www.washburn.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-resources/governance/faculty-senate/committees/graduate-committee.html>

***Committee Charge***

The Graduate Committee is charged with evaluating carefully and **making recommendations to the Faculty Senate** regarding new graduate programs and major revisions to programs proposed by any Major Academic unit of the University. The primary concern of the committee shall be consistency of the proposed program with applicable University-wide guidelines and regulations, potential impact of the program on other established programs in the University, and financial implications of such new or revised programs.

***Committee Members***

- JuliAnn Mazachek, VP- Academic Affairs (Ex-officio)
- John Francis, Associate Dean- School of Law (Ex-officio)
- Tracy Routsong, Assistant Dean- College of Arts and Sciences
- Erin Grant, Faculty- Criminal Justice and Legal Studies, School of Applied Studies
- Rhonda Peterson-Dealy, Faculty- Social Work, School of Applied Studies
- Becky Dodge, Faculty- Allied Health, School of Applied Studies
- Stacy Conner, Faculty- Human Services, School of Applied Studies
- Michael Rettig, Faculty- Education, College of Arts and Sciences
- Jim Schnoebelen, Faculty- Communication Studies, College of Arts and Sciences
- Dave Provorse, Faculty- Psychology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Tracy Davies, Faculty- School of Nursing
- Michele Reisinger, Faculty- School of Nursing
- Danny Funk- School of Business
- Barbara Scofield, Faculty- School of Business
- Sarah Daniels- Mabee Library
- Abby Trautman, Student Representative- Washburn Student Government Association
- Tonya Ricklefs- Faculty Senate Representative



Faculty Senate Constitution revision

G. Graduate Academic Affairs Committee

1. The Graduate Academic Affairs Committee reports to the Faculty Senate.
2. The Graduate Academic Affairs Committee is charged with making recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding graduate academic programs and policies. The primary concern shall be ensuring the consistency of proposed programs with applicable University-wide and external accreditation guidelines and regulations including admission criteria and procedures, potential impact of the programs on other established graduate programs in the University, and financial implications of such new or revised programs. Joint programs including the School of Law are subject to this review; all programs exclusive to the School of Law are not subject to this review but will be submitted as information items to Graduate Academic Affairs Committee and Faculty Senate.

The committee's purview includes:

- a. all new graduate academic programs, including majors, dual degree programs, expedited dual degrees with undergraduate programs, and certificates;
- b. deletions of and major revisions to academic programs (those that fall into categories c-e below);
- c. policies that redefine standing university criteria (e.g., the prior completion of undergraduate work);
- d. academic or programmatic changes to graduate programs requiring financial investments beyond the unit (i.e., new university funding); and
- e. changes that directly affect other units, including courses accepted by units and programs included in dual and expedited degrees.

The Executive Committee may also delegate other matters to this committee.

3. Graduate Academic Affairs Committee membership will include one Faculty Senator from University-Wide Faculty, and one faculty member from each School and College that offers at least one graduate program.

The VPAA or their designee will serve as ex-officio, non-voting member.

If possible, all faculty members of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee should be senators. However, if a Major Academic Unit has three or fewer senators, or University-Wide Faculty has only one senator, the Executive Committee may ask the relevant unit(s) to elect a non-senator to the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee to ensure adequate representation. If elections of non-senators must be made, the minimum proportion of the faculty members of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee who will be senators is one half.

4. The Graduate Academic Affairs Committee is reconstituted each academic year. Each member is appointed to a one-year term.
5. The committee selects its own chairperson.

Decisions of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee require the affirmative vote of a majority of the membership. Proxy voting shall not be allowed.

Agendas that contain items that constitute first reading for Faculty Senate will be distributed to all members of the committee six calendar days in advance of any scheduled meeting time.

6. The Graduate Academic Affairs Committee is a standing committee.