

Washburn University
Faculty Senate Minutes
October 9, 2023
3:00 PM – Forum Room, BTAC

Present: Altus, Barraclough, Camarda, Cook, Cook-Cunningham, Dahl, DeSota, Florea, Friesen, Grant, Von Hansen, Hakenewerth, Hartman, Heusi, Holt, Kay, Kendall-Morwick (K.), Kowalska, Lolley, McGuire, Mercader, Miller, Moddelmog, Porta, Ricklefs, Rivera, Scofield, Sneed, Steffen, Steinroetter, Toerber-Clark, Wagner

Absent: Miller, Rivera

Guests: Ball, Boxterman, Frank, Grospitch, Lanning, Martinez, Nizovtsev, O’Neill, Stephenson, Wade, Worsley, Schnoebelen

I. Meeting called to order 3:30

II. Minutes from September 25, 2023, meeting of Faculty Senate approved unanimously with grammatical adjustments.

III. President’s Opening Remarks

- Reminder that the meeting may get contentious regarding the new USLO; please be kind to one another as we proceed.

IV. WUBOR/KBOR Update

- There is a meeting of Faculty Senate Presidents meeting this Thursday. There are no KBOR meetings this month; the next WUBOR meeting is the 19th.

V. VPAA/Provost Update

- Nothing new since the General Faculty meeting last Wednesday.
- WU101 students were surveyed week three of the semester. Bearman provided the results which included factors that may affect retention. In terms of positive feedback, there are fewer students who feel financially at risk or indicate mental health concerns. There are still concerns that many students are working more than twenty hours per week, which has been an issue for retention in the past.
- There are several activities leading up to the inauguration later this month.
- Fall break is next week.
- If faculty wants to weigh in on the Henderson renovations, deans and chairs will be consulted. The next step is a recommendation regarding the architect to hire and

the construction manager to be hired (McGuire). Stephenson was a reviewer for the RFPs on both and they are getting people who know about higher education and academic buildings and renovations. The architect piece will be ongoing for one year, not yet any definitive plans.

- Steinroetter asked about graduate exit surveys and the comments regarding which faculty made a difference. Ball reported that they do still collect this data and will be sending on to the deans.

VI. Faculty Senate committee reports

- Minutes of the March 27, 2023, Academic Affairs Committee meeting approved unanimously.
- Minutes of the September 18, 2023, Academic Affairs Committee meeting approved unanimously.

VII. University committee reports

- Minutes of the September 21, 2023, International Education / International WTE Committee accepted unanimously.

VIII. Old Business

- 24-2 Non Nobus Solum (NNS) USLO Faculty Senate Proposal
- Update (Ricklefs): discussed with Mazachek last Wednesday. She supports the content as a general education item, but not the motto. The university has the right to retain and determine the use of motto, mascot, likeness, etc. There is a history of not permitting use of the motto, e.g., capital campaigns by the alumni association. After meeting with Fried to review, it was suggested that using the lens of copyright law is a good way to examine. All said, we can still move forward with the title. If we choose this option, Mazachek can write a letter to the Senate explaining the university position. If there is no agreement, this goes to WUBOR (the process is in the constitution). The General Education committee was informed and discussed at a meeting last Thursday. This provides the opportunity for a friendly amendment.
- DeSota moved to proceed, McGuire seconded.
- The first discussion is regarding the motto. DeSota moved to amend the title to that discussed in the General Education committee meeting, which is inclusion and belonging. Cook seconded. Altus asked if this change would include the adjustment to the language in the SLO as well. Yes, all changes in the agenda addendum sent Friday are included.

- Porta asked about the need to change the title and who wants it changed. Ricklefs reminded that the title needs addressed first and then the substance of the SLO.
- Porta asked whether we want to consider these changes. Cook confirmed that is the motion on the table. McGuire suggested that it makes sense to change from Latin to English; it makes more sense, particularly with diversity being a politically charged term. Overall, he felt positive regarding the title changes.
- Changes included in the agenda addendum were approved unanimously.
- Ricklefs in response to Porta: diversity was passed as part of the new general education requirements, which requires a new USLO. The General Education committee worked with a group from ADIC to create the USLO which has been approved via the governance process through Academic Affairs. The proposal for the new USLO included replacing the Global Citizenship USLO.
- Scofield: concerned we will be removing valuable learning objectives. Kendall-Morwick explained that most universities have chosen to create a diversity requirement. At WU, students have consistently requested there be a diversity course, and this is an opportunity to make that happen. The ADIC group discussed adding versus replacing and, due to overlap with the existing SLO, ended up suggesting replacing the global citizenship SLO. It is recognized that ethics and global citizenship are important. Ethics is implicitly relevant for inclusion and belonging. In keeping with peer institutions, we can move ethics to the critical thinking SLO and ensure belonging and inclusion remain the focus.
- Scofield asked if there could still be a Global citizenship and ethics SLO. The concern is not with the courses to be included, but with not stating important components of the current SLO - would like these explicitly stated in the new SLO. Per Kendall-Morwick, the current SLO should already include a diversity component. Those which do not could move to critical thinking. Modellmog agreed with Scofield that words matter. Some faculty in CAS were concerned about global not being mentioned. Porta noted that while students want changes, it is not always what is best for them. Ensuring this is not just about Kansas diversity is important for selling ourselves.
- Kendall-Morwick noted that per recent political discussions, we do not understand our own culture. It is important to have students understand and feel seen in the curriculum. Morse suggested wordsmithing for the purposes of clarification. Global citizen, ethics, etc. add to what is included and can be understood in many contexts. Ball disagreed that if we add ethics, then it is implied we are discussing diversity in

ethics. What needs to be clear is diversity in humans. If needed, we can create a USLO that is specific to global citizenship.

- Scofield asked whether general education courses ever have more than one USLO. Per Ball, they can but do not.
- Steinroetter: regarding the new title, asked whether the phrases or words are those that can be accessed and how this USLO will be measured. Ricklefs clarified that the title is identify and the measurement comes from the content. We are tied to content not the title. The ADIC members did create a rubric with measurable outcomes (Kendall-Morwick). Moddelmog asked if global was included in the rubric. It was clarified that the rubric was sent with the recommendations to the General Education committee, and they will determine what to do with this.
- Nizovtsev there are courses in humanities that may address critical thinking. We could reconcile them at the same time as addressing the diversity needs. We can keep the current USLO intact. Scofield would like to see the Global Citizenship SLO remain intact. Moved to remove the language regarding eliminating the USLO and change the language to add the inclusion and belonging USLO and send back to General Education committee for discussion. Porta seconded.
- Morse asked with a new USLO, will we need to choose or assess both. Ball indicated that one can choose one or both. Moddelmog confirmed most classes may have two USLOs. Ball indicated that there would need to be edits proposed to the Global citizenship USLO but will not be today.
- Kendall- Morwick: this leads to more assessment work. The proposal, as is, is better for global than what we currently have. Just because global is in the name does not mean that it must include that. Further, a student does not have to take a global citizenship course under the current framework. The proposal makes room for the global context and all students must take it, meaning more students will enroll in a course regarding global citizenship.
- Porta suggested the point was being lost. It appears that we think that Kansas is more important than the world. The new language prevents us from pulling students out of Kansas and does not speak directly to the word ethics. Mercader reiterated that we don't require people to take a global course. They can currently, and if the diversity course is required and includes global citizenship aspects, they will be more likely to get this education.
- O'Neill asked about how global diversity is being excluded. Porta's concern is that the global part is being diluted, an afterthought. Altus does not see this as written

as being only about Kansas. Those who drafted the language did a great job and we are going backwards. Supports as is.

- Kendall-Morwick: the team that drafted this were not asked to revise, but to develop with a diversity focus. It has been done so in a way that ensures ethics and global aspects can be included. Porta remained concerned that if the term global is removed then those who are not interested in students learning about other parts of the world will not have to ensure there is a more global understanding of things.
- Nizovtsev: the ADIC was charged with creating a USLO; the initial intent was not to replace. Per the minutes from April 26th of General Faculty, the USLOs were not going to be changing or going away. Hopes someone will consider changing the language in the proposal to adding the new USLO rather than replacing.
- Ricklefs: if we do two SLOs, there is too much overlap; things will need to change. If we just wanted to require a global citizenship course, this is what should have been done. However, this is not the proposal made. If we start to try and insert ethics and global citizenship it is not in the spirit of what passed in General Faculty last year.
- Wagner: concurs nothing should be done on the fly. Suggested working the word global into the language to appease. Noted that we are transitioning to discuss language and should first vote on whether the USLOs are being separated.
- Steffen called to question and Kendall-Morwick seconded. Motion on the floor to move forward to strike the replacement language. Porta abstained. Steinroetter asked the pros and cons of striking the replacement language. This can no longer be discussed as there was a call to question.
- The vote:
 - Voting yes means two USLOs and inclusion and belonging will be a requirement. Voting no means just one SLO. If the suggestion to separate does not pass, we move back to the motion on the table and can do more to modify (Kay). Nine yay; 18 nays; three abstained. The motion to ensure there are two USLOs did not pass.
- Lolley confirmed that the university was not in support of the title; content was fine, but the title wasn't going to work. Per Nizovtsev, there are people who want inclusion and belonging; there are others who want to keep global citizenship. We could keep the description for inclusion and belonging and not make it an SLO. Could send this back to the General Education committee.

- Moddelmog would like both DEI and global citizenship to be present. Moved to return the USLO to the General Education committee to reword to ensure ethics are highlighted. Porta seconded.
- Ball: two years ago, we suggested global be required; there was a preference for a DEI requirement among faculty. The General Education committee cannot overturn what has been decided. Steinroetter mentioned remembering faculty voting on the requirement, unsure when this became a new USLO. Per Ball, the General Education committee received recommendations and put them forward.
- Porta: referencing decisions made by General Faculty, suggested it was a mistake to remove the global component. The USLOs should have been combined rather than replacing Global Citizenship. Are we stuck with this going away or can we weave this into the new USLO? Changes can be made to specifically include global citizenship and ethics in the new USLO.
- Kendall-Morwick: the existing USLO does not require inclusion and belonging. There is nothing that prevents global citizenship from being included in the new requirement.
- Ricklefs: currently discussing whether we send back to the General Education committee; after we can do the overall vote.
- Florea: we should send it back for further discussion, as some things may be politically charged. More people should be involved in the process. McGuire was struggling with seeing the USLOs as different. Inclusivity implies ethics already. With the issues we are having now, there is concern about what the General Faculty meeting will entail. Worsley was concerned if things are sent back to the General Education committee, the timeline will not permit us to have courses approved this year. Ball suggested moving forward to General Faculty to let things play out there.
- Kay: after we make the decision whether to send back, we can still add suggestions to adjust. We can send it back with modifications. Altus had concern regarding the suggestion that there was not time for input; believed there was plenty of time for input. The General Education committee representatives should have discussed with their units to determine the level of support.
- Porta asked if there is room for a friendly amendment, as it seems people are interested. Per Kay, we can add secondary motions, but they must be germane to the current and main motions on the table. Another amendment can be made after these have been decided upon.

- Kendall-Morwick called the question; McGuire seconded. Motion carried with two in opposition.
- Vote on the motion to send back to the General Education committee with the changes suggested for further work. Four voted to send back; nineteen opposed and two abstained.
- Ricklefs returned attention to the main motion which is to send to General Faculty. Wagner asked if we can still modify if it moves forward. It can be modified further in the larger meeting.
- Porta: requested a modification to include global citizenship; believes without including students are missing out. Kendall-Morwick suggested including wording that suggests belonging and inclusivity are important as global citizens.
- Steinroetter: this is the first time she has seen this as an SLO; there were not any representatives that provided information that this would be an SLO. Can it be only a university requirement without making it an SLO? Ball reiterated this is what has come out of the governance process; the motion can be made that it does not move forward as an SLO.
- Modellmog suggested that those in the social sciences had issues with the pace and inclusiveness of things. Altus reiterated that SAS was provided the opportunity to make comments.
- Kendall-Morwick thought inclusion for all people in a global context can be added. Altus moved for the addition of language in the last sentence, regarding the need for students to evaluate their own role as global citizens in advancing respect, equity, and inclusion. Kendall-Morwick seconded. Steffen asked whether this solves anything for those who were interest in making changes. Porta asked why there is an issue with adding global language here. We need to determine whether there should be separate SLOs. Kendall-Morwick indicated that global citizenship is not a category of diversity which is why it is not included specifically. Ricklefs noted that neither local nor Kansas is included. Passed the language change; Steffen abstained.
- Returned to the original motion on the table, to change the name and language as provided in Friday's addendum. Mercader suggested that we need to pass this so we can move on. Kendall-Morwick called to question; Lolley seconded. Steinroetter and Porta abstained. The original motion passed with two opposed (Moddelmog and Florea; Steinroetter and Steffen abstained).

IX. New Business

- None

X. Information Items

- None

XI. Discussion Items

- Equity committee update
 - The committee came together in 2021 when we were back on campus and discussing equity and service issues coming out during the pandemic. Those on the committee were among those already highly overcommitted. An instrument was created to account for committee work and other time people engage in service. The information gathering process was minimal; unsure where those details and data are. As 2021 brought leadership changes, a difficult decision was made to put a pin in it. (Morse).
 - Worsley asked about whether the ad hoc committee had expired based on the new rules put in place for time limits on these committees last year.
 - The climate survey resurfaced these issues. McGuire suggested that once we have new people in leadership roles rather than interim and necessary transitions have taken place, we can return to the conversation in a transparent way.
 - Wagner moved to include this item in the agenda as a discussion again next time. Kendall-Morwick seconded. Lolley asked whether there are rubrics to share. Morse can provide the rubric or survey instrument that has been used.
 - A second request for the breakdown of service datapoints by the next meeting agenda. Faculty success reports from the college also include data we can request.
 - Lolley asked about clinical load. The breakdown has shifted significantly, and it may be something to discuss regarding whether this is load or service.

XII. Announcements

- None

XIII. Adjournment 5:00