

+Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
October 21, 2024 at 3pm
Meeting in Forum Room Hosted by FS Executive Committee

Present: Cook, Dahl, Davies, Francis, Fritch, Gonzalez-Abellas, Hansen, Harnowo, Hartman, Heusi, Holt, Hu, Kay, Lambing, Lolley, Maxwell, Miller, Perret, Schmidt, Schnoebelen, Scofield, Sneed, Steffen, Stevens, Toerber-Clark, Wagner, Williams

Absent: DeSota, Dickinson, Kendall-Morwick, Mosier, Ricklefs, Smith

Guests: Broxterman, Grospitch, Holthaus, Hutchinson, Lanning, O'Neill, Wade, Worsley, Burdick, Barnett, Kohls, Lisher, Frank, Fried, Sun

- I. Call to Order at 3:02 by Schnoebelen
- II. Approve minutes- Moved by Kay and seconded by Cook. Motion approved unanimously
 - September 16, 2024 (pages 2-6)
- III. President's Opening Remarks - none
- IV. WUBOR/KBOR Update- Jim Schnoebelen
 - KBOR
 - WUBOR – See updates sent out by PR team/Dr. Mazachek. Appreciate the emails keeping us informed and coming out before the meeting so we can know what will be considered.
- V. VPAA Update - Dr. John Fritch
 - Sense of semester is that we are at a half-way point, very busy, but it still seems like we are still just getting started. Appreciate work everyone is doing to keep things going. A 27% increase in first year students is a lot. We won't see this increase every year. 😊 When I talk to students, they are consistently proud and excited about the faculty.
 - Faculty Senate is a place where I can get information to folks. One of these items is health insurance increases for singles (very small amount, \$5, \$10, \$14.50) Overall policies are going up by \$70 so Washburn is covering most of the increase. We are self-insured, so we collectively are paying for each other. Pharmaceuticals are the primary driver and BCBS is going to a system where they will *double check with doctors* to see if high-cost medications can be replaced with equivalent medications that cost a lower amount (High Touch Program). (*Emphasis from FS secretary to indicate that this is being done in consultation with the doctors and does not mean people won't be able to get the medicines they need.*)
 - Video retention – Washburn has decided, through ITS, that we would retain videos for 2 years. If they are not touched in two years, they will be moved to archives. If not looked at for another two years, they will be removed from the server. We currently have 2-5X more material than the archive contract allows for. (COVID created lots of material through video

lectures that is now just sitting there.) My recommendation is to make copies for yourselves of anything you want to make sure you have.

- Schnoebelen – It would be good to take this information back to your units.
- Schmidt – Do we have a records retention policy? Fritch – No
- Lolley – If students open the video, does that count as a “touch”? Fritch – I believe so.
- Williams – Will there be an alert that videos will be deleted? Fritch – That may not exist now, but I have asked that they do something like that. I would prefer it to occur before going to archive since that takes a bit of work to get it back. I won’t promise this though, since there is so much to get caught up with from COVID.
- Kay – Has this already happened? Fritch – Just starting to archive for first time so nothing has moved to deletion.

VI. Consent Agenda – Move to accept as a block by Steffen, 2nd by Kay. Motion approved unanimously.

- Faculty Senate Committee Reports-
 - FAC minutes (pgs 7-8)
 - AAC minutes (pg 9)
 - Graduate Counsel minutes (pgs 10-11)
- University Committee Reports-
 - Assessment Committee Minutes (12-13)

VII. Old Business

- FS Action Item 24-14 Corrections to Faculty Senate Constitution (Wagner) (pg 14)
 - Wagner – this was an action we voted on last year in Faculty Senate to correct some typos in the number of days before a meeting that Agendas must go out. This should have gone on to General Faculty, but we did not vote to do so and this needs to happen.
 - Moved to send on to General Faculty as an Action Item by Cook and seconded by Steffen. Schmidt states that this should happen automatically since the Faculty Senate Constitution requires all amendments go to General Faculty. Wagner agrees that the section on amendments says it needs to go to General Faculty, but that it is not listed as an item automatically going forward in earlier sections. Having a specific vote makes sure it goes. Motion passes unanimously for 24-14 to move to General Faculty as an Action Item.
- FS Action Item 25-1 Middle School Math (Steffen) (pgs 15-17)
 - This is a stop-gap measure since state is moving to Core Math licensure that is working its way slowly through the state system. Since the state has not approved this licensure, we cannot advertise the degree we passed for this purpose. We already had a middle grades math/science degree with licensure, so this will give students a program they can graduate with where they can be

- licensed. This is covering students who are ready to teach but we don't have a program for them.
- Move to approve by Lolley and seconded by Scofield. Wagner – How is this different from the program we approved last year? Steffen - Issues with Licensure at state level means we can't use that program yet. We need to use this program which can be used at state level. Once the state passes licensure standards then this degree will drop off and the Math program passed last year will go into place. Cook: just want to confirm that the Math Department Degree will be the one used in the future. Steffen – Yes, students will need this for the coming semester, but once we get through the standards at state level, will use the program we approved last year. There can be big delays at the state level when getting things approved (6-12 months....) Would like to think by end of next year this will be done.
 - Schmidt – How does this work since the catalog is already out? O'Neill – typically don't approve new options once the catalog goes out but given this specific situation, then we will add an addendum to get this through. Schmidt – Are there additional costs to offer this program? Steffen -No, all classes are currently part of other programs, so nothing added with the exceptions of the practicums that adjuncts can cover.
 - Motion for Middle School math passes unanimously
 - Move to pass on to General Faculty as an Action Item – Steffen moves and Lolley seconds. Scofield – this does not need to move forward based on our current constitution or what we think we might change it to. (It's not a new degree program.) Schmidt does not think it needs to go forward either. It should be sent forward as information item absolutely. Williams – Does Education want it to go forward? What is the benefit of this? Steffen – Can't think of any reason why it would need to go forward. To my knowledge the State has never gotten involved in how something goes through the University. Schmidt – Move to table until after our discussion at the end of this meeting. Seconded by Kay. Holt – Just want to clarify what tabling does. Will we be able to come back to this at the end of the meeting if we want? (Yes from parliamentarian and former parliamentarians.) Lambing so if it dies because we don't vote on it at the end, then it goes straight to WUBOR? (Yes again from current and former parliamentarians). Motion to table passes.
 - FS Action Item 25-2 Medical Dosimetry (Kohls) (18-23)
 - Proposal for new program here since there is a need for new dosimetry programs across the country. We have an online radiation therapy program so this would be a good link to that. This is a Master's degree. We surveyed previous students to see if they would be interested in this, and there was a lot of interest. Radiation Therapy degree is a natural pipeline to feed this program.

It is online and would have the same accrediting body. This would be a July-July type program.

- Moved to approve by Cook, second by Gonzalez-Abellas.
- Lolley – If this is a Masters level program and we previously just got radiation approved after some issues, so when would accreditation go through for this? Know it might take some time? Kohl – will start as soon as the first cohort gets started.
- Wagner – What would the numbers be (vs percentages given in the proposal)? This is important to know since you will have to hire new faculty. Kohls -There are forty students/cohort in the Radiation Therapy program, so 20-25 from that would progress to our program. Would also get students from other areas.
- Lisher – Must graduate from accredited program for this degree. There are only 17 total dosimetry programs in the US and only 6 are at the Master's degree level (*Master's of Science*) and of those, only 4 are online. First year would be smaller numbers while we are getting the program up and accredited. We also don't want to get so big that we oversaturate the market. Lolley – Can students still sit for boards if not accredited? Lisher - You can start the (*accreditation*) process as soon as students are in clinicals. We will have to make sure we are open with students about where we are, so they know they are coming into a program that is working on accreditation.
- Cook – It will be a Master's of Science. This is the only Masters of Science we have listed in Allied Health. When I think Master's of Science, I think Biology, Chemistry... Lisher – That's what this degree is. This is all the radiobiology, computer, math, etc needed for treatments. Washburn would be an outlier if we didn't name it as a Master's of Science.
- Williams – Do you have any concerns about accreditation, etc? Khols - No, since this is similar process to what we did for the Radiation Therapy. It's a National Accreditation.
- Motion to approve passes unanimously.
- Scofield moves and Cook seconds that this goes forward to General Faculty as an Action Item. Schmidt – This is a big enough change I think this should go forward. Lolley – Will this happen in time for when you need it to get passed through all the levels of approval? Kohls - Yes Motion passes unanimously for 25-2 to go forward to General Faculty as an Action Item.

VIII. New Business-

- FS Action Item 25-3 Faculty Termination Policy (Fritch) (pgs 24-31)
 - Big thanks to Holly and Beth in my office who were working on Medical Dosimetry program to get it to all the right places in time.
 - This is new business, so we will come back to look at it again in the next meeting. We've been calling this the "Termination Policy: but in Section 3.V.A. of the Faculty Handbook, it is called "Procedures

for Termination.” I’ve handed out lots of paper which I hope is useful. It includes a list of many faculty who have worked on it, highlights of the changes and a flow chart of the procedure.

- Have been working on this a long time, at least 20 faculty members, 11 deans, and 3 provosts. It has been worked on for so long, I can’t find patient zero (no one from the beginning of the process that I can find).
- Recently had to go all the way through this process with a termination of a faculty member and many people said this needs to have changes to make the process better. People talked to those who had been involved. (*See highlights of those changes and other papers passed out during this meeting attached at the end of the minutes*). Basically, this moves termination to the end of process and makes sure there are multiple times for faculty input to help make sure bias of one individual can’t cause someone to lose their tenure.
- There are some changes in the language for ground for dismissal. Take a look at those.
- Shorter Sheet handed out is the current policy with termination at start of the process. That means the paycheck could be stopped at the beginning. Your first meeting is with President who just fired you. Only two appeals before it goes to WUBOR (including President).
- Longer sheet shows the proposed process. Termination happens at end, meetings start with department and move to Provost where there is a chance to create appeals. More options for appeals as it moves through. Coming in from the outside, I think there are lots of steps for consideration in here, so I see this as a strong process for faculty.
- Miller – Does current (*in effect*) policy affect both tenured and non-tenured track faculty? Will this new policy remove protections from non-tenured faculty? Fried – It does have different pathways for tenured and non-tenured, but that is just to make them clearer. Doesn’t change material protections. Remember this policy is just for cause, not termination of a lecturer contract. Miller – I don’t see any differences for tenured vs non-tenured in current policy. For new policy, it appears that it goes through Dean, Provost, President. There are not the additional steps that it appears that Tenured track faculty have (like having more places to appeal). I’m concerned that we might be losing protections for non-tenured people.
- Williams – During the termination process, is the person being paid and are they still expected to do their duties? Would it still be safe for them to be doing those? Fritch – The Provost may provide an alternative assignment (*for the faculty member*) if this is the case. Hypothetical, if the case is mistreatment of students, let’s find

something for the person to do during this process that doesn't involve students.

- Cook – Follow-up to Miller, in the current system the Faculty Committee offers a decision and in the new system there is a recommendation from the Faculty Committee. Fritch – This mirrors the tenure process, where it is a recommendation, not decision by the faculty. I should also point out that this process has only been used once, and this is not an attempt to make this happen more often. I think it would be more difficult to terminate someone. Fried – In the current process, the decision to terminate starts it, so for the decision of the Faculty Disciplinary Review Committee (FDRC) to have any impact if the faculty disagree, we thought it needed to be a “decision.” Now, the final decision doesn't happen until the end, so you can't have the FDRC making a decision before the President/WUBOR has a chance to fire someone. This would mean the faculty would be firing their colleague. That is why the wording switched from decision to recommendation. Cook – The policy reads FDRC as described in _____ and no reference to the blank and no section G that is referred to later. Fried - That may be an error on my part, as we are trying to see where all the numbers end up. There should be a separate section as to how the FDRC operates, which this refers to.
- Miller – Can I ask what the specific concerns were with the old (*in effect*) policy? Fritch – There were several. There were no time frames, so things kept dragging on. Current procedure had no specific rules as to how things should happen. Mostly procedure, how it was implemented, and how long it took. Thousands of pages of testimony were created when we went through this process.
- Francis – The procedural rules created inferences, but weren't clear. Without the due process clearly listed this created other legal issues. We did our best to mirror what would happen in a court procedure, making sure both sides had a chance to make their arguments. Committee sat from July through May of next year and met for hours each week. (8 hours every Friday.) It was very time consuming. Based on the way we read the procedures the lack of clarity was an issue.
- Scofield – We had the question that only pertained for tenured faculty. Could we have charts next time for non-tenured?
- Steffen – What do we mean by non-tenured? Lecture vs tenure-track and not tenured yet? Fritch – The term is for both.
- Schmidt – This doesn't mention loss of tenure anywhere, but should it? Fried – So you are saying that loss of the job should also terminate rights of tenure? I'll have to look back and see if it's stated anywhere. I can add if we need to.

- Miller – Once someone received official notice, the person has seven days to list out in the appeal of every issue they want appealed. Is that correct? Seven days may not be enough... Fried – Which step specifically? (Cook – Step 2) There is a process for the party to ask for extensions of time, but there are reasonable extensions. Miller – I have to look at it, but appealing the decision to the Provost while asking for an extension seems a bit(*words trailed off*) Steffen - Who are the parties that may agree to the extension? Lolley – If the extension is not approved, do you now have less time to write the appeal? Holthaus – It's important to look at everything in context. This is not the first time the person is hearing about this. Miller – But the person will have seven days at the end of the pre-termination process. The person will likely be working while trying not to be terminated.
- Scofield – Let me ask a clarifying question. Step two is stating the reasons and step three is the meeting, so there might be more time to develop the full support. Would have to have the reasons within seven days. So, would the person have everything ready at 7 days, or have the 14 days from the meeting? M Fried – remember there are many conversations before this. If it's a particular incident, then it's just that. If it's several things, then both parties will understand that it will take longer. This is a system to try to resolve the issue short of termination, which we could not do before. We have timelines to keep the process moving while making sure people have a specific set of items they will need to respond to.
- Miller – Do faculty have a right to counsel?
- Fried – Yes can have advisors the whole way through. Exact numbers in the document.
- Miguel - What is "reasonable" duties? Fritch - I see this as added protection for the Faculty Member, before it didn't say "reasonable."
- Williams – When would this be put into place? New Hires, all hires, etc. Can someone use the old version? Fritch – Once it's adopted, this would apply to all.
- Maxwell – Question about step 7 mentions bringing in outside evaluators from the faculty member's field, but doesn't specify where they could be from. Fritch – external only. Wagner - This is a bit of a protection for other faculty members in the department, to prevent them from having to make statements they may not be in a good situation to make/conflict of interest. Fried – This is especially important in issues of incompetence, where personal views may not have anything to do with incompetence....
- Miller – It seems like there are discussions, and eventually gets the charges from the Provost. Why doesn't that happen at the beginning? Fritch – there are lots of conversations happening earlier before the charges are written up. Miller – I think someone

shouldn't have to appeal if there are no written charges yet. Fried – Think you are looking at process for non-tenured. Miller – No, Tenured...(Miller read off a section from the termination process.) Fried – earlier on the Provost is deciding IF there will be a recommendation to terminate. The Dean may have a longer list and by the time it gets to the Provost, perhaps some of the issues may be resolved. Miller – But the person is being terminated, or is being told they are trying to be fired, so they should have the whole list at the beginning of the process to help them know what they need to do to defend themselves. Nothing says things must be stated with reasonable particularity in earlier meetings. Fried – It does state they will be provided with a list of the charges earlier on. Miller – But because it states later that they get very particular information, that would imply they don't need it earlier. Fried – But in the reference of a trial, they aren't getting the charges right before the "jury." (*Miller earlier stated that if a parallel was made to a jury trial, the faculty member was getting the charges given to them right before the jury, implying that there wasn't sufficient time to defend oneself against the charges. Secretary was not able to capture all these comments.*)

- Francis – Creighton (*Miller*) does raise a good point, that the written statement should be clear and given with particularity so that the person can have an idea of what they need to defend.
- Schmidt – Move to close 1st reading, Kay seconds and motion passes.
- Fritch – This is the first reading, so we will come back. General Faculty Meeting is being moved back a week so that we will have a chance to finish this discussion. (New date for General Faculty meeting is November 13th.)
- Schnoebelen – please take this back to your areas to get feedback. Wagner – if you want to have a friendly amendment, please send to me if you want to have them go out in the Agenda. (Schnoebelen – Not a rule, but a humble request...) Wagner – just think it's easier if we have something written we can all look at.

IX. Information Items-

X. Discussion Items-

- Presentation of Enrollment Numbers (Christa Smith) (pgs 32-37)
 - Christa is the Chief Data Officer, in charge of Data Governance. You can find the Data on WU Homepage, can go to "About Us/Institutional Research."
 - Snapshot of data is taken on 20th day of classes.
 - Data shows WU, WU+Tech, Total Students vs Full Time Equivalent (FTE) – divided by 15 for undergrads, 9 or 12 for graduate students to determine full time equivalent numbers. (FTE includes all campuses)

- Pie Chart, freshman now make up a bigger piece of the pie (usually it's seniors)
- Line graphs show 5 year trends, Notice that some lines will start going up (ie 1st time Freshmen is up, so continuing should start going up). Full time retention is starting to rebound.
- Williams – What are our goals for next five years? Smith – Want to see it go higher, but no specific numbers (Would like to get to low 70 for retention.) Would like measured growth for next year. Want to see good graduation rates...) Williams – What are we doing to retain?
- Smith – Advising, FYE, lots of different things. Dr. Bearman can tell you more at the next meeting. Fritch – Submitted a grant for a Trio Student Success grant (200-250,000/year.)
- FS Constitution Section I.D (pgs 38-39) –
 - FS constitution – (Schmidt) Questions about what should go forward. Scofield – probably don't need to forward something when it's a within department issue, but things that affect the whole campus, would like to add new degrees (vs new majors).
 - Survey – What do people want to go forward? Schmidt lists off all the things that were originally in the Constitution and surveyed the group. This will go back to FAC for consideration.
- Made a choice to keep Ed Degree on table so that motion will not be voted on, Math Ed Degree (25-1) will not go on to General Faculty as an Action Item.

XI. Announcements

- Shared Governance Speaker will be here November 18th
- Chartwell's Voice to Vision Survey:
<https://selfserve.decipherinc.com/survey/selfserve/160d/240803>

XII. Adjournment