

Washburn University
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
April 7, 2025 at 3pm
Meeting in Kansas Room Hosted by FS Executive Committee

Present: Cook, Dahl, Davies, Dickinson, Francis, Fritch, Hartman, Holt, Hu, Kay, Kendall-Morwick, Lambing, Lolley, Maxwell, McHenry, Miller, Mosier, Perret, Ricklefs, Schmidt, Schnoebelen, Scofield, Sellak, Smith, Stevens, Toerber-Clark, Wagner, Williams

Absent: DeSota, Hansen, Heusi, Sneed, Steffen

Guests: Bailes, Broxterman, Grospitch, Holthaus, O'Neill, Wood, Worsley, Camarda, Erby, Lockwood, Sun,

- I. Call to Order at 3:03 pm
- II. Approve minutes- Moved to approve by Cook, seconded by Kay. Motion passed unanimously
 - February 24, 2025 (pages 2-6)
- III. President's Opening Remarks
 - First meeting since February, but doesn't mean things weren't happening. Many valuable discussions/meetings since then. Several meetings about Academic Freedom statements
 - Meeting with Dr. Mazachek – still having discussions about Shared Governance Committee. Hopefully will have discussions about this soon.
 - Lots of changes each week, just trying to get to end of semester.
 - One more meeting and then the transition meeting. Come forward if you have questions about being an officer. We have 3 nominees for the At-Large positions on Faculty Senate.
- IV. WUBOR/KBOR Update- Tonya Ricklefs
 - KBOR – Tenure bill is dead this year, but almost 100% certain it will come back next year. Reps will try to recruit more support for it next year (ie want to get rid of tenure). They are looking at other states and their language that will help get it to pass. Some of it may make tenure look different. Dickenson – crafted after ALEC Shell Bill (*American Legislative Exchange Council which helps create legislation that can be used in states*). If we can get a hold of it, that will help us learn the language. I won't be able to access it, but maybe someone can. (Many of us can't access it, as they are keeping it quiet)
 - WUBOR – Good meeting with celebrations about retirements, promotions and tenure.
- V. VPAA Update - Dr. John Fritch
 - Would like to announce the new Interim Dean of Nursing – Crystal Stevens.

- Now in the sprint to the finish. Lots of things going on, “one-off” events that are fun, but can create stress. We like celebrating our students and each other. (April 16th Employee Celebration, Commencement lasts Wednesday to Saturday starting with Washburn Tech.)
- Enrollment looks really good for the fall, impressed with how many continuing students are enrolled already. Not sure if it will lead to higher retention rates yet.
- Grospitch – Had Student Government Elections – Wood: Kate Coulter and Ryan Durst were elected as President and Vice-President. Kate will be here next meeting. Very close to solidifying cabinet, our group is almost done. New officers love listening. Fritch – There was a high voter participation this year.
- T&P recognition – Many are Fac Senators, please raise your hand. Congrats to all of you. This is an important part of the University.
- Lots of moving going on and communication about it. It will feel like a headache, but will likely end up being better long term. Will have to trust us that it will be worth it. (Law School Experience – enjoying new space, enrollment is up).
 - Campus Master Plan is available through my.washburn.edu on a SharePoint site. Will use emails, Deans, SharePoint to communicate. Would like the first point of contact to be your Dean rather than Eric Just. Will also talk during Town Halls (*April 22 3:30-4:30 and April 23 12-1 pm, both in Washburn B*) and at General Faculty. Will work hard on signage this summer. Make sure students know they will not have classes in Henderson, as it’s easy to forget. Can have tables out at start of semester to direct people. Start packing early if you are moving. It takes longer than you think and you may not have the space you have right now. Movers will handle University Property, personal items/fragile move yourself. Really focus on how this will get us to a better place during the struggles. We will try to make things as good as we can going forward. Benton also moving. Benton will not be completely back to green space in the Fall, but there will be progress. Will start tearing down after they clear out everything shortly after semester is over.

VI. Consent Agenda – Moved by Miller, seconded by Stevens. (Need to look for minutes from Jan 13th meeting for Faculty Handbook since we may not have had those brought forward for the consent agenda.) Motion passes unanimously

- Faculty Senate Committee Reports-
 - AAC Minutes 2-17-25 (pg 7)
 - FAC Minutes 11-11-24 (pgs 8-9)
- University Committee Reports-
 - Gen Ed Committee 11-21-24 (pgs 10-12)
 - International Education Committee 2-5-25 (pgs 13-14)
 - Faculty Handbook Committee 2-3-25 (pgs 15-16)
 - Faculty Handbook Committee 2-26-25 (pgs 17-19)

VII. Old Business

- 25-10 Inactivation of Computational Physics, BS (Karen Camarda) (pgs 20-22) Moved by Cook, seconded by Hu. Motion passes unanimously. This does not need to go to General Faculty for a vote.
 - Camarda – This option was introduced several years ago, very few majors choosing this option, so we are choosing to delete it as part of cleaning up the course offerings. (Ricklefs – side note: Good job on the interview.)
- 25-11 Inactivation of Bachelor of Musical Arts, BMA (Craig Treinen) (pgs 23-25) Moved to approve by Kay, seconded by Lolley. Motion passes and will go forward automatically to General Faculty for a vote (since Music clearly sees this as a degree program)
 - Erby - presenting on behalf of Music Dept. Accrediting body recommended it be inactivated.
- 25-8 New Minor, Great TEXTS (Kelly Erby) (pgs 26-27) Moved by Smith, seconded by Cook. Motion passes unanimously. Does not need to go to General Faculty for a vote.
 - Erby – Started a couple of years ago. CAS Did not have a clarification of “certificate” vs “minor”. It is now a true certificate, but would also like to have a minor (a little bigger, has a capstone).
- 25-13 New Minor in Kinesiology (Park Lockwood) (pgs 28-29) Moved by Lolley, seconded by Stevens. Motion passes unanimously. Does not need to go forward to General Faculty for a vote.
 - Lockwood – Something we have been talking about for a couple of years. Changes in General Education have allowed us to get a general minor that will work well with other departments majors. Students can choose the direction since 12 of the credits are very flexible.
- 25-12 New Certificate in Intensive English (Kelly McClendon) (pgs 30-35) Moved by Kay, seconded by Lolley. Motion passes unanimously, and does not need to go forward to General Faculty for a vote.
 - McClendon – No new curriculum, but currently students finish this and there is nothing on the transcript. This could also be available for community members. It would allow people with degrees from other countries to get some certification. Schnoebelen – Is this a common program? McClendon – No.
- 25-9 New Certificate in Cybersecurity (Nan Sun) (pgs 36-38) Moved by Miller, seconded by Schmidt. Motion passes unanimously, does not need to go to General Faculty for a vote.
 - Kendall-Morwick- Seeking to meet demand from students to have a credential for their studies in cybersecurity. Also hoping to help people who already have degrees. It will include a cybersecurity introduction course, legal course, and specialization for the exam in cybersecurity. Cook – It has enough credits, is there a thought

about a Minor? Kendall-Morwick- Looking at some other options, but this will be good for a wider group.

- 25-14 New Certificate in Artificial Intelligence Literacy and Application (Nan Sun) (pgs 39-41) Moved by Kay, seconded by Schmidt. Motion passes unanimously. Does not need to go to General Faculty for a vote.
 - Sun – CIS has courses in AI, and a degree program that orients towards AI, but those classes are for majors. Would like to have AI programs for non-CIS majors. Worked with faculty from a range of departments (EN, MM, CN) – AI108 (Fundamentals), 208 (Concepts – applications), a Philosophy class. This is interdisciplinary. Because this is a certificate, anyone can earn it (students or community). Cook- Are these courses ones we currently offer. Will there be a rotation? Sun – All are new, hope to offer 108 first, then see how enrollment goes. Plan to run at least one section of each course every semester. (Cook – or at least one per year).
 - Fritch – We are currently in a midst of a search for this position. I think this is where we need to be as a University. Got to present that we are having an interdisciplinary degree at a gathering with other universities. People are jealous – thanks for working so well together and letting me brag. Trying to figure out what other schools are doing to support faculty with AI. We don't want to start from scratch, especially since everyone is so busy.

VIII. New Business-

- 25-15 Amendment to Faculty Handbook for Not Tenured Faculty (Tracy Wagner) (pgs 42-44) Move to open on first reading. Moved by Lolley, second by Miller.
 - Tracy Wagner provided an overview because she is on senate and Faculty Handbook. She is also not connected to administration and is representing the broader faculty. A couple of things she wanted to share. Make-up of the committee is the Deans and another representative from each division. Administrative heavy possibly (if assistant deans are the other representative) and have legal counsel to keep it legal. This motion came forward because Maddy had come forth with an amendment on the removal for cause changes to Faculty Handbook. The Tenure portion moved forward without the changes for not-tenured. The Faculty Handbook committee was charged with looking at the amendment. Everyone discussed this and read it carefully. In the course of the discussion, the definition of “not-tenured” referred to a broad category of people. Wanted to make sure people were valued and did not want to offer false protection? At the end of the day, many people felt if cases had happened “for cause” they would have cases where someone was dragging something out. Is this a balanced amendment? Any Dean would not use this unless it was an egregious case. We are trying to look forward at what might

happen. This vote was 7-2 where it was defeated. Several people asked to make sure it was possible to go to senate and if the language that was crafted would go forward as well. Faculty Senate has broader representation vs a smaller group of administrators. You do not want to appear to give protection that does not actually give protection. We don't want to do something that was not discussed transparently to through senate. We put forward the language that was written by the handbook committee.

- Sarah Cook- At our first meeting we basically met and asked what our charge was and what is ok. What was to begin with and what wording went through is why we shared this.
- Smith – What was final rationale for voting down? Wagner – False sense of security vs potential harm to university. Miller – Why? Cook – The way contracts are written annually, it's often easier to use that instead of for-cause.
- Schmidt – I did vote against this. It is an extra step, more people at university will know what is going on, which may not be good for University. Doesn't add the kind of protection since there is no real Faculty Oversight in the process.
- Lolley – When I listened to Tracy describe the point of looking futuristically, would that have switched the vote. Schmidt – In terms of can a Dean make a “poor” decision? Hopefully administrators above the Dean would correct that.
- Miller – Just want to address real vs false protection. If someone does something that Dean feels should be fired for. If contract is not renewed, they continue to work for the remainder. If fired for cause, they don't work any more. If they are not renewed, they may have benefits (unemployment). If fired, then there is no support from faculty (no one other than Dean knows about it.) As a not-tenured member, would like to bring my case forward to someone other than the Dean. (Fritch – They can appeal to Provost). I would like for faculty to have some chance to make a case for other faculty in this case. Tenured faculty had a number of protections that are not in place for Not-Tenured. I think having the amended policy will at least change the “divisiveness” that exists if there is no chance to have faculty input. That counts for something.
- Cook – There are so many balls up in the air now, and I totally understand your discussion, but that (the protection) is tenure (for now.)
- Ricklefs – a reminder that this is the first reading, but there will be time to make amendments. The vote is on 21st of April.
- Lambing – Not a legal scholar, not claiming to be. Thinking about contracts and how does this dovetail with “right to work” state? Does it even work?
- Miller – This is NOT legal advice, I can't give legal advice. Right to Work is the minimum. Employers can provide greater protection. They can be “nicer” than the law, but they have to at least follow the law.

- Kay – Can we get clarification of what we are allowed to do? Lolley – we can approve and choose to send on to General Faculty, or it passes here. Holthaus – We have not been in this situation before, so we need to clarify this. Fritch – At most this is a recommendation to the president. Kay – Hypothetically, if we recommend this go forward, would any sort of structure we craft have any power and do we as Faculty Senate have the ability to recommend they, a faculty committee, have power in this situation? Lolley – My interpretation is that the committee would make a recommendation to the Provost. (General agreement.)
- Ricklefs – Ultimately trying to have transparency, have two readings at Faculty Senate. This will pave some new pathways, so helpful for the future.
- Scofield – Would it be a stronger proposal if it had a written report in addition to just talking to everybody. Schmidt – Problem is this committee is outside the chain of command. Provost makes final decision. Scofield – Except we do think faculty have a different perspective than administrators. (Schmidt – maybe not...)
- Schnoebelen – If we let the contract run out (which is not a contract any more, but letter of reappointment.) All letters say in a situation of financial exigence we can all be let go. Also, I have a couple of typos. (Send to Tracy), Also section B is referenced – Can we have a comment about that?
- Smith – AAUP says there should be a faculty role, and this seems consistent. BUT it may not be enough. Can we get more, or if we can't this may be good enough.
- Miller – I do not see how anyone who reads Faculty Handbook if this policy is adopted would have any misconception. I don't think the "not real protection" if valid to not adopt. It may be a reason to amend the policy. Can anyone say more about why the faculty handbook committee would feel this way. Ricklefs – I don't think anyone can read their minds. Sometimes I have personally reached out to people to get their thoughts. That may be helpful.
- Wagner – It is important to note that administrators were worried about how this might affect the faculty member as more people learned about it. The Faculty Member can stop the process at any time.
- Beth O'Neill – Faculty member can't say they don't want to have a Faculty Committee if it goes to the Provost (as policy is written now). May want to keep that in mind.
- Williams – Faculty are required to be involved, perhaps some faculty might not want to be on the committee. (Say the person was dangerous, would not want to be on the committee. Also, potential power differential.)
- Miller – would be very supportive of an amendment that Fac Member can stop process at any point. It is true someone could be fired for a terrible reason, but this is also true for tenured faculty. They would have more protections and we didn't worry about it for their policy. Second consideration, just how uncommon these things are. More often it's for

not getting along, behaviors outside, (ie not violence against students). I don't want the rare issue to affect our reason to put in this protection.

- Schnoebelen – Dovetail off Williams – There are service obligations, how do we determine these committees, lots of ways of intimidating people on the committee.
- Cook – I do think Williams has a legitimate concern. We talked a lot about these concerns. Also, we debated a long time about the composition of the committee (tenured, not tenured). Tried to balance having a not tenured person (since the individual is not tenured), vs tenured (who might feel more protection).
- Kendall-Morwick- Thinking about Smith's comment about AAUP. Do they provide more specific language or an example. Smith – I will check that out and get back to this body.
- Cook – Reiterate what Lambing said. Can we have what was passed at General Faculty meeting in the agenda for the next meeting? (Wagner and if Smith finds anything, please send that in as well.)
- Fritch- Lots of work done by the committee, there was unanimous support for the language. As Wagner said, I'm very confident the committee voted with what they believed. (I don't vote by the way.) I thought it was a tough decision for folks. I hope you will take away that people did come to what they thought was best (even if you disagree with the decision.)
- Smith – How do we find the members? The list on website may be outdated (Wagner – look at members who were at the meeting in the minutes.)
- Move to close the first reading by Schmidt, seconded by Stevens. Motion passes unanimously.

IX. Information Items-

- At-Large FS Nominations (Amanda Hartman) –
 - We have three open at-large positions and no reason all three can't be elected. They are all placed in Gen Fac Voting Shell. Opens on 4-21 at 12:01 am and closes at 4-24 at 5:30 pm. Schnoebelen – Do we need to vote? (Since there are three positions open?) Wagner – everyone could vote against someone...

X. Discussion Items- none

XI. Announcements

- General Faculty Meeting on April 30, 2025 (Need to elect a new General Faculty Secretary)

XII. Adjournment Move to adjourn at 4:38 from several people.