

Washburn University General Faculty  
Meeting Minutes  
November 15, 2023

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

President Mazachek called the meeting to order at 3:34.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the October 4, 2023, General Faculty Meeting were approved unanimously.

**III. REMARKS**

**President Mazachek**

- Strategic framework
  - The next stages have been mapped out to present to the WU community (e.g., academic leaders and senate) for feedback. Have determined the framework will not be complete this semester. The goal is to take the final version to WUBOR February 1<sup>st</sup>.
  - The results will be a framework to aid in decision making regarding budget and how to distinguish WU moving forward. Additionally, it is meant to aid in ensuring said decision making is transparent. Details will be filled in later.
  - There is a community forum this Friday; please use it as an opportunity to give feedback. There will be one more iteration of the framework after this feedback is received.
- Work on the website
  - We will receive feedback from an outside audit regarding pages to focus on, including content suggestions, in December.
  - By February, there will be a map regarding how to move forward. Hutchinson is the lead in this effort.
- Branding
  - Will be working to do better at telling our story in ways our target markets will be able to hear the message. Meetings with deans and cabinets will take place to start an effort to ensure we have consistency across campus.
- Provost search
  - Jim Martin is the chair of this committee. The pool has been narrowed down to four candidates. All four will be on campus the first week after Thanksgiving break.

- A survey will be sent out for feedback. The email will include a recording of the open presentation. The survey will be open 24 hours. The intention is for a decision to be made by that Saturday to ensure an offer can be extended asap.
  - Morse asked about an opportunity to comment comprehensively after the visits have all taken place.
  - The hiring firm indicated this should be done one by one. The point is not to compare the candidates to one another but to focus on whether we want this person to be the next provost. People can email afterthoughts if they like or share comprehensive details in the final survey.
  - The searches for the Tech and Law School Deans will follow a similar process.
  - Wagner asked if there could be notification about the timeline when it becomes clearer, as there will be a hurray to submit feedback.
- Facilities
  - Working to update the campus master plan; this will include more fundraising.
  - Henderson and Plass are the first in line for updates. Architects will be on campus this week.

#### IV. NEW BUSINESS

Interim Provost Stephenson thanked Broxterman and all others who have been working on CourseLeaf.

##### **Requiring General Faculty approval**

24 – 2 Proposal to replace Global Citizenship, Ethics, and Diversity (GED) university student learning outcome (USLO) with the Inclusion and Belonging (IB) USLO

- Nizovtsev requested the item order be switched. Ball stated that this needed to be first due to the potential lengthy discussion.
- Smith moved to approve; Schnoebelin seconded.
- This item comes from the general education committee. At the April 2023 meeting, we approved a DEI course as part of the KBOR framework. Discussions have taken place around whether there needs to be a USLO replacement or whether revisions can be used with the same outcome (Ball).
- A subgroup from the ADIC met to create new learning outcomes for the DEI hours. There was an overlap with the GED requirement and the best path seemed to be a

replacement rather than revision. In 2019, students called for more cultural sensitivity and awareness; to answer that call, the new course requirement will need to address diversity in a substantial way. Had a revision been done instead, it would have language to ensure it was a diversity SLO rather than a grab bag where diversity was not necessarily being addressed. The subcommittee was mindful of other parts of the GED SLO and courses with this designation; most of them likely cover diversity. Ethics is also part of this but may be a better fit under critical and creative thinking. (Kendall-Morwick, K.)

- The general education committee initially decided things would be considered I and B and those currently GED would be grandfathered in. The course would be reviewed by general education in the next few years to ensure that it lined up with I and B, giving time for needed adjustments. The faculty also had the option of removing the course from I and B.
- Nizovtsev, as a member of the general education committee, is not comfortable with a complete replacement. The change in the language from GED to I and B completely excludes global and environmental issues and ethics. He suggested that the current USLO is kept, with a subset for the DEI requirement. It is much less disruptive.
- Gonzalez-Abellas spoke in support of support Nizovtsev. Diversity and global citizenship are not the same thing. We are wiping out global citizenship. We can find diversity here in Topeka. We need students to be exposed to the world.
- Morse acknowledged the issue with the lack of global in the language. Suggested it be IB and Global Citizenship if it makes people more comfortable.
- It was suggested that the SLO language does not address belonging. Historically excluded people may continue to feel this is an issue. A better name might be equity, inclusion, and global citizenship; this ensures the micro and macro level diversity needs are met (Walter).
- Jones asked whether general education courses would count towards the core. They will but not in both spots. Ball clarified that this has been consistent.
- Cook was unaware when voted for diversity and inclusion that it would include eliminating an existing SLO. Can see issues with this replacement. Ball reiterated that the replacement does not have to happen. We can leave the GED SLO and add subsection.
- Faculty senate modified the language to incorporate global citizenship. Open to removing belonging and keeping inclusion. GED has always been a problematic category; moving forward, there should be a new SLO. It is important that we stick to what has been proposed, as it is what was mandated and requested by students (Kendall-Morwick, K.).

- Byrne agrees there are potential issues, particularly with students mandating things.
- Smith (I.) indicated that if both GED and I and B SLO are kept, people can still be assessed for both. Some may want that.
- Prasch moved to amend.
  - a. Strike the language starting at replace through GED. The USLO for I and B will be created but not a replacement. Smith (I) seconded.
  - b. Clarification: remove the language of replacement and approve the outcome for the area. GED can include courses that are and are not I and B.
  - c. O'Neill noted this would be a new way of doing things. unsure the assessment and approval processes for general education would go. SLOs must match the chosen USLO. Course learning outcomes will need written for two purposes: assessment and distribution.
  - d. Gonzalez-Abellas agrees with the amendment. GED as the SLO, I and B outcomes to be met for the core course requirement. All GED could start as I and B until able to review.
  - e. Kendall-Morwick (K.) believes this will be confusing for students. A cleaner way is to approve the I and b and if folks feel strongly about GED, there can be another USLO created.
  - f. Memmer whether a course submitted for the I and B will go to the general education committee for approval or through divisions. Ball clarified that they go through divisions if they are in that division; otherwise, they go to committee.
  - g. Nizovtsev called to vote.
  - h. Ball asked for the Amendment to be clarified one more time before vote.
    - i. The proposal is to create outcomes for I and B as a distribution area. The beginning will be removed, and it will be indicated that there is a subsection for I and B.
- The proposal passed with the friendly amendment.

24 – 6 Proposal to revise the Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning (QSR) university student learning outcome (USLO)

- Nizovtsev moved to approve, Cook seconded.
- Last April it was proposed that we break up the current SLO into two sections. The first section (a) being about quantitative reasoning. The second section (b) focused on scientific literacy. Part b will be used for the general education requirement.

- There were concerns raised, as not all courses included are about scientific literacy. This can be addressed by a review by the general education committee.
- Sollars asked if this could include social science courses. Ball confirmed that any discipline on campus can put a course forward to be considered.

#### **Informational**

Several new programs were approved by Faculty Senate. Details were provided in the agenda. No discussion.

#### **V. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- CTEL winter social – December 6<sup>th</sup> from 3 – 5 pm. There will be students selling art (Kendall-Morwick, K.)
- Tomorrow from 5 – 7 pm is the celebration of cultures (McClendon)
- Reminder that Aperion is next semester (Sullivan)

#### **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.