

**Faculty Senate  
Washburn University**

*Minutes of Dec. 8, 2008  
Kansas Room, Memorial Union*

Present: Arterburn, Berry, Bowen (VPAA), Byrne, Camarda, Chorba, Concannon, Croucher, Ding, Ginzburg, Jacobs, Kaufman, Kerchner, Khan, Lockwood, Manske, McGuire, Mechtly (sub for C. Schmidt) Melick, Naylor, Porta, Pownell, Prasch (President) , Ramirez, Ray, Routsong, Russell, S. Schmidt, Sharafy, Shipley, Sullivan, Unruh, Walker, Wunder, Wynn

- I. The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:32 PM.
- II. The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of Nov. 10, 2008 were approved.
- III. President's Opening Remarks.
  - A. Prasch reported on the WTE Compensation Plan that President Farley presented to faculty members, deans, and VPAA administrators the morning of Dec. 8. Summarizing the plan Farley presented, Prasch said that the compensation in the form of a cash payment will be attached to credit courses (with tuition modeled on a 3-hour course). In many instances, the WTE will be factored into a faculty member's regular load, but in the event the member is doing a WTE independently, then the faculty member could be compensated. There could also be a division in compensation in the case where two faculty members divide the WTE advising. Prasch reported that this university-wide compensation plan referred specifically to the Scholarly and Creative TEs.
  - B. Prasch read a brief statement written by Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas, the chair of Modern Languages, who expressed dismay over the fact that Modern Language faculty often advise students who are going on semester- or year-long study abroad programs and that they must grade pre and post-departure papers. These papers often require revisions and thus a significant amount of a faculty member's time. While he knows that this work is significantly less than what is required of members advising Scholarly and Creative TEs, it is nonetheless more work and he hopes that the university will provide at least a little amount of compensation for this extra effort.
  - C. Bowen reported that it was not the intent to leave out the International Study Abroad TE and that should be addressed soon now that the plan for Scholarly and Creative TEs has been formulated.
  - D. Prasch also stated that Farley announced that advising TEs is still voluntary on the part of the faculty, though Unruh announced that it was not optional for SON faculty. Sharafy wondered if there was a back up plan for students who could not find a faculty member willing to work with them a particular semester and Walker wondered whether non-tenure-track faculty in SOB could oversee Scholarly and Creative TEs.
- IV. Report from the Faculty Representatives to the Board of Regents.
  - A. Prasch reported that the Board of Regents would be meeting the week of Dec. 8 and said he would report on that meeting at the next Senate meeting.
- V. Faculty Senate Committee Reports.

- A. Minutes from the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of Nov. 20, 2008 were approved (Schmidt's affiliation was corrected).

VI. University Committee Minutes.

- A. Minutes from the General Education Review Committee meeting of Nov. 7, 2008 were accepted.
- B. Minutes from the General Education Review Committee meeting of Oct. 13, 2008 were accepted
- C. Minutes from the Faculty Development Committee meeting of Aug. 22, 2008 were accepted.
- D. Minutes from the Faculty Development Committee meeting of Nov. 14, 2008 were accepted.
- E. Minutes from the Library Committee meeting of Nov. 6, 2008 were accepted.
- F. Minutes from the Faculty Grants Committee of Oct. 17, 2008 were accepted.
- G. Minutes from the Curriculum Grants Committee of Oct. 21, 2008 were accepted.

VII. Old Business.

- A. A motion for a friendly amendment to attach the following statement (which was approved by the General Faculty on May 9, 2002) to the end of Agenda Item 08-07 was made and passed:

“Each member of this joint appointment will receive an individual contract. Each member will receive half of the full-time compensation for the position. Both of the members sharing the full-time jointly-held appointment shall be entitled to benefits otherwise accruing to full-time faculty members. Among these are:

- Academic and Sweet Summer Sabbaticals (to be shared).
- Retirement (each receiving benefits based on their individual salary).
- Life insurance (each insured based on their individual salary).
- Group Health Insurance (each receiving full benefits; premium payments based upon salary, plan selected, and type of coverage elected).\***
- Tuition waiver for children of either participant.

Note: The faculty benefit of short-term and long-term disability insurance will not be available to faculty members sharing jointly-held appointments due to insurance company regulations requiring full-time employment.”

**\*Indicates the section Deborah Moore reworded.**

B. A motion was then made to add a second friendly amendment to the document was made and approved. The following sentence will be added immediately after the sentence ending “that expected of a full-time faculty member”: “Responsibilities for teaching, research, and service should be balanced on an annual basis except by special agreement between the two members and the department.”

C. The motion for a third friendly amendment to add “in teaching, scholarship, and service” after “the accomplishments of each individual” was made and passed. The sentence now reads: “A joint petition may be prepared, but it should clearly state the accomplishments of each individual in teaching, scholarship, and service; each individual may choose to present his or her own petition.

D. A fourth motion to correct the spelling of the word “petition” was made and passed.

E. The Senate voted on the whole document (the entire action item 08-07) and it passed.

VIII. New Business.

There was none.

IX. Information Items.

There were none.

X. Discussion Items.

A. IT issues

a) Senators were asked to review the following documents before the senate meeting:

- 1) Russ Jacob's memo to Robin Bowen about his concerns over Mike Gunter and IT issues at WU.
- 2) Alan Bearman's emails outlining IT problems at the Mabee Library
- 3) The proposed *Electronic Information Security: Regulations and Procedures*
- 4) Minutes from the Faculty IT Advisory Council meeting of Oct. 22, 2008.
- 5) Resolutions regarding the ISS electronic information security regulations from NS and SS divisions of CAS

b) President Prash began with three points regarding IT issues at WU:

- 1) He pointed out the immediate and specific problem of the "alarming" *Electronic Information Security: Regulations and Procedures*
- 2) He claimed that the above mentioned document was "the straw that broke the camel's back."
- 3) He underscored two very specific issues:
  - i) The fact that the ISS director does no report to any academic unit causes difficulties.
  - ii) The specific problem of Mike Gunter and the frustrations faculty feel over the fact that he does not seem to listen to them.

c) Prash raised the possibility of the Senate issuing a vote of no confidence in Gunter and then opened up the floor to comments from senators.

- i) Jacobs pointed out to Bowen the problem of lack of academic oversight of ISS. Bowen responded that this issue was one of the first she dealt with in July 2007. Bowen said she brought the two parties together and that progress on the issue seemed incremental, especially in regard to the fact that faculty gained two more spots on the steering committee. She acknowledged that issues remained and that faculty asked for a consultant to be brought to campus, but the one recommended had yet to respond to the request.
- ii) Sharafy said that he felt that the proposed regulations created rules that were being imposed on faculty who had never had the chance to offer feedback. He wondered who decided on the draft. Bowen responded that the document went to the IT Steering Committee and that she was incorrect in assuming that it had first gone to the Faculty Steering Committee.
- iii) Mechtly said that the academic side had been completely cut out.
- iv) Camarda stated that at a supercomputing conference, colleagues from other universities were surprised to learn that IT was not under academic oversight.
- v) Walker stated that the IT Advisory Committee saw pg 7-8 on the encryption of data, but did not see the rest of the document until a week before the Senate meeting.
- vi) Mechtly (sitting in for Senator C. Schmidt), stated that the document did not have to be so complex and claimed that if the document were passed the CIS would be derailed. He explained that CIS professors need administrative access because their students install thousands of pieces of software in order to test it. He added that as part of the CIS program, students are supposed to develop programs

and asked: "How do you get permission for a piece of software that doesn't exist? This gives too much power to one person."

- vii) He claimed that 6.3.5 on pg 12 of the document would devastate computer classes.
- viii) Sharafy questioned whether Gunter would have time to give permission to an instructor every time that individual needed to download free software in order to test it to see whether it will work when teaching a class.
- ix) Concannon mentioned this could cause accreditation issues in the Law School and Law Library.
- x) Kaufman said that the FS needs to make a change in the director's reporting requirement.
- xi) Ray declared that IT problems in the library affect all of the CAS and that the library was mentioned as an issue in the accreditation report.
- xii) Jacobs said that the document requires the dept. head to carry an enormous amount of responsibility.
- xiii) Arteburn wondered aloud why the document, which requires so much of dept. heads, was never brought to their attention.
- xiv) Mechtly said that as department head, he would refuse to check his colleagues' cellphones or PDAs to see if they carried students' grades.
- xv) Bryne said that it seems as though Gunter had been making decisions that made his job easier.
- xvi) Jacobs called for a motion, citing the resolutions of Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. He suggested that the Senate adopt a similar resolution and have President Prasch forward it on to President Farley. Ray seconded the motion.
- xvii) Several senators expressed reservations about the "harsh" language of the wording of #4 in the NS and SS resolutions.
- xviii) Jacobs suggested pulling #4 (making the no confidence vote a separate issue), made a motion to do so and it passed.
- xix) McGuire suggested that the Senate include specific items to which it objects in the WUPRDM document and Prasch said that it would take at least a week to do so.

B. In the effort to save time, a motion was made to close the discussion of the resolution on first reading. The motion passed.

C) A motion was then made to suspend the rule requiring a second reading of the document. The motion passed unanimously.

D) A motion was then made to move the resolution to passage and the Senate voted unanimously to pass the resolution. Please find immediately below the resolution Prasch signed and sent to President Farley the evening of Dec. 8<sup>th</sup>:

Insofar as the proposed Regulations and Procedures for Electronic Information Security would impair the ability of faculty to engage in collaborative research, impede basic research by faculty and students, inhibit free flow of ideas, interfere with the normal operations of university libraries, ignore basic principles of academic freedom in classroom use of technology, eliminate faculty and student rights to intellectual property, impose unreasonable requirements and oversight to a wide range of faculty and student academic activity, limit the ability of the university to engage with the wider community and its off-campus constituencies, and fundamentally undermine teaching practices,

The Faculty Senate resolves:

- 1) That the present proposals be immediately abandoned;

- 2) That any future such document be prepared with full involvement of academic units affected by such practices;
- 3) That clear academic faculty oversight be established for technology initiatives that directly affect academic programs and activities.

At the end of the meeting, Prasch asked the Senate to consider two issues: the pursuit of a vote of no-confidence in Gunter and the action of immediately composing a document that would outline the specifics the Senate would like to see vis à vis clear academic oversight of ISS. Senators affirmed that they would like to pursue both issues in the next FS meeting, though Unruh urged caution in the wording to be used in the vote of no-confidence, asking the senate not to use language that would be perceived as attacking Gunter's personality. Prasch requested that senators speak to their constituencies about the IT issues and report them to the executive committee which will soon begin work on a no-confidence document.

XI. Announcements.  
There were none.

XII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by Courtney Sullivan, Secretary to the Faculty Senate.