

MINUTES
Faculty Senate Academic Affairs
September 2, 2008, 3:30 p.m.
K-State Student Union, Room 204

Present: Carroll, Charney, Chengappa, Devore, Hendrix, Huschka, King, Rintoul, Roberts, Rogers, Staggenborg, Sump, Turvey-Welch

Guests: Fred Fairchild, Monty Nielsen, Karen Myers-Bowman, Greg Eiselein, Melody LeHew, Vicki Clegg, Greg Zolnerowich, Sara Kearns, Yacoub Najjar, and Kerri Day Keller

1. Doris Carroll, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
Carroll began the meeting with introductions of committee members and the General Education Task Force members.
2. A motion was made by Chengappa and seconded by King to approve the May 20, 2008 minutes. Motion carried.
3. General Education Task Force Proposal - "The K-State 8: General Education Program" First reading – **Attachment 1**

A motion was made by Staggenborg and seconded by Chengappa to receive the proposal as a first reading. Motion carried.

General Education Task Force: Melody LeHew and Greg Eiselein began by giving a brief history of how the General Education Task Force was formed and information regarding the three years they've been working on this proposal. The task force was initially charged to review the current UGE (University General Education) and provide a report as to what changes could be made. After submission of the task force's recommendations in the summer of 2007, they were then charged by the Provost with the task of creating a proposal to implement their recommendations. Some items in the original recommendations were not forwarded on due to budget concerns. Throughout the process, the task force held sessions with faculty members, students, and different faculty senate committees in order to get feedback and make a workable proposal. The proposal which Academic Affairs has received is not the entire lengthy document, but is the version that needs Faculty Senate approval. Karen Myers-Bowman gave the highlights of the proposal. A minimum of 18 credit hours will be required. The task force really tried hard to make sure the universities 5 SLOs were considered within this proposal. They believe this does move us forward several steps, but isn't such a huge change that it will be impossible to accomplish by both faculty and students. Karen opened the floor to questions:

Monty Nielsen, Registrar, began by commenting on some of his colleagues' concerns. Some of these concerns had to do with staffing and technology issues. Nielsen believes some conversation has taken place about the impact of implementation of this proposal and more dialogue will continue to take place in the future. Carroll commented that both she and Nielsen can have a role in helping make sure this takes place.

Chengappa commented on the Global Community and Human Diversity within the U.S. areas and asked if there was a way to connect these. Myers-Bowman responded that they did try to connect them as one, but it proved difficult. After many discussions the task force examined how several courses are examples of ones that fit very well with Global Community, but do not necessarily touch on Human Diversity. Eiselein also commented on this regarding Human Diversity. Clegg mentioned they had attempted to put them together, but then people questioned why they weren't separate so it was finally concluded that the students would benefit best if they were separate. Charney commented about the discussion his college had. It was highlighted that three sections are heavy in the social sciences and they wondered why the categories are labeled in the way they are. He talked about maybe "Global Perspectives" instead of "Global Community" and as opposed to "Human Diversity within the U.S." why not "An American Experience". Also, to what degree does the proposal responds to our status as a comprehensive land grant institution. Content areas seemed more like course descriptions was another comment from his college. The natural environment could possibly be considered. Staggenborg and Devore commented on the hour requirement and how to get the time filled. Both of them were considering specifically how students could complete the hours, what types of courses would be part of their choices. Devore also commented on page 3. Eiselein thanked them for their excellent questions. He did not think it would be a problem to answer some of the logistics type questions, but some of the other comments/concerns are of a larger nature such as are these being mainly social science areas. Eiselein

emphasized there was no agenda to the creation of this proposal. The committee members really do have the best interest of the students in mind and they spent a lot of time visiting other colleges and doing research. Clegg, Najjar, and LeHew also responded to these concerns. Myers-Bowman commented that department heads were sent a survey asking what courses could be tagged and what area they would fulfill, etc. Eiselein mentioned there is a great deal of dissatisfaction regarding the current system. Carroll asked about the assessment piece of this proposal. Who will monitor the process? Myers-Bowman responded that the assessment part hadn't come yet because the program was not fully mapped out. It will most likely *not* be left up to each department's discretion. The Office of Assessment is working on this as well in connection with another project. Carroll requested before the end of the year that there is some type of outline for what assessment will be for this program.

Rintoul had a few comments that possibly the focus of the areas is unbalanced. He also mentioned for-credit experiences and whether these are tuition-bearing experiences. He too has concern about waiting on the assessment piece. Myers-Bowman responded the task force feels the same concern and is very willing to be engaged in this if permitted when the final proposal is approved. She also mentioned this conversation did come up several times during their discussions. Academic Affairs committee members asked if a list of courses exists somewhere from what was turned in by the survey? Clegg responded that they do have the ones that *were* turned in, but that doesn't include those from areas that didn't respond to the survey. There are major holes in the information at this point, but they would be happy to provide them.

Devore commented he is astounded that technology is not included somewhere in these areas. Also, it may be difficult finding the funding to fulfill this proposal.

Carroll thanked the task force for the dedicated effort on this and she also addressed AA committee members to take this to their caucuses and get concerns addressed early on. She asked that these comments be sent to her so they can be discussed at the next meeting. Feedback is very important.

Also discussed by committee members is the process for moving this proposal forward. Carroll will be discussing this with Faculty Senate Leadership Council to ask for their guidance as well since this is a very important proposal. It was also requested that the task force submit to Academic Affairs a compilation of concerns that were given or if one does not exist, Academic Affairs should compile one. Members would also like to have the list of courses that were provided to the task force. Carroll will contact Karen for this information.

4. Revised Course and Curriculum Process update – Effective Fall 2008

Candace Becker reviewed with the committee the communication that has taken place over the summer with colleges to inform them of the revised procedures for course and curriculum changes. She also gave a brief overview of the changes and indicated this year will be sort of a probationary year and the Academic Affairs is charged with the responsibility of monitoring the effectiveness of the changes. The website to direct faculty members and others to regarding questions about the process is www.ksu.edu/registrar/ccap.

5. Course and Curriculum Changes - none

6. Graduation list changes

A. A motion was made by King and seconded by Turvey-Welch to approve the May 2008 Graduation list as submitted by the Registrar's office and also the following additions to that list:

Christopher Exum, Bachelor of Science, College of Arts and Sciences

Elias J. Martinson, Bachelor of Science, College of Arts and Sciences

Jessica Blair Robison, Bachelor of Science, College of Arts and Sciences

Shannon O'Neal, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, College of Business Administration

Evan Fairfield, Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering, College of Engineering

Motion carried.

7. Committee Reports

A. University Library Committee

The committee has not met yet this semester, however, a new representative from Academic Affairs will be needed.

- B. Committee on Academic Policy and Procedures (CAPP) – Doris Carroll
Grade submission deadline this year is earlier due to the holiday dates. Dismissal of a student was also discussed.
CAPP will meet next Wednesday.
- C. Student Senate – Andrew Huschka
Their first meeting is coming up this Thursday. The Executive committee did hold a retreat and they discussed goals for the upcoming year.

8. Old Business

A. Plagiarism Definition update – **Attachment 2**

This will be on the Faculty Senate agenda for next week for second reading. Charney voiced several concerns about this policy and about whether it should be placed in the university handbook or whether the Honor and Integrity System should be the link in Appendix F in the handbook. Carroll responded that once this language is approved by Faculty Senate, it will be used university wide and the language in the Honor and Integrity System Constitution will be amended to reflect this language. Charney invited committee members to visit the following website:

www.plagiarism.org.

B. Final Exam Policy update

Nielsen and Carroll reminded the committee that the Final Exam Policy currently in place will be in effect until the end of this semester. Then starting in Spring 2009 the new policy will go into effect as approved by Faculty Senate:

http://www.k-state.edu/facsen/policies/fy2008/documents/ChangetoUnivHandbookSectionF71FinalExamPolicy02_12_08.pdf .

9. New Business

A. Appointment of CAPP alternate

Carroll requested an alternate be available to attend CAPP on meeting days she is not available. Please email and let her know if you are willing to do this.

B. 2008-2009 Chair elect for Academic Affairs

Carroll also informed committee members this is the third year of her term on Faculty Senate and she will not be completing a second term. Therefore a new chair of Academic Affairs will be needed next year. She would like committee members to consider who may be willing to chair this committee next year.

10. For the good of the University

11. The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.