

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty Senate Academic Affairs**  
**September 17, 2013, 3:30 pm**  
**114 Hale Library**  
**Polycom number: 785-532-7282**

Present: Bennett, Bolton, Bormann, Goodson, Linville, Narayanan, Pankl, Satzler, Zajac, Unruh

Absent: Jani, Pacey, and Wang

Visitors/Guests: Ruth Dyer, Lynn Ewanow, Monty Nielsen

1. Andy Bennett, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm
2. The minutes of September 3, 2013 were approved as submitted.
3. Course and Curriculum Changes – none
4. Graduation items:
  - A. A motion was made by Zajac and seconded by Satzler to approve the following graduation list corrections and additions:  
Yacine Ait Si Amer, Bachelor of Science, College of Engineering, May 2013.  
Jessica Renee Tonne, Bachelor of Science, College of Human Ecology, December 2012.

A brief question was asked regarding the Engineering request. Satzler reported there was a misunderstanding between department and dean's office. The department believed a course was missing; however, it was determined by the dean's office that the student had all needed requirements. Therefore, it is being requested that this be corrected.

Motion carried.

5. Old Business
  - A. Update on Approval, Routing, and Notification for Course and Curriculum changes  
This item should be on an October agenda for discussion. Ms. LaBerge noted as background information that the last time these procedures were revised, the changes were given to FS as an informational document noting that it would not be a static document, but rather one that could be edited as needed. It is now time to make several adjustments and add a couple pieces. Bennett reported that the CCAPIC (Course and Curriculum Approval Process Improvement Committee) is now meeting to work on an automation process. It is expected this work will continue for two years or more.
  - B. Update on University Handbook revisions to Section F  
Bennett reported that section F of the University Handbook is the section that discusses many academic policies and procedures and therefore it was given much scrutiny by CAPP. CAPP should be finished with their edits and ready to send these revisions to Academic Affairs in time for the October 1 agenda. Bennett commented that the handbook undergoes continual review.
  - C. Undergraduate Certificate policy  
Bennett directed committee members to the document sent to them via email with the proposed changes to the current undergraduate certificate policy. There were a few major changes noted. The revisions allow for undergraduate certificates to be stand-alone. A question of qualified admissions standards came up. They are not required at this time for these stand-alone certificates. There was much discussion about the ramifications of this. If there are no standards, how would a student be prevented from 1) taking a course for which they are unqualified or 2) taking additional courses that are not part of the certificate program. Discussion ensued. Non-degree seeking students can only take a maximum of 15 hours before being required to be admitted as a degree seeking student. Some certificates are 18 credit hours and so this does happen on occasion. Someone questioned whether iSIS could handle this type of issue. Several other questions arose. Who is the final approver of giving the certificate? Could the advisor monitor the student? If a student takes a certificate that requires 18 hours, then they are admitted as a degree-seeking student and they can take their final course.

Imposing qualified admissions solves some of the issues, but creates others. It was noted again that an advisor or program coordinator could be a logical person to monitor this. There isn't a concern over students who enter under qualified admissions; it's the ones in the special category that are of a concern. This new process creates the special category. It was questioned how we would know this is going on? The consensus was that it seems worthwhile to move this forward and see how it goes. However, it is important to consider all the aspects so this conversation was valuable.

Goodson moved to place this proposal on the October 1 agenda with the intent committee members will take action on it. Zajac seconded the motion. Discussion: It was noted some certificate programs have 9 credit hours, but they will grow to 12 credit hours to comply with the revised standard set out in this new policy. It was also clarified this policy does not include non-credit bearing DCE certificates of completion. In addition, setting standards for what level courses should or could be included was discussed in CAPP, but not determined to be necessary at this time. Motion carried.

## 6. New Business

### A. Posthumous degree request process

Bennett reported one of our committee members had requested this process be discussed. It was noted some other universities have more rigid requirements, whereas K-State has not had any specific stipulations. Lynn Ewanow, Assistant Dean from Architecture, Planning and Design was present in order to share in the conversation as her college had just put forward a request recently for this kind of degree to be awarded. Committee members discussed the process we currently follow. It was noted that to be able to provide families who are grieving and who have an attachment to K-State this offer is an act of compassion and extends good will. Every university is entitled to their processes, however; it seems ours has served us well. Compassion is more the issue than anything else it seems. Accrediting bodies have not shown concern over the frequency. It was inquired how these requests come about. It was conveyed there isn't a "usual" way; however, it's generally a meeting of the minds, so to speak. Sometimes, it's the suggestion of the dean's office, sometimes it's the request of the family, or a faculty member introduces it. Committee members identified that in offering these, it should be clear there is no favoritism involved when making these decisions. Currently, there is no standard that "all students who die while pursuing a degree at K-State will be awarded a posthumous degree". As it stands, there are no written rules; however, if a student is not in good academic standing, it is most often the case the degree would not be awarded.

Committee members discussed the process of submission for posthumous degree requests. Currently there are no particular stipulations, except that the request comes from the dean of the college.

Overall conversation highlighted we want to be sure these are offered equitably to parents and families of deceased students. It may be a good conversation to have with Student Life. There may be some traditions and practices throughout colleges we are not aware of. Knowing how each college handles these situations could bring light to whether we are handling these appropriately or if any changes need made. Perhaps something could be identified to be offered to grieving families, such as a "care package". If each college does their own thing, it may not be equitable. Setting some minimum rules could be appropriate. Bennett commented that CAPP has deans, assistant deans, as well as a member of student life representatives. It could be they could assist in crafting some brief language, or give suggestions.

Bormann made a motion to request CAPP input and to have them draft language on some broad rules. Such as perhaps they must be in good standing and currently enrolled. It was also mentioned there are those serving abroad who may die that would not have been enrolled currently. This is a very good point to consider. Narayanan seconded the motion. Motion carried.

## 7. Committee reports:

### A. CAPP – Bennett

Bennett reported that CAPP discussed posthumous degrees at their last meeting as well. The Board of Regents has required that Universities have a recorded transfer of credit policy as well as an appeals policy. Currently we don't have a *written* policy and therefore CAPP has worked to write down the practice currently used. The change to that current policy is the addition of an appeals section. Bennett will bring this forward to Academic Affairs at the next meeting.

B. iSIS – Satzler

Satzler noted they are discussing the course and curriculum automation process. Also, working on making iSIS more friendly on mobile devices.

C. Library Committee – Bormann

Bormann reported the committee has not met yet.

8. Announcements/for the good of the University

Bennett reminded members about the State of the University Address on Friday, September 20. The Salina Address will be on October 3.

He also reported the Board of Regents established a Core Outcomes committee some years ago. That group meets once a year and they will meet in Manhattan this year on Friday, September 27.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday, October 1, 2013; 3:30 pm; Union room 204