
Proxies: Elder, Greene, Gwinner, Maatta, Nafziger, Reese, Rys, Spooner, Stewart

Absent: Baker, Behnke, Brockway, G. Clark, DeLuccie, Dryden, Dubois, Fick, Grice, Jackson, Jones, Mack, Marr, McHaney, Oberst, O’Hara, Quaife, Rahman, Rietcheck, Roozeboom, C. Ross, Schlup, F. Smith, Staggenborg, Thompson

Parliamentarian: Jerry Frieman

Visitors: Tim Lindemuth, Jerry Reeck, Don Robertson, Byron Jones, Patricia Marsh, Blair Reynolds, Hayley Urkevich, Eleri Griffin, Erik Ankron, Tyson Moore

I. President Bob Zabel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. Senator Hosni moved for approval of the minutes of the March 9, 2004 meeting. Motion was seconded and carried.

III. Reports from Standing Committees

A. Academic Affairs Committee - Pat Ackerman

1. Course and Curriculum Changes

   a. Undergraduate Education

      1. Pat Ackerman moved to approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Arts and Sciences February 12, 2004 minus the curriculum change for chemical sciences under Department of Chemistry (page 5 of white sheets).

      Department of Military Science
      CHANGE:
      MSCI 100 Introduction to Military Science and ROTC
      MSCI 101 Introduction to Military Leadership
      MSCI 401 Leadership Challenges and Objective-Setting
      MSCI 402 Transition to Lieutenant
DROP:
MSCI 102 Basic Riflery
MSCI 107 Rappel Master Skills

Department of Chemistry
DROP:
CHM 567 Instrumental Methods of Analysis Laboratory
CHM 586 Physical Chemistry Laboratory I
CHM 598 Physical Chemistry Laboratory II

ADD:
CHM 596 Physical Methods Laboratory

CURRICULUM CHANGES:
CHANGE:
(Page 108, undergraduate catalog)
Under Chemistry curriculum for the BS degree
*See page 4 of white sheets for details.

Department of Music
CURRICULUM CHANGES:
CHANGE:
(page 134, undergraduate catalog)
*See page 6 of white sheets for details.

Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Sciences
CHANGE:
(page 93, undergraduate catalog)
Additional requirements for the B.S.
Natural sciences
*See page 7-8 of white sheets for details.

Motion carried.

2. Senator Ackerman moved for approval of undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Agriculture February 19, 2004.

Agronomy
CHANGE:
AGRON 305 Soils

Horticulture, Forest and recreation Resources
HORT 508 Landscape Maintenance
HORT 585 Arboriculture

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS:
Department of Grain Science and Industry
B.S. in Feed Science and Management (change)
*See white sheets for details.

Department of Secondary Education and College of Agriculture
B.S. in Agriculture, Major in Agricultural Education (change)
*See white sheets for details.
2. Senator Ackerman moved for approval of additions to graduation lists.

   December 2003
   Derek Andersen, Business Administration, BS-Marketing and International Business
   Helen Brazzle, Arts and Sciences, Bachelor of Fine Arts-Fine Arts-GD
   Anne E. Finley, Business Administration, BS-Accounting
   Benjamin Lee Schuermann, Business Administration, BS-Marketing and International Business
   Lindsey Shurtz, Education - Elementary Education

Motion passed.

3. Policy on Dropping Students After First Class Day

   Senator Ackerman moved to approve the Policy on Dropping Students after First Class Day. Senator Pacey discussed the proposal and stressed that the policy is written to be permissive with “may” language but not required. Within the College of Engineering they have problems with students on wait lists and no shows in classes. This will allow students to be added to the course more expeditiously. Senator Hamilton spoke against the policy. His department has most of his classes filled by 2/3rds of the way through enrollment so he has an understanding of the issues. He has much experience with students waiting to get into a class. His department is concerned about the deluge of appeals.

   Blair Reynolds spoke representing Student Senate. He said SGA has reviewed this for months and has discussed it thoroughly. This policy does not allow for any contingency and is a major change in the procedures. If students do not show up by first minute of first class they could be dropped. He indicated that the students have responded with a well thought out compromise resolution asking for dropping the student by the end of the second day.

   Senator Eckels discussed lab classes that have student groups formed on the first day.

   Senator Ransom moved to amend the policy as follows:
   “An instructor may drop a student from any or all components (e.g., lecture, recitation, lab, etc.) of a course if the student is absent at the end of the second class period of any component of the course. Students who cannot be in attendance should arrange prior permission from the instructor in order not to be dropped.” Senator Hosni seconded the motion.

   Senator McCulloh was concerned about classes that only meet once per week, this amendment would mean that students could not be dropped until after the second week of the class.

   Senator Erickson pointed out that the policy language is permissive as it says “may drop a student.”

The amendment failed.

   Senator Hosni moved to change the wording to: “An instructor may drop a student from any or all components (e.g., lecture, recitation, lab, etc.) of a course if the student is absent at the beginning of the second class period of any component of the course. Students who cannot be in attendance should arrange prior permission from the instructor in order not to be dropped.” The motion was seconded.
Senator McCulloh felt that the proposal could cause collateral damage and this amendment has the same problem as the first amendment.

The amendment failed.

Senator Dodd spoke in favor of the proposal for managing classes that are overly subscribed, and if there is concern that faculty are abusing the policy, students could bring that issue to administrators and it would be dealt with at that time. She said that abuse would be unlikely.

Senator Murray stated his agreement with Senator Hamilton.

Senator Adams called the question. Motion was seconded. Motion carried.

The motion to adopt the policy carried.

4. Approve Student Learning Outcomes  ATTACHMENT 2

Senator Ackerman discussed the proposed student learning outcomes that include recommendations resulting from the discussion board. She moved to approve the Student Learning Outcomes in attachment 2.

Senator Rintoul read a statement regarding his understanding of development of these outcomes and his concerns. He said we should also consider assessment in the development of these learning outcomes. We need to look at outcomes in relation to desirability as well as teachability and feasibility of assessment. We should only include outcomes that can be assessed. Although he believes that diversity is a desirable outcome, diversity should not become part of the student learning outcomes because it cannot be assessed. Rintoul is not aware of any tools available to assess this outcome at the department level. He stated that if you can’t teach it and assess it at the department level, it should not be included in the student learning outcomes. Therefore he will vote against this policy.

Senator Michie agreed with Senator Rintoul as she cannot determine how the diversity learning outcome could be assessed, and she would like to see an example of how this could be assessed. She suggested assessing this outcome at the university level rather than at the program level.

Senator Spears stated that assessment would be done at a program level. A department would be required to add a component that addresses diversity.

Cia Verschelden mentioned that the department is not expected to deliver all of this content. They are responsible for assessing it, however. The Tilford Group has come up with a list of skills that could be used for assessment. There are people at the university working on how to assess various outcomes and assistance will be provided. This Student Learning Outcomes document will be a political document to be widely publicized in the catalog, available to parents, etc. She said certain curricula such as the hard sciences will need some additional assistance but that it is doable. Many other programs already have this diversity component embedded in their curriculum.

Senator Brigham mentioned that the English department is working on a project to address diversity. They are not yet in a position to determine whether not they will be able to assess this or not.

Senator Clegg discussed the Tilford Group’s concern of the “washed out” nature of the student learning outcomes as proposed. Assessment and Program Review looked at various statements provided by departments and how Tilford Group principles could be adopted. She said the program, not the individual students, would be assessed. Just because you do not know exactly
how you will assess something at this time, doesn’t mean you should leave it out as a goal. Although they are really student learning “goals,” she said they are being called “outcomes”.

Patricia Marsh stated that the public will see the university-wide assessment. The intention for the university-wide outcomes should provide for general student outcomes, not particularly the programmatic student learning outcomes. The things that exist university-wide will not be tailored to department programs.

Senator Hosni stated that we all agree that diversity is important and cherished. One of the outcomes they have to assess is life-long learning. To assess that they include specific questions in alumni surveys that get at this issue. He appreciates the difficulty of assessment but he wants his students to deal with the question of “What does diversity mean to you?”

Senator Hamilton stated that a number of these items are being addressed at the department level. It appears that we may be developing additional courses to address outcomes such as professional ethics within the discipline. He would like to know to what degree and what kinds of impacts on programs might follow from this.

Senator Rintoul mentioned that the outcomes will have to be assessed for your major. He continued to request information on assessment tools on the discussion board but never has a tool been mentioned. He disagrees - we need a plan that we can implement, and we should not adopt a plan until you know how it can be assessed.

Senator Michie mentioned that she is hearing conflicting information from Cia Verschelden and Senator Clegg. Are we saying that every student must demonstrate these outcomes or are we saying the program should demonstrate?

Senator Clegg mentioned that not every student is being assessed, but as an aggregate of all students.

President Zabel ended the discussion. Senator Ackerman returned to the issue at hand and said that the current student learning outcomes will stay in the University undergraduate catalog if these are not passed.

Senator Bloomquist moved to amend the title of the statement of “student learning outcomes” change to “student learning goals”. Motion was seconded by Senator Michie. Senator Dodd stated that the intent would be that they would be goals to strive for.

Senator Hosni stated that the original charge to develop student learning outcomes came from an accreditation visit. Senator Spears said that we need to develop outcomes and then assess the programs related to feedback loops for program assessment.

Senator Hamilton argued against the amendment because goals can be conflicting, but when you have plans and outcomes you have things they you can aim to accomplish.

Senator Bloomquist responded to Senator Rintoul’s concern about how outcomes will be assessed. Stating them as goals does not require direct assessment but rather looking at student learning outcomes that we propose to see how they look at the student assessment.

Senator Cox asked about the change in the wording from outcome to goals; would that still meet our needs?

The amendment failed by hand vote, 26 for and 33 against.

Senator Anderson moved to change the 5th statement:
“Students will demonstrate decision making ability which reflects an awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to live and work in a diverse world”. Motion was seconded. Senator Clark said the amendment was redundant. Senator Simon mentioned that as they went over the policy in the committee they thought it was okay to restate the language within the area. Senator Hedrick spoke in opposition to the amendment when considering behavioral or psychological aspects. Senator Brigham said there are criteria on what is accessible whether you are in the humanities, social sciences or hard sciences. Senator Prince said the outcomes have now been watered down and is opposed to the amendment.

President Zabel called for a vote and the amendment failed.

A vote was taken on the main motion. Motion carried.

5. Resolution regarding Bachelor’s Degree Completion Programs (Con. Ed) ATTACHMENT 3
(First Reading at April Faculty Senate meeting; vote at May Faculty Senate meeting)
Senator Ackerman announced that this will be voted on at the May Faculty Senate meeting.

6. TEVALs and evaluation of teaching
President Zabel announced that in light of the announcement that TEVALs would be discontinued next year, the Executive Committee discussed this and requested the establishment of a task force to address student evaluation of teaching. Faculty Affairs, Academic Affairs, and FSCOT were asked to provide suggestions for membership on the committee. The task force includes the following members: Jim Dubois, Frank Spikes, Mickey Ransom, Bob Homolka, Sherry Haar, Bruce Prince, David Pacey, and Lee Behlman. Senator Rintoul will chair the task force. Senator Clegg will be involved with the task force as well. The Executive Committee has requested a report to Faculty Senate by next October. Senator Dodds requested stipends for 9-month faculty for the summer to work on this task force. President Zabel said that Faculty Senate does not have resources to provide stipends.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee - Roger Adams
1. Classified research amendment presentation - Byron Jones, Mo Hosni, Jerry Reeck, and Don Robertson
Senator Adams introduced Drs. Jones, Reeck, and Robertson.

Jones said that classified research as defined in the University Handbook does not meet the normal definition as most people would think of it. They are suggesting formation of a committee on classified research to ensure that proper procedures are in place. The formal draft policy was distributed. See ATTACHMENT 6. The vast majority of the research at K-State would not fall under the policy definition.

Senator Adams requested any proposed changes to the proposal be addressed to him at Faculty Affairs since they have passed this proposed policy change unanimously. Any changes will be discussed with the authors and then would require a re-vote in Faculty Affairs. Adams said the proposal will likely be on the May agenda.

2. Grievance Board amendment ATTACHMENT 4
Senator Adams moved approval of the Grievance Board amendment. The increase in number is because we are having conflicts when a grievance board is being seated requiring a larger pool. Senator Hosni suggested consideration of a percentage of faculty rather than a set number of members as proposed. President Zabel mentioned that the proposed change was initiated by Jane Rowlett, Academic Services. Senator Clark asked about how the members are chosen. Adams and Zabel explained that each tenured faculty member is obligated to be in the pool and should serve if selected. Names are drawn randomly each year ensuring that women and minorities are represented in the pool.
Motion carried.

3. Chronic Low Achievement Policy amendment  
Senator Adams announced the committee is continuing to discuss this proposed policy change.

4. Teaching Scholars  
Senator Adams announced that the Faculty Affairs committee has drafted a memo to Provost Coffman and incoming Provost Nellis requesting a moratorium on the use of the “Scholar” job title and the use of working titles for various teaching scholar levels.

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - Walter Schumm  
Nothing to report.

D. Faculty Senate Committee on Technology - Mike Haddock  
1. Online grade submission resolution  
   ATTACHMENT 5  
   Senator Haddock spoke about the resolution. In February Dr. Andrew Barkley, 2003-2004 Coffman Distinguished Teaching Scholar sought support for implementation of Online Grade reporting. FSCOT then brought the resolution to the Executive Committee, with Dr. Barkley and Registrar Monty Nielsen in attendance to discuss the proposal. The Executive Committee added the last paragraph to the resolution.  

   Senator Haddock moved for passage of this resolution. Motion carried.

V. Announcements

A. Faculty Senate Leadership Council  
President Zabel announced that the Leadership Council met with President’s Staff on March 26 and most of the discussion concerned proposals from the Compensation Task Force. Based upon revised recommendations of the Salary Committee, approximately $550,000 in targeted salary enhancements has been budgeted for next year. Salary enhancements of $2500 will go to about 220 high achieving faculty with the number apportioned primarily based upon the number of full-time faculty in each college. Deans and department heads will have responsibility for determining who will receive targeted enhancements. A similar amount has been committed to salary enhancements the following two years, so that upwards of 600 faculty will eventually receive the enhancements.

Although the targeted increases will not address the severe shortfall of K-State salaries, Zabel said he believes this Faculty Senate initiative represents an important first step and represents a collaborative effort of the Compensation Task Force, the Administration, and Faculty Senate. In addition, Zabel said that the Administration is committed to working with the Board of Regents and the other university administrations toward some kind of tuition benefit program for employee dependents. In addition, it appears there will be an average 3% cost of living increase for state employees plus an additional 1% for faculty salaries under SB 345, the Reorganization of Higher Education bill, that has not been funded for the past two years.

B. Kansas Board of Regents  
Zabel reported that the next Regents meetings are later this week. He referred to the on-line faculty morale survey conducted by COFSP at the request of the Board. He expects that some preliminary survey data will be available and that he will share K-State data with Senate. Zabel said that there has been confusion about faculty input to CEO evaluations. Last fall the Board indicated to COFSP they would like faculty input. When COFSP asked for clarification, the evaluation subcommittee asked each faculty senate president to solicit evaluations from faculty and submit a one page summary to the Board. At the March meeting, COFSP was advised that the Board wished to further study the advisability and procedures for faculty evaluations of CEOs.
C. Report from Student Senate

Blair Reynolds announced that he is the new student senator representative to Faculty Senate. Student Senate held elections and he announced each of the successful candidates: Hayley Urkevich is Student Body President and Eleri Griffin is Student Senate Chair.

President Zabel thanked Sam Meier for his conscientious participation in Faculty Senate this year.

D. Faculty Senate Elections
President Zabel mentioned that Faculty Senate elections should be concluded and the newly elected senators will be invited to the May meeting. Zabel encouraged interested senators to consider placing their name on the ballot or encouraging others to run for President-Elect in the May election.

E. Other
President Zabel announced that the calendar committee has been working very hard and they will be finalizing additional changes to the calendar so the calendar can be on the next agenda.

VI. Old Business - none

VII. New Business - none

VIII. For the Good of the University
Senator Schmidt requested commentary on the publication of salaries in the Manhattan Mercury. President Zabel said that people involved in providing of the data consulted with the University Attorney and received the opinion that all pay should be reported as requested by the Mercury. He spoke with Bruce Shubert, Associate Vice President for Administration & Finance, who said they will attempt to handle this information differently by providing access to the university budget for future requests.

Senator Ransom requested that Faculty Senate should have been informed via Leadership about the request and that actual payroll data was going to be released by the university as a result of the Open Records act. Senator Gehrt mentioned that it was discussed with Leadership but perhaps not clearly enough.

IX. Adjournment
Senator Fairchild moved for adjournment. Motion was seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 1

Proposed Undergraduate Catalog Policy Change
(Approved by Academic Affairs 3/2/2004)

Purpose:
The main purpose of this proposed policy change is to facilitate the timely and efficient addition of students to “full” course sections. The new policy will allow instructors to more quickly determine available openings in a course and thereby be able to more quickly authorize enrollment permission to students wanting to enroll in the course.

2002-2004 Undergraduate Catalog, Enrollment, Drop/Add (page 14)
Replace the following paragraph:
The instructor *may* drop a student from a course after the first week of classes if the student has neither attended any of the scheduled course meetings nor notified the instructor of his or her intent to take the course. For purposes of this procedure enrollment in and payment of tuition for a course do not constitute notification of intent to take a course.

With this paragraph:

An instructor *may* drop a student from any or all components (e.g., lecture, recitation, lab, etc.) of a course if the student is absent at the beginning of the first class period of any component of the course. Students who cannot be in attendance should arrange prior permission from the instructor in order not to be dropped.
Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes at Kansas State University

Kansas State University strives to create an atmosphere of intellectual curiosity and growth, one in which academic freedom, breadth of thought and action, and individual empowerment are valued and flourish. We endeavor to prepare citizens who will continue to learn and will contribute to the societies in which they live and work.

Students share in the responsibility for a successful university educational experience. Upon completion of their degree and regardless of disciplinary major, undergraduates are expected to demonstrate ability in at least five essential areas.

**Knowledge.**
Students will demonstrate a depth of knowledge and apply the methods of inquiry in a discipline of their choosing, and they will demonstrate a breadth of knowledge across their choice of varied disciplines.

**Critical Thinking.**
Students will demonstrate the ability to access and interpret information, respond and adapt to changing situations, make complex decisions, solve problems, and evaluate actions.

**Communication.**
Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate clearly and effectively.

**Diversity.**
Students will demonstrate awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to live and work in a diverse world.

**Academic and Professional Integrity.**
Students will demonstrate awareness and understanding of the ethical standards of their academic discipline and/or profession.
ATTACHMENT 4
(Changes are in italics)

UNIVERSITY HANDBOOK APPENDIX G

General Grievance Board Policy and Hearing Procedures

D. Composition

The GGB shall be composed of 45 tenured faculty members on full-time appointment, including a minimum representation of women and minorities as defined by federal regulations (Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American) in equal proportion to their numbers in the eligible faculty pool, or eight women and five minorities, whichever is greater. One member shall be the chairperson.
ATTACHMENT 5

RESOLUTION
ONLINE GRADE SUBMISSION

Whereas online grade submission could provide a significant gain in efficiency to Kansas State University,

could enhance the accuracy, storage, and transmission of grades,

could be particularly beneficial to faculty who manage grades for large classes,

could be made available on a voluntary basis to encourage gradual adoption,

be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate of Kansas State University supports the expeditious creation of an electronic means for faculty to submit final course grades to the Office of the Registrar.

Faculty Senate Committee on Technology is asked to work with interested faculty and the Registrar to report back by the October 2004 Faculty Senate meeting on estimated time and effort required to implement stop-gap measures.