

MINUTES
Faculty Senate Academic Affairs
February 3, 2009, 3:30 p.m.
K-State Student Union, Room 204

Present: Carroll, Charney, Devore, Garcia, Hendrix, King, Rintoul, Rogers, Turvey-Welch

Absent: Chengappa, Huschka, Staggenborg, Sump

Visitor(s): Vicki Clegg, Karen Myers-Bowman, Melody LeHew, Monty Nielsen, Frank Spikes

1. Doris Carroll, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
2. The January 20, 2009 minutes were approved with a minor correction to a url link.
3. Revised General Education Task Force proposal/Academic Affairs subcommittee report – **Attachments 1 and 2**
Carroll shared a memo with the committee that was sent by Fred Fairchild, Faculty Senate President, regarding requested action on the General Education proposal. Carroll deferred to King to mention concerns that were expressed by the Executive Committee at their January 28 meeting. One concern was that the General Education courses would have to come to Faculty Senate twice for approval. Discussion continued regarding concerns from Executive Committee. Carroll reminded members that when the University Honors Program was approved by Senate, as an example, the shell of the program was approved first. The application piece for each college was approved afterwards. The Senate leadership has suggested that this model be followed regarding the General Education proposal. She reiterated that the proposal should be as clear as possible so that all involved can make an informed decision.

Devore would still like a second course approval checkpoint to make sure everything is being implemented in a reasonable way. It seems logical to ask the Senate to review a complete list of courses once all the tagging is done. Myers-Bowman asked whether the second approval checkpoint could be under the General Education Council and the “Administrators’ Council” once the proposal is approved by Faculty Senate. Spikes commented that it seems Academic Affairs could ask for an update later on in the process, from those involved, regarding the implementation. Representatives could be invited to the Academic Affairs committee meetings to give updates on the progress. If the process is not going well, then the Faculty Senate Leadership could be asked to address the issue. Charney referred to the approval flow chart. He suggested one of the diamonds that represents Senate approval could be eliminated. A lengthy discussion between committee members and visitors continued.

Carroll stated the responsibility of Academic Affairs now is to (1) approve or not approve the K-State 8 and (2) make recommendations regarding the implementation, tagging, and assessment. The latter tasks are not uniquely curriculum matters that Academic Affairs addresses.

Rintoul responded that he believes that assessment is part of our [committee’s] charge. He stated that the subcommittee’s report clarifies information that he argued was missing from the original report received by the GE task Force. With a new university administration coming in the near future, clarification regarding assessment is critical since updates alone are not sufficient.

Hendrix asked if we approve the [GE Program] shell, to whom will the assessment be delegated, if not Academic Affairs? Would it be the Provost or a designee? It seems uncertain, but surely the Assessment Office, which reports to the Provost, would have a role.

Myers-Bowman commented that this proposal is a framework, but it is not a degree program. She briefly discussed the university SLOs in regard to this framework and in relation to the content areas of the proposal.

Rintoul commented that it really comes down to “How”. How will this proposal be implemented? Where are the details and steps about how implementation will be done? He believes if the proposal is presented in this way, without any clarifications, senators will have these questions as well.

After much discussion, Carroll outlined what the committee’s options for approval.

Devore moved that Academic Affairs accept the revised proposal, dated December 12, and that the Academic Affairs Gen Ed subcommittee's report be included as supplemental material. He added the recommendation that Senate implement it according to the flow chart found on the last page of that attachment. The motion was seconded by Rogers. Carroll opened the floor for discussion.

Garcia commented that the proposal and the attachment seem like two competing plans. It creates confusion. She believes it muddies the waters, and that the attachment should be sent to whomever would execute the proposal, not the full Senate. Devore countered that the K-State 8 proposal by itself seems to be two different plans. After further discussion, Devore made a friendly amendment to his motion to replace the word "amends" with the phrase "reviews and/or amends" to the flowchart box that read, "*Academic Affairs amends the proposal*". There were no objections. Amendment was accepted. Rintoul made a friendly amendment that the text from the subcommittee report not go forward, but only the flowchart, with the aforementioned changes, be submitted along with the proposal to Faculty Senate for approval. His friendly amendment was accepted. After further discussion, Devore made an additional friendly amendment to approve the revised General Education Task Force Proposal, dated November 11, 2008, and to title the Academic Affairs flowchart document as "*Proposed K-State 8 General Education Implementation Plan*". There were no objections to this. Amended motion passed.

Spikes thanked the Academic Affairs committee and the General Education task force for their diligent efforts on this proposal and for the continued discussion of concerns regarding it. He reminded the committee that the Faculty Senate Leadership Council will have the opportunity for continued dialogue with the university's central administration about this proposal.

4. Course and Curriculum Changes –

A. General Education – A motion was made by Hendrix and seconded by Rogers to approve the following course for UGE status as approved by the UGE Council on October 30, 2008.

♦EDCEP 311 Guidance for the Paraprofessional (SHAPE)

Motion carried.

5. Graduation list additions – A motion was made by Turvey-Welch and seconded by King to approve to add the following graduation list additions:

James Elmer Tubach, Bachelor of Science, College of Arts and Sciences, August 1974

August 2008

David Alan Storey, Bachelor of Science, College of Technology and Aviation

Ivan R. Bowlin, Bachelor of Science, College of Technology and Aviation

Samuel R. Finan, Bachelor of Science, College of Technology and Aviation

Geffrey R. Garcia, Bachelor of Science, College of Technology and Aviation

Daniel J. Scott III, Bachelor of Science; Assoc. of Science in Applied Business; College of Technology and Aviation

Brian R. Zey, Bachelor of Science, Assoc. of Science in Applied Business, College of Technology and Aviation

Jason John Sorensen, Bachelor of Science, College of Technology and Aviation

Motion carried.

6. Committee Reports

A. Committee on Academic Policy and Procedures (CAPP) – Doris Carroll

CAPP will meet on the 11th. Rintoul reported the iSIS steering committee has not met since our last meeting.

B. Student Senate – Andrew Huschka

No report

C. University Library Committee – Scott Staggenborg

No report

7. Old Business

A. Instructor permission to enroll; Advising Flag in iSIS; Waitlist purging – **Attachment 3**

Carroll referred to attachment 3 as submitted by CAPP for approval by Academic Affairs. A motion was made by Rintoul and seconded by Charney to approve the request from CAPP. Concerns and questions were noted and addressed. One concern was what a student may or may not miss if the deadline is changed. Rintoul noted that this deadline change would be of assistance to office personnel and others in the trenches who are directly impacted. Motion carried.

8. For the good of the University

Carroll thanked the committee members again for their work on all issues that come before Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate. She encouraged committee members to attend the budget meetings the Provost has scheduled with each college. She encouraged them to be informed about what is going on and ask questions regarding the university budget.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Next meeting: February 17, 2009; 3:30 p.m.; Union 204