

MINUTES
KSU Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, January 24, 2023, 3:30 pm
K-State Student Union, Big 12 room
Zoom ID: 149 712 846; <https://ksu.zoom.us/j/149712846>

Present: Adams (Rebecca), Adams (Roger), Ahlers, Bach, Bennett, Berumen, Bishop, Blair, Blevins, Bowen (Sullivan), Brusk, Buffington, Caldas, Cassel, Craghead, Crawford, Crowell, Cunningham, DeRouchey, Disberger, Dodd, Douthit, Durtschi, Finkeldei, Gabbard, Gates, Genereux, Gragg, C. Grice, Haub, Hay McCammant, Hicks, Higginbotham, Higgins, Hiller, Hohenbary, C. Jackson, D. Jackson, Johnson, Jones (Chris), Kastner, Keen, Kempton, Kiss, Kliewer, Kohn, Korten, Kramer, Krysko, Launius, LeHew, Lehman, Leimkuehler, Liang, Littrell, Luly, Maseberg-Tomlinson, Mason, McCulloch, McGlynn, Miller, Moorberg, Nasser, Nutsch, Oetken, Oshnock, Payne, Porter, Presley, Raine, Rubin, Rys, Saucier, Savage, Schermerhorn, Scott, Seay, Self, Shappee, Smith Caldas, Stroot, Tarpoff, Thompson, Vardiman, Vipham, Von Bergen, Vulgamore, Wanklyn, Warren, Wefald, Wigfall, Wilken, Young, Yu-Oppenheimer, and Zecha

Absent: Chengappa and Graff

Proxies: Aakeroy, Baird, Bentley, Bitsie-Baldwin, R. Grice, Jones (Cassie), Jones (Chris – after 5 pm), Kohn (after 5 pm), Kramer (after 5 pm), Little, McCulloch (after 5 pm), Perez, Raine (after 5 pm), Rundus, Smith, Wilken (until 4 pm)

Guests/Visitors: Sherryl Allen, Barbara Anderson, Jenny Bormann, Tyler Bowen, Kelley Brundage, Bronwyn Fees, Tanya González, Dan Moser, Gwendolyn Sibley, Scott Tanona, Jonathan Ulmer, Marqueleta Wall, and Mark Wilkins

Parliamentarian: Daniel Ireton

1. President Saucier called the meeting to order and the Land Acknowledgment was played.
2. Approval of December 13, 2022 minutes
President Saucier inquired if there were any changes or corrections to the minutes of the December 13th meeting. Seeing none and with no objection, these were considered approved as submitted.

President Saucier thanked all for attending this special meeting. To make the best use of time, he wanted to share a few reminders and comments with all. The due date for potential amendments was January 9th. These potential amendments were shared with senators in advance of today's meeting so this should have allowed opportunity to review them. No amendments will be accepted from the floor of the senate meeting today, as was agreed to at the December meeting. Caucus position statements that were also received by January 9th have been shared in a supplemental informational file. Though we understand reference will be made to these statements reflecting their nature, it is not the intention to have caucus chairs read these in their entirety. Additionally, the Senate meetings are open, but **only faculty senators** may vote on a proposal. Only proxies submitted by 2 pm today are recognized. If you have not signed in via Zoom or on the attendance sheet outside the door; please do so. Lastly, we want to remember to be civil to each other during this process. We may not always agree with each other, but we are on the same team working for the same goal of providing excellent education to the students here at K-State and therefore we want to be respectful and courteous to one another.

3. Report from Academic Affairs

- A. Academic Affairs – Andy Bennett/Brandon Kliewer
- Proposed K-State General Education Core (for action) – **Attachment 1**
 - Tracked version of proposal – **Attachment 2**
 - i. Including retiring of the K-State 8
 - ii. Including proposed change to University Handbook, [Section F120](#)
 - iii. Including proposed process for creation of K-State General Education Council and routing for adding courses to the list of approved courses for different buckets (for action)
 - Proposed expedited process for course and curriculum changes related to becoming compliant with the K-State General Education Core (for action) - **Attachment 3**
 - Potential amendments to Proposed K-State General Education Core – **Attachment 4**

Senator Bennett shared with Faculty Senate that after attending a KBOR webinar the following message was sent to all those in attendance: “Thank you for attending the January 20th Webinar. While we will answer all the questions that were submitted at the webinar, I want to immediately follow up on the questions about using 3 electives in Bucket 7, the institutionally designated bucket. This does not conflict with the policy and guidance issued thus far. Thus, I did not express a concern about employing this concept during the Webinar. While this is the case, please note that the Board of Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) will likely discuss the institutionally designated bucket, Bucket 7, at its January 31st meeting as such. Please note that there may be additional guidance from BAASC on Bucket 7 in the very near future. Thanks, Daniel Archer, Vice President for academic affairs, Kansas Board of Regents.”

Given that there might be no changes after the January 31st meeting, Academic Affairs has decided to move forward with the original plan.

A question about the possibility of KBOR modifying the timeline was presented but Dr. Tanya González shared that they received a timeline explicitly saying what dates certain things need to be done so she does not anticipate an extension to the deadline.

Senator Bennett informed all that the FS Executive committee decided they would present Attachment 1 in two parts. He moved to approve part 1, which includes the following: to retire the K-State 8, there would be no university-wide requirements for BS vs. BA, and all general education courses in buckets 1-6 are at the 100- and 200-levels. Double dipping will be allowed, but students will need to meet 34 to 35 total credit hours. Performance courses will be accepted for Bucket 6, and Bucket 7 is designated as elective credit hours. Lastly, the University Handbook, Section F120 will be revised.

No second was needed since this was coming from committee.

Discussion: Senator Dodd moved to consider the first Amendment offered by the College of Arts and Sciences, it was seconded by Senator Adams. Senator Dodd expressed the DEIB amendment would update the list of courses and that it neither narrows nor expands the current array of courses. Another senator wanted to amplify Senator Dodd’s amendment. Senator Higgins doesn’t believe open or free electives should be the sole requirement for filling Bucket 7. He suggested that establishing Bucket 7 as electives alone would not appropriately reflect K-State’s commitment to student education and that we view general education requirements as less important. Senator Kohn also shared that it is appropriate that our vision and mission be reflected in general education requirements for recruitment and retention but also for creating meaningful actions that reflect the institutions values. KSU has experts in nearly all academic colleges and units that actively contribute to DEIB. If we value DEIB work, the inclusion of such would ensure that they are funded. Students would also benefit from a critical learning experience without the need to add additional courses.

Senator Keen opposes the motion, not in terms of opposing DEIB, but under the idea that if placed under bucket 7 this would prevent departments from being able to mandate the DEIB requirements. She suggests the institution should have the option to include them later in the curriculum rather than in the general core. Senator Warren also shared that with buckets one through six alone this is causing engineering students to lose six credit hours of general courses in exchange for the core mandate of upper credit courses. They do not see a practical reason for this amendment to be adopted.

A vote was conducted on the amendment to add DEIB to Bucket 7. A majority vote is needed for this amendment to pass. A secret ballot was requested. The votes were counted, and the amendment was rejected. No further discussion.

President Saucier called for further amendments.

Senator Dodd moved to consider the third amendment submitted from Arts & Sciences for adding ethical reasoning in Bucket 7. The rationale presented was similar to the DEIB amendment, this is to preserve the existing value of ethical reasoning within the K-State 8, which is going away. Motion was seconded by Senator Korten.

Discussion:

Senator Hicks presented that the advantages of a liberal arts education and the benefit of thinking of ethical issues comes from exposing students to a variety of classes and issues that goes beyond legal compliance and beyond professional codes of ethics. Why not recognize the importance of ethical reasoning today. The budget model, in combination with pressure to graduate students quickly, incentivizes department to minimize the number of courses taken in each college. Given KSU is a high-quality institution, Ethical Reasoning should be given its own course.

Senator Keen stated she appreciates the importance of ethics but encouraged the senate to not place those classes in Bucket 7 and to find an alternate solution. Senator Vulgamore presented a question regarding K-State's commitment to a multicultural overlay and wanted to know if the ethical reasoning requirement could fulfill the multicultural overlay. Senator Bennett shared the history behind the multicultural overlay and that with Dr. Johnson just recently being hired they would wait and see what direction she wanted to go with the multicultural overlay. Senator Warren shared that the subject of ethics is taught in a number of contexts. In engineering the curriculum is already stretched, and they are losing a lot of technical curriculum that will affect the quality of engineering programs. He does not think a required three-hour class is the right direction.

Senator Luly shared she would support this if DEIB and ethical reasoning could be offered at the upper levels. Senator Hicks agreed that including requirements into Bucket 7 does not guarantee every student will be reached but feels that we should not make perfection the enemy of the good. She reminded the Senate that they do not have to choose and can still address ethical reasoning in their courses while also offering a class dedicated to synthesizing the principles of ethical reasoning. Senator Douthit reminded everyone that many of the courses tagged with Ethical Reasoning only require one credit hour of content to fulfill that topic. Senator Gragg noted many classes which address ethical reasoning do so in the context of students' majors. She also pointed out that not only is there a restriction by KBOR on the framework of 34-35 hours but also a cap of 120 for degrees.

No further discussion, the motion to amend was rejected.

President Saucier called for a vote on the overall proposal.

It was asked what the alternative would be if this doesn't get approved today. Senator Bennett informed the senate that in the executive committee meeting, a fallback proposal was agreed to that does not mention Bucket 7. It was also commented we just vote everything down. Another senator noted that there can always be a motion to table.

Neither such motion was put in place and after no further discussion, President Saucier called for a vote. Motion carried.

Senator Bennett moved on to part two. He presented a motion to approve the addition to the Approval, Routing, and Notification (ARN) policy document as shown in attachment 1. The proposal calls for a General Education council to be formed, which would be comprised of Associate Deans for Academics at each undergraduate-serving college or campus or their designees. A General Education Committee Disciplinary Advisory Board will be formed for each of the general education areas. The disciplinary teams make recommendations but the general education council votes if a course moves forward to Academic Affairs, Exec, and full Senate. President Saucier reminded senators this motion does not need a second since it is coming from committee.

Senator Gragg moved for senators to consider the amendment submitted from the agriculture caucus related to the first paragraph of the proposed addition to the ARN policy document, which proposes having the General Education Council make the initial staggered appointments, rather than the provost.

Senator Bennett reminded the Senate that those initial members would be proposed by the provost but that as people rotated off the general education council would appoint new members. He explained that the amendment would make it so that the original appointments were also made by the general education council. He reported that Academic Affairs made this proposal for the initial appointments in the interest of efficiency and speed, rather than possibly waiting several months to get responses.

Senator Gragg elaborated on the rationale behind the amendment as expressed in the materials.

Senator McCammant shared that they have reached out to associate deans, and she yielded her time to Dan Moser, Associate Dean in the College of Agriculture. He supported the idea that this process could be done in quick order if necessary. Senator Kramer wanted clarification over the need for this amendment and whether in the past was there a specific college that was not represented. Senator Gragg shared that in terms of the multicultural overlay committee, agriculture was not included although they have an office dedicated to diversity. They wanted to make sure that did not happen again.

Senator McCammant shared that other colleges had multiple representation while agriculture and architecture were not represented, which is why they request the associate deans select the faculty for the general education council to ensure equitable representation.

President Saucier called to vote on the amendment that the general education council select the representatives rather than the provost office. The amendment carried.

Senator McGlynn moved for senators to consider the Architecture, Planning, and Design amendment number one. They are proposing to clarify the procedure when a discipline or a subject area has been proposed for inclusion in the core. He noted that the first bullet point in the ARN language discusses the process for adding courses for inclusion, that will be sent on to the general education council. Their amendment includes additional language, which similarly to bullet point three, just says that general council does not forward the proposal to the advisory board instead it decides directly to if they recommend the discipline or subject for inclusion. Senator Gabbard seconded the motion to amend.

Discussion:

Senator Bennett shared that some disciplines will be added so the notion of not asking the general education council for information if a major discipline change comes through seems odd.

Senator Gabbard added that much has been said about K-State 8. It was something created by K-State faculty but this general education change, they feel, is being forced upon the faculty and does not allow our values. The selective nature in this idea of general education is problematic. He asked the Senate how it can be made so that all students can make it through the curriculum without having to majorly rethink what they are going to do with their lives.

There was a point of clarification requested on the role of the General Education Council. Senator Bennett reminded all that the role of the advisory board is to advise. The General Education council will vote on whether to send something forward or not based on a report from the advisory council. The report does not stop or guarantee the process, the vote of the General Education Council will decide what moves forward.

Senator Cunningham suggested that language in the amendment should clearly specify the process. If there isn't clear language it can cause confusion later when trying to be applied.

Senator Gabbard paraphrased what Senator Bennett stated and reiterated that they do not want an advisory board to exclude a certain discipline from participating in general education.

Senator Littrell conveyed a comment from the chat and Senator LeHew followed up on her initial comment as well that if a new discipline is being considered, then that means it will not be represented in the advisory board, so they won't have someone supporting their case. Senator Dodd pointed out that it looks like there are two things being presented. One is to clarify that the third bullet not only pertain to courses but should also imply pertaining to disciplines. The other question alluded to the budget model being a threat that we all perceive when addressing general education. If this amendment is defeated, then at the next meeting this issue could be reconsidered. The parliamentarian reminded the Senate that at the next meeting the normal Senate rules would be back in place.

A few options for addressing this amendment were discussed by senators and the parliamentarian. It was suggested perhaps key language could be added to the existing bullet. We are under specials rules today regarding amendments though, which was approved by a two-thirds vote previously. However, Senator LeHew does not believe adding the discipline to the bullet point is going to work because, as she understands it, if there is a new discipline there would be no one there to represent the discipline. Senator Bennett noted that the final vote would come from General Education Council where every discipline would be represented.

Senator Douthit clarified that not all disciplines would be represented in the advisory board. She also questioned the ability to have two amendments that seem contradictory. There was further discussion. Senator Bennett commented that the amendment only changes the advisory board for disciplines and not for courses. Senator McGlynn clarified their college does not oppose to the advisory board for course approval, they are just wanting to clarify that it is a process for disciplines and subject areas as well as courses.

After conversation continued further on this topic, it was inquired if it was possible to table this amendment, then perhaps suspend the rules for today and come back to this if that passed. Yes. Senator Dodd moved to lay this amendment on the table. Motion was seconded by Von Bergen. Motion carried.

Senator Dodd then moved to suspend the special rules that were put in place for amendments today. Motion was seconded by Senator Smith Caldas. Senators were reminded this motion need a two-thirds vote to pass. Motion to suspend the rules for today passed.

Senator Dodd moved to amend by adding the word discipline within the third bullet in the appropriate place. Senator Cunningham seconded the amendment.

Senator Nutsch wanted clarification. Does adding the word discipline to the third bullet do the opposite of the original amendment put forward by architecture. Senator McGlynn clarified that this would create the same process for discipline inclusion as for course inclusion and this amended language would clarify this process.

President Saucier called for a vote. The amendment carried.

It was asked if we can and should now bring the Architecture, Planning and Design amendment back to the table. President Saucier inquired if there was such a motion to bring the Architecture, Planning, and Design amendment off the table. Senator McGlynn moved, and Senator Gabbard seconded. Motion carried to bring the amendment off the table.

President Saucier opened the floor for further discussion. Seeing none, he called for a vote on the amendment from Architecture, Planning and Design. The amendment was rejected.

President Saucier called for the vote on the second part of the proposal, as amended (by Agriculture and Senator Dodd). Motion carried.

Senator Bennett reported there is one final item to vote on today. Attachment 3, the proposed expedited process for course and curriculum changes related to becoming compliant with the K-State General Education Core. Senator Bennett moved to approve. No seconded is needed since this is coming from committee.

Senator Bennett provided a brief overview of the proposal. We are proposing that changes necessary to make your curricula compliant with the K-State General Education Core can be considered expedited, even if they have impacts on other units. However, if at some point during the process a certain proposal is deemed to need the full process, it can be requested, and FS Academic Affairs can agree to that. Even now, this is infrequent. As noted in the document, this is for a limited time. No amendments were submitted for this proposal.

With no discussion, President Saucier called to take the vote. Motion carried.

Senator Yu congratulated the co-chairs of academic affairs with "Buckets of Gratitude."

4. Announcements - none
5. Open discussion period for senators as needed - none
6. The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted by:
Graciela Berumen
Faculty Senate Secretary

Next meeting: Tuesday, February 14, 2023; 3:30 pm