

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty Senate Academic Affairs**  
**February 19, 2002 3:30 pm K-State Union, Room 204**

Present: Haddock, Herald, Molt, Olsen, Pesci, Selfridge, Smith, Spears, Yagerline

Absent: Callahan, Mortensen, Roush, Schlup,

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Jackie Spears, Chair, at 3:35 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes of February 5, 2002 Academic Affairs Committee meeting.

A motion was made by Smith and seconded by Selfridge to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2002 Academic Affairs meeting. Motion passed.

III. Announcements - none

IV. Course and Curriculum Changes

A. Undergraduate Education

1. A motion was made by Selfridge and seconded by Yagerline to approve Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Architecture, Planning and Design January 31, 2002.

CHANGE in course prerequisites:

ARCH 248	Building Science
ARCH 302	Architectural Design Studio I
ARCH 348	Structural Systems in Architecture I
ARCH 403 and ARCH 404	Architectural Design Studio III and IV
ARCH 413	Environmental Systems in Architecture I

Motion passed.

B. Graduate Education

1. A motion was made by Yagerline and seconded by Olsen to approve Graduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by Graduate Council February 5, 2002.

CHANGE

AT 820	Thermal and Barrier Properties of Textiles
--------	--

DROP

AP 778	Respiratory Function in Health and Disease
AP 860	Neuroscience
RRES 756	Design of Parks and Recreation Areas

NEW

CS 871	Fundamentals of Feedlot Health and Management
--------	---

New Graduate Certificate - Certificate Program in Feedlot Production Management

New Degree - Master of Public Health

Motion passed.

C. General Education - none

V. Old Business

A. Course and Curriculum Changes

1. On-line form filler/paper format - John Selfridge

Selfridge had nothing new to report on the on-line form filler/paper format.

2. Format for Course and Curriculum Changes

Selfridge said there was nothing new to report on the format for course and curriculum changes. Molt mentioned that she had a faculty member ask if notification was sent to departments when courses changes passed Faculty Senate. Since there is no notification process, Academic Affairs members agreed that it would be best if faculty ask senators from their college about whether course and curriculum changed passed in Faculty Senate.

B. Academic definitions

Spears said there was nothing new to report on this issue.

C. Exams Scheduled Outside of Regular Class Times

Spears reported that this issue was discussed at CAPP. They agreed to remove the requirement that faculty have to cancel the class before an evening test and have the faculty be responsible for making sure class time does not exceed the Board of Regents requirement. Academic Affairs members agreed this is a monitoring issue that hasn't been communicated before. Students will need to be the ones to monitor class time and complain if instructors have more contact hours than allowed. With space for classes being tight and demands on students' time being much greater than in the past, this policy is fair to everyone. CAPP is willing to let the 800 and 900 level classes schedule evening exams if students agree to it, but not other courses. CAPP is willing to let Academic Affairs rewrite the policy and then bring it back to them for review.

CAPP is also looking into scheduling class meeting times from 7:30 a.m. through 10:30 p.m. Night classes will have to fit into guidelines similar to those used in scheduling day classes. Registrar's Office checked on starting times for classes and during the evening there are classes starting every five minutes. Hopefully, more classroom space will be freed up with classes being regularly scheduled throughout the day. Smith asked if regularly scheduled exams would take precedent over ORC exams. There could be a conflict between the two policies. Academic Affairs members agreed not to move ahead with the Policy for Exams Scheduled Outside of Regular Class Times until CAPP has figured out what they will do with the class time schedule. Spears will report to Faculty Senate where the issue is and that the out of class exams will be brought to Senate along with the new class schedule.

Spears reported that CAPP would prefer that no classes be allowed to grandfather in anything that does not fit in the policy for evening exams. Spears agreed to invite department heads that have exams outside of regular class times come to the next Academic Affairs meeting to discuss the concerns brought up by students and Faculty Senate.

D. Semester Final Examinations

Spears reported that CAPP discussed a revised semester final examination schedule.

E. Credit hour requirements for graduating with honors

Spears said this issue was still at CAPP and has not been discussed.

F. Plus/Minus System

Spears reported that Danny Callahan, the SGA representative, talked with students and got a 50/50 split on the plus/minus system. Students want to have the plus with grades but not the minus. CAPP felt there was little reason to take this issue up. Academic Affairs members agreed that until students are willing to have both the plus and minus figured in with grades there was no reason to bring this issue to Faculty Senate. Spears said she would talk to the faculty member that brought this issue to her.

G. Secondary Majors and Minors

CAPP wants to have the directors of the programs that offer secondary majors and minors come to CAPP and report on how many students are affected by the current graduation rules. Students have to complete secondary majors and minors at the same time that they graduate with their major degree.

H. Line Schedule Issues - no report

I. Report from the Advising Enhancement Task Force

Spears reported that the data from the fall semester advising study should be out soon. The data in the Advising Enhancement Task Force Report is very limited and Academic Affairs members agreed that it is hard to tell how widespread the problem is. The Provost has postponed appointing members to an Advising Council until he has the results from the fall study. The data from fall semester will give an analysis of each department's advising. Spears will be meeting with Provost Coffman and Vicki Clegg in ten days to discuss the issues. Academic Affairs members agreed to wait until they had the fall semester data before moving forward with this issue.

VI. New Business

A. Approve Graduation List and additions to graduation list:

1. A motion was made by Herald and seconded by Molt to approve the December 2001 Graduation List. Motion carried.

2. A motion was made by Herald and seconded by Yagerline to approve additions to the December 2001 Graduation List:

December 2001

Jeremy Ryan Claeys, Arts & Sciences, BS - Mass Communications-EL

Eric Douglas Doty, Human Ecology, BS - Hotel & Restaurant Management

Linda M. Henry, Arts & Sciences, BS - Social Science

Travis D. Hunsicker, Arts & Sciences, BS - Geology

Jason Jarrett Knoll, Arts & Sciences, BS - Social Science

Travis Dean Lenkner, Arts & Sciences, BS - Mass Communications-PR

Heather Dawn Nippert, Arts & Sciences, BS - Fisheries & Wildlife Biology - WB

Robert Shannon Patterson, Arts & Sciences, BS - Social Science

Raymond Penner, Arts & Sciences, BS - Psychology

Ashley D. Sutton, BS in Business Administration - Marketing and International Business

Motion passed.

B. Need for catalog revision stating number of upper level credit hours required

Spears reported that the Board of Regents wanted to increase upper level courses required to graduate to 54 hours. Most programs at KSU don't require more than 40 hours of upper level courses. She said that 88 - 89% of students have more than 54 hours of upper level courses when they graduate. Currently, there is no policy in the Board of Regents Policy Manual regarding the number of upper level courses. Until the Board of Regents has this policy in their manual, Academic Affairs will not address on the issue.

VII. Committee Reports

A. Pesci report on General Education Council

Pesci reported that the General Education Council will meet on Thursday and will review classes for general education.

B. Haddock report on University Library Committee

Haddock reported that the University Library Committee had not met since the last Academic Affairs meeting so there was nothing new to report.

C. Spears report on Committee on Academic Policy and Procedures (CAPP)

Spears said that she had covered almost everything that was discussed at CAPP earlier in the meeting. They are working on how to help international students pre-enroll when they come over on an exchange program. They get locked out of many classes and are only here one or two semesters. CAPP is working with the Registrar's Office, International Programs, and Lafene Student Health for their tuberculin screening.

VIII. For the Good of the University

There were no items for the good of the university.

IX. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Date: February 19, 2002

**ATTENDANCE SHEET  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS  
2001-2002**

- Danny Callahan/~~Sean McGivern~~ in Tupelka today
- Mike Haddock
- Tom Herald
- Mary Molt
- Norm Mortensen
- Charlotte Shoup Olsen
- Patrick Pesci
- Jim Roush
- John Schlup
- John Selfridge
- Fred Smith
- Jackie Spears (Chair)
- Joyce Yagerline

Visitor(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



Assessment and Program Review  
 226 Anderson Hall  
 Manhattan, KS 66506-0103  
 785-532-5712  
 Fax: 785-532-2120

## MEMORANDUM

To: Jackie Spears

From: Ron Downey, Associate Provost, and Director, Assessment and Program Review *RWD/JK*

RE: Future status of UGE Portfolio Assessment Project

Date: February 22, 2002

The Portfolio Assessment Committee was charged with implementing the pilot studies over two years as outlined in the 1999 "Feasibility Study and Implementations Proposal for a Portfolio Assessment: Study Achievement of Critical Thinking, Communication Skills, and Educated Habits" ([www.ksu.edu/catl/uge/portpro.htm](http://www.ksu.edu/catl/uge/portpro.htm)). At the completion of the pilot process, the committee will report to Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate who will consider fully implementing the process (Fall, 2001). As cited in the above document,

A formal review process will take place after the Experimental Stage (early Fall, 2000). The Faculty Committee appointed by Academic Affairs to oversee this project (described elsewhere in the proposal) will provide a summary report to the UGE Implementation Task Force, Academic Affairs, and ultimately to Faculty Senate for approval to proceed with the Implementation Phase. The review process will focus on the effectiveness of the portfolio process (student volunteers, quality of information and scoring rubrics, etc.), faculty commitment and interest, and determine if the portfolio process will be used to assess student achievement of UGE goals ([www.ksu.edu/catl/uge/portpro.htm](http://www.ksu.edu/catl/uge/portpro.htm)).

Several reports have been published on the milestones of the UGE Portfolio Assessment Project. All links to these reports are listed ([http://www.ksu.edu/apr/generaled\\_assess/gened\\_assess.htm](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/generaled_assess/gened_assess.htm)) within the APR website.

**Note:** The "?" mark in these statements (e.g., [www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/?](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/?)) indicates that the web page is being built for these reports. As soon as they are completed, we will e-mail them to you.

- Status Report of the UGE Portfolio Assessment Committee, October 2000  
([www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/Report-Fall2000.PDF](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/Report-Fall2000.PDF))
- UGE Status Meeting July 19, 2001  
([www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/))
- Status Report of the UGE Portfolio Assessment Committee, October 2001  
([www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/))

Components of the Review Process of the Portfolio Project:

1. Effectives of the portfolio process

- From the October 2000 Status Report, most of the findings from Pilot Study A of this project would not support the effectiveness of the portfolio process ([www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/Report-Fall2000.PDF](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/Report-Fall2000.PDF)). Some supporting statements from this document are: “Too much is expected of the portfolio assessment process,” “Many of the portfolio s are incomplete and inadequate for scoring,” and “There were serious flaws in the original design of attempting to evaluate the effect of UGE courses on development of students’ writing.”
- From the October 2001 Status Report, most of the findings from Pilot Study B would not support the effectiveness of the portfolio process ([www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/)). For example, the small sample sizes for the portfolio writing sample, CAAP exam, and UGE interviews were insufficient to produce reliable results. “The committee was unclear how informed decisions could be made about the effectiveness of the CAAP exam, UGE interviews, and writing samples with the limited number of samples collected.”

2. Faculty commitment and interest

- From the October 2000 Status Report, there is support for faculty commitment and interest in the portfolio project, such as faculty volunteering from various departments to participate on a Summer Assessment Team ([www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/Report-Fall2000.PDF](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/Report-Fall2000.PDF)).

- In order to maintained faculty commitment and interest, the Portfolio Committee recommended “Colleges and Departments become involved in the recruitment, retention, and coordination of future students participants” (October 2001 Status Report, ([www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/)?)).
3. Whether the portfolio process will be used to assess student achievement of UGE goals
- From the October 2000 Status Report, most of the findings from Pilot Study A of this project would not support the object of assessing student achievement ([www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/Report-Fall2000.PDF](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/Report-Fall2000.PDF)). For example, it was found that “[t]here were no major differences between the writing samples of first-year students and seniors.”
  - From the October 2001 Status Report, most of the findings from Pilot Study B of this project would not support the object of assessing student achievement ([www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/)?). For example, “[o]nly the highly-motivated and committed students participated in the study; these students are not representative of the student population.”

Below is a sample list of recommendations provided by the Portfolio Assessment Committee in their October 2001 Status Report ([www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/](http://www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/)?):

- A much larger sample of portfolios needs to be gathered and evaluated before this assessment process would have validity. If this is not possible, this type of assessment should not be repeated.
- Portfolios should contain no more than five papers. No papers should be accepted without an assignment so scorers will more easily be able to evaluate the extent to which the student responded to the assignment. No short answer assignments should be submitted; assignments should be a minimum of two pages each.
- Students who participate in the entire process should be paid more money. A stipend of \$50 was suggested for the submission process and additional stipends should be considered for other assessment elements (interviews, CAAP exam, etc.).
- Students participant in the assessment process during only one semester; the current 8-month process seems too cumbersome.



- The UGE Portfolio Committee recommended Colleges and Departments become involved in the recruitment, retention, and coordination of future student participants. It was suggested colleges select a specific number of courses for student participation. The students enrolled in the courses could be asked to voluntarily participate in collecting the necessary student assessment measures. Further follow-up and discussion with Faculty Senate Leadership and the Provost staff is needed to establish this model.
- Representation from all Colleges is needed on the UGE Portfolio Assessment Committee. The time commitment of 2-years has expired; this issue of committee membership needs to be addressed by The Faculty Senate's Academic Affairs Committee. A potential obstacle is having all the current UGE Portfolio Assessment Committee Members leave the Committee en masse which would lead to a loss of continuity and history of faculty called to serve, which would result in a significant amount of preparation time and coordination to acquaint new members with the current status of the UGE assessment project.

The Academic Affairs Committee will need to review and address the findings related to each of the review components for the portfolio project. To enter the next phase of the assessment process, we need input from Academic Affairs. This needs to be done in the near future if we are to continue this very valuable and needed process.

CC: Jim Coffman, Cia Verschelden, and Patricia Marsh

**Subject: Future status of UGE Portfolio Assessment Project**

**Date: Fri, 22 Feb 2002 16:28:25 -0600 (CST)**

**From: Patricia Marsh <pmarsh@ksu.edu>**

**To: Jacqueline D Spears <jdspears@ksu.edu>**

**CC: Ronald G Downey <downey@ksu.edu>, James R Coffman <provost@ksu.edu>, Cia Verschelden <cia@ksu.edu>**

Dear Jackie Spears,

As mentioned in a memo from Ron Downey entitled "Future status of UGE Portfolio Assessment Project," there was a note about two web sites for UGE-related documents. The web pages have been built and the addresses are listed below:

1. UGE Portfolio Status Report Oct 2001  
www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/ugeportstatrptoct2001.htm
2. UGE status meeting - 07/19/01  
www.ksu.edu/apr/relatedlinks/ugestatmtg071901.htm

Please let me know if you have any problems accessing these documents.

Patricia

\*\*\*\*\*

Patricia A. Marsh  
 Coordinator, Assessment & Program Review  
 Kansas State University  
 226 Anderson Hall  
 Manhattan, KS 66506  
 Phone: 785.532.5712  
 FAX: 785.532.2120  
 pmarsh@ksu.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

"Assessment of student learning begins with educational values"