

MINUTES
Faculty Senate Academic Affairs
January 20, 2009, 3:30 p.m.
K-State Student Union, Room 204

Present: Carroll, Charney, Chengappa, Devore, Garcia, Hendrix, Huschka, King, Rintoul, Sump, Turvey-Welch

Absent: Rogers, Staggenborg

Visitors: Vicki Clegg, Karen Myers-Bowman, and Monty Nielsen

1. Doris Carroll, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Carroll welcomed Jane Garcia, who will be replacing Kevin Roberts.
2. December 16, 2008 minutes (composed from electronic votes) – Informational item
3. General Education Task Force; Revised proposal – **Attachment 1**
Carroll referred to the revised proposal from the Gen Ed task force that came to the committee on Dec. 16.
4. Academic Affairs Sub group report for General Ed proposal – **Attachment 2**
Carroll deferred to the subcommittee for more information regarding the report they submitted after meeting over winter break. Rintoul briefly went through the items they clarified and spoke about issues that the taskforce did not touch on in their proposal because it was not their charge to do so. He thanked them again for their efforts on the proposal. The subcommittee was provided with a fair amount of resources from the Office of Planning and Analysis. They researched those and included their thoughts on them within their report. It was noted that some assessment is done at the institutional level, not the course level. This is an institutional responsibility. Rintoul suggested reviewing this document in more detail prior to putting it forward to the full faculty senate. Carroll opened the floor for comment and questions. Garcia mentioned confusion over the assessment portion, whether it is for the overall outcomes for the program, or the student's view of their learning experience, etc. Rintoul agreed that has been part of the confusion because it was charged to the task force not to include any assessment procedures in their proposal and therefore it isn't really clear how the program is to be assessed. The hope is there will be alignment or a thread to tie the assessment of general education and other parts of education here at the university together. There was a question about how the Higher Learning Commission views general education assessment. Clegg commented briefly that the revised proposal from the task force touches on assessment and what is already being done and what work is in progress. Rintoul referred to a link within the subcommittee report and suggested that committee members review it: <http://nsse.iub.edu/index.cfm>. Charney commented that this subcommittee report speaks to the "missing link" of what comes after the proposal is passed by Faculty Senate.

Carroll wanted to address the revised proposal sent by the Gen Ed Task Force on December 16. She asks the committee whether we should move forward with the revised proposal and the subcommittee report. Turvey-Welch suggested sending forward the revised proposal and the subcommittee report as a "white paper" for consideration. Rintoul wants to make certain that when the proposal is passed and has more added to it, as far as process goes, that it comes back to Academic Affairs for follow up. Devore also echoed these sentiments. Carroll encouraged committee members to thoroughly review the subcommittee report and the revised proposal from the Gen Ed task force so that action may be possible at the next Academic Affairs meeting in February. She then commented that, as an institution, we are still learning about assessment and the full scope of what is involved in that process. Charney expressed that it is very important to have faculty support of this and Rintoul concurred. The greater clarity we can have to put forward regarding this proposal, the better it will be once implemented and the time will have been well spent. Turvey-Welch commented that this deserves a first and second reading at the faculty senate. All were in agreement.

Carroll wanted to thank the subcommittee for their hard work, especially over the winter break.

5. Course and Curriculum Changes
 - A. Undergraduate Education
 1. A motion was made by Chengappa and seconded by Turvey-Welch to approve the following course and curriculum changes as approved by the College of Human Ecology on December 8, 2008 (see approval sheets for further details):

COURSE CHANGES

General Human Ecology

Add:

GNHE 210 Foundation of Human Ecology

GNHE 410 Seminar in Human Ecology

CURRICULUM CHANGES

General Human Ecology

Changes to B.S. in Human Ecology; General Human Ecology

See page 3 of approval sheets for rationale.

- Add GNHE 210 and 410 to Human Ecology courses under Professional studies
- Professional studies credit hours from ~~63~~ to 66.
- Unrestricted elective credit hours from ~~21-22~~ to 18-19.
- Total credit hours for graduation remain the same.

Changes to B.S. in Human Ecology; Consumer Sciences Teacher Licensure Program:

See page 4-5 of approval sheets for rationale.

- Remove CHM 210 and 230 from General requirements.
- Add GNHE 210 and 410 to Professional studies.
- Move HN 352 to be under required Human Ecology courses within Professional studies.
- Change wording under Professional studies to: ~~Two~~ One of the following courses, ~~each from a different department.~~
- Total credit hours for graduation will change from ~~129-134~~ to 132-133.

Motion carried.

6. Graduation list addition – A motion was made by Charney and seconded King by to approve to add the following addition to the May 2008 list: Jordan Camille Brinkman, Bachelor of Science, College of Arts and Sciences. Motion carried.
7. Committee Reports
 - A. Committee on Academic Policy and Procedures (CAPP) – Doris Carroll
CAPP met on January 14 and the proposed change to the final exam schedule policy, which would include non-standard class time requests, was reviewed. A first reading of changes took place and it is not likely to get on Academic Affairs agenda until the end of February or March. Sump briefly reviewed again the challenges that come to light when non-standard class times don't fit within the scheduling grid for final exams. CAPP is trying to finalize language to aid in this process. Rintoul suggested that possibly the form for non-standard time requests ask whether a final exam is given for that course. This would provide more information than previously given.
 - B. Student Senate – Andrew Huschka
Their first meeting will be this Thursday. Upcoming: Student Senate will be holding a campaign week to inform students of what is going on in student senate and encourage them to get more involved. During this time, Lynn Jenkins will be speaking regarding higher education and its future challenges and a question and answer session will follow. This will be during the week of Feb 16 and will most likely be on Monday or Tuesday of that week.
 - C. University Library Committee – Scott Staggenborg
No report.
8. New Business
 - A. Instructor permission to enroll; Advising Flag in iSIS; Waitlist purging
Changes in the deadlines are being requested by the iSIS task force for these listed items. It has been noted that by moving the deadline to a later date this allows a little more flexibility for both students and advisors. Nielsen highlighted the steps that are involved in this process and commented how it creates a bottleneck for deans' offices. There are pros and cons to changing this. Also, Sump mentioned one situation that comes up is a class could fill up past capacity and then the instructor is calling with a need for a bigger classroom and there isn't one available. Huschka commented it seems that by having either 10 class days or 14 calendar days as the deadline

this may alleviate some of the problems. A question was raised about the advising flag. The advising flag prevents the student from enrolling until it is lifted by the advisor. It was the decision of committee members that CAPP should submit a formal request to Academic Affairs. It was decided they could do this electronically and the committee could then vote on this via email. All were in agreement with this.

9. For the good of the University

Charney requested an update from Nielsen regarding how submission of final grades went this semester. Nielsen said overall it went very well.

Charney mentioned that due to one student's family misinterpreting the on line University Calendar and when classes ended the student missed the final exam. He mentioned that possibly the calendar could state the week classes end, but also somehow indicate that finals are to follow the week after. This is also something for instructors to be aware of.

Carroll reminded the committee that the second presidential candidate for Kansas State University will be here this week and the public forum will be Thursday, January 22, at 3:30 p.m. in Student Union's Forum Hall (ground floor). Also, the Provost and his staff will be coming to individual colleges to discuss the budget issues. Carroll encouraged members to participate in the meeting that takes place in their respective colleges.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

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