

MINUTES
Faculty Senate Academic Affairs
November 4, 2008, 3:30 p.m.
K-State Student Union, Room 206

Present: Carroll, Charney, Chengappa, Devore, Hendrix, King, Rintoul, Roberts, Staggenborg, Turvey-Welch

Absent: Huschka, Rogers, Sump

Guests: General Education Task Force members: Karen Myers-Bowman, Vicki Clegg, Greg Eiselein, Judy Hughey, Kerri Day Keller, Brian Kovar, Greg Zolnerowich. Fred Fairchild, Monty Nielsen, Frank Spikes, Dennis Law

1. Doris Carroll, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
2. A motion was made by Chengappa and seconded by Roberts to approve the October 21, 2008 minutes. Motion carried.
3. General Education Task Force Presentation on "The K-State 8: General Education Program"
Several members of the General Education Task Force were in attendance to give a presentation regarding the history and process of how the current proposal came in to creation. Greg Z. began the presentation by giving a detailed outline of the process and history. Karen continued on with a review of the current proposal. In view of the several discussions with Academic Affairs committee members and the concerns presented, the task force reviewed the proposal with these in mind. Karen highlighted possible alternates to the version Academic Affairs has been reviewing. The revised version has changes regarding the tagging of courses; a change to the title of the Global Community area. It also now focuses more on the eight areas versus credit minimums. Karen then discussed the possible leadership structure that could be put in place to implement the new program. Also considered was the assessment portion of the new general education proposal.

Carroll thanked members the task force for being present and opened the floor for comments and questions. Dean Dennis Law thanked the task force for their diligent efforts in working on this. He thanked them for their willingness to be flexible in even making alterations at this late stage in the process. He urged Academic Affairs committee members to act on this today so it can be moved through the rest of the process. President Fred Fairchild also thanked the task force and committee for their efforts.

Comments/Questions:

Rintoul – Recognition of engineering, agronomy, architecture, biology, etc.... interaction of humans with the environment. Where is that in the proposal? Greg Z. responded it has been woven into four different content areas. Rintoul felt this should be a separate area. Karen mentioned the task force discussed this thoroughly and they felt it would be stronger if it was included in more than just one area. Rintoul commented that a student could go through the entire eight areas and may still not have been exposed to this important area.

Charney – Concerned about the matter of how the university can "spread the load" so to speak. He would like for Architecture be able to participate in offering general education courses and not just have their students' reach out to other colleges to complete their general education. Greg Z. commented that having these courses tagged across campus will hopefully allow a more equal offering between colleges. Charney also responded that schools with professional programs may be not as able to offer general education courses because of having requirements that would limit a non-major student from enrolling.

A lengthy discussion also took place regarding assessment and how general education courses would be chosen. Karen and Vicki reminded committee members that the assessment being discussed is not of the courses themselves, but of the students learning. There is a separate assessment committee working on that portion.

Devore commented that he agrees in principle with the general education mechanism. He does feel technology should be a section, but he stated the alternate version of this proposal seems better. He would like time to review the alternate changes made to the proposal prior to sending a final version to Faculty senate.

Charney thanked the task force for the strides taken to alter the current proposal. He asked the question: Where is the “fail-safe”? Vicki responded that there is a general education program already in place, but the health of it is weakening. Staggenborg mentioned their college had a meeting and discussed this proposal and all but one was in favor of it. The tagging process was what concerned a lot of the faculty. However, with the changes to the proposal outlined today, that concern has been addressed. What happens though if the proposal is passed and then it’s not working after a few years? Greg E. responded that it seems the proposal needs to be passed first and then the tagging needs to go forward and it needs to be done by the department. If things are not working as they should after time passes, review the process. During his comments, he also addressed several of the other concerns and questions brought up today.

Turvey-Welch made a motion to put the proposal on the table. Chengappa seconded the motion. After a brief discussion, Turvey-Welch withdrew motion. Turvey-Welch made a motion to have the General Education Task Force bring the proposal back to Academic Affairs with the alternative changes integrated as outlined today. Chengappa seconded it. Motion carried.

Carroll thanked all in attendance for their input and encouraged continued dialogue between committee members and the task force. Vicki wanted to clarify that when the proposal comes here to Academic Affairs next time, if the committee feels strongly about making a change to the proposal, it can be made by this committee. Carroll thanked her for that clarification. Charney seconded everything Carroll stated about the continued dialogue between the task force and Academic Affairs committee members. It is important for this to take place so that when the proposal is put into place all are clear on how to convey this to students and advisors, etc.

4. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm

Next meeting: November 18, 2008; 3:30 p.m.; Union room 204