

MINUTES
Faculty Senate Academic Affairs
September 7, 2010, 3:30 p.m.
K-State Student Union, Room 204

Present: Baillargeon, Bennett, Cox, Easton, Hornsby, Moser, Roberts, Sachs, Spears, and Zajac

Absent: DeRouchey, Ganta, and Oliver

Guests: Fred Burrack, Vicki Clegg, John Devore, Monty Nielsen

1. Dan Moser, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Introductions were made.
2. The May 18, 2010 minutes were approved as submitted.
3. K-State 8 Assessment proposal – Vicki Clegg
Moser began by introducing where the K-State 8 is. The program itself has been approved by Faculty Senate and course tagging has been done and now the assessment piece is being proposed to go through Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate. Clegg and Burrack talked with members individually over the summer and got feedback and revised the proposal with that feedback. The proposal was submitted for review and is here today for a vote. It is being proposed as part of the senior survey (which will be rewritten and a committee will be composed soon)

Hornsby has concern over using a survey to assess breadth of knowledge. Skewed toward and biased by memory, etc. Systematic bias could cause the evaluation process to be flawed. Discussion ensued about this topic. Will the questions used in the survey be more pointed than just asking about their feelings? The comment was made that they have no base line to compare to if they don't do a starter survey, etc. Also, content learning is very different from class to classes.

Burrack indicated surveys can be sorted by college etc. and that might give instructors an indication whether a course may need improvement.

The comment was made this seems to assess students' perceptions. But that is part of the intention ... to get their perception of whether or not classes fulfilled broadening their knowledge base.

Zajac remarked we want to know if a student has had a "sense" of the areas, such as ethics; quantitative reasoning... etc. Does that student realize that we've touched on these particular points? The question was raised though about how it will be fixed if students, through the survey, indicate they haven't learned enough?

Differences of view point were shared by committee members regarding how they believe the assessment process should be administered.

Sachs moved and Zajac seconded that the K-State 8 Assessment proposal as presented be approved by Academic Affairs and moved forward to Senate. Bennett moved to amend the proposal to change page 2, paragraph 5, second sentence, from reading "some majority" to read "68%". Easton seconded. Amendment carried. Zajac asked for clarification regarding the sample questions. These are not the exact questions to be used, but can senators still view them as examples? Yes, these will go along with the proposal itself to senate. Easton also had one more concern on page 2, paragraph 1 about the first question regarding effectiveness. Spears offered that this be altered to say: "1) Determining students' perceptions as to the contribution of the K-State 8 to their breadth of understanding in and beyond their disciplinary areas of study." This would make it in line with the rest of the document. All were in agreement of this change. Amendment carried. Zajac made a motion and Easton seconded to add a third purpose on page 2, paragraph 1 to read: "3) Suggest corrective action for weaknesses identified in the assessment." Also change the word "two" to read "three" on page 2, paragraph 1. Amendment carried. Motion with amendments passed.

4. Course and Curriculum Changes

A. Undergraduate Education –

1. Approve the following curriculum drop as approved by the College of Arts and Sciences on February 4, 2010:

Dean of Arts and Sciences

- Drop: Associate of Arts for Military Personnel *

Rationale: This degree has not been used in the past 10+ years

*This drop was inadvertently left off the February 16, 2010 Academic Agenda and was to be acted on at the same time the drop of the Associate of Science for Military Personnel was.

Monty Nielsen, Registrar, requested (on behalf of emails sent to him from DCE and in correspondence with Arts & Sciences) to remove this item from the agenda at this point in time due to concern over removing this program. It appears this has a direct impact on Ft. Riley students. This could affect retention of K-State presence at Ft. Riley. Suggestions have been given to see if there is interest in working again with these programs. It was discussed that there is interest, but students have not been “enrolled” in these programs in the correct process so it may be just a need to have DCE follow through with the students that are in belief that they are enrolled in the appropriate way.

There was no objection to removing this from the agenda.

5. Graduation list addition: A motion was made by Bennett and seconded by Spears to approve the following graduation addition:

May 2009 – Brittany Danielle Weber, Bachelor of Science, College of Arts and Sciences

Motion carried.

6. Reports

A. CAPP

CAPP meets again next week. The majority of last month’s meeting was spent discussing the implementation plan for the stand alone minors. There are many questions that need addressed. For example, if a student has taken all the classes for a minor, do they have to be enrolled at the time they apply for the minor? The stand alone minor was approved with no implementation proposal and it is being put in order by CAPP at this time.

B. iSIS Task Force

The task force was also focused on conversation regarding stand alone minors.

7. Old Business

A. Professional Program update – Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering

Moser updated the committee that last spring this program proposal came forward and was sent back to the college for further detail. It is on hold until the Math and Physics departments are contacted for further discussion. Easton commented that there is a subcommittee reviewing this program proposal and discussing whether the whole college will bring something forward. Academic Affairs will most likely not see this specific proposal again, but possibly something different.

B. Math 100/101 update (was the issue resolved) – Bennett

The iSIS description field was updated by the Registrar’s office as requested. Whether this was the resolution or the fact that this is the second year around is not known, but the department has had almost no complaints so the problem has been resolved at this time. Bennett thanked the Registrar office for their work.

8. New Business

A. RRES 200 -- Appropriate use of Topics course?

Moser brought up the use of topics courses and asked if anyone knows if there is a specific policy on the use of these. Spears believed the college of Arts and Sciences has an internal policy that you can only teach a topics course for three semesters before having to propose it as a new course. This item will be discussed further at a future meeting.

B. Representative for CAPP meetings –

This committee meets the second Wednesday of the month in the morning and the chair of Academic Affairs is usually the liaison for this committee, however, Moser has a class conflict. He requested another member attend in his place. Cox offered to do this.

C. Representative for Senior/Alumni survey committee

Moser also requested a volunteer for this committee that will be starting work on this very soon. Hornsby offered to do this.

D. Need a room for the September 21 Academic Affairs meeting

Baillargeon offered a room in Hale Library that can be used. 114 Hale.

9. For the good of the University

State of the University will be Sept. 24 in Alumni Center then in Salina on October 11.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Next meeting is Tuesday, September 21, 2010 Room: 114 Hale Library