

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty Senate Academic Affairs**  
**December 6, 2011, 3:30 pm**  
**Union room 204**

Present: Bennett, Bonella, Cox, Dille, Easton, Roberts, Sachs, Spears, Zajac

Absent: Arthaud-Day, Bormann, Derouchey, Ganta

Guests: Vicki Clegg, Monty Nielsen, Ruth Dyer

1. Andrew Bennett, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
2. The November 15, 2011 minutes were approved as submitted

3. Mid Semester student evaluations

Guest: Vicki Clegg

Bennett welcomed Vicki Clegg to the meeting. Clegg thanked the committee for taking time to meet with her. She wanted to have a conversation about mid-term evaluations, which nationally are becoming more of an issue. Some institutions are starting to do mid-term evaluations. Using the current forms, student ratings are not returned to faculty until after student grades are submitted. Clegg usually helps faculty to determine the IDEA and TEVAL forms are not the best avenues for this kind of evaluation. Typically faculty want more specific feedback during mid-term. She also explains that if they want to do this type of evaluation, they need to work with and respond to the results, not just receive the information and do nothing with it. She mentioned the Axio survey system, which could be used. It would create difficulty in the Center if the TEVAL or IDEA forms are used and she gave examples. Should we begin thinking about creating a different form, or perhaps an Axio survey that may address these requests as they come up? Spears asked whether this movement is being pushed by students or more by faculty. It seems to be a little from both areas. Clegg responded that at times students would like to give feedback during the semester so that a change could take place while they are still in the class. Also, teachers would like to improve their teaching. Easton commented that handwritten evals should not be used. Dille had an example of something used by University of Nebraska from previous years and she shared that with those present. Bennett mentioned that the Axio survey system could be used. A template might be possible, and you could add additional questions if you wish. It would be in need of some changes, but it could be possible. Or perhaps the on-line TEVAL could be updated to have a pull down menu and a selection of "mid-term". Zajac pointed out that we should consider too the possible negative effect on faculty this could have if they don't choose to use the mid-term. Easton also noted that having too many surveys or evals could become an annoyance to students and the evals might reflect that. Bennett felt it is important too that a faculty member be open with their students about how a mid-term eval will be used in their class; what its purpose is. It could be made available, but not be mandatory. Clegg mentioned perhaps there might be some language available on the Center website that would be similar to the advice she gives a faculty member when they call about mid-term evals. Spears commented she also believes the Teval shouldn't be used for a mid-term evaluation. Clegg thanked the committee for the conversation and suggestions. There was no action taken at this time.

4. K-State 8 Tags

Guest: Vicki Clegg

Bennett brought up a housekeeping issue basically with the K-State 8 tags. Courses numbered 100-699 qualify for being tagged for K-State 8. The reason for courses over 600 is that some of those courses are taken for undergraduate credit. Bennett mentioned a course from Ag Econ that is a 700 level course, that during the initial tagging process was requested to be tagged and after further research, was allowed. However, the tags were inadvertently removed when tags were being placed on courses. This was a clerical oversight and Academic Affairs committee members agreed that legitimate errors could be fixed by Vicki.

Another topic about tagging was discussed. What should be an expedited change and what should be a non-expedited change. This was discussed in March 2011 and at the time committee members felt ALL

changes having to do with tags should go through the full non-expedited process. They wished to revisit this topic. Spears, serving on one of the subcommittees discussing tagging and criteria, reported they concluded a dropping of a tag is usually internal to a college and does not impact others, so it could be expedited. However, others felt like students now depend on others college's tags and so dropping a course with a tag or dropping a tag from a course shouldn't be expedited. Clegg discussed a report that could be run in iSIS listing any changes made to tags, so that all departments could be informed. That is a possible option and would make departments aware of a class that may be changing its tag the following semester. It was also noted that expedited changes do get routed through the course and curriculum listserv when. Committee members agreed that having a report sent to department heads each semester about what is being dropped could be useful.

After further discussion, the consensus of the committee was: dropping tags could be expedited; new tags and changes would be non-expedited; and true clerical errors could be fixed internally by Clegg at this time.

A motion was made by Spears and seconded by Dille to approve the following: 1) changes may be made by Clegg's office to correct legitimate, clerical errors; 2) dropping of a tag can be expedited; 3) a new tag or changes to a tag will still be non-expedited. Motion carried.

Committee members thanked Vicki for attending.

## 5. Course and Curriculum Changes

### A. Undergraduate Education -

1. A motion was made by Roberts and seconded by Cox to approve the following course and curriculum change as approved by the College of Architecture, Planning and Design on November 18, 2011 (approval sheets sent out by Lisa Shubert to the listserv on November 22, 2011):

#### **COURSE CHANGES:**

##### *Department of Architecture*

##### Add:

ARCH 274 Digital Architecture I, K-State 8 tag: Aesthetic Experience and Interpretive Understanding; Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning

ARCH 373 Digital Architecture II, K-State 8 tag: Aesthetic Experience and Interpretive Understanding; Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning

ARCH 374 Digital Architecture III, K-State 8 tag: Aesthetic Experience and Interpretive Understanding; Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning

##### *Dean of Architecture, Planning and Design (Environmental Design Studies)*

##### Add:

ENVD 020 University Honors Program

ENVD 189 Introduction to University Honors Program

##### *Department of Landscape Architecture/Regional and Community Planning*

##### Add:

PLAN 010 Planning Field Trip

PLAN 316 Planning Principles Seminar

PLAN 415 World Cities, K-State 8: Global Issues & Perspectives, Social Sciences

PLAN 444 Internship Planning Seminar

PLAN 510 Tech Module, K-State 8: Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning, Natural and Physical Sciences

#### **CURRICULUM CHANGE:**

##### *Department of Landscape Architecture/Regional and Community Planning*

Changes to the Minor in Community Planning (see supplemental information for detail)

A motion was made by Easton and seconded by Dille to drop the tags on the one credit-hour courses (motion withdrawn). Discussion: Academic Affairs has done this before when courses with one-credit hour and two tags have come before the committee. Committee discussed this in more detail. Committee members were concerned about not allowing one tag for a one credit hour course. Discussion continued. Since there is a taskforce working on K-State 8 tagging, this will be part of the task force's deliberations, but a decision needs made for courses coming through now as to what Academic Affairs will accept. Dyer made a comment about courses that are tied to each other with pre-requisites and perhaps it would be possible to tag the third course, etc. Zajac wondered if we might contact this department and find out first what options can be provided. Sachs would also like to know the options. How do committee members feel about allowing the tags to be placed on the third course in the series? Discussion ensued.

Spears motioned to table the three ARCH one-credit hour courses and have Sachs take these back to the department, seconded by Easton. Motion carried. Bennett wanted a consensus from the group about these courses. Would they be ok with the last course being tagged? Roberts wondered what will happen in a year when the task force makes their recommendations and how will exceptions be handled. Bennett shared some of the conversation by their taskforce at this point. There is a draft right now that has some stipulations that may be useful to those wanting to put forward tags right now. Sachs will take this feedback to the department so they can discuss and decide what to do with those three courses. Easton also moved to table PLAN 510 until more information can be received on this course as well, Cox seconded. The discussion continued about exceptions and also, it seemed to some, that it is possible for a one-credit hour course to fulfill one tag. Bennett will take these comments and information back to his part of the K-State 8 tagging and criteria task force. Zajac, also on the task force, received comments from others who feel strongly that one course, no matter the credit hours, should never have more than one tag. Motion carried. Course and curriculum changes were approved, with the exception of the three ARCH courses and PLAN 510.

2. A motion was made by Zajac and seconded by Roberts to approve the following course and curriculum changes as approved by the College of Technology & Aviation on November 28, 2011 (approval sheets sent out by Kathy Sanders on November 28, 2011):

#### **COURSE CHANGES:**

Changes:

~~AVM~~ AVT 485 Helicopter Maintenance (~~7~~) (3) K-State 8: Ethical Reasoning and Responsibility

Add:

AVT 389 Problems in Aviation

PPIL 219 Single Engine Seaplane Transition

PPIL 315 Certified Flight Instructor Glider

PPIL 316 Certified Flight Instructor Glider Flight Lab

AVT 470 Unmanned Aerial Systems Operations

#### **CURRICULUM CHANGES:**

*Department of Aviation*

Changes to the Bachelor of Science, Unmanned Aerial Systems Option. (see supplemental information for more detail)

Rationale: The purpose of these changes is to reflect the AVT course numbering changes, readjust the courses to the correct semesters, and add in a Senior UAS Operations Course. AVM 151 was removed to add AVT 317.

There was a question about the tag on AVT 485 having Ethical Reasoning. Zajac responded there is much ethical reasoning involved in maintenance, the code and regulations involved, as well as validating actions performed by the operator. Committee members agreed this was a practical tag. Motion carried.

3. (Old Business) Update on the following course changes as approved by the College of Arts and Sciences on October 6, 2011 and November 3, 2011 (approval sheets sent out by Karen Solt on November 4, 2011):

### **COURSE CHANGES**

#### *Political Science (Nov. 3)*

Changes:

From: ~~POLSC 301~~ – Introduction to Political Thought

To: POLSC 165 – Introduction to Political Thought

From: ~~POLSC 325~~ – U.S. Politics

To: POLSC 115 - U.S. Politics

From: ~~POLSC 333~~ – World Politics

To: POLSC 155 - World Politics

From: ~~POLSC 344~~ – Introduction to Comparative Politics

To: POLSC 135 - Introduction to Comparative Politics

#### *English (Oct. 6)*

ENGL 756 Business Communication

ENGL 758 Scientific Communication

Bennett contacted the chair of Political Science who will be meeting with Don Von Bergen, Salina and Dave Stewart, DCE. The Political Science courses will be left on the table for a future meeting.

Bennett also reported that ENGL 756 and 758 were approved by this committee, but were returned by the Executive committee because of a committee's members concern that the Dept of Communication in the College of Agriculture wasn't contacted. However, upon researching the concern, Bennett was informed the Dept of Communication had contacted the Dept of English about this issue, but this initial communication hadn't been followed-up. He suggested to the English Department head that she contact her counterpart in the Dept. of Communications and reach an understanding on the proposal. Once this has taken place and Bennett is notified, the courses can return to the Exec agenda for approval. If no agreement can be reached, Academic Affairs will need to consider the proposal again in light of this information.

6. Announcements/for the good of the University

Bennett reported there have been questions raised in recent months about process and policies for course and curriculum approval, such as requirements for certificate programs, K-State 8 tags, post-bacc minors for non-K-State graduate, etc. Also, work on a credit-hour definition is still underway.

It was determined no meeting will be held for Academic Affairs on January 3, but the December 20 meeting will have a full agenda.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 pm

Next meeting is Tuesday, December 20, 2011, 503 Hale Library, 3:30 pm