Attachment 3

Response to:
Motion to Rescind the Previous Action to Approve a Task Force Report Related to the K-State 8 Course Tagging Procedure and to Implement the Recommendations of the Task Force Report
Presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on October 29, 2012

This is the argument is being made:

We believe the action taken by Faculty Senate on June 12, 2012 was out of order for two reasons:
1. *The document that was submitted for consideration was the report of a task force. It was not submitted in the format of a proposal as required in the language above.*
2. *The proposed changes to the K-State 8 course tagging should have been voted on by Faculty Senate only after a proposal had been properly circulated as a non-expedited curriculum item. This did not occur. In fact, there was no circulation of the task force report at all.*

The following information will provide evidence that Faculty Senate did follow correct process:

1. The original proposal for K-State 8 was approved in the format of a proposal and recommendations from a task force, following the correct process outlined.
2. The recent revisions to tagging criteria followed the same correct process as outlined in the Approval, Routing and Notification procedures for Course and Curriculum Changes and did not need to be circulated in a curriculum format through the non-expedited process reserved for changes to specific curricula such as degree programs, certificate programs, minors, specializations and the like.

Faculty Senate followed their process and did not set precedent by approving the proposal in this manner.

1) The original K-State 8 proposal followed the same model and process as was used for the current revisions to the K-State 8 tagging criteria, as outlined in the Approval, Routing, and Notification procedures for Course and Curriculum changes on pages 14-15:

   A. A task force was convened.
   B. Each task force used varying methods for discussion regarding their task, as determined necessary. Appropriate persons/committees were contacted for input as deemed necessary. Academic Affairs committee was kept in the loop regarding progress.
   C. The task force report and recommendations were then presented to Academic Affairs for input and revisions, if necessary.
   D. Academic Affairs had discussion and voted on the report and recommendations.
   E. Report and recommendations were placed on the FS Executive Committee agenda for approval to be submitted to Faculty Senate for a vote. Both proposals were submitted in the same report and recommendation format.
   F. Faculty Senate voted and implementation began.

2) The original K-State 8 proposal was voted on as submitted in its proposal and recommendation format. Please see the 2008-2009 policies and resolutions page of Faculty Senate: http://www.k-state.edu/facsen/policies/fy2009.html

A. The course and curriculum listserv, used as part of the expedited and non-expedited course and curriculum approval process, was never utilized for the original proposal, the assessment piece of the proposal, or the proposal for K-State 8 requirements for students in associate degree programs. This is due to the fact it was not the correct process for those types of proposals.

3) The process outlined on Pages 14-15 of the Approval, Routing, and Notification Procedures for Course and Curriculum changes was and is the appropriate process followed for both the original proposal and the recent revisions. (http://www.k-state.edu/registrar/ccap/Approval_Routing_and_Notifcation%20Policy%20for%20course%20and%20curriculum%20chnges.pdf)

Using the document linked above, please see the glossary on page 32. K-State 8 is not considered an Academic Plan no more than UGE was considered an Academic plan that a student specifically applies to and is admitted nor does it belong to any one specific college. It is the University's method for providing general education to its students. Changes to it have never been made through the Non-Expedited process used for specific curricula changes. Examples of what curriculum changes *do* come through this process can be provided. Rather, the course change process is used with K-State 8, as it was with UGE. If a college wishes to change a tag to a course or add a tag in order to make it eligible for general education, this goes through the course and curriculum listserv as a *course* change, not as a *curriculum* change.

4) In addition, by reading the entire section discussing K-State 8 Tags in the March 15, 2011 FS Academic Affairs minutes, (beginning at the bottom of page 2) you will find that committee members were discussing what process to use in regard to changes made to specific course tags, not the overall tagging *procedures* or criteria. It refers to new courses with K-State 8 Tags, as well as courses already having K-State 8 tags. These would follow the process for making a change to a course, by either the expedited process or non-expedited process. http://www.k-state.edu/facsen/acadaff/2011/documents/aaminutes031511.pdf

The December 6, 2011 FS Academic Affairs minutes also indicate this conversation was with regard to changes in tagging to a specific course (beginning at the bottom of page 1). http://www.k-state.edu/facsen/acadaff/2012/documents/aaminutes120611.pdf

5) Faculty Senate *would* be setting a precedent if they chose to use a process that is outlined for changes to specific courses and curricula (i.e. BS/BA/MS/MA/PhD/degree program, minor, certificate, specialization, option) for this proposal. There is no record of these types of proposals being treated in that manner.