

Faculty Senate Executive Committee – FacEx
33 Strong Hall
January 29, 2019– 3:15 p.m.

Approved: February 26, 2019

Members Present: Kirk McClure, Ruben Flores, Megan Greene, Suzanne Valdez, Cambrey Nguyen, Nancy Kepple, Hossein Saiedian (via zoom),

Excused: Shawn Alexander,

Also Present: Kathy Reed and Ellen Slikker, University Governance, Josh Potter, Center for Teaching for Excellence

Kirk McClure, FacEx chair opened the meeting.

I. Josh Potter, Center for Teaching Excellence

McClure introduced Josh Potter from the Center for Teaching Excellence.

Potter gave an update on the previous University Academic Assessment Committee (UAAC.) The previous committee was dissolved after discussions with various bodies. The question was asked if the committee was serving as an effective faculty voice of leadership, outreach, and education on assessment.

There have been ongoing discussions regarding a new committee and how it would function. The Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, Provost and governance leaders have discussed possibilities. Potter has spoken to the Deans twice in the last few months. Potter is in the process of finalizing what a replacement committee for the UAAC may look like.

Potter handed out a one-page sheet (see below.) The handout outlined what he had spoken with the deans about. Potter noted the following:

- Degree-level assessment has been going on at KU since 2014.
- There is a large amount of units that participate in the process.
- No unit has seen any punishment for not participating.
- This also helps KU with the accreditation process for the KBOR, HLC, etc.

Potter asked why we needed faculty leadership and what it should look like for Degree Level Assessment. Assessment of student learning is tied too numerous initiatives taking place on campus, accreditation, recruiting, strategic planning, etc. The first year KU had Degree Assessment we were at 50% across degree programs on campus. Four years later we are at 75%.

We want meaningful, visible faculty leadership and input on assessment. The Provost will provide oversight, resource allocation. Potter noted that they would communicate directly to the deans, rather than the chairs. Allowing deans to ask departments to meet the reporting requirements in ways that are most fitting for each of the various schools and the CLAS.

Potter stated the Faculty Advisory Board, would be 15 to 20 faculty members. Meet once per semester to review where the campus is at, offer workshops, etc. Potter would like Governance to nominate a set percentage of faculty to the board. He has also stated that deans want to make sure they also have the opportunity to make appointments. Often this would fall under the associate's deans.

Faculty Reviewer Pool: Smaller group, focused on providing guidance and feedback.

Create a smaller faculty reviewer pool three or four tenured faculty. Support them with stipends, providing feedback, guidance, and sharing of best practices.

Comments:

Kepple: What was the response from the deans regarding this model?

Potter: The first meeting was to educate them on the concept. They liked having a faculty reviewer pool and the advisory board. The Provost and Potter spoke to the deans, regarding how the deans could be included in the process.

Valdez: The Law School has the American Bar Association (ABA) as its accrediting agency. In the last 3-5 years, the ABA did a major change of the accreditation outcomes for Law Schools. Law Schools now have an obligation to teach the practical side of the practice of law. KU is working on making sure they are compliant with the new standards. Would the CTE be part of, or could they help with this?

Potter: They could help, but they have no oversight. Potter noted he had worked closely with a couple of people in law school, but not recently.

Valdez: How do we measure what we are doing? Do you help measure the outcome of what they are teaching?

Potter: We could help you think through measurement strategies that are best for the Law School.

Flores: My concern is the larger question, it seems that given the emphasis on the metrics that are now being included in the new budget model, the assessment of the core curriculum, annual review for professors, and all the other ongoing assessments within the units, the degree assessment will become homogenized within these assessments. We are actually collapsing any assessment at this level into a larger assessment review.

Potter: Is not sure how it will all go together. For the time, units have some incentive to see how this works. Potter wants to make this work, we don't know when the Higher Learning Commission will start mandating this.

Greene: I'm unclear how a faculty advisory board would work. Who owns it, what is the balance.

Potter: Governance had the UAAC, but it wasn't doing anything with Faculty.

Reed: Noted that the UAAC reported to and was charged by the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The Governance was only given the opportunity *to nominate* members to the committee, but the final appointment was done by the Provost Office.

Greene: What is the structure of the board, what does it look like? To what extent is it owned by the faculty or the administration?

McClure: The next step would be to forward to a committee. It would normally go to FRPR, but they have so much to do now. McClure is concerned about who would own the committee.

McClure thanks Josh Potter for attending the meeting.

Action: McClure and Potter will meet again before McClure brings it back before FacEx to discuss.

II. Approval of Minutes from November 6, and November 27, 2018. Approved

III. Report of Faculty Senate President Kirk McClure

McClure went over his report (see report at end of minutes.)

Do we have suggestions on what we want to discuss at the first Faculty Senate Meeting?

- Article X, will be discussed at the Faculty Senate Meeting on February 7, 2019
- Article VII. Amendments to the Procedures Governing the FRB, there is a working group that will be reviewing the amendments.
- Budget cuts, nothing has changed. Questions from the open forum did go to the administration.
- Proposal on JCCC/KU, they have asked for a 5 year at KU, Edwards and JCCC.
- Two pending amendments that have been pushed back, due to the budget cuts. McClure will ask the provost to review the requests.
- Graduate Studies Committee: Greene noted that the two committees did meet. The Provost does not want one report, but several ideas that he and the chancellor review.
- A committee is being formed regarding the continued use of Academic Analytics (AA)
- Request from a faculty member, regarding the policy, for the order of authors. Belinda Sturm will be attending the next face meeting.

IV. Report of University Senate President Ruben Flores

Flores: Stated that more of the comments received regarding the appointment of a Dean without a search were more ambient than the provost suggest. The provost also had asked the deans and chairs to weigh in on the appointment. Flores did ask the provost about the questions that were sent to both he and chancellor. The provost is asking for some direction in answering the questions.

Flores also mentioned that the Staff Senate had sent a letter to the provost regarding the budget. The KC Star will also be posting a form of the editorial that was sent to various news outlets over the holidays.

Valdez asked when the provost search is going to be launched. McClure and Flores will check with the Chancellors when they meet with him.

V. Unfinished Business

Budget cuts (steps after the Op-Ed, if any)

Budget Model

FSRR VII on FRB

Reorganization of Graduate Studies

Open Forum

Library Journals canceled

JCCC/KU Pilot Program

Faculty control of curricular matters (including the UCCC)

GTA Grievance Board – (The workgroup has a meeting scheduled for 2/6/19)

FRPR proposal on appointment of acting chairs etc. (On senate agenda for 2/7, discussion)

VI. New Business –

Valdez report that KSTATE is reviewing their current Governance system. Valdez was included in a conference call with the K-State Faculty. They are going to review their senate. They have future conference calls scheduled. Michelle Ginavan Hayes and Robert Waller were also included in the calls.

Kepple: Moving forward, is there somehow we could also promote positive actions that have taken place. McClure mentioned the Blackboard observer for NCAA compliance.

Meeting adjourned.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Report of the Faculty Senate President

January 29, 2019 (Kansas Day)

1. Article X. Procedures for Review and Reappointment of Chairpersons, Academic Deans, Vice Chancellors, and Vice Provosts

Background: FRB found that there is no language in FSRR that addresses the appointment of interim or acting administrators. This absence of this language has posed a problem for FRB in recent cases where appointments have been made without normal consultation with affected faculty.

Proposed revisions: Article X of FSRR has been modified adding appointments of interim or acting administrators throughout.

Action: Approved by FacEx November 6, 2018, the proposed amendments are going out for comments and headed for a vote before the Faculty Senate, February 7, 2019.

2. Article VII. Amendments to the Procedures Governing the FRB

Background: Faculty Senate approved proposed amendments to:

- a. Permit FRB to hear cases on the basis of violations of faculty rights alone, rather than requiring a violation of both rights and procedures, and
- b. Permit FRB to hold for the appellant if there is a preponderance of the evidence supporting as opposed to clear and convincing evidence.

Actions: Faculty Senate leadership has been meeting with representatives of the administration (Provost, General Counsel, and the Vice Provost for Faculty Development). Leadership asked for a decision by the administration this academic year. The General Counsel asserts that the proposed amendments will not achieve the intended objectives and wants to review all rules governing the actions of the FRB. The Provost indicates that he will not move forward until review of the rules by the General Counsel is complete. Leadership and the administration will continue to meet this semester in an effort to move the process forward.

3. Budget Cuts

Efforts to reach out to the alumni and taxpayers through an Op-Ed piece was not picked up the major media.

Time is running out to reduce the harmful effects of the budget cuts.

4. Update on JCCC and KU-Edwards Proposal

Background: JCCC and KU-Edwards want to permit JCCC students to transfer as many as 75 credit hours toward the 120 required to graduate from KU. This arrangement would reduce the number of

hours at KU and any KBOR 4-year institution from 60 to 45. The proposal was opposed by all Kansas baccalaureate faculties.

Actions: KU withdrew the proposal at the January KBOR meetings and substituted a short-term, pilot program for only JCCC and KU-Edwards campus.

5. **Proposals Pending**

Faculty Senate proposals from 2017-2018 academic year are pending on:

- a. Proposed faculty review of large gifts; and
- b. Proposed faculty control of all curricular matters, including control of the UCCC by the faculty rather than the administration.

6. **News Items:**

Graduate Studies Office: The Provost has appointed a committee to investigate the future of the Graduate Studies office.

Department of Anthropology: Bylaws suspended by the Interim Dean with a new chair appointed.

Cancellation of Journals: The Dean of Libraries announced that journal subscriptions would be cut. Leadership asked for clarifications on which journals are being cut. To date we have not heard back.

KBOR asked Faculty Senate Presidents to assemble information on:

- a. Consensual relations policy;
- b. Acceptance of International Baccalaureate credits;
- c. Use of Open Educational Resources; and
- d. Alternative pathways to meet math requirements. It is unclear what the implications of these requests are.

The KU administration is forming a committee with Governance representation to investigate the usage of Academic Analytics and whether or not to renew the contract for the software.

The Provost is seeking comments on a proposal to allow KAI advisors access to student-athletes' grade performance in order to satisfy NCAA rules.

Faculty members have asked FacEx to examine a possible policy governing the order of authors listed in a multi-author publication.

DEGREE-LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

DEANS MEETING, 1.22.2019

Dr. Joshua Potter, Documenting Learning Specialist

Reminder

At a recent meeting of the provost's direct reports, we discussed the **substantive side** of this topic:

- Degree level assessment has been ongoing at KU since 2014 (we are, today, in the middle of the **fifth annual reporting cycle**)
- Most degree programs willingly participate in the process and their activities have generated **multiple hundreds of course- and curriculum-level revisions**
- These revisions serve to (primarily) **improve the student experience** and also (secondarily) help KU meet its external reporting / accreditation responsibilities to HLC, KBOR, etc.

Today, we would like to talk more about the **logistical side** of assessment.

Previous Framework

The previous framework for degree-level assessment involved **four entities**:

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| ■ Joshua Potter / CTE | Support, education, outreach, management, review |
| ■ Senior Vice Provost | Messaging, oversight, resource allocation |
| ■ Department chairs | Direct the work at local level, interface with Joshua |
| ■ UAAC Committee | To be frank: pretty unclear |

Why Now?

The practice of degree-level assessment at KU is **expanding, improving**, and increasingly beginning to **dovetail with other initiatives** like professional accreditation, strategic planning, and recruiting.

In addition, the UAAC elected to dissolve itself in Summer 2018 and we are in the process of designing a replacement to better serve the changing needs of faculty in this area. **GOAL: We want meaningful, visible faculty leadership and input on assessment.**

A New Framework

We have been working on a new approach with the provost's office, deans, CTE, and faculty governance. It would involve the following entities:

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| ■ Joshua Potter / CTE | Support, education, outreach, management, review |
| ■ Provost | Messaging, oversight, resource allocation |
| ■ Faculty Advisory Board | Broad-scale – though infrequent – faculty voice in assessment |
| ■ Faculty Reviewer Pool | Intensive, focused work on providing feedback / guidance |
| ■ Deans | Communication, outreach, support, other? |