

**Minutes of the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents – 10:00 a.m., May 14, 2014 – Curtis State Office Building, Topeka, KS**

**Present:** ESU: Sheryl Lidzy and Manjula Shinge; FHSU: Stephen Donnelly KSU: Julia Keen and David Rintoul; KU: Chris Steadham and Jim Carothers; KUMC: David Naylor and Sandra Bergquist-Beringer; PSU: Justin Honey and Julie Dainty; WSU: Victoria Mosack and Mehmet Barut; Guests: Gary Alexander,

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Facilitator</b>	<b>Meeting Action</b>	<b>Follow-up Action</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Approval of the Minutes: April 16, 2014 meeting	S. Lidzy	Minutes, as written, approved by consensus		
Report from Governance Committee attendees	J. Keen and D. Rintoul	A 360 review of Chief Academic Officers (excluding FHSU) will occur in March 2015 Discussion of Student Success Plan – special advising and resources are available Information sharing from the System Council of Chief Academic Officers (SCoCAO) – Discussing concurrent enrollment issues: a committee has been established to communicate through the colleges offering credit for concurrent enrollment; Outcomes-based learning is another issue being addressed	Monitor to assure a faculty voice in the 360 review of Chief Academic Officers (excluding FHSU) before March 2015	

Additional Discussion Topics	S. Lidzy	<p>Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) – will move forward with PLA (Credit for Prior Learning). – Discussion about attending the related KBOR meetings on May 30<sup>th</sup> and June 24<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>Discussion about how the acceptance of prior learning can affect accreditation of some programs – Discussion about how the credit for prior learning will appear on transcripts and the transferability of such credit. – Will ask G. Alexander for information when he visits this meeting today. (see additional information at right and below, under Additional Information from G. Alexander)</p>	<p>Several CoFSP members have indicated intent to participate in one or both meetings. Register through the KBOR website to attend the May 30<sup>th</sup> and/or June 24<sup>th</sup> meetings,</p> <p>G. Alexander indicated that the status of the Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) taskforce and coming out of BAASC that Appendix D was removed from the PLA Guideline with the following recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Universities are to review the practices regarding PLA</li> <li>2. Students have ample opportunity to make full use of PLA</li> <li>3. Place the responsibility of PLA under VPAAAs <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. That transferability of credit for prior learning is an important issue as this goes forward.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
------------------------------	----------	--	---	--

Discussion of Social Media Policy (SMP) action from this Council	S. Lidzy	C. Steadham and J. Keen presented a prepared statement about the CoFSPs experience and response to the pending acceptance of the social media policy which continues to include punitive elements. Discussion about the statement ensued with a plan to ask the Board of Regents to accept the recommendations of the Social Media Workgroup. Additionally, the current members of the CoFSPs will support S. Lidzy when she delivers the CoFSPs report related to the SMP by standing with her.	See the attached statement (last page of this document)	Social Media Policy Statement prepared for dissemination (see the last page of this document)  The current CoFSPs will stand with S. Lidzy during her report today
Report from KBOR Liaison	G. Alexander	Additional Information from G. Alexander: There will be a recommendation to move forward with application for SARA (State Articulation & Reciprocity Agreement) membership – KBOR then becomes the portal and each university would make separate application to the SARA-Midwest Exchange Commission (MEC).		
Adjournment	S. Lidzy			

**Council of Faculty Senate Presidents**  
Statement to the Kansas Board of Regents  
May 14, 2014

As the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents, it is our responsibility to express to the Board the concerns of the faculty we represent. When the Social Media Policy was introduced in December, we recognized that connecting terminations to faculty speech was extremely problematic, and we requested an opportunity for input and collaboration prior to its passage. This request was denied.

When the newly enacted policy predictably generated national attention and widespread controversy, we were pleased with the Board's willingness to form a Work Group and revisit the policy. In light of the considerable distraction and backlash created by the policy, we requested a suspension of the policy pending the Work Group's recommendations. This request was also denied.

When the Work Group's extensive research failed to identify any university in the nation with a similarly punitive policy, we were hopeful that the widespread and enthusiastic support for the Work Group recommendations would persuade the Board to adopt an advisory policy that would align Kansas with best practices within higher education. Up to this point in the process, this request – like the others before it – has been denied.

Today, we stand before the Board, once again reiterating our unanimous opposition to the chilling effect created by the punitive aspects of this policy. Although we appreciate the creation of the Work Group, and the Governance Committee's adoption of considerable portions of the Work Group proposal, we fear that the most important point continues to be ignored. That point is this: a university system cannot properly function when external groups are allowed to influence university personnel decisions whenever they find certain speech to be objectionable. Because the punitive aspects of this policy create precisely this "heckler's veto" scenario for controversial speech, we must once again respectfully request that the Board reconsider its determination that the disciplinary aspects of this policy are necessary and desirable.

In conclusion, we accept the premise that the Board has acted in good faith and has endeavored to act in the best interests of the Regent's universities. While we accept this premise, we disagree with the Board's analysis of the universities' best interests. In recent years, we have been asked to become more efficient, we have been asked to do more with less, we have been asked to undergo post-tenure review, and we have been asked to improve our standing among our peers across the nation. Believing that our advocates have our best interests at heart, we have willingly embraced all of these challenges, and have already begun to succeed on many fronts. Yet, there are certain rights and responsibilities that are non-negotiable. However expedient it may seem at the time to surrender these cornerstones of the academic mission, there are certain principles that cannot be bargained away, because once they are conceded, the integrity of the entire enterprise is compromised. The freedom to speak without fear of reprisal is perhaps the ultimate example of a principle with which we are not at liberty to experiment and this is why we continue to oppose the punitive aspects of this policy. This policy will continue to be plagued with controversy and opposition as long as it exists.

Because of these imperative principles, and because of practical concerns that this issue will continue to pose a distraction and a drain upon precious time and resources, we once again respectfully ask the Board to adopt the Work Group recommendations in their entirety.