MINUTES
Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
March 9, 2004     3:30 p.m.  Big 12 Room, K-State Union


Proxies: Bloomquist, Gehrt, Greene, Knapp, Nafziger, Rietcheck, M. Smith, Spooner

Absent: Behnke, Chang, Dandu, Dhuyvetter, Dryden, Erickson, Fick, Fritz, Grice, Grunewald, Hosni, Jones, Marr, McHaney, Morrow, Reese, Roozeboom, F. Smith, Staggenborg, Thompson

Parliamentarian: Jerry Frieman

Visitors: Sue Peterson, Thomas Rawson

I. President Zabel called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. Senator Prince moved to approve the minutes of February 10, 2004. The motion was seconded and passed.

III. Report on University Administration’s role with Topeka - Tom Rawson, Vice President of Administration and Finance, and Sue Peterson, Assistant to the President and Director of Governmental Relations

Sue Peterson spoke about message development and delivery. Regarding message development, the Board of Regents reviews all requests for bill introductions that are submitted by the Universities, Community Colleges, and the Vo-Tech Institutions it oversees. The Board reviews all requests, and only those that are approved are introduced to the legislature for consideration. On bills that are not submitted by the Regents, but are of interest to its constituents, the Board takes a position (or declines to take a position) based on input it receives from its constituents. The University supports the positions taken by the Board of Regents. Regarding message delivery, the Board testifies on related bills. As agency head, President Wefald additionally testifies by preparing a “mini” State of the University Address, along with budget highlights. Peterson’s role is engaging in one-on-one discussions with legislators, attending Board meetings and legislative hearings, and engaging in follow-up on campus with various parties that have input to the issues being discussed.

Tom Rawson discussed the unified budget request. The Board of Regents develops a
unified budget request on behalf of the universities, community colleges, and the vo-tech institutions it oversees. The framework is developed each May for the proposal that goes to the governor the following October. After the governor has considered (and amended) the board’s recommendation, it will go forward to the legislature the following January. The role of his division in the legislative process is to respond to the variety of requests for supporting data that come from the various legislators, and staff members from the legislative and executive branches. Peterson works closely with his staff in this process.

Rawson provided the opportunity for questions of Sue Peterson and himself: Senator Rintoul inquired if the reductions from various sources such as SRO were recommended by the Regents. Rawson responded no. Senator Rintoul requested further comment regarding the board’s stance and response to the precedence this has set, as well as the legality of the reductions. Rawson indicated that the concerns regarding precedence have been voiced to the State Budget Director and others. Regarding legality, the University’s legal counsel, as well as the University’s outside consultant that assists with the indirect cost proposal, have both issued opinions that the action of the State is legal. Senator Cauble asked for clarification on the Board’s opinion and the Universities’ support of the Board’s opinion. Rawson responded that the University takes/supports the Board’s position once it has been made. However, discussions with the Board on the various issues continue and related concerns are expressed. Senator Schlup asked for additional clarification on the legality. Rawson noted the feedback received from our legal counsel. Senator Dodd inquired as to the potential of the employee relationship influencing the University legal counsel’s opinion on legality of the callbacks. Rawson indicated that he did not believe they were influenced, and additionally noted the opinion of an outside party was consistent with University counsel. Senator Ransom asked what the Regent’s position on tuition waivers for dependants and spouses of faculty was. Rawson responded that the Board was not in favor of the tuition waiver proposal presented by Fort Hays. Peterson added that there were a number of tuition waiver proposals submitted to the legislature for consideration in the current session. She stated that the legislature has chosen not to support any of the current bills. Senator Rahman noted that speaking for herself, she believed that tuition waivers for faculty were good for recruitment as well as retention. Rawson agreed and indicated that we needed ownership from the other institutions in regards to a proposal for the Board’s consideration. There are discussions with faculty senate leadership currently on how to proceed in this area next fall.

Senator Hamilton asked if the University’s stance of general support for the Board’s position on legislative matters was binding on the KSU Faculty Senate. Peterson responded that as an individual or body, positions contrary to the Board’s may be taken with the legislature. She cautioned that such positions should be clearly communicated as separate from the university and that one’s own letterhead or e-mail address should be used (not ksu.edu address).

Senator Brigham asked if there were any political issues regarding the use of tuition revenues on campus. Peterson responded that this has not come up in legislative discussions. Senator Ransom asked why there was such a heavy focus on the Fort Hays State proposal on tuition waivers. Rawson indicated that the Fort Hays State proposal was the proposal on the table with the Regents and from it a general stance has been elicited. Senator Michie asked if there was any discussion regarding the value of the idea. President Zabel responded that he as faculty senate president has indicated support
in a number of forums and has received interest from the Board on this matter. Senator Maatta asked about how the cost of a tuition waiver program was calculated, and asked further if consideration has been given to differential costs. Rawson indicated that to determine the amount for KSU, the current employee dependents and spouses attending class last fall was determined and from this an amount of lost revenues was determined. He recognized the value of consideration of differential costs.

President Zabel thanked Sue Peterson and Tom Rawson for coming to Senate, sharing information about their roles, and responding to questions.

IV. Reports from Standing Committees
A. Academic Affairs Committee - Pat Ackerman

1. Course and Curriculum Changes
   a. Undergraduate Education
      It was moved to approve Undergraduate Course and Curriculum changes, no discussion, motion carried.


      *See page 1 of white sheets

      **CHANGE:**
      FROM: IDH prefixes for all Interior Design Courses
      TO:       ID prefixes for all Interior Design Courses
      Rationale: To change all current Interior Design IDH course prefixes to ID prefixes. (210, 215, 310, 315, 320, 360, 410, 415, 425, 435, 440, 445, 499, 500, 530, 545, 599) *Other graduate course prefixes are listed but will need to be approved by Graduate Council.
      *See page 1 of white sheets.

   2. Approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Technology and Aviation January 21, 2004.

      *Department of Engineering Technology
      Additions:
      ADD:  ET 020  Engineering Technology Seminar

      **Degree Program Deletions:**

      **DROP:**
      Associate of Technology Degrees in:
      . Civil and Construction Engineering Technology, Civil Options (CET-CV)
      . Civil and Construction Engineering Technology, Construction Option (CET-CN)
      . Computer Systems Technology (CMST)
. Electronic and Computer Engineering Technology (ECET)
. Mechanical Engineering Technology (MET)
. Web Development Technology (CWDT)

Bachelor of Science Degrees in:
. Computer Systems Technology (CMSTB)
. Electronic and Computer Engineering Technology (ECETB)
. Mechanical Engineering Technology (METB)

**Proposed New Degree Programs:**

Associate of Technology in Engineering Technology
*See pages 3 - 6 of white sheets for details.

Bachelor of Science in Engineering Technology
*see page 3 -6 of white sheets for details.

**Proposed Associate Degree Program Options:**

Associate of Technology Degree in Engineering Technology
Construction Engineering Technology Option (ET-CN)
*See pages 6 of white sheets for details.

Associate of Technology Degree in Engineering Technology
Computer Systems Technology Option (ET-CP)
*See page 6 of white sheets for details.

Associate of Technology Degree in Engineering Technology
Electronic and Computer Engineering Technology Option (ET-EC)
*See page 7 of white sheets for details.

Associate of Technology Degree in Engineering Technology
Mechanical Engineering Technology Option (ET-MT)
*See page 7 of white sheets for details.

Associate of Technology Degree in Engineering Technology
Web Development Technology Option (ET-WD)
*See page 8 of white sheets for details.

**Proposed Bachelor’s Degree Program Options:**

Bachelor of Science Degree in Engineering Technology (ETB-CP)
Option in Computer Systems Technology
*See page 9 of white sheets for details.

Bachelor of Science Degree in Engineering Technology (ETB-EC)
Option in Electronic and Computer Engineering Technology
*See page 9 of white sheets for details.
Bachelor of Science Degree in Engineering Technology (ETB-MT)
Option in Mechanical Engineering Technology
*See page 10 of white sheets for details.

Department of Aviation

CHANGE:
AVM 285 Helicopter Maintenance to: AVM 485 Helicopter Maintenance
PPIL 221 Preventive Maintenance
PPIL 362 Multi-Engine Ground School
PPIL 363 Multi-Engine Flight Lab to: PPIL 263 Multi-Engine Flight Lab
PPIL 379 King Air Transition to: PPIL 379 Turbine Transition
PPIL 440 Air Carrier Operations
PPIL 290 Multi-Engine Crew Coordination

b. Graduate Education

It was moved to approve the Graduate Education Course and Curriculum changes, no discussion, motion carried.

1. Approve a graduate course and curriculum change approved by Graduate Council December 18, 2003 (this course was granted a conditional approval pending a description modification at their December 2, 2003 meeting.

CHANGE:
FDSCI 600 Microbiology of Food

2. Approve graduate course and curriculum changes approved by Graduate Council February 3, 2004.

Changes
ARCH 605 Architectural Design Studio V
CS 822 Exotic, Wildlife, and Zoo Animal Medicine
ENTOM 885 Conventional and Molecular Methods for Evaluation of Crop Plant Resistance to Pests
IAPD 608 (IAR 408) Design Workshop II
IAPD 644 Interior Architecture Internship
IAPD 646 Interior Architecture Foreign Studies
IAPD 760 Interior Architecture Seminar
PLAN 631 Computer Applications in Planning I
PLAN 632 Computer Applications in Planning II
PLAN 715 Planning Principles and Process
PLAN 721 Infrastructure Planning and Financing
PLAN 731 Solid Waste Planning and Management
PLAN 748 (710) Urban Visual Analysis
PLAN 765 (640) Growth Management
PLAN 803 (821) Community Research Methods
PLAN 815 (826) Planning Theory, Ethics and Practice
PLAN 820 Planning Administration
Drop
DVM 700  Veterinary Orientation I
PLAN 605  Planning Communications
PLAN 620  Urban America
PLAN 754  Fiscal Processes of Plan Implementation
PLAN 755  State and Regional Planning
PLAN 780  Planning in Developing Areas

New
AP 715  Veterinary Comparative Embryology (22)
HN 820  Functional Foods for Chronic Disease Prevention
IAPD 614  Design Workshop II Studio
IAPD 622  Building Construction Systems in Interior Architecture
IAPD 625  Lighting in Interior Architecture
IAPD 710  Advanced 3-D Computer Modeling
IAPD 713  Furniture Design Workshop Studio
PLAN 717  Seminar in Grant Preparation

Prefix change
IAR to IAPD   600, 602, 606, 607, 645, 647, 705, 706, 707, 708, 720, 730, 740,
753, 756, 821, 830
IDH to ID   600, 630, 645, 650, 651, 660, 680, 710, 725, 740, 760, 800, 825, 840,
870, 875, 899, 920

Curriculum change
Master’s degree in Regional and Community Planning

c. General Education
It was moved to approve the General Education course proposals, no discussion, motion carried.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAR 730 Facility Management</td>
<td>11/13/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 577 International Relations since 1815</td>
<td>11/13/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCH 470 Rhetoric of Community Building</td>
<td>11/13/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN 352 Personal Wellness</td>
<td>12/15/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German 221 German III</td>
<td>12/15/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German 223 German IV</td>
<td>12/15/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music 421 Salsa: Afro-Cuban Music of the Past and Present</td>
<td>12/04/03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Approve graduation list and additions to graduation list

It was moved to approve the graduation list and additions to graduation list, no discussion, motion carried.

a. Approve December 2003 graduation list.

b. Approve additions to graduation lists.
December 2003
Kurtis Cornejo, Arts and Sciences, BS-Social Science
Chandana Ghosh, Doctor of Philosophy
Angela Hands, Arts and Sciences, BS-Kinesiology
Amber Washington-Hilliard, Arts and Sciences, BS-Political Science
Justin D. Raaf, Engineering, BS - Construction Science Management

August 2003
Emma Larrissa Woodhull, Architecture, Planning, and Design - Bachelor of Interior Architecture
Katherine Marie Schiller, Architecture, Planning, and Design - Bachelor of Interior Architecture

B. Faculty Affairs Committee - Roger Adams

Roger Adams reported that they FA is looking at section C31.5 thru C31.8 of the University Handbook by Provost request. He also noted that they are reviewing the policy on chronic low achievement and that a motion would be made to make the interim policy on mediation a permanent policy effective with the fall 2004/spring 2005 academic year.

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - Walter Schumm

Walter Schumm noted that at the March 4, 2004 meeting the following items were discussed: chronic low achievement, athletic reforms, salary allocation guidelines, the student senate resolution concerning the Governor’s budget proposal, and KSU performance agreements. He noted that the committee engaged in discussions with Larry Moeder, Director Admissions and Student Financial Aid regarding a concern over heavier debt being taken on by students due to tuition increases. Moeder indicated that there has not been a significant increase in student debt. Schumm also mentioned the proposal from the College of Education regarding reorganization of departments.

D. Faculty Senate Committee on Technology - Mike Haddock

Mike Haddock noted that since the last faculty senate meeting, his committee has met twice. The following items were discussed: 1.) In January, $10 worth of free laser printing began being provided in the fall and spring semesters and $5 in the summer for all K-State students, faculty, and staff. This printing is available in the InfoCommons in Hale Library and the university computing labs. K-Staters can access the free printing by using their eID password. 2.) Federal government agencies have ruled that accessibility must now be built-in when distance education courses are created. One group at K-State is currently examining policy issues and a second group has begun putting together technical information that will help faculty proceed as they develop course content. The goal is to have information and help material available to faculty by August 1, 2004. 3.) TEVALs will no longer be given in paper format; they will be done online. 4.) Security continues to be an issue. There were eight new worms in just the past week. There is a particular problem with anti-virus software definitions not being kept up-to-date on student computers. By the fall semester, CNS hopes to move to centrally managed anti-virus
capability. The most current virus defenses would be pushed out centrally, rather than relying on each individual to do their own updating. 5.) Self-extracting files are currently blocked on the central mailer. Any message with an executable attachment is now rejected and bounced back to the sender. Zip files are not yet being blocked, but this is under consideration by SIRT (Security Incident Reporting Team). 6.) The target date to have the new centralized e-mail server in place is by the start of the fall semester. The new e-mail system will provide enhanced security.

Haddock provided the opportunity for questions: Senator Dodd asked about how the TEVAL conversion would be implemented since many of the classes are not taught in high-tech classrooms. Senator Clegg noted that the reason for the conversion is that the main-frame system that maintains TEVALs is going away. Senator Clegg discussed some of the positive features of a new system such as immediate availability and customization of evaluations. Senator McCulloh noted that the reason for the TEVALs originally was to assist in faculty evaluation and administrative decision-making. Senator Clegg concurred and provided additional information regarding the IDEA Center’s evaluation process. Senator Michie inquired what would happen to return rates and no-shows responding to evaluations when they had not attended the class. Senator Clegg concurred that studies have indicated that a conversion to on-line assessments would show an initial drop in return rates. She noted the concern of no-shows responding, but also noted that responses from those attending who were not present at the time of evaluation would now be gathered.

Senator Eckels noted a concern regarding limitations on e-mail attachments. Haddock responded that this concern should be brought to the SERT committee representative for his area. Senator Maatta voiced a concern that too large of a time span for testing could dilute the responses received, and his concern was noted by Haddock and Senator Clegg.

V. Announcements - Bob Zabel
A. Faculty Senate Leadership Council - Zabel referred to the Executive Committee Minutes, which are attached to the agenda. He highlighted the Foundation report and the improved returns on investments in 2003. He also noted Senator Ransom’s and David Stone’s work on the Steering Committee for Future of General Education. He indicated that they would work with Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee to gather information on what general education should look like and to get input on how to gather information. Zabel noted discussions with President Wefald about Compensation Task Force proposals and the tuition waiver issues. Zabel noted that discussion were open, frank, lengthy and that they were making progress. He felt that we have the attention and that there is a commitment for targeted salary increases and a multi-year plan. He also noted a commitment to a tuition waiver program and encouraged continued work by the Task Force. Zabel noted classroom space concerns that were raised and indicated that he had been reassured that new Kedzie and Rathbone classroom space would be ready for use by fall. Senator Cauble asked for clarification as to the Rathbone space being general use space. Zabel indicated that this was general classroom space.

B. Board of Regents Meeting - Zabel noted two items: 1.) Faculty Morale Surveys will be finalized next week and that tenured and tenure-track faculty should be receiving the surveys within the next month. 2.) CEO Evaluations - Faculty Senate Presidents have been asked to provide input to the CEO (President) evaluations. Zabel will ask for input from the Faculty Senate and with the assistance at Senate Leadership, will summarize
C. Report from Student Senate - John O’Hara, Student Body President, noted the Student Senate Resolution concerning the Governor’s Budget Proposal and indicated that he had received positive responses to it from the Board of Regents.

VI. Old Business - None noted

VII. New Business

A. Student senate Resolution concerning the Governor’s Budget Proposal

Senator Hamilton moved to approve the Student Senate Resolution concerning the Governor’s Budget Proposal. Several seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

ATTACHMENT 1

B. Approval of University Calendar (Fall 2004 - Summer 2009) - Senator Michie noted a concern with the early start dates and also indicated a concern with starting classes on a Friday. Senator Rahman noted the same concerns, saying that the draft calendar was not yet at a state where she would like to approve it. In particular, she objected to beginning the semester on a Friday. Senator DuBois, a member of the Calendar Committee, pointed out the misperception that start dates for the fall semester are occurring increasingly early. His review of the past fifteen years revealed that early dates occur in cycles. He noted that the Friday start date was one of the reasons that the calendar was being presented to Faculty Senate as a draft for discussion and that the Fall Break requested by the student body has caused some of the changes. Senator Dodd declared that it made no pedagogic sense to begin the semester on a Friday, which would serve only as a placeholder day. She stated that the Fall Break was designated not to “fix a problem” but to “fulfill the desire” of the students. She asked if the Calendar Committee had a rationale for beginning on a Friday. Senator DuBois indicated that was a compromise position. When Senator Simon asked if anyone had asked about the options of the two-day break versus a Friday start date, Ms. Quaife replied that Student Senate preferred to start on Friday in order to retain the two-day Fall Break. Senator Hamilton noted that assessment strategies being developed across campus often involve pre-testing, which would be problematic if there were low attendance in classes on a Friday start day. He also mentioned that 9-month faculty members are often on campus to do student advising and class preparation a week earlier than their contract states … and that time is unpaid.

Senator DuBois remarked that there are 100 days in each semester, regardless of the start date. He also asked that Faculty Senate provide strong and clear direction if the draft was to be sent back to the Calendar Committee. President Zabel observed that the motion was to approve the draft, that no amendments would be possible, and that because the calendar is to be presented to the provost in May, Faculty Senate could vote to approve at the April meeting. Senator Hamilton asked if there had been any consideration for modeling the fall semester vacation schedule on the spring semester – a week fall break rather than any vacation at Thanksgiving. Senator Simon wondered if the students were aware of the new drop policy when they voted in Student Senate. Student Senate President indicated they were aware. Senator Hedrick talked about the “psychology of the partial week” and noted that with three partial weeks of the current calendar draft, there would be greater student absences.
The motion failed. President Zabel directed members of the Calendar Committee to take the opinions and thoughts expressed to committee for further consideration.

VIII. For the Good of the University

A. Senator Hamilton noted that it was Gary Hellenbust’ view in the announcements regarding the possibility of a new hotel on campus.

B. Senator Ransom suggested that the Academic Affairs Committee consider the issue of online TEVALs.

IX. Adjournment - Meeting was adjourned at 5:18 p.m.
BY: John O’Hara, Travis Stryker, Tyson Moore, Laurie Quaife, Jennifer Bakumenko, Cabinet, Hayley Urkevich

WHEREAS, There is increasing public support to ensure the accessibility and affordability of higher education in the state of Kansas as proven by the Governor’s “Education First” Report;

WHEREAS, Governor Sebelius promised in her State of the State address to reduce the need for significant tuition increases by stating, “Because of our difficult financial times, we have failed to keep a promise made to the state’s colleges and universities to provide funding to retain key faculty and minimize the need for tuition increases. My proposal fulfills that promise;”

WHEREAS, The Governor’s budget proposal actually increases the financial burden on state higher education institutions by recalling restricted and student fees from universities and issuing unfunded mandates;

WHEREAS, The re-allocation of funds from tuition dollars and restricted fees to the State General Fund sets a dangerous precedent for future legislators to take funding from higher education,

WHEREAS, The restricted fees and tuition dollars that are being called back can be considered a “specialized tax” on students;

WHEREAS, These recalls serve only as a one time fix and thus will create significant problems during the next fiscal year;

WHEREAS, This will create even more of a financial burden on universities, citizens, and future students; and

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

SECTION 1. Kansas State University Student Governing Association strongly encourages that the Students’ Advisory Committee to the Kansas Board of Regents not support Governor Sebelius’ callbacks for restricted fees and tuition dollars in her budget proposal regarding higher education.

SECTION 2. Moreover, Kansas State University Student Governing Association strongly encourages Students’ Advisory Committee to pass a resolution reflecting the concerns of the student body.

SECTION 3. Kansas State University Student Governing Association strongly encourages the Kansas legislature to commit to prohibiting the future practice of calling back students’ tuition dollars and restricted fees to use for other purposes.

SECTION 4. Upon passage a copy of this resolution be sent to: Kansas Board of Regents President Reginald Robinson, Chair Janice DeBauge, and the Students Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents.