

MINUTES
Faculty Senate
February 14, 1995 3:30 pm Big 8 Room K-State Union

Members present: Anderson, Baker, Balk, Biere, Brightman, Carrel, Charney, Conrow, Dubois, Dukas, Cyer, Erpelding, Exdell, Foster, Frieman, Gallagher, Glasgow, Harbstriet, Hassan, Havlin, Higgins, Hummels, Jardine, Johnson, Kassebaum, Klabunde, Kolonosky, Kuhlman, Lamond, Laurie, Law, Legg, Madsen, Maes, Martin, McCulloh, McVey, Miller, C., Miller, J., Moeller, Mohr, Molt, Nafziger, Niehoff, Ott, Ottenheimer, Pence, Pierzynski, Poresky, Rahman, Ransom, Reeck, Royse, Schoning, Shultis, Swanson, Taylor-Archer, Twiss, Verschelden, Wilson

Proxies: Frieman for Michie, Kassebaum for Moxley, McCulloh for Oukrop, Moeller for Pallett

- I. President Dennis Kuhlman called the meeting to order at 3:34 PM.
- II. Senator Law moved and Senator Legg seconded approval of minutes from the January 10, 1995 meeting of the Faculty Senate. Senator Law noted that a correction to those minutes was in order regarding items 2 and 4 under Academic Affairs. The minutes should read: "Master of Software Engineering," and should not indicate courses 599 and below from Arts and Sciences were approved by the Graduate Council. The Faculty Senate approved the corrected minutes by voice vote.

III. Announcements

1. President Kuhlman introduced Brice Hobrock, Dean of the Library, who discussed the costs for books and subscriptions. He noted that libraries around the country are struggling with how to deal with the rising costs of scholarly subscription rates. The University's projected budget is to maintain the current subscription list, depending upon legislative appropriations. Dean Hobrock discussed costs for titles from the publisher Gordon & Breech. Farrell Library spends around \$31,000 on Gordon & Breech titles, some of which run \$3,000+, \$4,000+, and \$5,000+ a year. Gordon & Breech has developed a "license to photocopy" policy allowing for photocopying beyond "fair use" provisions. The publisher charges up front for such photocopying. Farrell Library has paid for all subscriptions through this year and will not be canceling Gordon & Breech subscriptions, but Dean Hobrock indicated several libraries are talking about canceling or have already canceled their subscriptions in protest over the excessive rates being charged.

Dean Hobrock said the library needs faculty input on whether the value the university gets out of the Gordon & Breech journals balances their cost. He noted that cancellations have influenced publishers to raise subscription costs by around 10% annually.

Senator Legg said if faculty received a list indicating costs of Gordon & Breech titles – plus a history of Gordon & Breech subscription costs – then faculty could assess value versus cost. Dean Hobrock noted it was difficult to track the actual costs Gordon & Breech has charged due to variations in its pricing of volumes. President Kuhlman said the list would be made available in the minutes of Faculty Senate. Senator Nafziger asked what our alternatives are and if we should rely more on interlibrary loan. Dean Hobrock indicated that Linda Hall Science Library in Kansas City will enter into agreements with libraries in the Big 12 to make available copies of journal articles; this plan could lead to law suits. It will probably cost up to \$15.00 per article. The Library has made use for some time of FedEx as a rapid access courier. Senator Poresky wondered how soon we would be using full time electronic media for access to articles. Dean Hobrock indicated there will be a mixture of hard copy and electronic transmission over the next 50 years, but said there will be a rapid growth in use of electronic media.

2. President Kuhlman introduced Maarten Van Swaay to report on the AAUP sponsored Legislative Day in Topeka.

3. President Kuhlman noted that some faculty had participated at University expense in an American Association of Higher Education conference held in Phoenix. He asked Senators Havlin and Law to report on the conference.

Senator Havlin said a major theme at the conference was faculty productivity and post-tenure review. The conference presenters noted that higher education institutions in the United States are undergoing change, in part due to public skepticism about universities and faculty. There is also pressure because there is less money for education. The big issue is accountability for undergraduate instruction, and the focus is on student learning not faculty teaching. Productivity is considered a quality issue, not one of quantity. Critics should not be focused on how many students we teach or how many hours we work per week, but rather on active learning to promote students' education. There is heightened awareness of need for faculty to handle problems of "disengaged faculty." A summary of conference themes: post-tenure review, equal rewards for teaching, research, and service, more accurate assessment of student learning, rethinking rewards for teaching, professional development opportunities, and teaching graduate students to be teachers.

Senator Law concurred with the report given by Senator Havlin. The meeting put Senator Law in a more relaxed position regarding the coming changes for two reasons: (a) the state of KS is not isolated in its concern over these matters and (b) programs developed by some institutions of higher education are exciting.

Senator Exdell asked whether there would be a written summary of what the participants learned at the conference. Senator Havlin said there were no plans to provide a summary of each workshop, but a copy of the program is available and audio tapes of all the sessions have been ordered. Senator Rahman asked how post-tenure review is conducted. Senator Havlin indicated a few sessions at the conference were on post-tenure review and on programs at institutions using it. For instance, attention was given to the way post-tenure review occurs at the University of KY; the new Chancellor for KU was at the University of KY and is willing to meet with KSU faculty and discuss post-tenure review issues.

4. President Kuhlman noted that Parking Task Force recommendations were attached to the minutes. There are 8 short-term recommendations and one long-term (building a parking garage). There is wide agreement that parking poses long-term problems requiring a long-term solution. Because Manhattan has no city bus system, a shuttle system would face obstacles not encountered at other institutions (such as Univ of MO at Columbia).

Senator Reeck asked how the long-term solution will be pursued. President Kuhlman said there is opportunity to give input; many steps have to be followed to implement any such proposal. Senator Reeck asked how would people be able to make their feelings known if they disagree with the proposed parking garage to be built at the stadium. President Kuhlman said University President Wefald will establish a procedure for such feedback. Senator Verschelden wanted it clear that the Parking Council and the Parking Task Force were separate groups. She also said it was unclear to her how funds for the proposed parking garage would be raised. Senator Rahman wondered if there was a need for a referendum. President Kuhlman said he knew of no requirement to have a university referendum on the decision. The Student Body Vice President, Brad Finkeldei, said there would be no need for a referendum since funds will be raised from a user fee rather than a general fee. Senator Swanson asked if KSU contacted other universities which had built parking garages; she noted that she came from a large university which constructed a parking garage only to decide later that the same problems still existed. President Kuhlman said schools in the Big 8, primarily Univ of MO, had been contacted; the pattern was to continue building parking garages once the first was constructed. President Kuhlman noted that KSU had the least expensive parking fees of any university he had contacted. Senator Verschelden said a major problem with students is reserved stalls which students see sit vacant. Some persons consider the system of reserved parking stalls elitist. Senator Verschelden requested that senators having input contact her or Senator Anderson.

5. The new regents have been appointed. Gene Bicknell's nomination was not approved. Regent Warner was re-appointed to fill Regent Conger's remaining term. The new regents are Regent Docking, Regent Havner, and Regent Talkington.

6. President Kuhlman thanked Senators for participating at the Lady Cats basketball game against Iowa State. He welcomed comments and input. There is thought to going to an evening baseball game, with the chance to tour the press box.

7. Concerns have been raised about financial data released by the Athletic Department, particularly concern over where the money went. Twelve copies of a letter from the Athletic Department are available for review.

8. The March Board of Regents meeting will discuss faculty productivity. There was a specific request from Board Chair Sabatini to have this policy discussion. President Kuhlman is on the committee to cover research and extension. Steve Scott from Pittsburg State will cover teaching and service.

IV. Standing Committees

A. Academic Affairs

1. Senator Law noted that the Student Senate passed a resolution to end the university-wide requirement for Principles of Physical Fitness (KIN 101). Senator Law noted that this course and curriculum change was coming from a source other than the normal sources for such matters. Academic Affairs reviewed the resolution and will vote on the matter at its next meeting. Senator Legg remarked that the resolution covered a substantive issue and said the green sheet proceedings should be followed. Senator Law said that he will

recommend to Academic Affairs that the matter be sent to Arts & Sciences to submit the course and curriculum change to the green sheet procedures.

2. Senator Law asked the Chair of the General Education Implementation Task Force to give a report. Senator Balk said the Task Force was preparing for review of more than 100 course proposals and would set aside a Saturday morning and afternoon (date as yet unspecified) for this review once the proposals reached the White Sheet stage and were sent to the Task Force Chair. He indicated that the Chair will distribute proposals to 3 or 4 member teams for review; the team will present the proposal and its recommendation about the proposal to the Task Force. Proposals approved by the Task Force will be sent to Academic Affairs. The Chair of the Task Force will contact the Department Head about proposals needing revision. A copy of the template to follow when making general education course proposals was distributed in December. A re-formatted copy – identical in content to the original template – is attached to the Faculty Senate minutes.

3. There are changes to the graduation list for May 1991, July 1994 and December 1994.

Graduation list changes for December 1994. ADD: Christy A. Young, Amanda L. Meyer, James T. Dauer, Diane Herman, Dale Potter, Vark Vielhauer, Christopher, F. Bayne, Denise L. Blakely, Catherine J. Daniel, Suzanne M. Kraus, Flint G. Pierce, Robert M. Potter, Thomas G. Skinner, Wendy C. Wildeman, Tracy Jo Orr, Sondra L. Sewell, Kelly A. Evans, Michael L. Aspen, Michael J. Burton, Luke J. Dowell, John Montforte, Julie R. Muckenthaler, Kevin J. Nilges, Bryan J. Renyer, Brandon T. Wilson, Agnes L. Callison, Joseph C. Carney, Patricia A. Horton, Jennifer R. May, Shawn Rogers, Cheryl Ortiz, Michael E. Werner, Daneale J. White, Richard N. Battig, Matthew S. Brady, Melinda D. Elledge, Michael A. Hind, Tara L. Houston, Lisa Ruskanen, Beth Ann Sehom, Christopher Boone, John William Hancock, Janell Denise Venter, and DELETE: Yuet Wang Soo, Kevin B. Vandiver, Robert W. Jackson, Stacy Purvis, David A. Lyle,

Graduation list changes for July 1994. ADD: Robert D. Bearman, Heather R. Meyer.

Graduation list changes for May 1991: ADD Kevin L. Davis.

B. Faculty Affairs

1. Senator Dubois remarked that the Institutional Review Board, chaired by James Shanteau, had developed new procedures for review of research involving human subjects. These new procedures had been distributed in a campus-wide mailing. Senator Ottenheimer remarked that the new guidelines on human subjects research would require informed consent when obtaining student evaluations of a course.

2. Faculty Affairs will revisit issues centered on the Faculty Satisfaction and Morale report next year when a new committee is in place. Faculty Affairs will bring the matter to Faculty Senate with recommendations on how to proceed with the report.

3. Faculty Affairs is looking at C20 in the Faculty Handbook on faculty searches. The interest is to tighten the language.

4. Faculty Affairs is looking at policy regarding salary for administrators who return to faculty lines.

5. The procedure for the evaluation of deans needs final approval by Central Administration. Amendments made on the floor of Faculty Senate are being reviewed by Faculty Affairs. The document is being used in evaluation of three deans.

6. Senator Dubois has appointed a Task Force to inquire into the role of Senate in today's university. The Task Force will carry over into the Fall of 1995. Questions being addressed include whether the title "Faculty Senate" is appropriate given the composition of the current Senate. Another issue being studied is what level of Senate involvement in policy making is appropriate.

C. FSCOUP

Senator Maes said that Senator Klabunde briefed FSCOUP on Strategic Planning Committee issues he had brought to the attention of Faculty Senate. The user tax to fund A&S unfunded sections did not re-emerge at

Strategic Planning Committee meetings. The Strategic Planning Committee will be forwarding recommendations to President Wefald, the Deans, and Faculty Senate in the coming month.

Senator Maes said John Struve, Director of the Budget Office, will be addressing FSCOUP on the upcoming budget.

- V. Old Business – None.
- VI. New Business – None
- VII. For the Good of the University

President Kuhlman provided an update on budget issues in the Kansas legislature. The Kansas Senate has passed out of committee recommendations for a 3.5% salary increase and a 1% cost of living increase. The Kansas House wants to cut 100 million dollars, and many trial balloons are floating around about how to achieve those cuts. One legislator has asked the BOR to identify where it would cut 13 million dollars. President Wefald gave one of the very best presentations to a House subcommittee. He stressed management and stewardship of state resources, and pointed out that KSU has the lowest administrative costs of the Big 8 schools and of its peers. The Legislative Review Group identified education costs and benefits in Kansas. The information indicated per student costs at KSU are \$5,188, and per student costs at community colleges are \$6,675. Kansas spends \$4,661 per student in K-12 education. The teaching load at KSU averages 249 student credit hours, the second highest in the Regents system. KSU's economic impact is 1.3 billion dollars. A majority (58%) of KSU graduates stay in Kansas and generate \$730,000 in state income tax revenues.

Senator Nafziger read the following statement to Faculty Senate:

We are all aware of the bilateral negotiations between the United States and China on allegations of Chinese theft of U.S. intellectual property. There may also be theft of intellectual property going on at Kansas State University. The Kansas State Collegian reported on February 13, 1995 that a note-taking firm is selling KSU faculty lecture notes for profit. Certainly faculty members encourage the sharing of lecture notes among students. But selling faculty lecture notes without the faculty member's permission may be a form of intellectual theft.

Most faculty lectures are a form of research, often involving several hours of preparation for an hour lecture. Many faculty members, myself included, use lecture notes as a basis for future published work. For example, in the Department of Economics, three professors have published textbooks for classes they are teaching.

I see two potential problems from the unauthorized commercial use of lecture notes. First, a commercial note-taking service may be stealing intellectual property that a faculty member may be using for publication. Second, the commercial service may fail to cite sources for lecture material, even though the faculty member has been scrupulous in mentioning the sources. Most faculty lecturers acknowledge the last name of the author from whom a concept is borrowed, implying that students can request the full bibliographical detail. To illustrate, I tell students periodically that I can provide more detailed citations for the works of scholars I mention in my lectures.

I suggest that the Senate's Academic Affairs Committee investigate adding to Appendix F of the Faculty Handbook the point that plagiarism covers "the commercial use of a lecture without the permission of the lecturer."

Senator Martin pointed out that the person in her course taking the notes for commercial use is not enrolled in the course.

- VII. Adjournment - Senator Poresky moved and Senator Brightman seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 4:57 PM.



General Education Template

When submitting an existing course, a new course, or a modification of an existing course, provide the following information in the "Rationale" section of the Green Sheet for Course and Curriculum Changes. Page references are to the May 10, 1994 version of the University General Education at KSU Proposal.

1. General Introductory Paragraph.

Why is this a general education course? Use this introduction to describe your basic reason(s) for suggesting this course/experience for general education. Tell why you think non-majors would benefit from this course. (See page 18 of the General Education Proposal).

2. Three Major Criteria for Approval. Tell how the course/experience will incorporate:

A. **Active Learning.** Active learners are engaged in doing things and thinking about what they are doing. (See page 4).

B. **An Experiential Context for the Matter to be Studied.** Base the content on experiences that students have already had or on direct experiences induced in the course and then move beyond that level. (See page 5).

C. **Foster Connections to Other Areas of Thought and Experience.** Emphasize a whole rather than a part in order to challenge students to seek the connections across knowledge, to focus on the relationships among ideas. (See page 6).

3. Identify Expected Student Performance.

Will students write papers? Solve problems? Write essays on tests? What level of content mastery is expected? What level of analytical skill and connection-making is expected? How will students display this? Indicate here whether you expect this course to be an upper- or lower-division course. (See page 18).

4. Discuss the Fit Between the Course Content and the University General Education Plan.

Emphasize the place of this course in the overall understanding of general education at Kansas State University. Is the content of intrinsic interest to a general audience? Is it interesting for its utility to such an audience. Is it interesting for the connections it makes with other disciplines or experience. (See pages 6-7 and 18).

5. Explain How the Course Content will be Covered.

What would be the format of the course? How will you use lectures, demonstrations, laboratories, discussion sections, readings, films, etc.? What class size do you expect? (See page 7, "Format" and page 18).

6. Provide a Syllabus, Course Outline or Other Supporting Material.

Illustrate specifically how you plan to fulfill the aims in items 2, 3, and 4 above.

7. Personnel.

List persons identified to teach the course and a statement that each has agreed that the course proposal outlines his/her interest and commitment to the general education plan.