

MINUTES

Kansas State University Faculty Senate
May 9, 1995 3:30 p.m. Big 8 Room -- K-State Union

Members present: Anderson, Aramouni, Baker, Balk, Behnke, Brightman, Charney, Conrow, Dubois, Dyer, Erpelding, Fingland, Foster, Frieman, Gallagher, Glasgow, Hamilton, Hassan, Havlin, Higgins, Hummels, Jardine, Kassebaum, Klabunde, Klopfenstein, Kuhlman, Lamond, Law, Legg, Madsen, Maes, May, McCulloh, McVey, Miller, Moeller, Mohr, Molt, Moxley, Murphy, Nafziger, Niehoff, Ott, Ottenheimer, Oukrop, Pallett, Pence, Pierzynski, Poreseky, Rahman, Ransom, Reeck, Royse, Schoning, Shultis, Taylor-Archer, Twiss, Verschelden, Wilson

Proxies: Hassan for Mosier, Hassan for Homolka, Frieman for Michie

- I. President Dennis Kuhlman called the meeting to order at 3:37 PM.
- II. Senator Oukrop moved and Senator Rahman seconded approval of minutes from the April meeting of the Faculty Senate. Senator Rahman noted she had been present at the April meeting. The Faculty Senate approved the minutes by voice vote.
- III. Announcements

President Kuhlman reminded all persons present that only members of the 1994-1995 Faculty Senate could vote. President Kuhlman noted that the Faculty Handbook is available on Unicorn, on diskette formatted for Word Perfect 6.0, and in hard copy purchasable in the Union Bookstore. He then referred to a handout with his announcements for this meeting and drew attention to the discussion covered in the most recent Executive Committee minutes.

The announcements contained in the handout are presented below.

1. Final legislative action has been completed authorizing a 3.5% salary increase. However, a portion of this increase could be used to finance other budget shortfalls with the Board of Regents system. Kansas State University ended the session with a \$730,000 tuition shortfall along with other areas of budget constraint. The University of Kansas has a much more serious financial shortfall. Options available to address these financial problems include: (1) implement the full pay increase effective on July 1, 1995 and adjust other spending priorities to cover budget shortfalls; (2) implement a lesser amount of pay increase (each .5% reduction would result in a savings of approximately \$350,000) effective July 1, 1995; or (3) delay implementation of the 3.5% pay increase until January 1, 1996 (saving \$1.3 million). Following a meeting of administration and Faculty Senate Leadership, President Wefald indicated that he would present and argue for option 1 at next week's BOR meeting. The final decision as to distribution of funds rests with the BOR. While there is some concern over KU's leaning toward option 3, President Kuhlman had learned that BOR President Sabatini favored option 1.
2. The Manhattan City Commission is in the process of considering the Capitol Improvement Project requests that the University forwarded. Final Commission action will occur May 16.
3. Slots, Lottery and the Regents: As you will recall a bill was introduced into the Kansas Legislature addressing the issue of slot machines at race tracks. While this bill might have helped the Regents system eventually, there were significant drawbacks. The bill would have provided for 80% of the slot revenues to go to the owners of the slots and only 20% to go into the general funds. On the House side, 75% of the 20% would be dedicated to the Regents institutions. The Senate version would direct all 20% into the State General Fund. The 80% apparently was to go to the racetrack owners, animal owners, and winning purse in some general way. Also, it appears that the contract on the new SE Kansas track dictates that the original financial supporter of the track was the only person who could be contracted with for slots. All startup costs for this would be taken from the state's 20% which Legislative Research indicated would take two years to recover. The racing group supporting the bill indicated that \$885 million/year would go through the slots, accounting for the \$132 million figure for the BOR used in advertising. However, Legislative Research indicated that \$24 million/year would go through the slots and would yield \$3.6 million/year for the BOR (assuming the House version would pass). If this issue comes up next year, let us hope that the state gets a better deal and that the BOR gets a fair shake.
4. The funding of student loans has been cut from the Federal budget. Write or call US senators and congressmen in Washington, DC to encourage support of restoring the Federal Student Loan funding.
5. Following a review by the BOR, the Kansas State University peer institutions remain unchanged from those of previous years.

6. A BOR sponsored Conference on Diversity will be held at KSU on October 22-23, 1995. Details to follow later.

IV. Standing Committees

A. Academic Affairs

Senator Law mentioned the issue of professional note takers vis-a-vis the intellectual property of professors' classroom presentations. A draft of a policy has been reviewed by the University Attorney, and no problems were seen. However, it only addresses discipline of the student but not of the commercial entity soliciting the note taking. Academic Affairs desires input from Faculty Senate. Are lectures in the public domain? Are they private intellectual property? Senator Legg asked if placing a copyright notice on the syllabus would preserve the property rights of the faculty member. Senator Kassebaum said the copyright indication would provide notice of protected property. Senator Poresky suggested tongue in cheek that the issue be placed in the context of the BOR policy on conflict of time and interest, and that taking and selling such notes be seen as theft of BOR property. President Kuhlman said it would be worthwhile to contact Ted Ayres at the BOR about the overall issue of intellectual property in this matter. Senator Verschelden reported representatives of the company selling notes at Varney's had approached her to obtain her permission. Senator McCulloh noted that all note taking during the semester had been done without the professors' permission or without notifying the professors. Senator Law said seeking permission from the professor was in the spirit of the concerns Senator Nafziger had raised when first bringing the issue to the attention of Faculty Senate.

Senator Law clarified that General Education courses were not being presented for approval by Faculty Senate unless explicitly noted in the agenda.

Senator Law moved and Senator Verschelden seconded approval of course and curriculum changes approved by the Graduate Council on October 4, 1994. In a review of the work of Academic Affairs over the past year, Senator Law could find no record these courses had been approved by Faculty Senate. Senator Conrow asked for clarification about which version of ENGL 897 was being presented for approval: Sandra Wood indicated the old course version. The motion passed.

Senator Law moved and Senator Shultis seconded approval of course and curriculum changes approved by the Graduate Council on March 7, 1995. The motion passed.

Senator Law moved and Senator Oukrop seconded approval of course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Business Administration on February 17, 1995. The motion passed.

Senator Law moved and Senator May seconded approval of course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Arts and Sciences on February 23, 1995. The motion passed.

Senator Law moved and Senator Erpelding seconded approval of course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Agriculture on February 23, 1995. The motion passed.

Senator Law moved and Senator Klabunde seconded approval of course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Engineering on April 5, 1995. The motion passed.

Senator Law moved and Senator Verschelden seconded approval of course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Technology at Salina on April 13, 1995. The motion passed.

Senator Law moved and Senator Verschelden seconded approval of course and curriculum changes approved by the General Education Implementation Task Force on April 14, 1995. Senator Shultis asked which courses were being talked about and requested that a list of courses be attached to the minutes. Senator Reeck asked if there were any urgency to approve these courses. Senator Law said the motion could be tabled. Senator Ottenheimer moved to table until the June meeting of Faculty Senate the motion to approve the course and curriculum changes approved by the General Education Implementation Task Force on April 14, 1995. Senator Miller seconded the motion.

Senator Law indicated there had been some changes to the graduation lists presented by the Deans of the various colleges and a listing of 39 candidates for graduate degrees, March 1995 from Dean Donoghue. December 1994: ADD - Andrea S. Dennis, James Francis Nelsen, Christopher Boone, May 1994: CHANGE - William Shane Thompson from a BS(23) to a BA (20).

Senator Law drew attention to the annual summary of the Academic Affairs Committee which had been available to Senators when they entered the meeting. Senator Law thanked the members of the committee for their hard work.

Senator Law asked the Chair of the General Education Implementation Task Force to make a report on the Task Force's work over the ending academic year.

His report noted that in May of 1994 Faculty Senate had passed the General Education Plan, and one of the provisions was for Academic Affairs to charge a committee of faculty to form a General Education Implementation Task Force. This charge occurred in June of 1994, but College elections of faculty members did not occur until September and October. The Chair of the Task Force indicated he would request the Secretary of Faculty Senate to include the names of Task Force members in the minutes; the Secretary seemed perfectly agreeable on this point. The members of the Task Force: George Clark (Geology), Carol Ann Holcomb (Foods and Nutrition), Maurice Stark (Accounting), Hermann Donnert (Nuclear Engineering), John Heublein (College of Technology at Salina), John Steffen (Educational Psychology and Counseling), Mick Charney (Architecture), Steve Thien (Agronomy), Mark Tomb (Student Senate), David Delker (College of Technology at Salina), John McCulloh (History), David Royse (Music), Sarah Engler (Student Senate), David Seamon (Architecture), Kay Stewart (Business Administration), Bill Dawes (Electrical Engineering), Nancy Goulden (Speech), Dave Nichols (Animal Science and Industry), and David Balk (Family Studies and Human Services). The Task Force has worked together extremely well and accomplished a lot in its weekly meetings.

The first job for Task Force members was to familiarize themselves with the General Education Plan. The Task Force produced a Template based on the General Education Plan and a checklist to use in reviewing course proposals (both are attached). The Task Force receives a proposal once it reaches the White Sheet stage.

The Task Force review procedures involve teams of 3 or 4 members, with a member of the team designated the lead for a proposal sent to it for review; team leads rotate with each new proposal. The team presents to the whole Task Force its review of a proposal and its recommendation about it; if recommended for approval, Task Force members review the proposal (kept on reserve in Farrell Library) and it will be sent to Academic Affairs with the recommendation for approval if the Task Force agrees at a second reading. Proposals not meeting the guidelines in the plan are informally discussed with the faculty member who submitted the proposal; the purpose of the Task Force is to support the development of proposals which meet the General Education criteria set forth in the May 1994 document. These informal discussions occur prior to any official review of a proposal by the whole Task Force, and the intent is to work with faculty to get the proposal in acceptable form. Once the Task Force decides in a meeting that a proposal needs revision, the proposal will be returned to the department head with specific reasons noted on the Template Checklist. As of May 9, 1995 the Task Force had received 113 course proposals, and knew of at least 28 others in preparation in colleges. Forty proposals had been recommended for approval at a second reading and sent on to Academic Affairs.

With the help of Bill Dawes, the Chair has developed a set of procedures to insure accurate records are kept on each proposal submitted for review. The result is a spreadsheet entitled General Education Status Sheet that will provide an ongoing record of the Task Force work with course proposals. A copy of the spreadsheet as it looked for proposals seen as of April 8, 1995, is enclosed.

There are periodic meetings with Task Force members and the Inter-College Coordination Panel. Minutes of all Task Force meetings are sent to Task Force members, the Convener of the Inter-College Coordination Panel, the Chair of Academic Affairs the Registrar, and the Provost.

There is need for close coordination between the Panel and the Task Force in developing criteria and procedures for approving general education programs. The plan gives no such criteria nor does it spell out any procedures.

The Chair's overall assessment was one of considerable optimism over the responses of colleges and faculty to the call for general education course proposals. There was remarkable team work, even in the midst of some serious disagreements along the way. Anecdotes from around the University were that some faculty were surprised that the Task Force was taking its job seriously. The Task Force does, and enjoys working together.

A discussion ensued when Senator Law moved and Senator Charney seconded to continue with the General Education plan. Senator Reeck asked how many courses are needed to fulfill the intent of making the plan a requirement for undergraduates. Senator Pallet noted that his estimates put the number at around 180 sections. Senator Reeck asked if faculty had seemed reluctant to submit proposals because they did not see any incentives in the work. Senator Balk noted that there was reluctance on the part of some faculty as well as a feeling of dislike on the part of some faculty when an outside committee was given authority to pass judgment on a course proposal. Senator Conrow expressed concern over the motion to continue. Senator Law agreed that the motion did not preclude any Faculty Senate review of the efforts to implement the plan. Senator Shultis noted his concerns over the idea of voting to continue with the efforts without a sense of whether programs could be developed in various departments and colleges. Senator Frieman said the motion is not a decision to go ahead without any review at a later date, but simply a motion to continue developing the plan. Senator Verschelden said there is need for training in the Fall of 1995 regarding programs; perhaps work done over the summer could attend to these matters. Senator Foster noted that material for the Fall 1996 catalog must be ready by December of 1995. Senator Dubois said there was clearly a need for a favorable report in the Fall of 1995 for Faculty Senate to be willing to go ahead with requiring the plan for 1996 incoming students. The motion to continue with the General Education plan passed, with at least one noticeable dissenting voice.

Senator Conrow moved that Faculty Senate revisit the subject of implementing the General Education plan in October. Senator Reeck seconded the motion. Senator Poresky said the October review should include judgment on the feasibility of implementing for the Fall of 1996. A friendly amendment was suggested to move the review until November. President-Elect Havlin said the Senate should have the benefit of more than one meeting to review this matter before the December 1995 deadline that Senator Foster had pointed out. The friendly amendment was not acceptable to Senator Conrow. Senator Murphy called for the question, and Senator Aramouni seconded. The motion passed. The motion from Senator Conrow that Faculty Senate revisit the subject of implementing the General Education plan in October passed.

B. Faculty Affairs

Senator Dubois mentioned the handout he had made available to Senators as they entered the room.

Under agenda item 1, he noted that #3 and #27 should be removed from the recommended revisions to the KSU Faculty Handbook. He moved and Senator Verschelden seconded acceptance of #1-41, minus 3 and 27. Senator Kassebaum noted that #41 was not entirely accurate since the Student Discrimination Review Committee has not been active for ten years and a process is established for student appeal. She recommended we consider only up through #40 and leave #41 to be changed at a later date. Senator McCulloh moved to amend the motion by deleting #41; Senator Verschelden seconded. Senator Legg pointed out that on these policy statements Faculty Senate is not passing or rejecting them but rather accepting or not accepting them. Senator Frieman concurred that we are not in the position of making policy in these matters. He also asked if it was not the case that #41 actually contained intertwined policies: one racial harassment, and the other sexual harassment. Senator Dubois said the agenda for the coming Faculty Affairs Committee is to look at appropriate location of policies in the Handbook. Senator Oukrop asked "What is the material in boldface type?". Senator Dubois said that the boldface type material was not part of the motion, but rather indicated discussion in the Faculty Affairs Committee. The motion to amend the motion by deleting #41 passed unanimously. Then a vote was held on the motion to accept #1-40, minus 3, 27. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 2: Policy Changes regarding Shared Leave and Phased Retirement. Senator Dubois moved and Senator Rahman seconded acceptance of these changes. Senator Dubois emphasized that

the Faculty Senate was not voting on approving the policy changes but only on including the statements in the handbook. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 3: A proposed change to Section C20 of the Handbook. Senator Dubois moved and Senator Oukrop seconded acceptance of the proposed change to Section C20. Senator Rahman moved and Senator Legg seconded that the words "Assistant Professor," be added to the sentence that began "For appointments at the rank of Associate Professor...." Senator Pierzynski disagreed with the proposed amendment because he said it was unduly restrictive. Senator Legg said department heads are required to gain advice from tenured faculty. Senator Pierzynski said the intent of the change was to focus on hiring someone at a higher rank than Assistant Professor. Senator Verschelden wondered if the statement dealt with awarding tenure. Senator Dubois said there was nothing in the proposed change to C20 that discusses tenure, and thought issues of awarding tenure did not belong in C20 but that such matters need to be addressed in other sections of the Handbook. Senator Rahman said she concurred with Senator Legg in his comments about department heads' being required to seek tenured faculty's advice. She also said it only made sense to include Assistant Professors because faculty participation is important in hiring faculty. Senator Frieman agreed with Senator Rahman, and he said faculty should take seriously the hiring of any person brought into the faculty. Senator Moxley said she was concerned over the logistic problems of faculty hires over the summer when faculty on 9-month appointment would be absent; she said the faculty should vote on promotion to a higher rank. Senator Kassebaum asked how Assistant Professors could be made part of the motion. Senator Reeck said it would restrict only faculty who are not tenured, and President Kuhlman said there were some tenured Assistant Professors. The vote on the amendment to add the words "Assistant Professor" passed 29 to 26.

During discussion of the amended motion, Senator Dubois indicated the Deans were not endorsing the requirement for a faculty vote in this process, but could live with the procedure. Senator Dubois moved that the first sentence be moved to the end of the section. Senator Frieman seconded. The motion passed.

Senator Verschelden asked if tenure is still required for faculty to vote in the matter of a new hire. Senator Wilson said the issue was one of advising and consenting. Senator Moxley said the vote is only on rank, not the employment decision. Senator Hamilton said he couldn't imagine trying to run his department without all faculty knowing the candidate well and having a say in the hire. Senator Poresky noted we should not disenfranchise people who have not yet earned tenure. Senator Legg said the policy only spells out the procedure for giving the department head advice. Senator Rahman said the intent is to affect the whole hiring process, and departments where this procedure does not occur would be required to change. Senator Twiss asked for an explanation of the term "normally." Senator Pierzynski called for the question, and Senator Ransom seconded. The motion to end discussion passed. The vote on the amended motion passed, but not unanimously.

Agenda Item 4: Changes to Section B125. Senator Dubois moved acceptance and Senator Frieman seconded. The motion passed.

Senator Dubois thanked the members of the Faculty Affairs Committee for their hard work.

C. FSCOUP

Senator Maes expressed her apologies for being absent from the last meeting. FSCOUP had met with Mike Lynch, Director of the Academic Assistance Center, about the program for students at risk of academic failure. She noted that the College of Technology at Salina is looking at an at risk program.

Senator Maes provided an annual summary of FSCOUP activity in a handout. She said some potential issues in the upcoming year involve distance learning and trends of students to purchase their own computers. She thanked the members of FSCOUP for their hard work, and singled out Senator Klabunde for his work on the Strategic Planning Committee. Senator Klabunde made available a handout on this committee's work, and he noted a full report is available from the Provost's Office.

V. Old Business -- None.

VI. New Business -- None.

VII. For the Good of the University

President Kuhlman said several on Faculty Senate were aware of issues dealing with women in unclassified positions. President-Elect Havlin, soon to become President Havlin, and he had met with the Provost and there are plans to address these issues. The matter will be brought forward in the coming year.

Senator Klabunde read an announcement about the death of Jack L. Lambert: "It is with deep feelings of grief and loss that the Kansas State University Faculty Senate eulogizes Jack L. Lambert. We send our heartfelt condolences to his family. He was a remarkable man. For over 40 years, Jack served Kansas State as a teacher, scholar, inventor, and true friend. He made his indelible mark helping to shape the university through his staunch defense of academic freedom and the right of faculty to participate in governance. The fruits of his labors are evident in many ways, but especially through the publication, under his guidance, of the Faculty Handbook.

"Many within the University walls will miss him, especially his colleagues in the Chemistry Department, but also Faculty Senators across the campus, for he will be remembered as a tireless worker for the faculty of this great university."

Senator Klabunde noted that the funeral would be at 10:00 AM on May 11 at Seven Dolores Catholic Church.

President Kuhlman recognized Paul English, who is on the Executive Board of Associated Residence Halls. Mr. English said there was campus concern over sexual assaults on women, and he had worked on a campus program aimed at males to fight against rape of women. The result was a poster signed by males at the University expressing opposition to acts of violence against women. Mr. English asked for Faculty Senate help in distributing the posters. Several Faculty Senators took posters with them following the meeting. Donations for the poster came from many organizations. The Senate suggested he work with Pat Bosco, Associate Vice President for Institutional Advancement and Dean of Student Life, to distribute the posters. President Kuhlman had a sign-up sheet for faculty who wanted posters.

Senator Verschelden commended Sandra Wood for her secretarial help to Faculty Senate. President Kuhlman concurred. He noted Mrs. Wood had learned things quickly in a short time, and had done an outstanding job.

President Kuhlman recognized Senator Phil Anderson for his representation (and no doubt his stamina) during the late night vigils called Student Senate meetings.

President Kuhlman thanked Paul Friedrichs for his assistance on parliamentary rules.

President Kuhlman thanked University President Wefald and Provost Coffman for their openness and their open door policy. They are most willing to discuss issues of concern to faculty. He noted that this openness is not to be found in other schools.

President Kuhlman thanked the Faculty Senate Leadership: Senators Havlin, Law, Dubois, Maes, and Balk.

Senator Rahman thanked President Kuhlman for his work in leadership over the year.

The meeting adjourned at 5:16 PM. Now President Kuhlman was Past President Kuhlman, and he seemed a lot younger in just a few brief, shining moments.

An Abridged Set of Minutes for Consideration

Faculty Senate met on May 9th. A lot of people were present. Lots of things got said, and someone kept repeating "All in favor say 'Aye'." Things got voted on. The meeting ended about 2 hours after it started. People seemed really happy at the end.