

MINTUES

Faculty Senate
March 14, 1995
Big 8 Room -- K-State Union

Members present: Anderson, Baker, Lyman, Balk, Biere, Brightman, Dubois, Dyer, Erpelding, Exdell, Fingland, Foster, Frieman, Gallagher, Glasgow, Havlin, Higgins, Hummels, Jardine, Johnson, Jones, Kassebaum, Klabunde, Klopfenstein, Kolonosky, Kuhlman, Lamond, Laurie, Law, Legg, Madsen, Sue, May, McCulloh, Miller, Mohr, Molt, Moxley, Nafziger, Niehoff, Ott, Ottenheimer, Pallett, Pence, Pierzynski, Poresky, Rahman, Ransom, Reeck, Royse, Shultis, Swanson, Taylor-Archer, Verschelden, Wheeler

Proxies: Hummels for Fenton, Fingland for McVey, Pallett for Moeller, Jardine for Buchholz

- I. President Kuhlman called the meeting to order at 3:36 PM.
- II. Senator Shultis moved and Senator Poresky seconded acceptance of the minutes for February 14, 1995. Senator Swanson remarked that the minutes did not provide any detail about Professor Van Swaay's remarks to the Senate. [President Kuhlman had invited Professor Van Swaay to report on the AAUP sponsored Legislative Day in Topeka, and he discussed AAUP concerns over grievance procedures affecting faculty.] The motion to accept the minutes passed with a voice vote.
- III. Announcements
 1. Regent Robert Docking visited our campus on March 7, 1995. Members of the Faculty Senate leadership group had the opportunity to visit with Regent Docking. Regent Docking stressed that it is his desire to be a strong advocate of the Regent's System.
 2. The evaluation process of the Deans Donoghue (Graduate School) and Stowe (Human Ecology) is underway and Donoghue's will be initiated immediately after spring break.
 3. Legislative Update - The good news is that an unclassified pay raise of 3.5% is looking positive at this time. The bad news is that a \$5.7M cut for the BOR system still is a possibility. KSU Extension is facing a cut of \$446,870 in a separate bill. The final outcome will not be known until the legislature adjourns. Renewal of the lottery does not look positive which could have a significant impact on future budgets. A bill to grant resident status to military dependents who graduate from Kansas high schools and enroll in KSU within 6 months of high school graduation remains active.
 4. The DRAFT Copyright Policy that was discussed by Faculty Affairs has been removed from consideration by Administration. Development of this extensive policy may be delayed until a BOR policy is developed.
 5. The proposed BOR Conflict of Interest policy has been reviewed on the KSU campus (by the Provost appointed COI Task Force) and comments forwarded. A first reading of this policy is expected this month with BOR final approval following in April.
 6. A copy of the white paper on Faculty Productivity and Undergraduate Education is on file in the Faculty Senate Office. This will be used as the discussion base for the March Board of Regents discussion. Senator Poresky asked if a summary of the paper was available. President Kuhlman said a one page executive summary would be attached to the minutes of this meeting.
 7. Faculty may review in the Faculty Senate Office a library document from Dean Brice Hobrock regarding costs for subscriptions to Gordon & Breech publications.
 8. Senator Havlin noted that the City of Manhattan's request for a federal block grant to widen Anderson Avenue had been denied. He said loss of the block grant put back for at least one year debate over a campus parking garage.
 9. Original item IV.A.5. Academic Fresh Start had been placed on the agenda by mistake and was not yet ready for presentation to and discussion by the Senate.

- IV. Standing Committees

President Kuhlman requested a motion to allow discussion of the Faculty Affairs Committee as the next agenda item. A motion to amend the agenda was made by Senator Jardine and seconded by Senator Frieman and approved by voice vote.

A. Faculty Affairs

Senator Dubois moved and Senator Madsen seconded a change to C157.3 of the Faculty Handbook. The proposed change, which involves Provost communication with an affected college about a Dean's evaluation, reads: The Provost will meet with the faculty of the college to announce the **outcome and discuss relevant issues**. [The proposed change is noted in bold type].

President Kuhlman asked Provost Coffman to address the change to C157.3. Provost Coffman said several points prompted changes in the wording. The proceedings must be confidential because they are personnel matters, in the same vein as evaluation of department heads, tenure decisions, and promotion decisions. He stressed the need to preserve confidentiality in these matters. Discussion with the Provost began.

Senator Nafziger: No one is challenging the authority of the Provost to appoint or to remove a dean. But it is possible to imagine a situation in which faculty are involved in a highly negative evaluation of a dean that still results in the Provost's reappointing the dean. How can faculty participate when they do not know even aggregate data? Or don't know differences between faculty recommendations and the Provost's decision?

Provost Coffman: This is a dilemma. Faculty are sought as advisors. A dilemma arises when we attempt to dissect the reasons for a decision.

Senator Nafziger: What input is there when faculty don't know the reasons of the Faculty Advisory Council?

Provost Coffman: The question seems to focus on whether there is agreement between the faculty and the Provost, not whether there is input.

Senator Nafziger: While not currently facing the problem, what in this set of circumstances protects the University from a capricious Provost?

Provost Coffman: A Provost's integrity runs in both directions: toward the deans and toward the faculty.

Senator Rahman: There is no need to go into details, but just to explain the rationale for reappointment or dismissal.

Provost Coffman: That is a different matter than getting into the discussion and recommendations of the advisory committee. The amended section allows for the explanation Senator Rahman has identified.

Senator Rahman: There are times when an administrative decision is opposite to the concerns of faculty. Don't faculty deserve to know the reasons for the decision?

Provost Coffman: There is lots of flexibility needed in this matter. At times there will be no divisive issues, but at other times the issues will be divisive. I am not willing to get into revealing the particulars of a situation. And I hold a fundamental and deep-seated concern that an evaluation not turn into a plebiscite.

Senator Poresky: Faculty want to know why something is happening. This desire is particularly important when faculty may be unsure of the direction of administration vis-a-vis faculty.

Provost Coffman: It is perfectly appropriate to know the logic of the decision, but it is inappropriate to discuss the outcomes of surveys or any other information.

Senator Dubois: The amended section promotes discussion of relevant issues. We cannot write so finely tuned documents that insure the goodwill of persons involved in governance. The process rests on the integrity of the people involved.

Senator Conrow: Would the Provost be satisfied with a return to the original wording in section C157.3, with the insertion of the words "general reasons"?

Provost Coffman: I like the current wording in the proposed change.

Senator Verschelden: Is the definition of "relevant" a negotiable matter or a term defined by the Provost?

Provost Coffman: In any real situation, in any discussion, the Provost will have no control over the questions asked.

Senator Verschelden: But the Provost will have control over the answers given.

Senator Rahman: Would people accept a friendly amendment to substitute the term related for the term relevant?

Senator Exdell: The debate really boils down to a conflict over two values, confidentiality versus accountability. I intend to choose accountability.

Senator Reeck: Is there any way to discuss outcomes without revealing the internal discussions of the faculty advisory committee? For instance, providing summary findings from a survey.

Provost Coffman: I am not agreeable to such a provision. All we would have then is a plebiscite.

Senator Biere: If Senators favor release of information about the faculty advisory committee discussion, they would also have to support release of student ratings of faculty teaching. Faculty do not lose the right to discuss what is going on because confidentiality is preserved about the faculty advisory committee proceedings.

Senator Reeck: Can we explore this concept of a plebiscite? Evaluation is a multiple component process. It is hard to assess the impact of each component of the process without knowing how the components are being used in forming a judgment. Faculty would feel better not having to second guess the process.

Provost Coffman: Taking that step simply creates a plebiscite.

Senator Shultis: I like the new wording because it requires an exchange. The new wording expects a dialogue over the general reasons which influenced the Provost's decisions. Certainly such a question will arise at a meeting between the faculty and the Provost.

Provost Coffman: Such a question is not out of bounds, but would require care in how it was answered.

Senator Nafziger: There is no shared governance or collegiality when the procedure prevents the faculty from knowing the information which led to the decision.

Provost Coffman: I don't agree. If that were true, there would be no faculty advisory committee.

Senator Baker: How can faculty assess the worth of input if it knows only output?

A vote was taken on the motion to amend section C157.3; the motion passed by a voice vote, but not unanimously.

Senator Legg questioned if all faculty of a college are to be surveyed in the evaluation of a dean. He said this question was pointed particularly at the evaluation of the Dean of the Graduate School. President Kuhlman said every graduate faculty member would get a survey.

B. Academic Affairs

Senator Law moved and Senator Poresky seconded course and curriculum changes from the College of Human Ecology, approved by the Graduate Council on February 7, 1995. The motion passed.

Senator Law moved and Senator Verschelden seconded course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Architecture and Design on January 19, 1995. The motion passed.

Senator Law moved and Senator Verschelden seconded course and curriculum changes approved by the Salina College of Technology on January 12, 1995. The motion passed.

Academic Affairs will distribute a second survey on diversity in the curriculum. The Committee has collated information from the first survey, and is sending out the second survey to obtain additional information. Senator Law will report results by the end of the Spring semester.

C. FSCOUP

Senator Maes said John Struve gave FSCOUP an overview of the budget and discussed administration priorities in the budgeting process: equipment for Farrell Library, per credit hour costs, and provisions for keeping tuition fees at their campus of origin.

Senator Maes moved and Senator Dubois seconded an amendment to the Faculty Handbook's Appendix K: Discontinuance of Academic Program or other Units with Tenured Personnel. The proposed change is the addition of a footnote to Section IIIA2. The new footnote would read: "If FSCOUPE determines that the CCOP was directly involved in the decision to recommend program discontinuance, FSCOUPE will appoint a new committee from that college to conduct the investigation." Senator Ransom noted that the change is to remove conflicts of interest in any investigation of a program recommended for discontinuance. The motion passed.

V. Old Business -- None

VI. New Business

President Kuhlman said there were two resolutions to be discussed. They would be discussed in the order he received them.

Senator Reeck moved and Senator Verschelden seconded Senate approval of a resolution opposed to the construction of a parking garage. Senator Reeck presented an overview of the resolution and said KSU does not have a parking problem but rather has a walking problem. There is a perception KSU has a parking problem, but parking problems are not a reality. Recent survey data indicate there are always 200+ parking spots free at various lots around campus. A parking garage will not solve the endless appetite to get a parking stall as close as possible to one's office. Putting up a parking garage requires input from architects.

Senator Verschelden said she had yet to find anyone in favor of a parking garage.

Senator Jones, a signer of the second resolution, said he had no problem if the Senate adopted the first resolution, and remove the second resolution thereby from consideration.

Senator Havlin said the Task Force made nine recommendations. Eight deal with issues mentioned in the resolution. It is not just a matter of perception that there is a parking problem. It is not realistic to expect persons to walk 30 minutes to and from their cars. The defeat of the federal block grant allows for discussion of issues. Parking garages do proliferate, especially on landlocked campuses, once one is built. There is an interest on such campuses to protect green space. The university needs additional parking in proximity to the Union in order to accommodate conferences and the projected expansion of the Union. Senator Anderson noted that Student Senate on March 16, 1995 would debate whether to support a parking garage. He said the students probably would support a garage, but not in Memorial Stadium. He noted concerns over the recommendations having been made without advice from experts.

Senator Ransom said the resolution's phrase "to postpone indefinitely" made moot the later statement "to study the effectiveness of those measures etc."

Senator Reeck acknowledged Senator Ransom's concern and said he was amenable to alter the wording.

Senator Dubois said KSU had an Advisory Committee on Campus Development, but it was not involved in the task force on parking. The university should make use of this committee to get some sanity into review of the issues.

Senator Reeck said he believed this advisory committee had been disbanded. In earlier attempts at making reference to this committee, he had concluded it no longer operated.

Senator Jones: Concern over a projected student body increase has been offered as one justification for the parking garage. What other options are being considered to accommodate this increase in enrollment -- such as housing? The overall cost for the parking garage would reach 30 million dollars.

Senator Ransom: What will be the outcome if we don't pass the resolutions?

President Kuhlman: If the Faculty Senate does nothing, the response will not change. Nothing has started yet. There will be the inclusion of expert opinion from professional consultants, and there will be input from faculty, students, and staff.

Senator Dubois: The resolution is not a mandate. Passing nothing implies faculty are not concerned over the process being used on campus to make these decisions. We should not put concerns over the issue on hold because a federal block grant was denied.

Senator Law: Is a straw poll possible regarding the resolutions? I prefer the second resolution.
After consultation with the parliamentarian, President Kuhlman announced a straw poll could be taken. The straw poll indicated senators favored sending a resolution

expressing disfavor with the idea of a parking garage. President Kuhlman said a motion could be made to postpone action on the first resolution until action was taken on the second. Such a move would allow for discussion of the second resolution. Senator Law made such a motion, and Senator Legg seconded. Senator Legg said the problem he saw with the first resolution is that it assumes it knows the answers to the issues, whereas the second resolution says we should find the facts. Senator Reeck said the resolutions arose independently. President Kuhlman noted we had to vote on the motion before we could discuss the second resolution. The motion passed. Senator Dubois moved and Senator Law seconded acceptance of the second resolution. Senator Erpelding asked what is the urgency of passing any resolution at this meeting. There were so many other things deserving attention. He moved that the second resolution be returned to the original drafters. Senator Rahman seconded this motion.

Senator Carrell said Student Senate would be discussing the matter this week because President Wefald had made known his intent to decide on the matter around Spring break.

Senator Brightman: We should come forth with a resolution in order to get more discussion of issues and facts.

Senator Dubois: I agree with Senator Brightman. What will be accomplished by sending the resolution back to the persons who drafted it?

Senator Rahman: I support sending it back because the resolution assumes Faculty Senate is the central place for these decisions when in actuality it is the university administration that should handle these matters.

Senator Ransom: I support Senator Erpelding. The resolution is unclear. Who are the responsible parties it mentions? How will the information be obtained? There is no timetable.

The motion to return Resolution #2 to its drafters was voted on. The vote was 26 yes and 26 no. The motion was defeated.

Senator Verschelden moved to amend the resolution as presented by Senator Ransom's concerns over wording. She moved to remove the sentence reading, "We request that the faculty senate invite the responsible parties to make a formal presentation to the senate." Senator Brightman seconded. Senator Erpelding expressed concerns with the English used in the resolution, and pointed out that there was an incomplete sentence in paragraph 2. The amendment proposed by Senator Verschelden passed unanimously in a voice vote.

Senator Shultis called for the question, and Senator Dubois seconded. The motion to end debate passed. The resolution was voted on and defeated.

Discussion of the other resolution commenced. Senator Ransom moved to strike the word indefinitely. Somebody else seconded the amendment. The motion passed.

Senator Carrell asked if the drafters of the resolution had ideas about the simpler measures referred to.

Senator Reeck said the first 8 recommendations of the task force came to mind.

Senator Ransom said the "whereas" statements contained opinion, not evidence.

Senator Havlin noted that there is no construction of a parking garage to be postponed. The resolution is based on emotion rather than on evidence. Delay in the block grant may have removed the option of a parking garage from being included even in the university's 5-year plan. Senator Kassebaum suggested sending this resolution back to its drafters since there was no urgency about the matter. Senator Ransom seconded the motion. Senator Dubois argued it was important to send a signal and that the major point is over the ignoring of proper planning procedures. Senator Havlin noted that a survey had been administered, data reviewed, a task force formed, and recommendations given. No parking garage was being built.

Senator Kassebaum said changed circumstances made the resolution no longer the particular statement the senate wanted to make.

Senator Rahman said she no longer was having problems finding a place to park, and asked if Parking Services had done anything since the task force had met.

Senator Havlin said nothing has changed on campus since the task force had met. Parking Services had surveyed the various lots. We need to study the first 8 recommendations of the task force; if implemented, space congestion would be alleviated.

Senator Jones noted the resolution's wording was open to quibbling. The statement in the resolution must be clear.

Senator Carrell noted that the Union lost about ten events a month because parking around the Union was not accessible. The lost events meant a loss in revenue.

Senator Foster supported Senator Kassebaum's motion. The words in the resolution point to a solution, and what is needed is more study to get information.

Senator Conrow said it was important to send a message today.

Senator Dubois called for the question, and Senator Klopfenstein seconded. The motion to end debate passed. The motion to send the resolution back to its drafters was defeated in a split decision voice vote.

Debate on the resolution started again. Senator Verschelden moved to amend the resolution by striking the words insufficient evidence. A voice said second. The amendment was approved in a voice vote.

Senator Rahman moved to strike the first sentence to the resolution. Someone said second. Senator Law said the real problem is that we have had insufficient study of the problem. Senator Verschelden said striking the first sentence would make the resolution more palatable since there were some who did not agree with the first sentence. The motion to strike the first sentence passed.

Senator Dubois called for the question, and Senator Rahman seconded the motion. The motion to end debate passed. The resolution as amended passed with 33 in favor and 15 against.

VII. For the Good of the University

President Kuhlman mentioned that faculty thinking of running for Faculty Senate President or for Faculty Senate Secretary need to get materials to the Faculty Senate Office.

Senator Nafziger read a tribute:

Professor Jim Greig, an emeritus professor in the College of Agriculture, passed away recently. He was a long-time member of this body, retiring from the Faculty Senate in the late 1980s. For several years he was the designated member to adjourn. He was a good scholar, courteous person, and had a lot of common sense. We will miss him.

Senator Moxley mentioned several upcoming lectures:

March 30: George Connick, head of the Learning Network of Maine
April 12: Calvin Trillin
April 12: M. Scott Momaday
April 13: William Raspberry

VII. Senator Poresky moved we adjourn, and Senator Jardine seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:21 PM

IMPROVING THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: FACULTY WORKLOAD AND UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Executive Summary

Last September, the Board of Regents and Council of Presidents adopted a mission statement and five objectives for the 1994 - 1995 academic year. Objective Four identified the Board's desire to establish "undergraduate education as a fundamental priority, and assess faculty workload and productivity as they relate to undergraduate instruction." The purpose of this policy discussion is to provide the Board with information and perspective on the roles and responsibilities of faculty at the Regents universities, particularly as they impact the undergraduate learning environment.

The paper initially reviews the major lessons from studies on faculty workload and productivity. Generally, these studies demonstrate that faculty work between fifty-two and fifty-seven hours a week and that they are working more hours per week than in past decades. These studies also reveal that mandates to report workload or increase instructional contact hours have generally failed to increase the number of hours faculty spend in the classroom. These mandates have also failed to elevate the priority of undergraduate education for several reasons. It may be more useful for the Board of Regents to focus on the broad policy issues that provide guidance for the faculty's efforts to enhance the undergraduate experience.

The paper presents an overview of the major conclusions drawn from faculty workload studies. It concludes by offering a list of eleven principles as a blueprint for the creation of an attractive undergraduate learning environment. These are drawn from the aspirations and planning goals of the Regents universities. The Board might consider adopting these strategies as a plan for improving undergraduate education. A plan for the implementation of these principles is also outlined.

FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY IN ITS MEETING
OF MARCH 14, 1995

Whereas a sound and thorough study of parking at Kansas State University has not been conducted,

and whereas no evidence has been presented that a parking garage would solve the perceived parking problem on this campus,

and whereas simpler measures may be more effective than constructing a parking garage in dealing with the perceived parking problem,

the Faculty Senate strongly urges the University's central administration:

- to postpone indefinitely the construction of a parking garage;
- to put simpler measures into effect;
- to study the effectiveness of those measures and the possible need for a parking garage using appropriate standing committees and offices of the University;
- to present to the entire University community the findings from those studies and the range of possible solutions.

Merald R Reed Biochemistry

Richard J. Ehrens Entomology

Cia Kuschelder SASW

Tom Tanager ECONOMICS

Jan C. Reese Entomology