

**Minutes**  
**Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**February 11, 1997 3:30 p.m. Big 12 Room, K-State Union**

**Present:** Anderson, Aramouni, Atkinson, Baker, Balk, Benson, Bissey, Briggs, Brigham, Bussing, Charney, Clegg, Deger, Dyer, Feyerharm, Fingland, Foster, Fritz, Glasgow, Gould, Gray, Hamilton, Hansen, Harbstreit, Hoag, N. Johnson, Klopfenstein, Krstic, Laughlin, Legg, Maes, Martin, May, Michie, Miller, Molt, Ottenheimer, Oukrop, Peak, Poresky, Reeck, Reeves, Ross-Murray, Smith, Stewart, Taylor-Archer, Wright, Zschoche

**Absent:** Abbott, Aslin, Barkley, Behnke, Buchholz, Chastain, Conrow, DeBowes, Elkins, Exdell, Fjell, Hagmann, Hassan, Higgins, Homolka, J. Johnson, Jones, Kuhlman, Lamond, Mathews, McNamara, Moeller, Mosier, Niehoff, Pierzynski, Rahman, Raub, Ross, Royse, Schroeder, Shultis, Swanson, White, Wilson, Woodward

**Proxies:** Fenton, Kassebaum, McCulloh, Pallett

**Guests:** Kent Glasscock, Jeff Peterson, Ken Conrow, Beth Unger

- I. President Balk called the meeting to order.
- II. President Balk introduced Representatives Glasscock and Peterson who had been invited to the Senate meeting to discuss legislative matters.

Representative Glasscock began by explaining that it had been an active first month, not so much for bills debated on the floor and passed as for the committee work. He then outlined two approaches to financing government: the legislature determines the amount needed to provide services expected by the residents, then raises the necessary funds through taxes, or the legislature determines the total taxes and restricts the budget to that amount.

Governor Graves must, by law, submit a budget which matches expected resources with proposed expenditures. His budget commits carryover balances as a base for future years and offers several tax cut measures. Rep. Glasscock acknowledged that a number of people in Topeka want to cut taxes considerably more than the Governor proposes and thereby to require future budget cuts. He is particularly concerned about the status of the Board of Regents Budget. Almost all "new" money in the Governor's budget is earmarked for education in K-12, community colleges, and the Regents schools. The new money requested for Regents institutions includes \$7.5 million system-wide for technology improvements, an adjustment to the FY 97 base necessitated by the switch to linear fees at KU (\$1.2 million) and KSU (between \$840,000 and \$860,000), and about \$10 million for pay increases for classified and unclassified employees. Rep. Glasscock is hopeful that

the Regents requests can be retained on the floor, if they are recommended by the House Appropriations Committee.

Representative Peterson reaffirmed his commitment to supporting the KSU budget and his concern about improving our financial status relative to our peers. He acknowledged that controversy exists in the area due to his support of certain tax bills, but reiterated his interest in cutting property taxes. While he agreed with Rep. Glasscock that the tuition shortfall funding is at risk, he believes that KSU will come out of the legislative session fairly well. In response to Senator Reeck's suggestion that the proposed \$100 million property tax cut will have virtually no effect on the average household, Rep. Peterson underscored his belief in the importance of principles regarding the size and scope of government. Senator Legg argued that prior rescissions had cut the budget here to the bone and that loss of the base budget adjustment would cut into the marrow. Rep. Peterson agreed that the funding is critical, but thinks it is vulnerable nonetheless.

Rep. Glasscock spoke of the atmosphere in Topeka with its tax-cutting fervor. He believes that the government must have the vision to set priorities for the long-term good of the state and its people and then fund them. The current strategy appears to be to restrict the revenue stream, then force the Governor to make the politically unpopular choices in budget cuts, because his proposed budget must be balanced. Senator Hansen asked about the effect of recently reported tax shortfalls. Rep. Glasscock explained that the legislators are only required to respond to November and April figures. If a tax cut is passed and the April figures predict a shortage of money, he expects that the budget will be cut, not that taxes will be revisited. In any case, the tax and budget figures must match by the end of the session.

III. President Balk introduced Beth Unger and Ken Conrow, interim director of CNS, who had been invited to discuss the KSUVM system.

Vice-Provost Unger explained that the University began a migration to a distributed computing environment four years ago, namely to get rid of the ancient KSUVM machine. A new, state of the art, IBM 390 server is being delivered this week and environments will gradually be moved off the KSUVM platform. The University wants to provide newer, user friendlier systems with greater user capability. The plan is to provide early notice and education, even one-on-one support during the migration to the new system. Use of computer technology has increased exponentially during the last few years. A homogeneous environment will be more efficient for users and for CNS staff as well.

Several senators raised specific questions. Would mail sent to KSUVM addresses be forwarded? Yes. What about programs available for KSUVM? New versions for use on PC's have been acquired and are easier to use. Will the SIS system stay on KSUVM? For the present, yes. Is there a deadline for moving off KSUVM? It is being done case by case and will be completed this summer.

IV. Senator Stewart moved approval of the minutes of the January 14, 1997, meeting. Senator Baker seconded the motion.

He then requested that section VII. D. be amended to read: "Senator Rahman reported increased difficulty getting reimbursement from grant money from the Accounting Office. She also inquired about the progress in restructuring KSURF."

The minutes were approved as amended.

#### V. Announcements

1. As noted in January 27, 1997, announcements to the Executive Committee, a task force has been looking at Kansas State University's "specific indicators of performance." The task force members have sub-divided into two working groups: one looking at KSU's Vision 2020 initiatives on curriculum and instruction, and the other group looking at issues of faculty time and talent. Reports from the task force will be shared with the Faculty Senate Standing Committees and ultimately with Faculty Senate. There will be a meeting on March 4 with Regents Phyllis Nolan and William Docking, Regents staff members John Welsh and Tim Peterson, and KSU faculty and administrators. Each Regents institution is to provide to the Board of Regents by April 1, a full written report on specific indicators of performance.
2. The Provost's Office has sent to Deans and Department Heads a request for proposals (RFP) to conduct case studies of what faculty do. The deadline for submission of proposals is March 15. The Provost expects to fund one to three proposals in the range of \$7,500 to \$15,000. A copy of the RFP will be attached to the minutes of this Faculty Senate meeting. **Attachment 1**
3. There has been a flurry of e-mail supposedly from Jack Henry at KSU-Salina. These e-mails do not emanate from Jack Henry and, to paraphrase the KSU administration, the University disassociates itself completely from these messages that accuse Dean Henry of many improprieties (such as carrying a concealed weapon).
4. People have had questions about razing Denison Hall and moving the English Department faculty to Lafene. Both the Board of Regents and KSU have estimated the cost of tearing down Denison will be less than the cost of bringing it into compliance with ADA regulations. Funds to renovate Lafene will come from Crumbling Classrooms monies. All English Department faculty will be moved to Lafene, not only those now housed in Denison. The students have expressed support for moving health care services to the Memorial Hospital complex. KSU administrators are looking into the prospects of converting, at least on a temporary basis, some space at Memorial into classrooms. There will be some inconvenience in terms of classroom space for the Fall Semester of 1997.
5. Another opening on the KSURF board has been made available for KSU faculty. The appointment of a faculty member will occur in the next month or so. The Faculty Senate President submits nominations to the KSURF Nominations Committee. Please send me names of faculty to suggest as nominations for the KSURF board. My e-mail address is [Balk@Humeck.ksu.edu](mailto:Balk@Humeck.ksu.edu). While not mandated as part of the credentials for KSURF Board

members, it would be helpful for the faculty's work to be involved in intellectual property (such as patents). The KSURF nominations committee has a spot for the Faculty Senate President or designee. I narrowed the choice down quickly to the designee option. Jay Ham, Associate Professor of Agronomy, agreed to serve in this capacity.

6. Regent Warner requested that the Board of Regents discuss the need for the Regents universities to develop a common course numbering system with the Kansas community colleges. Apparently, he had a discussion with some community college folks in southwest Kansas.

It is important for the universities to have some comments to offer the Board on this topic, as well as some idea about how to proceed. I would appreciate your ideas on this issue. I will take them to the BOR meeting, February 19-20, in Topeka and share them with other Faculty Senate Presidents and with the Board members. Some questions to consider include the following:

- A common course numbering system might prove beneficial in some limited way, but the more important issues involve equivalence in course content and the actual learning of students. Will an initiative to establish common course numbering deal with the important transfer and articulation issues from the perspectives of the Regents universities? Is the current system really a problem?
- Would it be better to start with one discipline as a trial?
- How will this benefit the Regents universities? How will it impede or help our efforts in VISION 2020 and program review, particularly those that involve some form of curriculum review and restructuring?

7. The Faculty Affairs Committee will be reviewing policy statements in the Faculty Handbook on having two ombudspersons appointed by the Executive Committee and serving staggered terms. This review will begin this month. In the meantime, I am looking into the possibility of appointing on a temporary basis one faculty member as a designated alternate to work as a second ombudsperson. I need the concurrence of the Executive Committee to make such an appointment. [Senator Michie countered that as things stand now such an appointment would have to be seen as the second position, not as a temporary position. She did note that -- given Faculty Affairs intent to investigate the policy in the Handbook -- the appointment of a second ombudsperson may be due for alteration. President Balk will seek counsel on this matter].

On a separate issue the Faculty Affairs Committee will review concerns that the appeals process during a grievance has become cumbersome and perhaps more time consuming than is necessary. The critical issue at stake is to provide a fair, reliable process that allows the grievant to have a full and complete hearing. Some concerns have emerged

from faculty who have served on grievance panels that the process has become burdensome and inefficient.

8. State Representative John Edmonds of Great Bend has questioned the need for increases in faculty salaries and criticized the selection of KSU and KU peer institutions (for instance, the selection of Oregon State and North Carolina State as peers for KSU). Rep. Edmonds suggested that selecting east and west coast universities -- with higher costs of living -- insures that our salary situation looks worse than it really is. Regent Noland pointed out that selections of peers are made on the basis of many factors. Rep. Edmonds suggested peer comparisons not be made to Oregon and North Carolina, but rather to Missouri, Nebraska, and Texas. The Annual Report on the Status of Faculty Salaries & Fringe Benefits makes these very comparisons on page six of the report, and KSU doesn't look any better when compared to the Missouri, Nebraska, and Texas schools. Some faculty on the KSU campus have expressed concerns over the claims that Rep. Edmonds has made, and they think it is important that a clear response from Faculty Senate be made to Representative Edmonds's assertions. With input from faculty on the Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits Subcommittee, I can provide a response in my role as Faculty Senate President. What is Faculty Senate's thinking about a response to Representative Edmonds?

[The concurrence of Faculty Senators was to develop a joint response with all the Regents institutions Faculty Senate Presidents. Senator Conrow suggested that the Salary and Fringe Benefits might join President Balk in responding to his statements. Senator Smith compared her experience in Kansas with that in other states and believes very strongly that we need to educate the public about the university and its importance to the state. Senator Hansen reported that the Student Senate had passed a resolution supporting improved faculty salaries at its last meeting. In addition, the students are conducting an all day lobbying effort in Topeka on February 13.]

## VI. Reports from Standing Committees

### A. *Academic Affairs Committee* -- Steve Harbstreit

1. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Human Ecology November 8, 1996. Senator Smith seconded. The motion was approved.
2. Senator Harbstreit moved to accept the report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Regents' Initiative on Curriculum and Instruction. Senator Gould seconded.

Senator Hamilton asked whether accepting the report meant accepting the plans proposed. Senator Harbstreit responded that he understood that we would be accepting the report for consideration of the proposals and that we would need a committee to work out details for implementation.

page 15. Feb. 11, 1997

Senator Hamilton suggested a friendly revision to the motion: "and that Academic Affairs will take the report under advisement for consideration and implementation". The revision was accepted.

Senator Michie moved tabling the report until the March meeting so that such uncertainties can be settled. Senator Conrow seconded. The motion to table passed without dissent.

3. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of the December 1996 graduation list. Motion was seconded and passed.

4. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of a change to the May 1996 graduation list. Motion was seconded and passed.

B. *Faculty Affairs* -- Fadi Aramouni

Senator Aramouni had no report.

C. *Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning*

There was no report beyond the information from their minutes of January 21, 1997, which were attached to the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting.

VII. There was no old business.

VIII. New Business

A. Senator Legg moved adoption of a resolution regarding faculty approval for distribution of classroom surveys. Senator Hamilton seconded. **Attachment 2**

Senator Legg described the background leading to the resolution and stressed the importance of the faculty member's control of the use of class time. Ensuing discussion stressed that the resolution would not ban surveys of students, but would insist that they be done in class only with the instructor's consent. Senator Poresky suggested dropping the fourth paragraph. Senator Baker felt it important to include Graduate Teaching Assistants in the resolution.

The resolution was adopted without dissent.

B. Senator Reeck noted that the Big-12 Faculty Fellowship program is posted on the web, but that selection criteria are not included. He would like to see that information added. President Balk indicated this request would be passed along to the Administration.

C. Senator Glasgow referred to the Collegian article regarding removal and replacement of bike racks on campus. He opposes any move that would discourage bicycle use.

Senator Anderson replied that some racks are being moved to more convenient locations and that there should be a net increase in available storage.

- D. Senator Bussing referred to problems arising from the PeopleSoft payroll system. It requires an enormous amount of secretarial time in departments and has led to numerous horror stories of overpayment or non-payment.
  
- E. Senator Smith asked why twelve month faculty got their pay raises one pay period earlier than nine month appointees. Senator Legg had checked and found that twelve month contracts started earlier.
  
- F. Senator Hoag addressed reports of the increase in fees for reserved parking stalls. He asked what increased services were involved and suggested that perhaps faculty should have some say in how this windfall was spent, e.g. for library acquisitions.
  
- G. Senator Hansen reported on several matters from Student Senate.
  - 1. The Honor System has been passed by the Student Senate and will be coming forward through Academic Affairs.
  
  - 2. The students will conduct an all-day lobbying effort in Topeka on Thursday, February 13.
  
  - 3. A Course Information Proposal will be discussed in Faculty Affairs Committee February 18. He hopes to bring it to the March 11 Faculty Senate Meeting. The complete proposal is available from Senator Hansen or the Student Government office.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

## Attachment 1

### REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS: CASE STUDIES OF WHAT FACULTY DO

It is doubtful that the majority of concerned stakeholders in higher education -- legislators, students, and voters -- understand what faculty at KSU do. The multiplicity of efforts faculty undertake at KSU may escape the understanding of many faculty and of the Board of Regents. Given the climate of concern and suspicion that university faculty poorly serve undergraduate education, given the climate of rapid change and external pressures that universities face, and given the climate of ignorance over the link between faculty scholarship and teaching, the time could not be more advantageous to tell the story of what KSU faculty do. It is time that KSU let the many stakeholders in this land grant institution know the investment of KSU faculty. We need to tell our story.

The Provost's Office at Kansas State University seeks research proposals that present plans for studying what faculty do. All the major roles of faculty need to be addressed. The plan needs to provide means for seeing how these roles interact and reinforce each other. More than one proposal may be funded. It is anticipated that a team of researchers rather than a single individual will be needed to accomplish such a study.

The purpose(s) of the proposed plan needs to be clear. The approach to be used is the case study method, or some derivative thereof, that emphasizes the collection, analysis, and interpretation of qualitative or quantitative data.

Major audiences for this study are: (1) the Regents, legislators, and Kansas voters; (2) faculty. We want Regents, legislators, and voters to gain a clear understanding of what university faculty do. We want to use the materials as a means to help new faculty learn what is expected of a faculty member.

Funding will include summer stipends (or DRA funds) for nine-month faculty, DRA funds for twelve-month faculty, and salaries for GRAs. Staff support will be available from the Office of Educational Advancement and the Office of Instructional Research and Analysis. By March 15, 1997, submit to John Lankford, Assistant to the Provost, 106 Anderson Hall, three copies of a proposal (not to exceed five pages, double-spaced). All proposals should include a timetable which takes into account work during the Summer and Fall of 1997; a report to the Provost by February 15, 1998; and a report to the Board of Regents in the Spring of 1998. Successful projects will begin work by April 15.

A committee nominated by the Faculty Senate President and appointed by the Provost will review proposals. The Provost will appoint a chair for the committee. Periodically during the course of the investigation the committee will bring together the teams of successful applicants for discussions of their work. We anticipate one to three awards in the \$7,500 to \$15,000 range.

If you have questions about case study design, please call Professor David Balk (2-1486). If you have questions about submission and review of proposals, please call John Lankford (2-4797).



**Whereas our KSU academic tradition is that departments and individual faculty members are responsible for what happens in the classroom;**

**Whereas our KSU academic tradition is that student surveys in the classroom are conducted only with the approval of the departments and individual faculty members;**

**Whereas our KSU academic tradition is that the faculty must approve the distribution and use of the results of classroom surveys;**

**And whereas it appears that these traditions were overlooked in a program of classroom surveys concerning Graduate Teaching Assistants' communications skill;**

**Be it resolved that Faculty Senate affirms our KSU academic traditions and that Faculty Senate requests that program procedures consistent with these academic traditions be used in conducting any future classroom surveys.**

*James C. Legg*

*Thomas Menzies*

*Mark Ott*

*F.M.A. Shwood*

*Anna H. Wallace*

*H. Rahman*