

Minutes
Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
April 8, 1997 3:30 p.m. Big 12 Room, K-State Union

Present: Anderson, Aramouni, Atkinson, Baker, Balk, Bissey, Briggs, Brigham, Buchholz, Charney, Clegg, DeBowes, Deger, Dougan, Elkins, Exdell, Fenton, Feyerharm, Finland, Fjell, Foster, Fritz, Gould, Gray, Harbstreit, Hassan, Higgins, Hoag, J. Johnson, N. Johnson, Jones, Krstic, Lamond, Laughlin, Legg, Maes, Martin, Mathews, Michie, Miller, Moeller, Molt, Niehoff, Ottenheimer, Oukrop, Pallett, Peak, Rahman, Raub, Reeck, Riemann, Ross-Murray, Shultis, Smith, Taylor-Archer, White

Absent: Aslin, Barkley, Behnke, Benson, Bussing, Chastain, Conrow, Dyer, Glasgow, Hagmann, Hamilton, Homolka, Klopfenstein, May, McNamara, Mosier, Pierzynski, Reeves, Ross, Royse, Schroeder, Stewart, Swanson, Wilson, Woodward, Wright, Zchoche

Proxies: Kassebaum, McCulloh, Poresky

Guests: Brice Hobrock, Chris Hansen, Aubrey Abbott

- I. President Balk called the meeting to order.
- II. The minutes of the March 11, 1997, meeting were approved with the notation that the General Education Assessment Task Force report had been tabled, not passed.
- III. Announcements
 1. Concerns about fire marshal decisions regarding changes needed in Justin Hall have led faculty and administrators in the College of Human Ecology to ask Faculty Senators if there are other colleges or units with concerns over the decisions he is insisting be implemented. Please let me know if you have any concerns over decisions that do not seem reasonable. I will look into avenues open to protest decisions that strike us as unreasonable.
 2. Several persons in the A&S caucus have been in touch with the central administration (directly, with Chuck Reagan) about faculty input into campus planning (such things as parking garage and Denison Hall). In a recent telephone conversation, Chuck has indicated that the administration would be interested in discussing with Faculty Senate leadership a structure or system by which faculty input could be ongoing and recognized as such. In other words, this discussion and input would not be ad hoc, issue by issue, but constant and that a faculty committee (possibly FSCOUP?) be recognized by faculty and administration alike as serving that role. Perhaps an announcement in Senate that such

discussions have been proposed by the administration (discussions between faculty leadership and administration) would be in order. Sue Maes reported that FSCOUP has already discussed the classroom issue and has invited Tom Rawson to meet with them to discuss the university's five year plan.

3. Jeff Dougan, chairperson of Student Senate, and Tim Riemann, Student Body President, were introduced as new representatives to Faculty Senate. Nicole Johnson will continue as SGA representative to Faculty Senate.

- IV. The agenda was revised to permit Brice Hobrock, Dean of the Library, to discuss with Faculty Senate the situation with respect to materials acquisition in the library. He had prepared handouts describing the problem and proposed solutions.

Dean Hobrock explained that "serials crisis" has become a common reference as libraries attempt to deal with the publishing industry inflation which is rising much faster than library budgets. The administration gave him the mandate a year ago to develop a plan to help Kansas State address the problem. His solution is to move toward electronic "on demand" delivery, whereby the library will acquire additional databases and subscribe to on-line services with money which formerly would have been spent on serials. As individuals request articles, the cost will be subsidized by the colleges or by personal accounts. Money saved from serials acquisition could then be diverted to monographs. On suggestion from the Senate, Dean Hobrock will plan to demonstrate the on-line Table of Content document delivery system at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Senators asked whether more money from SRO could be used to support research, why the search for private funding did not have higher priority, and whether user fees had been considered. Dean Hobrock explained that in the past some SRO funds had been used, but that money was replaced by General Fund dollars. The Foundation did research the feasibility of private funding for the new library catalog, but found almost no support. On the other hand, the National Endowment for the Humanities grant will provide some permanent support for humanities acquisitions. He thinks it unlikely that user fees for the library could be approved. The only way he sees around the current problem is for universities to recapture ownership of intellectual property.

- V. Standing Committee Reports

A. Academic Affairs Committee—Steve Harbstreit

1. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes (599 & below) approved by the College of Arts and Sciences February 20, 1997 with the exception of the Advising of Undecided Students sections (page 10) and the Interdisciplinary Majors section (page 11). Motion was seconded and passed.

2. He moved approval of Graduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the Graduate Council March 4, 1997. Motion was seconded and passed.

CHANGE

EDADL 835	Principalship
EDADL 889	Practicum in Educational Administration
EDCEP 816	Research Methods
EDCEP 819	Survey Research
EDCEP 877	Practicum in Counseling
EDCEP 887	Counseling Internship
HRIMD 621	Hospitality Law

NEW

AGCOM 770	Practicum in Professional Journalism
EDCEP 967	Advanced Counseling Appraisal
HRIMD 624	Procurement in the Hospitality Industry
HRIMD 665	Gaming Management
MLANG 710	Introduction to Foreign Language Pedagogy

3. He moved approval of General Education courses approved by the General Education Implementation task Force February 20 and March 3, 1997. Motion was seconded and passed.

GNHE 310	Human Needs
ENGL 261	British Literature: Medieval and Renaissance
SPCH 325	Argumentation and Debate
DAS 582	Natural Resources/Environmental Science Project
DEN 582	Natural Resources/Environmental Science Project
GENAG 582	Natural Resources/Environmental Science Project
PHYS 106	Concepts of Physics

4. He moved approval of changes in December 1995 and December 1996 graduation lists. Motion was seconded and passed.
5. He moved approval of the March 1997 graduation list from the Graduate School. Motion was seconded and passed.
6. Senator Harbstreit reported that an Ad Hoc Committee on the Undergraduate Honor System proposal has been formed and is at work. He expressed the hope that their report would be available by the end of the academic year.
7. Similarly, Academic Affairs has established an Ad Hoc Committee on the Regents' Initiative on Curriculum and Instruction. There, too, he hopes to have a report by the end of the academic year.
8. The report "Assessing the Outcomes of General Education at Kansas State University" was taken off the table for discussion and action. President Balk explained that the plan is to assess the program, not individual courses or instructors, and to evaluate outcomes of the program. Senator Pallett pointed out

that page 17 is the most important because faculty leadership and support are mandatory if the program is to succeed. The intention is to use data from evaluations currently being done of recent graduates and the students four years later as the basis for comparison. The report was approved.

9. Senator Deborah Briggs reported that several faculty members in the College of Veterinary Medicine had requested that the following information be brought to the attention of Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate:

“Recently some changes in pre-veterinary admission requirements were published without routing and approval from the appropriate committees in the CVM and at the University level. This afternoon I was informed that a special faculty meeting in the CVM would be held to address this situation. The faculty in the college are hoping that the ‘breach of rules’ can be rectified within the college. I would request the opportunity to report the progress back to the Faculty Senate at the next meeting.”

Her remarks raised a number of concerns about the failure to follow procedures in the College of Veterinary Medicine. Senator Harbstreit indicated that he has already scheduled a meeting with the Provost in an attempt to correct the matter. Senator Michie found that in addition to violating standard procedures within the College, the College of Veterinary Medicine also failed to notify other affected Colleges. Senator Martin pointed out that not only the requirements have been changed, but also the way in which transcripts are to be evaluated. This is particularly difficult for students who have been in preparation for two or three years already.

In view of the gravity of the issue, Senator Exdell proposed the following motion: “The Faculty Senate charges the Academic Affairs Committee to investigate whether the way in which changes in admission requirements for the College of Veterinary Medicine were made violates established University policy.” Senator Martin seconded the motion which was then passed unanimously.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee – Fadi Aramouni

1. Senator moved approval of the Course Information Proposal. Senator Anderson seconded the motion.

President Balk described the development of the proposal through the Board of Regents and on campus and lauded Chris Hansen for following procedures and working with faculty so closely.

Inquiries were raised by several senators about the questions on the student survey, whether they were clearly phrased, whether they would provide the

information sought, and whether the honesty of the answers could be assured. As Senator Charney pointed out, we are asking freshmen, in some cases, to answer questions where they may lack experience and knowledge. He was concerned that a poor questionnaire could damage both the proposal and the entire General Education program.

Senator Conrow moved to amend the proposal in the section "Time line". The first sentence in the italicized portion should be revised to read : "*After two years, the program will be reevaluated for administrative costs and student/advisor usage and other matter judged relevant at that time.*" Senator Oukrop seconded the motion which was approved.

Senator Rahman agreed with the information on the sample information sheet up to the "Survey Results". She would like to dissociate the instructor evaluation from the course information both because that individual may not teach the course again soon and because the results published might be used for the wrong purposes. Senator Smith's colleagues in Human Ecology agreed to restructure courses to fit the General Education guidelines and are now concerned that they are being asked to submit to student surveys on courses under development without reasonable explanations. They are also concerned about the effect this survey might have on grade inflation.

Senator Charney moved to amend the proposal as follows:

"1. The Course Information Questionnaire provided shall be considered as a sample and simply that, and 2. The Policy and Procedures Board shall develop, refine, and test a questionnaire for not less than one academic year, and 3. the results of the questionnaire shall not be published during that testing period."

Senator Ottenheimer seconded the motion.

Senator Dougan asked what the year of testing would entail and whether, at the end of the testing period, the Senate would have to again vote on the instrument. Senator Charney would expect the Board to check for ambiguity in wording, try parallel sets of questions, generally ferret out problem areas in the questions. He assumes the questionnaire would simply go into use at the end of the testing period and be reviewed as indicated in the proposal.

The motion to amend passed.

Senator Krstic explained that he is, as faculty, continuously evaluated and wondered what the long term result would be of making this a formal public document. His major fear is the possibility that the published survey might jeopardize the quality of instruction at Kansas State.

Chris Hansen described the mechanism for funding the proposal. The Administration would provide approximately one-eighth to one-tenth time of a

professional staff member in the office for Educational Advancement. The students would pay for a graduate assistant in the office, students hired to put data on the Internet, additional hardware as needed, and providing forms and about a thousand print copies of the report.

It was explained that much of the "Course Information" material would come from the material included when the courses were submitted for General Education approval.

Senator Buchholz called the question.

Senator N. Johnson called for a roll call vote.

Senator Bussing asked if there was still a quorum. There was no longer a quorum.

VI. The meeting ended at 5:40 for lack of a quorum.

SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING IN TRANSITION

Discussion Points

The Problem

Due to worldwide hyperinflation in the costs of scholarly information in print format:

- the unit price of the average scholarly journal subscription has increased 159 percent since 1986,
- the unit price of scholarly books has increased 70 percent since 1986,
- in large U.S. and Canadian academic libraries that support research, serial expenditures increased 130 percent since 1986,
- at KSU, serial expenditures increased 93 percent since 1986,
- in large U.S. and Canadian academic libraries, serial titles purchased decreased 10 percent since 1986,
- at KSU, serials purchased have declined 27 percent since 1986,
- in large U.S. and Canadian academic libraries, monographs purchased have declined 23 percent since 1986,
- at KSU, monographs purchased have declined 50 percent since 1986.

The Causes

While one factor or another may dominate in a particular year, all of the following contribute to the run-up in costs:

- devaluation of the U.S. Dollar against European currencies (KSU purchases about 50 percent from Europe),
- costs of scientific titles dominate the cost picture; the average cost of science titles is six times the average cost of humanities and social sciences titles. The language of international science is English, with European publishers dominating worldwide science publishing,
- there are more scholars writing and publishing. The number of pages published per title has increased dramatically. Each new title or total pages added to an existing title takes a slice of a limited financial pie, forcing up unit costs of every title,
- privately-held commercial publishers dominate publishing of scholarly material, compared to high incidence of non-profit societies 20 years ago. Profit margins are very large,
- the "economics" of scholarly publishing are characterized by low volume, unique product, high costs. The system is supply-driven, not market-driven,
- copyright is assigned by the producer for no cost consideration to the value-added processor and distributor,
- electronic publishing and indexing are adding to total output of information, but have not replaced print publishing or decreased costs.

Alternative Solutions

While cause and effect is well-known, solutions have been elusive. Despite the best efforts of universities, library organizations and scholars since 1986 to identify control/response mechanisms, the conditions and outcomes continue unabated. Most universities have substantially increased financial support, but well below the rate of inflation, resulting in overall decline of titles owned in print format. Alternative methodologies are being implemented by most libraries to supply single-instance requests for articles, in place of having sufficient volumes on the shelf. Electronic alternatives are promising but a) claims by techno-promoters are not fully realized, b) acceptance of the alternative is not yet part of the academic culture, c) authentication (peer review) must be assured, d) archiving electronic publications must be assured, and e) intellectual property must be protected. Thus, in the near term, we must:

- identify the information access models that fit KSU needs.
- define a "managed source" model for access to research information, implement alternative processes that put information in hands of faculty in a timely way, and recognize the unique characteristics of how specific disciplines access scholarly information,
- maintain a balance of print and electronic alternatives at our institution that meets the needs of researchers,
- fund the transitional needs for acquiring information for faculty and students from commercial suppliers, while the model changes,
- meet undergraduate/classroom needs increasingly with electronic full-text,
- develop the infrastructure at KSU that provides necessary access to electronic alternatives,
- offer custom table of contents access to journals not owned with user-initiated subsidized requests for single articles,
- reexamine ownership issues for intellectual property produced at KSU,
- increase faculty awareness of the scholarly publishing process. This is not a "library problem" but a "university problem,"
- increase partnering between academic departments and the Library on what is selected and paid for, e.g., acquiring joint licenses at lower costs.
- increase cost-sharing, joint licensing of electronic products among Regents, Big-Twelve universities,
- understand that electronic alternatives will not reduce costs. Costs will be increasingly shifted to the user and libraries and universities will be unable to support the demands of researchers for information.

April 8, 1997
Brice G. Hobrock

INFORMATION SOURCE MANAGEMENT
ALTERNATIVES

	OWNERSHIP			ACCESS					DOCUMENT DELIVERY		ARCHIVING		TOTAL	NEED
	Postage/ Handling/ Service Charges	Serials ¹	Monographs	InHouse (Ownership/Maintained Locally)		External (Access)			External User Initiated	Internal Mediated	Binding	Electronic ⁵		
				Databases	E-journals Partner Pub.	Databases ³	Full-Text ⁴	TOC	TOC/Copyright (NOT included in TOTAL)	ILS				
1996/97 (Current Year)	\$35,000	\$2,121,75 6,618 titles	\$343,250	\$160,000	\$0	\$37,000	\$58,000	\$0		\$46,000	\$85,000	\$90,000	\$2,976,000	
1997/98 Alternatives														
1. 2.0% increase across the board	\$35,700	\$2,164,185 6,130 titles	\$350,115	\$163,200 ⁶		\$37,740	\$59,160			\$46,920	\$86,700	\$91,800	\$3,035,520	\$59,520
2. Managed 2.0% increase	\$36,000	\$1,750,000 ² 4,957 titles	\$739,520	\$175,000		\$45,000	\$60,000	\$20,000	Deposit accounts subsidized by the Colleges: \$200,000	\$40,000	\$80,000	\$90,000	\$3,035,520	\$59,520
3. Rebuilding Budget	\$36,000	\$2,500,000 7,082 titles	\$724,400	\$175,000		\$45,000	\$60,000	\$50,000	Deposit accounts subsidized by the Colleges: \$200,000	\$40,000	\$90,000	\$100,000	\$4,144,400	\$1,168,400
4. Ideal 60/30/10	\$36,000	\$3,534,000 10,000 titles	\$1,630,000	\$175,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$60,000	\$50,000	Deposit accounts subsidized by the Colleges: \$200,000	\$40,000	\$100,000	\$125,000	\$5,900,000	\$2,924,000

¹ Title count based on \$354 per title

² Reflects a \$618,000 reduction (\$500,000 cancellation + \$118,000 inflation)

³ Includes CRL, Lexis/Nexis, INK

⁴ IAC and/or other full-text service

⁵ Includes LCSH, Marcive, BCR/OCLC

⁶ Reflects need to bring databases to a late summer or early fall subscription and license for the LAN

