

Minutes
Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
October 14, 1997 3:30 p.m. Big 12 Room, K-State Union

Present: D. Anderson, P. Anderson, Aramouni, Baker, Barkley, Bissey, Briggs, Brigham, Campbell, Charney, Clegg, Conrow, Dawes, Delker, Dodd, Dougan, Dubois, Dyer, Farmer, Fenton, Fenwick, Feyerharm, Foster, Fritz, Gray, Grunewald, Guikema, Hagmann, Hamilton, Hassan, Hightower, Holden, J. Johnson, N. Johnson, Jones, Kassebaum, Keiser, Krstic, Lamond, Laughlin, Legg, Mathews, McClaskey, McNamara, Michie, Miller, Ossar, Ottenheimer, Oukrop, Pence, Rahman, Reeves, Ross, Ross-Murray, Shultis, Smith, Stewart, Taylor-Archer, White, Wissman, D. Wright, K. Wright, Zabel, Zschoche

Proxies: Atkinson, Jardine, Koelliker, Riemann

Absent: Behnke, Benson, Deger, Devlin, Fjell, Higgins, Klopfenstein, Martin, McCulloh, McMurphy, Peak, Raub, Reeck, Royse, Schapaugh, Schroeder, Woodward

Guests: Cynthia McCahon, Brice Hobrock, Chris Hansen, Peter Knupfer, Cole Ehmke

The Faculty Senate *Royal Purple* photograph was made.

- I. President Legg called the meeting to order.
- II. Minutes of the August 19, 1997, meeting were approved as distributed.
- III. Announcements
 - A. A committee of faculty, administrators, and students from the Regents' institutions is identifying important themes for consideration in developing a new Regents' intellectual property policy. There will be a meeting at which all interested parties can discuss these themes.
 - B. The leadership expects to work with the administration to develop the Kansas State program review plan for presentation to the Regents.
 - C. Chris Hansen, former Student Body President, discussed the Course Information Program which Faculty Senate passed last spring. A committee of five members, three students and Buddy Gray and Bill Pallett representing the faculty, has met to discuss implementation of the program. The next meeting will be at 4 p.m. October 23 in the SGA offices. At that time the committee will discuss revising the questions in preparation for a late November or early December trial run of the program. The questions are posted on the Faculty Senate

web page (<http://www.ksu.edu/facsen/policies/quest.htm>). Mr. Hansen asked that faculty contact one of the faculty representatives or him at his e-mail address *cchan@ksu.edu*.

They are looking for volunteers for trial runs in November and in the spring semester.

IV. Standing Committee Reports

A. Academic Affairs Committee -- Don Fenton

1. Senator Fenton moved approval of dropping KIN 101 as an all university requirement. The College of Arts and Sciences approved this April 17, 1997, and Academic Affairs approved the change after its open hearing September 16, 1997. Senator Johnson seconded the motion. It passed without dissent.
2. Senator Fenton moved approval of Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes (599 & below) approved by the College of Engineering May 9, 1997, as well as changes approved by the College of Human Ecology May 9, 1997. Senator Shultis seconded the motion. It passed.
3. Senator Fenton moved approval of Graduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the Graduate Council September 2, 1997. Senator Hagmann seconded the motion. It passed.

CHANGE

ME 635	Dynamics of Flight - Stability and Control
ME 640	Automatic Controls
IAR 760	Interior Architecture Seminar
FN 630	Clinical Nutrition
IDH 645	Senior Interior Design Studio II
CT 610	Computer-Aided Design of Apparel
ECON 620	Labor Economics
GEOG 800	Graduate Colloquium I
GEOG 801	Graduate Colloquium II

NEW

EECE 887	Distribution System Engineering
FSHS 740	Play Facilitation
CT 725	Strategic Planning in the Apparel and Textile Industry
CT 645	Import/Export Strategy in the Apparel and Textile Industries

4. Senator Fenton moved approval of the General Education Program proposed by the College of Architecture, Planning and Design, and the Department of Landscape Architecture/Regional and Community Planning, the Department of Architecture, and the Department of Interior Architecture. The proposal was approved by the College November 13, 1996, and by the General Education

Implementation Task Force by a mail vote in the first two weeks of July 1997. Senator Delker seconded the motion. It passed.

5. Senator Fenton moved approval of graduation lists for May and August 1997, the Graduate School list for July 1997 and additions to the list of May 1996. Senator Johnson seconded the motion. It passed.

B. Faculty Affairs – Brad Fenwick

The Faculty Affairs Committee had intended to bring forward legislation for each Senate meeting this year, but matters did not evolve that way.

1. The Committee presented the amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution regarding representation of General Administration on the Senate. That done, the Committee would still like to look at the appropriateness of having all senators vote on some specific questions.
2. Senators Matthews and Reeves had put together a response to the Regents' Intellectual Property Proposal. That response should not be needed since the original proposal has been withdrawn from consideration.
3. A number of activities on campus have attracted the Committee's attention:
 - a. Senator McNamara reported on the general issues involving faculty rights and responsibilities in one of the colleges. A dispute among faculty members in one department led some faculty to attempt to remove one tenured individual from the department. The Dean removed the faculty member physically and administratively from the department without the benefit of due process. The individual now reports to an assistant dean.

Faculty Affairs finds the isolation from colleagues and the disenfranchisement this person is experiencing due to administrative action intolerable in a university situation. The Provost perceived this as a matter for the Grievance Board and not in the purview of Faculty Affairs.

A senator who is a member of the unit involved explained that it had been a grass roots action, working without the Department Head because of possible problems if the Head had become involved.

Senator Baker objected to limiting this case to grievance procedures because a faculty member can bring a procedure only against administrative action not against other faculty members.

Faculty Affairs will look into legislation to bar such actions by the Administration.

- b. The dean of one college effected the merger of two departments within that college against the wishes of the faculty in one of the units. Faculty Affairs will become involved, if necessary.
 - c. Faculty Affairs is trying to collect all of the departmental documents for implementing C31.5-C31.8 which have been rejected by the Provost. They hope to find a common thread which would enable them to solve the problem. The Committee is having to approach departments because the Provost's office reported that they had not kept the proposals.
 - d. This summer the Provost announced that he would no longer be involved in grievance procedures except for those involving tenure and promotion. He indicated that all other cases would be the individual dean's responsibility. The Faculty Affairs Committee has written to him pointing out that he is the Chief Academic Officer of the University. Faculty consultation was not solicited prior to the announcement.
 - e. The Information Technology Policy was put in place without faculty consultation and approval. The Committee's major concern with the content of the policy is that the Vice Provost has authority to permit reading of faculty e-mail.
 - f. The Committee is investigating the possible misuse of Foundation funds by at least one college.
 - g. The Provost announced a hiring freeze on Friday. The Faculty Senate Leadership group had not been consulted prior to his announcement.
4. Frank White and John Johnson are co-chairs of the Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee.
 5. The Committee needs to deal with inconsistencies in the *Faculty Handbook* which deal with the effect of scholarly leave on the tenure clock.

Senator Ottenheimer referred to a list of administrative raises which is circulating on campus. He would like for the Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee to look into the issue further. Senator Fenwick replied that that is on the future action list along with a study of what happens to the salary level of administrators who return to faculty positions. President Legg reminded them that the Administration agreed several years ago to report to the Faculty Senate, showing that their overall raises were in line with faculty raises.

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning -- Linda Brigham and Vladimir Krstic

FSCOUP has divided itself into four groups to study separate problems: the Library, Space Planning, Strategic Planning, and Teaching and Research Support for Faculty Members.

1. Dean Cynthia McCahon, chair of the Library Task Force, reported on the group's deliberations. The Task Force, appointed by Jim Coffman and Jim Legg, was charged to:

- a. Analyze the context of current funding issues
- b. Design future revenue streams
- c. Analyze the balance between print and alternative forms of materials
- d. Engage in "blue sky" thinking about the future of the Library.

The Task Force is to report to the Provost and the Faculty Senate President by November. Subgroups of the Task Force have attempted to set up benchmarks for library funding in comparison to other universities, to determine funding sources for electronic retrieval, to establish benchmarks for serials use based on other universities' experience, and have drafted short and long term funding mix proposals.

The group has determined that K-State dedicates 2.59% of its total educational and general expenditures to the library, lower than the 3.0% Big-12 average, but closer to the 2.69% average of our peer institutions. The funding level has remained at a fairly constant percentage of unrestricted educational and general expenditures. They looked at possible new sources of funding. If an additional 1% of the OOE budget were given to the Library, it would amount to about \$250,000 a year. A 1% tuition increase dedicated to the Library would raise about \$100,000. A \$1 million endowment at the Foundation would generate \$50,000 a year. One per cent of the administration and department pools of SRO money would be about \$52,000 yearly. A \$1 per credit hour fee increase would produce some \$350,000 each year.

Faculty should read the Task Force's October 1, 1997, letter to the KSU Community for further details of the findings and recommendations.

Senator Ottenheimer asked why the serials reduction is being dealt with in a crisis mode if the Library has understood the problem for 11 years. Dean Hobrock explained that he has reported this to the Administration and Faculty Senate for years. This is simply a last resort attempt to deal with the issue.

Senator Ossar wondered why KU is a member of the Association of Research Libraries and we are not, if funding levels are comparable. He also asked whether we would be at risk of losing accreditation if the number of serials continues to drop. Dean McCahon explained that admission to ARL is based on the number of volumes

in the library and requires a higher number for admission than for maintenance of membership. For K-State to join ARL, it would probably take a \$12.8 to \$14.4 million a year budget for at least five years. Aside from the unlikelihood of having the funds, membership may not be that desirable today.

This year's 5-20% cuts will take place October 17, but further cuts should not be needed for two years under these proposals, Senator Rahman learned in answer to her question. However, a department could also meet its assessment through additional serials cuts. The assessments for individual cost centers mentioned in the Short Term Recommendation 3.b. will be negotiated by the deans and by deans and departments.

Professor Peter Knupfer, a member of the University Library Committee, is seriously concerned about the Task Force's report and expressed the hope that that group would work with the Library Committee. He explained that reengineering the Library has caused reengineering of the faculty. It places the researchers' materials in the hand of programmers, not scholars. His extensive experience with HNet, which publishes on-line reviews and materials, has convinced him that search engines are seriously flawed and should not be relied on as a source for scholarly material. He would like the Library Committee to be the faculty voice in this discussion. This whole demoralizing process is, in his words, "not conducive to effective teaching and research."

Senator Hamilton suggested that the situation would not change until scholars quit "giving" their research to predatory publishers. In some fields scholars are beginning to do this. Senator Dodd mentioned that the University Library Committee should look at unfair prices for individual journals and work against the publishers through our professional contacts. The question was also raised whether libraries could collaborate in dealing with publishers. Dean Hobrock indicated that ARL had looked into it, but that the attorneys advised against such a plan because the publishers have a history of suing.

President Legg described the next steps. The Task Force will report. Then an all-University meeting will be called to hear presentations and ask questions. He emphasized the need for the Library Committee and FSCOUP to be our voice in these discussions and in implementing long-term strategies for the library.

2. Senator Krstic addressed issues raised in a reorganization which took place this summer in the College of Human Ecology. FSCOUP's concerns are whether affected faculty members were afforded due process and whether the situation properly reflected the principle of shared governance under which the University has worked for many years.

The issue was precipitated by a failed search for a department head. Dean Stowe then named the head of another department acting head of the department in question and the two

presented, on June 6, 1997, a structure with the two departments divided into three units for a 3-year trial period.

Among the problems seen by FSCOUP is that any reorganization which affects other units or colleges must, according to appendix N of the *Faculty Handbook*, be monitored by FSCOUP. This reorganization would affect departments in Agriculture and Arts and Sciences. Although a member of FSCOUP was present at the meetings, it was in the role of a department member, not as a FSCOUP representative. Changes of this sort can be detrimental to faculty and their work, therefore Senators Krstic and Fenwick sent letters to the College of Human Ecology asking for a moratorium on the change pending review and due process. Letters from the Provost, Dean Stowe, and the Chair of the Human Ecology College Committee on Planning have arrived. They indicate that the process will be restarted according to the *Faculty Handbook*.

Senator Grunewald stated that the two departments have formed three units and that the faculty are continuing discussions. President Legg's understanding from the correspondence is that the departments are to be clearly separate units, not coupled in any way. Senator Reeves indicated that the administrative structure imposed in June is still in place despite the Provost's statement that the two units should go back to their status as of May 20. President Legg reiterated that the departments involved should be conducting long range planning outside the strictures of this reorganization.

Moreover, Senator Wright pointed out many decisions regarding course and program offerings are being made in the College without faculty input. A matter of special concern is that faculty are being coerced to make their courses available for distance education, even though it was not part of the department's goal. President Legg encouraged the Human Ecology senators to have their Academic Affairs representative offer a resolution that on-line courses need to be approved separately by the Academic Affairs Committee.

FSCOUP will continue to monitor this situation.

3. The hiring freeze was not mentioned at the last Leadership meeting. FSCOUP had no contact and no input into the matter. Members of the group learned of the freeze from the *Collegian*. It is vitally important that the faculty have input, if we are to continue the tradition of shared governance. Senator Michie suggested that President Legg should ask why there was no prior consultation in this matter as called for by the *Faculty Handbook* and tradition.

President Legg emphasized that the *Faculty Handbook* means nothing if the faculty and administration do not subscribe to the principles of shared governance embodied there.

No one could answer Senator Smith's question whether the hiring freeze would affect the two deanships which will come vacant this year.

Senator Krstic assured the Senate that FSCOUP will follow through on the Human Ecology letter and will receive information regarding the hiring freeze.

V. There was no Old Business.

VI. There was no New Business.

VII. For the Good of the University

A. Senator Kathy Wright reported that Cooperative Extension has funded membership for the entire university in ADEC, the Distance Education Consortium of land grant and state universities. Its mission is to provide high quality programs and services via the latest and most appropriate information technologies.

Satellite teleconferences on "Changing Expectations of Faculty Roles and Responsibilities" will be open to interested faculty on November 4 and November 13 from 10:30 to noon in Waters 137. All interested faculty are invited to get further information by contacting Senator Wright by phone (2-6270) or by e-mail (kwright@oz.oznet.ksu.edu).

B. Senator Michie referred back to the Faculty Affairs Committee report. The statement that a grievance can only be brought against an administrative action is not true. She cited harassment and discrimination as bases for grievance against other faculty members.

VIII. The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

October 1, 1997

To: The KSU Community

From: Task Force: Funding the Library for the 21st Century

Re: Changing How We Acquire Published Research: Short-Term Recommendation and Long-Term Considerations for KSU

The "University Task Force -- Financing the Library for the 21st Century" was appointed by the Provost and Faculty Senate President last May to specifically develop strategies for funding a reasonable balance of information resources at KSU. Following is our proposal for supporting a balanced program of printed subscriptions, electronic text, and subsidized single-article document delivery. This memorandum is written to keep KSU Library users informed of our progress.

We believe that the KSU academic community needs to understand and adjust to conditions affecting worldwide scholarly communication, including a) increased output of published research, b) extraordinary inflation, and c) slow growth of university budgets. As the Library and the University consider how to bring purchased journals into line with available funds and pay for alternative strategies, it is important that every faculty member and scholar understand this matter and become a part of the longer-term solution. While the short-term reduction of subscriptions may seem unworkable, it is our intention that new strategies will increase accessibility and the total amount of information available to support the needs of students and faculty.

The need to reduce KSU commitments to printed journals will recur as state-funded allocations continue to cover a fraction of the inflationary increases that affect journal costs since 1986. Short- and long-term solutions are elusive and costly. However, we must satisfactorily deal with the short-term necessity to provide enough printed journals for your needs, while we shift to other ways to locate and acquire information.

The Library's subscription adjustment proposals are the result of a) 14 percent average annual inflation of serials costs since 1986, b) 2.25 percent average annual OOE increases, c) strains on the University to provide adequate supplementary funds from internal resources at the level required, despite approximately \$600,000 reallocated from university funds, and d) failure of the legislature to address this problem since the late 1980's on the mistaken belief that scholarly information is available electronically at lower cost.

Costs of scholarly information publishing are largely borne by subscribers, principally libraries, who subsidize individual access by paying full subscription prices. Library acquisitions budgets are the product of a university consensus to support scholarly output and communication. Library budgets reflect the university communities' understanding of this process and willingness to provide the necessary funding.

Costs have increased at the 14 percent annual rate because of a) devaluation of the U.S. Dollar, b) shifts of publishing from non-profit scholarly societies to large commercial publishers, and c) the need of the profit sector to protect revenue while subscriptions decline. Scholars contribute to the problem by assigning copyright to commercial publishers for no compensation.

The "system," publishing authenticated results in printed journals, is rapidly changing. All university libraries will have fewer printed journals on the shelf in the future. Although printed journals are increasingly available in electronic form, they are not free or less expensive. Access is dependent on paying the cost of the print subscription plus surcharge. Thus, publishers intend to control the transition to electronic format, while increasing revenue. Archiving, making results available to future scholars is also essential to the "system." Print remains the most viable archival format until a system of archiving electronic publishing is organized.

This is a transitional time. Many print journals have become unaffordable while some electronic alternatives are becoming more viable. Kansas State University believes that the only way to balance need and cost is to utilize a "managed sourcing" strategy where we utilize an array of sources -- print, electronic text, library trading partners, and commercial document delivery. A "managed sourcing" strategy allows us to choose the best way to expend scarce dollars.

KSU will meet faculty and student needs for timely information by providing a) a core set of essential printed journals plus 2) an alternative array of electronic indexes, full-text, and table of contents and document delivery services. Consequently, we must all adjust to changes in the ways that we acquire information in the future.

Please turn the page for proposed short-term recommendations and long-term considerations.

Short Term Recommendations:

1. The Library will not fall below a bare minimum of 5000 print journals in all disciplines.
2. The proposed \$ 500,000 in print subscription suspensions will be reduced to \$ 300,000 in the following manner: a sliding scale of 5% to 20% reductions by cost center (usually department) based on the following three criteria:
 - a. rate of serial inflation
 - b. proportion of overall serial budget
 - c. average cost per periodical subscriptionWe encourage faculties to review their entire collections for additions as well as deletions ultimately staying within their required budget reductions. We also encourage faculty to consider eliminating journals whose use is not commensurate with their cost.
3. To meet this \$200,000 shortfall and to provide \$100,000 for the implementation of UNCOVER in 1997-8 and to meet the inflation of journals kept (\$175,000) and the cost of UNCOVER for the year 1998-9, the following funding mix is proposed for the next two years:
 - a. The library increases its monograph purchases from the current \$300,000 to \$600,000 for 1997-98 and 1998-99 instead of the budgeted \$700,000.
 - b. All cost centers (except President's Office, Provost's Office and the Library) collectively contribute \$100,000 in 1997-8 and 1998-9.
 - c. The Provost's and President's Offices collectively contribute \$50,000 in 1997-8 and 1998-9.
 - d. The remaining shortage of \$225,000 in 1998-9 will be funded out of reallocated university resources (which may include departmental recommendations of further print serial subscription reductions, OOE, empty faculty lines, GTA salaries, etc.).

Long Term Considerations:

1. *Identification of Resources* - Currently we are considering as possible funding sources:
 - * Legislative action to augment Regents' library budgets (\$????)
 - * Higher across-the-board OOE increases (however, a 1% increase in OOE yields only \$250,000 for the *entire* university)
 - * Fund raising campaign with the Foundation (every \$1,000,000 in endowment would yield \$50,000/yr.)
 - * SRO reallocation (every 1% reallocation to the library would yield \$52,000/yr.)
 - * A percentage of certain athletic activity revenue: licensing revenue from sales of athletic merchandise, golf course usage fees, \$1-\$2 per football/basketball ticket sold (\$240,000 +/-year)
 - * A student privilege fee of \$2 per credit hour for library information resources (about \$700,000 per year)
 - * Occasional windfalls: coke/pepsi contracts (\$50,000-\$60,000)
 - * Various other "fund-raising" ventures: book drives/sales, voluntary contributions from faculty
2. *Efficient Use of Resources*
 - a. Implementing an annual dialog with departments and their library representatives to keep abreast of serials price increases and budgets available, as well as to adjust percentages of budget between serials and monographs ("living within one's means" test).
 - b. Collecting serials use data on serials, monographs and electronic resources.

Outline of Events
Proposed Reorganization: Depts FN and HRIMD
College of Human Ecology
10/6/97

This outline replaces the previous draft discussed in Faculty Affairs of Faculty Senate on 9/2/97. It was prepared by Kathy Grunewald (1996-97 CCOP Chair, College of Human Ecology), who incorporated written comments submitted by FN and HRIMD faculty and staff. It was then reviewed by three FN faculty: Robert Reeves (FS-Faculty Affairs), Chery Smith (FS-FSCOUP), and Carole Setser.

Date	Action	Comments and Concerns
1996-1997	Impending retirement of long-time Department Head (20 years)	
2-26	Mtg of FN faculty, Dean Stowe, and Provost Coffman	
March	Failed Dept Head Search. Judy Miller appointed Acting Head of FN while still remaining Head of Dept HRIMD	
4-25	Dean Stowe met with FN faculty to review reopening Dept head search -- suggestion by one faculty member that we combine HRIMD and FN into a division or school.	This comment was made to <u>consider</u> reorganization through discussion among both faculties
5-8	Mtg of FN faculty and Dean Stowe. Faculty vote of 9 to 3 to develop a list of pros and cons concerning restructuring.	
5-13	HRIMD faculty met with Dean Stowe indicating they did not favor combining with FN into 1 unit	
5-20	FN faculty and staff discussed reorganization and voted: 18 against, 0 for, and 2 abstentions.	Faculty also discussed renewed search for Dept Head at this meeting.
6-6	Dean Stowe & Dr. Miller met with combined faculties to present draft structure with 3 units for a FN/HRIMD school/division that they stated they planned to implement immediately for a 3-year trial period.	A draft of the proposed structure was distributed at the meeting without prior discussion among faculty involved.
		NOTE: Most of the following events occurred over the SUMMER . This was a problem for 9-month faculty who were here only sporadically or not at all.
6-7	Letter of opposition to reorganization sent to Dean Stowe by former FN Department Head Jane Bowers	
6-10	Dean Stowe called a CCOP meeting for them to "review K-State Faculty Handbook Appendix N and CCOP's responsibility to prepare a statement to accompany the submission of the proposal to central administration" (minutes of 6/10)	CCOP Mtg called <u>4 days</u> after "trial" reorganization was implemented. No agenda was distributed to CCOP members prior to the meeting. FSCOUP representatives from other affected colleges (A&S, AG) had not been notified. There had been no discussion of impacts on curricula and very little had been discussed of this structure in the 4-day period.
6-23	Mtg of FN faculty, HRIMD faculty, Dean Stowe and Judy Miller discussed aspects of the possible restructuring plan	
7-1	One Food Science faculty member moved to the College of Agriculture	

Date	Action	Comments and Concerns
7-14	5 of 6 tenured food science faculty sent letter to Provost Coffman requesting a move of the CHE Food Science program to College of AG to comply with 1992 Regents' recommendations rather than remain in reorganized CHE unit.	The move to AG makes sense from a university perspective because there are two Food Science programs - both having a small number of undergraduate majors. If the CHE Food Science remained in the reorganized structure it would be dwarfed even more.
7-15	Coordinators of 3 subunits in reorganized structure appointed by Acting Head Judy Miller Coordinators for 3 subunits: Nutrition/Dietetics: S Koo & D Canter Foods & Related: E Chambers, IV Hospitality Mgmt: R Gould Grad Program Director: C Shanklin Extension: P Peters Distance/outreach: K Grunewald and C Boger	Faculty did not elect the coordinators for their subunits, although faculty input was collected and considered by Judy Miller
8-12	Meeting of Food Science faculty with Dean Stowe and Judy Miller	
8-25	Letter received from Provost Coffman indicating that the departments of FN and HRIMD "have been merged with 3-year horizon for re-evaluation". Approval for moving the Food Science program to Agriculture was declined	Officially the departments were <u>not</u> merged, since CCOP had not released a statement; other affected units on campus had not been contacted, and the reorganization not yet been reviewed at the CHE college meeting
Late Aug	All but 2 of food science undergraduate majors transferred to the program in the College of AG; only 1 new graduate student in Food Science with Human Ecology Faculty	
8-7 to 8-29	Written survey on reorganization distributed by CCOP chair to 49 Faculty and Staff in Depts FN and HRIMD. 67% response rate	Vote for proposed reorganization: Yes (30%); No (42%), Abstain (27%)
9-5-97	CCOP Mtg. Chair Kathy Grunewald reviewed background on reorganization and survey results. Comments/concerns voiced from other CCOP members. Distribution of letter from Faculty Senate (Krstic and Fenwick) suggesting no additional action. CCOP recommended sending the issue back to FN faculty for continued discussion	No CCOP statement was released Curriculum issues and impacts on other colleges still not addressed.
Since 9/5/97	Judy Miller still Head of HRIMD and Acting Head of FN Proposed reorganization (3 subunits) maintained to give her structure to run two departments However, two departments officially remain separate	<u>Current Concerns:</u> Many faculty believe subunit structure is not effective Possible conflict of interest involving Acting Head's emphasis on the HRIMD Dietetics Distance Education Program (offered through Continuing Education) and the required FN courses to support this program. This semester 3 FN courses are being taped in the classroom for adaptation as web-based courses; two more courses are scheduled for Spring 1998. This was not the FN department's goal or agenda prior to the reorganization.
9-19	Letter from Provost Coffman to Brad Fenwick regarding the Departmental Restructuring	Final comment of 2-page letter states that the process is following an appropriate course and that the proposed model may change over time, perhaps leading to implementation.
10-10	Upcoming mtg with FN Faculty scheduled to discuss CCOP charge and the reorganization.	