

MINUTES

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
May 11, 1999 3:00 p.m. Big 12 Room, K-State Union**

Present: D. Anderson, P. Anderson, Behnke, Clegg, Conrow, Delker, Deluccie, Devault, Dodd, Fenwick, Finnegan, S. Flores, Foster, Gray, Grunewald, Hagmann, Hamilton, Holden, Hosni, Johnson, J. Jones, Kassebaum, Keiser, Koelliker, Krstic, Lynch, Martin, Mathews, McClaskey, McCulloh, Michie, Miller, D. Mosier, N. Mosier, Ossar, Ottenheimer, Oukrop, Pence, Rahman, Ransom, Raub, Salsberry, Schapaugh, Selfridge, Shultis, Schmidt, Stewart, Swanson, Verschelden, Weiss, White, Williams, Wissman, Worcester, Youngman

Proxies: Aramouni, Geiser, Zabel

Absent: Atkinson, Barkley, Briggs, Cushman, Devlin, Exdell, Fenton, Fjell, Glasgow, Higgins, Hightower, Hoag, Jardine, C. Jones, Kirkham, Legg, Lehman, Liang, Lutz, Maatta, Rush, Schroeder, Takemoto, Taylor-Archer, Webb

Visitors: Ron Downey, Tracy Mann, Andy Macklin, Amy Gross, Patricia Marsh, Bob Kruh, Ron Trewyn, Jon Wefald, James Coffman

I. President Rahman called the meeting to order.

II. Minutes of the April 27, 1999 meeting were approved.

III. Announcements

A. President Rahman noted that the Minutes of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee of Wednesday, May 5, 1999 has information about the Transportation Survey Forum held on April 27. The KSU Steering Committee has a web site (http://www.ksu.edu/psafe/parking/trans_study_sur.htm) about the transportation issues on campus and there is still time for faculty to provide input.

B. The Food Safety/Security Facility Forum was well attended, highly informative, and provided a arena for engaging discussion. The University and local communities had an excellent opportunity to learn about research at KSU. There will be another Forum held in the Fall.

C. At the latest leadership meeting, the formula for distributing the 4.9% faculty salary increase was discussed. It was decided that the best distribution would be 3.15% merit increase, .35% promotion monies, and 1.4% for equity and compression issues. A case for an equity or compression increase can be initiated by a faculty member with the request going to the Department Head and then to the Dean.

D. President Rahman visited the Salina campus and discovered that many faculty have very heavy teaching loads (some with more than 18 hours). She questioned how Salina is to fit into the larger picture of Kansas State University and, specifically, what the expectations for faculty and the distribution of resources will be. President Rahman also pointed out the need to establish good videoconferencing connections between campuses.

E. An Ad Hoc Committee has been appointed to look into student retention and graduation rates. This committee has met and is seeking ways to improve the poor rates reported to Faculty Senate by Assistant Vice President Lynch.

F. A Committee has been appointed to examine gender-based inequity issues. This Committee is the result of concerns by the Kansas Legislature and Board of Regents.

IV. Special Reports

A. Andy Macklin briefly described the Student Course Information Policy. He reported that a one year pilot program and one year of implementation have been completed. A graduate student is being paid to administer the program and a web page has been created where the results of the 65 course surveys have been posted (<http://www.ksu.edu/osas/cip>). The program has received two more years of support from Student Senate and asked that Faculty Senate formally support the program. Senator Koelliker raised the point of order that a motion cannot be made according to the rules since the matter was not on the agenda as New Business. Senator P. Anderson then moved that the rules be suspended to consider the motion to support the Student Course Information program. After being seconded, a vote was taken and the motion passed. Senator Gray then moved that Faculty Senate support the continuance of the program for two additional years. The motion was seconded and discussion raised several concerns: It was noted that the survey pays little attention to the quality of a course, that no attempt to evaluate the program has been undertaken, and it was questioned whether all course evaluations would remain on the web site or whether older ones would be removed. Following discussion, the motion was voted on and passed.

B. Robert Kruh and Ron Downey provided an update on the North Central Accreditation Self-Study. It was reported that a Steering Committee has been formed, a preliminary table of contents has been published, materials are being collected, and a report should be completed sometime during 2000 and the review completed in 2002. Kansas State University has been accredited since 1916 with the last review undertaken in 1992. Accreditation is important for a number of reasons including continued improvement of programs and the ability of students to get loans. Five general criteria have been established for accreditation and the Steering Committee will have to pay particular attention to the third one which states that "The institution is accomplishing its educational and other purposes."

V. Standing Committee Reports

A. Academic Affairs Committee - Margaret Conrow

1. Course and Curriculum Changes

a. It was moved and seconded that the Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Arts and Sciences April 15, 1999 be approved.

The motion passed.

b. It was moved and seconded that the courses approved for general education at the April 1, 1999 and April 15, 1999 General Education Task Meetings be approved.

CHEM 220	Chemical Principles I
CHEM 250	Chemical Principles II
THTRE 672	American Ethnic Theatre
SOCIO 670	Diversity and Social Interaction
WOMST 450	Stories of a Young Girl

The motion passed.

c. It was moved and seconded that the Graduate Course and Curriculum changes approved by the Graduate Council April 6, 1999 be approved.

DROP

ARE 742	Communications and Energy Management Systems Design
FN 691	Senior Project
FN 910	Advanced Nutrition: Carbohydrates, Lipids, and Proteins
FN 912	Advanced Nutrition: Minerals
FN 913	Advanced Nutrition: Vitamins

CHANGES

AGEC 520	Market Fundamentals and Futures/Options
AGEC 890	Advanced Food and Agribusiness Management
AGEC 905	Agricultural Demand and Commodity Marketing
ARE 523	Timber Structures
ARE 524	Theory of Structures II
ARE 528	Theory of Structures III
ARE 532	Lighting Systems Design
ARE 533	Building Electrical Systems
ARE 539	Architectural Engineering management

ARE 590	Integrated Building Systems Design
ARE 640	Building Mechanical Systems
ARE 690	Senior Project
ARE 731	Advanced Lighting Design
ARE 735	Electrical Systems Design
ART 602	Twentieth Century Art History III
ART 603	Twentieth Century Art History IV
FN 635	Nutrition and Exercise
FN 810	Advanced Macronutrient Metabolism
IMSE 641	Statistical Process Control in Manufacturing
IMSE 660	Introduction to Operations Research II

NEW

AGEC 680	Risk Management
ARE 741	Building Communication Systems
ARE 890	Problems in Architectural Engineering
CHE 750	Air Quality Seminar
ENTOM 680	Aquatic Entomology
FN 812	Advanced Micronutrient Metabolism
GRSC 830	Physical Properties of Cereal Polymers

The motion passed.

2. Graduation Lists

It was moved and seconded to approve the additions to the December 1998 Graduation List.

The motion passed.

B. *Faculty Affairs Committee* - Alexander Mathews

1. It was moved and seconded to amend Sections C53.1 - 53.3 (Departmental Procedure for Reappointment) of the Faculty Handbook as presented in Attachment 1 of the Agenda.

The motion passed. (ATTACHMENT 1)

2. It was moved and seconded to amend Sections C40 - 41.4 and B124 - 125 (Annual Merit Salary Evaluations) of the Faculty Handbook as presented in Attachment 2 of the Agenda.

During the discussion several typographical errors were corrected and friendly amendments were proposed and accepted:

- (1) Insert "who have a regular appointment 0.5 time or greater" after "...all unclassified personnel" at the end of the second sentence of C41.1.

- (2) Insert "and revising" between "...developing" and "an annual evaluation system..." in the first sentence of C41.2.
- (3) Change "(See Note 2)" to "(See Note 1)" after "...provost or president" in the first sentence of C41.2.
- (4) Change the second sentence of C41.2 to read, "At the time of initial consideration of...", replacing "or" with "of."
- (5) Insert "and other administrative supervisors after "...all **heads/chairs/directors**" in the first sentence of C41.4.
- (6) Delete the word "from" in the third sentence of C41.4. The sentence should read, "The mechanisms and frequency for soliciting outside input on... ."
- (7) Insert "before transmitting them to the person being evaluated" at the end of the penultimate sentence in C4.14. The sentence should read "...to preserve confidentiality before transmitting them to the person being evaluated."

The motion as amended passed (ATTACHMENT 2).

3. Senator Mathews indicated that the Committee is working on changes to the Section on Administrative Appeals in Appendix G of the Faculty Handbook. Any suggestions or comments can be directed to him.

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - Vladimir Krstic

The Committee is working with the Strategic Planning Committee and trying to ensure that the issues of achieving Research I status and the Library achieving ARL status are included. Dean Hobrock will make a presentation to Faculty Senate next Fall about the Library and ARL status.

VI. Old Business

None

VII. New Business

A. It was moved and seconded to adopt the Resolution Supporting the Creation of a Fall Break (ATTACHMENT 3).

The motion passed with the senator from Veterinary Medicine abstaining.

B. It was moved and seconded to adopt the resolution on classified research (ATTACHMENT 4):

A friendly amendment to drop the words "secret or" from the resolution was proposed and accepted. A second friendly amendment proposed and accepted was to drop the word "appointments," from the resolution. A third friendly amendment proposed and accepted was to add the following sentence to the resolution: "Any exceptions to the policy must be made in accordance with G53 of the Faculty Handbook. The resolution, as

amended, reads as follows: "University facilities will not be used to conduct classified research, and such research will not be considered in connection with reappointments, tenure, promotions, or merit pay raises. Any exceptions to the policy must be made in accordance with G53 of the Faculty Handbook."

The motion passed.

C. It was moved and seconded to suspend the rules to consider two resolutions brought by President Rahman.

The motion passed.

1. It was moved and seconded to adopt the Resolution Regarding Research and Graduate Education at K.S.U (ATTACHMENT 5).

A friendly amendment was proposed and accepted to insert "vitality and social" after "...economic" in the third segment of the preamble. It now reads, "whereas quality research and graduate education is essential for the technological progress, economic vitality and social welfare of the People of the State of Kansas;"

The motion passed.

2. It was moved and seconded to adopt the Resolution Regarding Funding of the K.S.U. Library (ATTACHMENT 6).

The motion passed.

VIII. For the Good of the University

- A. President Rahman presented a year-end report (ATTACHMENT 7).
- B. Senator Michie presented a plaque from Faculty Senate to President Rahman in appreciation of her work for Faculty Senate.
- C. President Rahman presented certificates of appreciation to Senators Mathews, Krstic, Conrow, and Ottenheimer for their contributions to Faculty Senate as Chairs of the Standing Committees and as Secretary to Faculty Senate.
- D. President Wefald and Provost Coffman expressed their thanks to Faculty Senate for the cooperative work that made it possible in the spirit of collaboration to accomplish a number of goals during the past year.

IX. The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

MINUTES

Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
May 11, 1999 5:50 p.m. Big 12 Room, K-State Union

I. The meeting was called to order by President Gray.

II. Nominations for Faculty Senate President-elect were opened.

Two Senators were nominated:

Senator Ransom

Senator Fenwick

There were no further nominations and a closed ballot was held. Following the vote, President Gray announced that Senator Ransom had been elected.

III. Nominations for Faculty Senate Secretary were opened.

Senator Zabel was nominated.

Nominations were closed and Senator Zabel was elected by unanimous acclamation.

IV. The meeting was adjourned at 6:05.

Substitute motion

Departmental Procedure for Reappointment

Revised Policy

C53.1 Departmental procedures. It is the responsibility of the department chair/head to make the candidate's reappointment file available to **all the department's tenured faculty members in the department and other eligible faculty as determined by departmental policy who are eligible to make recommendations**. A cumulative record of written recommendations and accompanying explanations forwarded to the candidate from previous reappointment meetings, and any written comments from relevant individuals outside the department will also be made available to the eligible ~~tenured~~ faculty (See C53.2). As part of this process, the department chair/head and the **eligible tenured** faculty will meet at least fourteen calendar days after the review documents are made available, to discuss the candidate's eligibility for reappointment and progress toward tenure. Subsequent to this meeting there will be a ballot of the **eligible tenured** faculty on reappointment of the candidate. Any member of the **eligible tenured** faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendation to the department chair/head, request the candidate meet with the **eligible tenured** faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.

C53.2 For individuals with appointments in more than one unit or department, comments may be solicited from other eligible ~~tenured~~ faculty members in the college or university relevant to the assessment of the candidate's performance. In the case of Extension faculty members or faculty members whose primary responsibilities are in Directed Service (e.g., librarians and clinicians), the comments of various clientele served may be solicited as part of the evaluation for reappointment.

C53.3 The department chair/head will forward a written recommendation and accompanying explanations to the dean, along with the candidate's complete file, the majority recommendation, and unedited written comments of each of the department's tenured faculty members. The department head will also meet with the candidate to discuss the separate issue of the candidate's progress toward tenure. The department head's written recommendation and accompanying explanations alone will be made available to the candidate and will become part of the candidate's reappointment file. (See C35 regarding confidentiality of peer evaluations).

ATTACHMENT 2

ANNUAL MERIT SALARY EVALUATIONS

C40 Bases for salary increases. Annual written evaluations conducted for the purpose of determining merit salary increases are based on the distribution of responsibilities assigned, the relative difficulty and importance of these responsibilities, and the level of success with which each was performed.

C41.1 Development and revisions of the evaluation system. Each unit which contains unclassified personnel (faculty or staff) must have a system for annual evaluation of all unclassified personnel who have a regular appointment half time or greater. The system of evaluation must include a statement of the department's/unit's evaluation criteria and standards. The evaluation will provide the basis for annual merit salary recommendations. See C30-C39: General Issues of Faculty Evaluation.

C41.2 The responsibility for developing and revising an annual evaluation system for unclassified personnel (See Note 1) rests primarily with the department's/unit's (See Note 1) unclassified personnel in consultation with the department's/unit's administrative head, dean, vice-president, provost or president (See Note 2), as appropriate, depending upon the department's/unit's reporting structure [concerned]. At the time of initial consideration of and with later revision of the system, unclassified personnel are expected to provide opinions about the department s/unit's evaluation system. The system that is developed should be consistent with the University's goals as well as those of the unit. ~~The system will include specific mechanism(s) for the supervising administrator to solicit confidential input from appropriate representative spectrum of persons, i.e. superiors, subordinates, colleagues, clientele, and appropriate faculty and staff, which could be beneficial in establishing individual performance goals and in assessing performance. This assessment will be reflected in annual merit salary adjustment and reappointment.~~

(Note 1. Excluding the provost, the two vice-presidents, the executive assistant to the president, and the assistant to the president)

(Note 2. Each teaching department is considered to be a separate "unit" and is, therefore, responsible for developing an evaluation system. At other administrative levels the appropriate administrator is responsible for seeing that a system for evaluating subordinate administrators (e.g., department heads, assistant deans, vice provosts, administrative assistants etc.) is developed and implemented following the principles described in C41-C44. Because many "support" units, which report to the President, a vice-president, or the provost, have only a small unclassified staff, the principal administrator may choose to consolidate some or all of them for purposes of developing and implementing an evaluation system. If a consolidated system is used, care should be taken to insure that it is applied uniformly by all units.)

C41.4 Annual performance evaluations of all **heads/chairs/directors** and other administrative supervisors ~~administrators~~ in academic and non-academic departments/units will be accompanied by the opportunity for input *from individuals under their supervision. Outside input may also be solicited from other faculty, unclassified and classified staff, and clientele as specified in the department's/unit's evaluation system.* The responsible dean, vice-president, provost or president (See Note 1), as appropriate, depending upon the department's/unit's reporting structure, will, in conjunction with the annual evaluation process, issue a written request for input from these

individuals regarding the performance of their department/unit administrator(s). The mechanisms and frequency for soliciting outside input on the department/unit administrator's performance will be specified in the department's/unit's evaluation system, but should occur at least once every five years. Outside input should include *appropriate* representative spectrum of persons outside the department/unit, i.e. clientele, faculty, staff, and students whose input could be beneficial in establishing performance goals for the administrator and the department/unit, and in assessing the annual performance of the department/unit administrator. The department/unit administrator and dean, vice-president, provost, or president as appropriate, depending upon the department's/unit's reporting structure should ensure that those [eligible for] providing input are [well] informed about the context of the mission and objectives of the department/unit. The specific source of all input will be held in absolute confidence by the dean or vice-president who should edit verbatim comments to preserve confidentiality, before transmitting them to the person being evaluated. The purpose of this input is to identify strengths and weaknesses and issues relevant to the administrator's annual performance (for reappointment of academic department heads/chairs see B123). ~~This assessment will be reflected in the annual merit salary adjustment.~~

~~B124 Evaluation of Central Administrators Reporting to the Provost~~

~~Central administrators reporting to the Provost will be evaluated annually by the Provost. At least once every five years, faculty and staff being served by these administrators will receive from the Provost a written request to provide input concerning the performance and reappointment of the administrator. The Provost should ensure that those eligible for providing input are well informed about the context of the responsibilities and objectives of the administrative position. The purpose of this input is to identify strengths and weaknesses, and issues relevant to the administrator's performance in the future. The specific source of all input will be held in absolute confidence by the Provost who should edit verbatim comments to preserve confidentiality. [Central administrators not reporting to the Provost are encouraged to seek input from faculty and staff in a similar manner.]~~

~~[B125 Annual Evaluation of Departmental Administrators]~~

~~[Annual performance evaluations of all administrators in academic departments/units will be accompanied by the opportunity for input from faculty, staff, and other individuals under their direct supervision. The responsible dean will, in conjunction with the annual evaluation process, issue a written request for input from these individuals regarding the performance of department/unit administrator(s). The departmental administrator and dean should ensure that those eligible for providing input are well informed about the context of the mission and objectives of the unit. The purpose of this input is to identify strengths and weaknesses, and issues relevant to the administrator's performance. The specific source of all input will be held in absolute confidence by the dean who should edit verbatim comments to preserve confidentiality.]~~

B124 Annual Evaluation of Department/Unit Administrators. See C40 to C41.4.

B125 Renumber B126 to B125

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE CREATION OF A FALL BREAK
Submitted by Academic Calendar Committee
(May 26, 1999)

- WHEREAS The Kansas Board of Regents requires each Regents University to hold 75 class days per semester, and
- WHEREAS Kansas State University currently has 76 class days during each fall semester, and
- WHEREAS A one day cessation from classes would help to relieve high stress levels for students and faculty members during the stretch from Labor Day to Thanksgiving Break, and
- WHEREAS Fort Hays State University, the University of Kansas, and Wichita State University all have fall breaks in effect or in planning stages, and
- WHEREAS The Kansas State University college of Veterinary Medicine currently has a two day fall break, and
- WHEREAS Fewer classes are taught on Friday than on any other day, and
- WHEREAS The Faculty Senate Calendar Committee has studied the issue and supports the scheduling of a fall break.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: That Kansas State University Faculty Senate supports the creation of a one-day fall break, to be scheduled by the Faculty Senate Calendar Committee to be the second or third Friday in October.

TO: Faculty, Staff, and Students
FR: Robert Hemenway
RE: Fall Break Proposal

I want to announce that I will recommend to the Board of Regents in May that K.U. implement a fall break of two days in length occurring in late October of each year, beginning in the Fall of 2001. I am announcing it now, to all of you directly, rather than through a press release, because this clearly affects our community, and it is appropriate to share it within the community first.

As many of you know, I have been reviewing the Fall Break proposal over the last two months. Provost Shulenburger's recommendation in favor of the proposal came to me on February 16th. He reports that recommendations in favor of a fall break have been received from the Student Senate, University Council and Senate Executive Committee. The Provost's recommendation, the University Council's recommendation, and the Senate Executive committee's proposal all recommended that if a Fall Break were approved, it should start in October 2001.

My review of the proposal included the gathering of information about the viability of a fall break from a large number of universities who have implemented a fall break previously. Virtually all reported that the fall break resulted in renewed student commitment to one's studies, and helped to avoid burn-out as the semester was completed.

I wish to commend all the campus groups that worked on the proposal. It went through a number of iterations. It ensures that K.U. will not lose a single instructional day. It preserves Stop Day. It preserves K.U.'s traditional Commencement time. It also creates an additional academic period, a between-semesters intersession of at least 14 days each year. This will allow us to develop opportunities for study abroad, internships, or special research projects, for the period prior to the second semester. For students taking such opportunities we will actually be adding two weeks of instructional time to the school year.

The issue of instructional time is paramount in my mind. The University's mission must be to provide the greatest opportunity for learning possible. To ensure this goal, if the Regents approve my recommendation for a fall break, I will ask the Provost's Office to monitor the effectiveness of the fall break period, and to implement policies that ensure there will be no diminishment of instructional time through student early departure or late return, or faculty accommodation to such activity. If the data show that the privilege of a fall break is abused, I will not hesitate to recommend that it be rescinded.

I do not believe such rescission will be necessary, and I have confidence that this is a positive improvement in the University calendar. But I wanted all to know the assessment that will be taking place as we implement it.

Finally, I want to say that this proposal has exhibited the positive nature of K.U.'s shared governance. Students and faculty have worked together to ensure that the institution's academic integrity is preserved and that student needs have been met. I have every confidence that this is a good decision for the University as a community. We have worked together to show our respect for the learning process. We have also worked to assure that a fall break will enhance that process, not diminish it.

ATTACHMENT 4

Resolution of the Faculty Senate (under New Business, FS Meeting of May 11, 1999)

University facilities will not be used to conduct classified research, and such research will not be considered in connection with reappointments, tenure, promotions, or merit pay raises. Any exceptions to the policy must be made in accordance with G53 of the Faculty Handbook.

Relevant sections of the *Faculty Handbook*:

G51 Classified research. The purpose of a university is to develop and transmit knowledge. Consistent with this purpose, Kansas State University is committed to making ideas and research results available to all who might wish to use them. Therefore, the policy of the University is that classified research may not be carried out under University auspices by any faculty member, staff member, or student.

G52 Classified research may be broadly defined as research about which any of the following aspects are kept secret for an indefinite period with control of their release or publication exercised by an agency other than the University: 1) purpose of the research, 2) the names of the investigators, 3) the amount and sources of funds, 4) the University facilities used, 5) research procedures, or 6) the results of the research.

G53 This policy does not abrogate the right of research investigators to protect their work until it is patented or copyrighted. Neither should the policy be construed to prohibit the exercise of conventional privacy rights or to restrict University personnel in private consulting arrangements. This policy should not be interpreted as restrictive but rather as a safeguard to free and open inquiry and discussion by faculty, staff, and students. Any exception to the policy must be recommended by the Graduate Council and approved by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

ATTACHMENT 5

**Resolution of the Faculty Senate
regarding research and graduate education at K.S.U.**

(New Business, Faculty Senate Meeting of May 11, 1999)

Whereas enhancement of research and graduate education is one of the five Strategic Planning Themes at Kansas State University;

whereas research and graduate education enhances the quality of undergraduate education;

whereas quality research and graduate education is essential for the technological progress, economic vitality and social welfare of the People of the State of Kansas;

whereas Kansas State University has made remarkable gains in research and graduate education in recent years; and

whereas a large proportion of the faculty at Kansas State University are dedicated to research and graduate education;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

that Kansas State University take all necessary measures to acquire Carnegie One Status among research universities and to gain membership for its Library to the Associated Research Libraries (ARL) within the foreseeable future.

ATTACHMENT 6

**Resolution of the Faculty Senate
regarding funding of the K.S.U. Library**

(New Business, Faculty Senate Meeting of May 11, 1999)

Whereas inflationary pressures will eventually erode any fees or tuition increase;

whereas the Library is essential to both the teaching and research missions of Kansas State University; and

whereas the students, the faculty, and the administration have worked together to address the historic chronic underfunding of the Library,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

that the University should continue its efforts to persuade the Legislature to fund the Library through O.O.E.; and

that it continue its efforts to find a stable institutional financial foundation for Library acquisitions and services.

President's Year-end Report
Submitted by Talat S. Rahman, President, KSU Faculty Senate
May 11, 1999

1998-1999 has been an eventful year in which the Senate has made gains on several fronts. When we began a year ago, we had several objectives before us. One of the most important aims was to institutionalize shared governance through our practices, and through articulations in the *Faculty Handbook*. I am happy to report that with the ready collaboration of the faculty at large and the central administration we have succeeded in both regards. Faculty Senate has been an equal player in major issues related to university governance. Through appropriate changes in the *Faculty Handbook* we have strengthened the faculty's and Faculty Senate's involvement in university governance. We realize that there remain some areas in which the language in the handbook could be made more explicit. I am confident that as issues come up, future Senate bodies will continue to institutionalize the concept and practice of shared governance. In the end, of course, shared governance will work only if faculty and departments choose to invoke it.

A major effort this year was the implementation of the recommendations of the Task Force on Appeal and Grievance Procedures. With the dedicated work of the members of the Faculty Affairs Committee, we have now reformulated the guidelines for procedures for tenure and promotion, making the process more open, fair and accountable. We have amended the appeal and grievance process to allow for more mediation, discussion, and consultation. In connection with these changes, the roles of ombudspersons and faculty advocates have been highlighted and defined. We have rewritten the clauses dealing with annual reviews of administrators so as to provide for input from subordinates, colleagues, faculty, students, and others, as appropriate. Finally, we have recommended periodic evaluation of administrative offices that serve faculty to promote better service and a more collegial atmosphere.

Since a number of senators are unclassified, non-faculty personnel, we have attempted to reflect their needs and responsibilities through appropriate changes in the *Faculty Handbook*. This attempt to be inclusive has paid off in creating a much more collegial and fairer atmosphere in which faculty and staff work towards the mutual good. There is still perhaps room to establish a standing sub-committee of Faculty Affairs devoted primarily to issues bearing on unclassified staff.

Several new task forces have been appointed jointly with the Provost's Office and/or the Office of the President, focusing on issues related to the following.

- 1.ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN THE UNIVERSITY. The charge of the Task Force is to make the principles, process and practices of the OAA transparent to the community.)
- 2.ENHANCEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE ADVISING. The charge is to recommend ways to systematize the academic advising process, and to foster coordination among colleges and

majors. The Task Force has already submitted an interim report, which will be placed on the Web.

3. **RETENTION, RECRUITMENT, AND GRADUATION.** The charge is to suggest ways to improve the university's performance in these areas, particularly in regard to students from underrepresented groups.

4. **GENDER-BASED SALARY INEQUITIES.** The charge is to examine the extent of such inequities university-wide, using statistical as well as anecdotal and experiential information, and to suggest ways to remedy the problem.

5. **STRATEGIC PLANNING.** The university SP Committee is an on-going effort with strong involvement of FSCOUP. The committee's proposal will eventually come to the Senate floor for discussion.

6. **DISTANCE EDUCATION.** The Task Force has submitted its preliminary report, which is available via a link on the Faculty Senate home page.

7. **INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY.** The charge is to formulate recommendations for KSU's policy in accordance with the guidelines established this year by the Board of Regents (about which, more below). The report should be forthcoming in early Fall.

Because of the increasing role of technology in the accomplishment of the university's mission, we have this year established a Committee on Technology (COT), which will serve as a standing committee of Faculty Senate and will be responsible for raising and resolving issues related to technology that concern faculty and unclassified staff.

We have also had a very active University Library Committee which has worked diligently to suggest ways of enhancing the funding and holdings of the library. Faculty leadership is now working with the KSU Foundation on long-term plans for acquiring endowments for the library. Through the efforts of the University Library Committee and Dean Hobrock, we have assessed our standing vis-à-vis requirements for membership in Associated Research Libraries (ARL), and have determined that membership is a goal worth pursuing even if it takes several years to accomplish. It is difficult to deny the importance of a well-equipped library for sound graduate and undergraduate education.

This brings me to the topic of research and graduate education, which was the subject of this year's State of the University Message by President Wefald and Provost Coffman. In one of my first dialogues this year with Provost Coffman, we found ourselves wondering what might be the response on the part of the general faculty to the prospect of strengthening our research and graduate education missions. Through continued discussions with faculty senators, members of the faculty at large, and appropriate administrators, we believe we have arrived at a consensus about the process by which we should undertake to enhance our graduate programs and research initiatives. The process has to be inclusive and beneficial to all segments of the university, in the long run. A long-term strategy with well-defined goals and priorities will be essential in bringing most departments and colleges on-board. Since we are so close to attaining Carnegie Research

I status, we should work towards it as a short-term priority. Although this may involve selective emphasis in some areas, faculty will not resist such preferential treatment if assurances are given -- and corresponding measures taken -- that *all* faculty will benefit from such moves. The unanimous passage of the resolution on this topic by Faculty Senate today gives our central administration the mandate to pursue both Research I and ARL status in a timely manner.

Turning beyond the university itself, let me summarize some of our activities with the Board of Regents. Faculty should congratulate themselves on their role in producing a Regents-wide Intellectual Property Policy which is one of the best in the nation with regard to retention by faculty of rights on the forms of knowledge that they produce. You may recall that the policy in place is quite a turn-around from the one that was originally proposed by the BOR. We are thankful to the members of the Kansas Board of Regents and the committee members who worked on the policy for their having incorporated our many suggestions into the final version of the policy.

At the Board of Regents level, too, the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents have enjoyed working on the Multiyear Plan for Faculty Compensation Enhancement. Here again we are very appreciative of the efforts of the members of the Board of Regents, the Regents' staff, and our own central administration in taking this issue to the Kansas Legislature. Although the raise this year was not as much as what we had expected, we are hopeful that the continued efforts on all sides will bring us positive results. In working on this issue we have realized the need for more direct interactions with both legislators and the public at large. We have put forth some concrete plans by which we hope to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of quality higher education and our role in bringing it to the younger generation. In this regard we have proposed the 3rd Wednesday in January to be declared a "Faculty Day" at the State Capitol.

Connected with the matter of salary enhancement is the concern about gender-based inequities. This question has been raised by the Kansas House Budget Committee and the Regents have been asked to look into the matter and report to the 2000 Legislature. After discussion with KSU faculty, I am proposing to the Regents that they request each institution to set up a committee consisting of a majority of senior female faculty to examine gender-based inequities within the institution using comparable statistical tools and anecdotal and experiential information. If we are able to remedy this subtle and unconscious form of discrimination, Kansas would find itself among the leaders in this country in this area.

This brings me to a point that may have escaped some faculty, since it was a discovery to me. Through participation at the recent meeting of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), I have found KSU to be in the midst of issues, debates, and discussions that are catching the attention of major institutions in the country. With active faculty involvement, there is no reason why KSU cannot be a major player in issues related to higher education nationwide. I believe we are in fact already there. We just need to stay concerned, involved, and active.

This has been a good year for all of us. None of it would have been possible without the participation of the faculty and the cooperation of the administration. Electronic mail and electronic discussion boards on the web have been a big help in getting the word out to, and among faculty. But, I repeat, what has made these technologies work is the willingness of faculty to exploit them by taking the time out to pay attention and to contribute their insights and perspectives. It has also been a tremendous boost to have had such a great group at work in faculty leadership who have all worked as a collective. It has been a wonderful learning experience for me. Thank you all so very much.