

MINUTES

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
February 13, 2001 3:30 p.m. Big 12 Room, K-State Union**

3:00 p.m. Presentation by HNTB regarding Campus Master Plan

Jackie McClaskey, chair of the Campus Development and Planning Committee introduced Gerald Carter, University Architect, and Kevin King, Vice President of HNTB. She noted that members of Faculty Senate, Executive Committee, and Leadership Council have been involved in the planning process. Carter said that planning began seven years ago at the request of VP Rawson and Provost Coffman. Throughout it has been essential to involve as many campus constituencies as possible.

King said four subcommittees - Buildings, Open Space, Infrastructure, and Circulation - are contributing to the Master Plan, and he cited the key role focus groups have played in providing information and ideas. He stressed the complexity of balancing factors such as quality and character, presenting a strong image, determining buildable sites, integrating circulation and transportation, and using energy responsibly.

Seminars to present analysis of information, identification of major issues, and options for the Master Plan are scheduled for March 6, 7, and 8 and April 17, 18, and 19. A draft plan will be developed this summer and communicated in the fall.

Several senators asked about the future status of Memorial Stadium, whether the Plan will be informed by mistakes made in the past, strategies for implementing the Plan, and joint projects involving the university, city, and private sectors.

3:30 p.m. Faculty Senate Meeting

Present: Anderson, Bradshaw, Brigham, Clegg, Cochran, Cox, Devault, Donnelly, Exdell, Finnegan, Gehrt, Geiser, Glasgow, Gormely, Gray, Greene, Haddock, Herald, Heublein, Holden, Johnson, Kirkham, Krstic, Legg, Lynch, Maatta, Mathews, McCulloh, Molt, Montelone, Mortensen, Mosier, Nafziger, Olsen, Oukrop, Pesci, Peterson, Prince, Ramaswamy, Ransom, Rintoul, Ross, Schellhardt, Schmidt, Schumm, Selfridge, Sheu, Shultis, Smith, Spears, Stewart, Takemoto, Weiss, S. White, Williams, Worcester, Yagerline, Zabel

Absent: Atkinson, Chenoweth, Ewanow, Fjell, R. Flores, S. Flores, Higgins, Hopper, Jurich, Karim, Keller, Lenkner, Liang, Michie, Newhouse, Owens-Wilson, Poresky, Reddi, Reeck, Sherow, Simons, Verschelden, W. White, Youngman

Proxies: Bockus, Burton, Hosni, McGee, Minton, Roush

Visitors: Jane Rowlett, Jon Kurche

- I. President Mickey Ransom called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m..
- II. It was moved and seconded to approve the Minutes of the January 16, 2000 meeting.

Motion passed.

- III. Announcements

Ransom referred senators to the Announcements contained in the Minutes of the FS Executive Committee meeting of January 29, which were attached to the agenda.

- A. Letters from James Coffman and Tom Rawson Regarding the Impact of Budget Recommendations

Provost Coffman sent a letter to the Council of Deans on February 7 listing actions to be taken in response to the Governor's budget recommendations for FY2002 (copies were distributed to Faculty Senators). Certainly, President Wefald and his staff and members of the Board of Regents are working very hard to get the proposed cuts restored. The letter states that all faculty searches will be stopped unless offers are currently out, the reclassification of classified positions will be suspended, and major capital equipment purchases on the general use budget will be stopped. Exceptions can be made at the discretion of the Dean and Provost.

Vice President Rawson has prepared materials (copies of this letter from Tom Rawson to President Wefald were also distributed to Senators) that summarize the cuts. It is hoped that the Legislature will act to restore at least part of the cuts, so that some or all of these contingency steps will be eliminated. The next two weeks will be very critical for legislative action. There is considerable optimism that the Legislature will at least "fix" the \$2.1 million cut caused by calculating our support using the current services budget instead of the previously used appropriated base budget.

- B. Lobbying Legislators - Ransom has discussed the possibility of a letter writing campaign by faculty and unclassified professionals with President Wefald, members of President Wefald's staff including Sue Peterson, and Regent Fred Kerr of Pratt. The consensus is that budget considerations are at a critical stage in the Legislature. One school of thought is that the Governor knows mistakes were made in the budget recommendations, and he will work with the Legislature to correct at least some of the problems caused by the budget recommendations. Following this school of thought, a extensive letter writing campaign could be counter productive and would not help the situation. Another school of thought is that a letter writing campaign could bring pressure to bear to restore the cuts.

The Faculty Senate Leadership Council has written letters to six key legislators. These letters mention our concern about the cuts and give specific examples of the consequences of the cuts. We asked the President's Staff to review a draft of the letters, and they recommended sending the letters. An example letter will be posted at the Faculty Senate web site. Any faculty member or unclassified professional can write a letter on their own to members of the legislature. Rosters of the House and Senate are available at:

<http://www.state.ks.us/public/legislative/>

Individuals considering writing a letter should consider the two schools of thought mentioned above. They can mention their job title or position at K-State in the letter, but the letter should be mailed using a personal stamp. You may wish to send a copy of your letter to Sue Peterson, Assistant to the President and Legislative Liaison in the President's Office.

Sen. Ramaswamy asked about strategies at other BOR institutions. Ransom said he will know more after this week's BOR meetings. He has heard that the President of the KU Faculty Senate has written to the Governor. Sen. Mathews asked about action from students. Student Body President Jake Worcester said that a number of student leaders will be leaving tonight for Topeka where they hope to meet with all legislators. They will advocate for funding of the 2 for 1 technology fee match, restoration of the base budget, and the library fee match.

- C. Changes in the Governmental Ethics Standards - Sue Peterson is closely monitoring bills currently introduced in the legislature that will modify the existing guidelines. The existing guidelines are also a problem at other Regents universities. There is a concentrated effort to try to make modifications to the existing guidelines.
- D. Faculty Senate Elections - A letter has been sent to each caucus chair indicating which Senators are up for election this year. Senators not eligible for reelection are also listed. Nomination ballots should be mailed by March 16 and returned by March 28. Final nomination ballots need to be mailed the week of April 2 and returned by April 11. Final results must be returned by April 16 to the Faculty Senate Office. The Election Committee consists of Jim Legg, Chair of Faculty Affairs; Mickey Ransom, President of Faculty Senate; and Bob Zabel, Secretary of Faculty Senate.

Unfortunately, Ransom has not had time to convene the Task Force on the Constitution and By-Laws of Faculty Senate. We do intend to have the task force working yet this semester, but there was not enough time for the task force to develop recommendations for changes in the election procedure for this year. Senators are encouraged to consider running for the office of President-Elect and Secretary. Elections for these offices will be held at the May meeting of Faculty Senate. Candidates are encouraged to contact the Election Committee before the April meeting of Faculty Senate so that their vita can be printed on the April agenda. Candidates can also be nominated from the Floor at the May

meeting. Ransom reminded Senate that they did not pass a proposal considered last year for the creation of a Nominating Committee. Therefore, it is very important for anyone interested in running for one of the offices to make their wishes known to other Faculty Senators and to the Election Committee.

V. Report from Student Senate - Jake Worcester, SGA President, and John Kurche, SGA Academic Affairs Coordinator

A. Student Senate Resolution - Support for Advising Accountability
ATTACHMENT 1

Worcester and Kurche provided background on their resolution and asked for Faculty Senate support. Worcester said that there is an unevenness across campus in the quality of advising and no consequences or rewards are tied to advising. This resolution demands that colleges hold advisors responsible and that the Provost hold the colleges responsible for advising. Student Senate is asking for support for the concept and will later work out details regarding advising standards. In response to questions, Worcester said that a second resolution will outline rights and responsibilities of students.

Several faculty senators asked about how advising would be evaluated, evidence of wide-spread poor advising, and student responsibilities to seek and follow advice. In addition, there were questions about how advisors would be rewarded for advising and where resources would come from. Kurche urged the Senate to suggest what student responsibilities should be.

On behalf of the FS Executive Committee, Sen. Cochran moved, "Faculty Senate applauds the interest of Student Senate to improve advising as stated in their Resolution #00/01/48. Motion was seconded.

Several additional senators asked questions and commented on the motion. Sen. Gormely asked if the motion was to applaud the student interest or to support the resolution. Sen. Holden said the motion was to applaud Student Senate's interest in improving advising.

Sen. Finnegan moved to table the motion. Motion to table was seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

VI. Report from the Parking Council - Scott Smith - No report

VII. Reports from Standing Committees

A. Academic Affairs Committee - Tom Herald

1. Course and Curriculum Changes

a. UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

1. Herald moved to approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Business Administration December 5, 2000.

New Certificate in International Business

Changes in the Department of Finance undergraduate curriculum and related courses

CHANGE:

FINAN 450	Principles of Finance
FINAN 562	Short-Term Financial Management

DROP:

FINAN 470	Financial Analysis and Valuation
FINAN 551	Investments

ADD:

FINAN 510	Debt Securities and Markets
FINAN 520	Equity Securities and Markets

Changes to the GPA requirements for students in the various programs in the College of Business Administration

Motion passed.

2. Herald moved to approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Arts and Sciences November 9, 2000 and October 5, 2000.

CHANGE:

BIOL 510	Embryology (approved by college 11/9/00)
BIOL 529	Fundamentals of Ecology (approved by college 10/5/00)

Motion passed.

3. Herald moved to approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes (undergraduate course & curriculum catalog changes) approved by the College of Human Ecology November 10, 2000.

Motion passed.

b. GRADUATE EDUCATION

1. Herald noted a correction in the number from FSHS 760 to FSHS 745 (Neuromotor Speech Disorders). Herald moved to approve the Graduate Course & Curriculum Changes approved by Graduate Council December 5, 2000.

CHANGES:

AGEC 700	Applied Agribusiness Economics
AGEC 701	Introduction to Computer Decision Tools for Agribusiness
AGEC 712	Optimization Techniques for Agricultural Economics
AGEC 713	Agribusiness Financial Management
AGEC 720	Agribusiness Risk Management
AGEC 730	Applied Agribusiness Logistics
AGEC 760	Applied Econometric Analysis
AGEC 770	International Agribusiness and Policy Analysis
BIOCH 766	Recombinant DNA Laboratory I
BIOCH 911	Molecular Signal Transduction
CNS 650	Construction Safety
EECE 624	Power Electronics
FSHS 706	Practicum in Audiology
FSHS 744	Aural Rehabilitation
FSHS 745	Neuromotor Speech Disorders
FSHS 750	Voice Disorders
FSHS 841	Acquired Language and Cognitive Disorders
FSHS 851	Professional Issues in Speech-Language Pathology
FSHS 897	Graduate Seminar in Communication Sciences and Disorders
GEOL 650	Exploration Geophysics
GRSC 731	Milling Science II Laboratory
PHYS 636	Physical Measurements and Instrumentation
PSYCH 605	Advanced Social Psychology

DROP:

FSHS 720	Audiology I
FSHS 721	Audiology I Laboratory
HIST 648	Naval History
HIST 649	Introduction to the History of Aviation

Motion passed.

c. GENERAL EDUCATION

1. Herald moved to approve change to the UGE program proposal for the College of Arts & Sciences approved by the General Education Task Force December 4, 2000.

Motion passed.

2. Herald moved to approve courses for general education approved by the General Education Task Force.

HIST 591	The Russian Empire (approved by task force 12/00)
PHILO 380	Philosophy and Race (approved by task force 01/01)

Motion passed.

2. Herald moved to approve additions to the following Graduation List:

May 2000

Brian Earle Custer, KSU-Salina, BS--Aeronautical Technology and an Associate of Technology in Professional Pilot

Brian Ray Krug, KSU-Salina, BS--Aeronautical Technology

Motion passed.

3. Herald moved to approve posthumous degree for Bryan James Dunn, Bachelor of Science in Agriculture.

Motion passed.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee - Jim Legg

1. As an informational item, Legg mentioned that the Faculty Handbook Committee is adding "unclassified professionals" in addition to "faculty" at appropriate places in the Handbook. These changes have been approved by the Faculty Senate President and the Provost and already appear in the on-line version.

2. Effects of C31.5 ATTACHMENT 2

Legg said this report was prepared by Jane Rowlett to provide an update on the effect of the policy on minimum standards of performance. So far 16 faculty have been identified who have failed to achieve minimum standards. Legg thanked Rowlett for preparing the report.

3. Interim KSU Policy on Mediation ATTACHMENTS 3 and 4

Legg moved adoption of the two documents. He explained that the policy is "interim" due to uncertainty that the committee got everything right the first time. A permanent policy should be written by 2004-2005.

Motion passed.

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - John Johnson

Johnson had no action items.

D. Faculty Senate Committee on Technology - Dee Takemoto

Takemoto had no action items. She reported that there are on-going discussions of how long E-mail should be saved (currently, it is forever). FSCOT is asking the IRMC to set a policy and VP Unger would like to move to three months.

VIII. Old Business - None

IX. New Business - None

X. For the Good of the University

A. Sen. Exdell said that a national representative of AAUP was recently on campus and met with some faculty interested in exploring a stronger presence. He invited interested faculty to attend an AAUP meeting at UMKC on February 24. He and Cia Verschelden plan to attend AAUP workshops at UMKC on March 3. Exdell mentioned the impact of C31.5 on tenure and the political vulnerability of faculty.

B. Sen. Schumm expressed concern that some walkways for persons with disabilities have yet to be cleared following the recent storm. Sen. Holden said that anyone aware of such problems should contact Jackie Toburen at 2-1795. Facilities has responded quickly to those situations when they learn of them.

C. Sen. Krstic suggested an energy audit of the University to reduce waste. Ransom mentioned that energy conservation is on the agenda for the Leadership Council meeting with the Administration on February 22.

XI. Sen. Finnegan moved adjournment. Motion was seconded and passed.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

1 **RESOLUTION 00/01/48**

**SUPPORT FOR ADVISING
ACCOUNTABILITY**

2
3
4 **BY:** Jake Worcester, Jon Kurche, Dana Pracht, Travis Lenkner, Matt Wolters and Academic
5 Affairs and University Relations Committee

6
7 **WHEREAS** academic advising is an essential part of a student's experience at Kansas State
8 University; and

9
10 **WHEREAS** the University has been charged with providing a quality advising experience for
11 all students by the Kansas Board of Regents; and

12
13 **WHEREAS** the Faculty Handbook outlines certain advising priorities and goals but does not
14 outline how they are to be implemented; and

15
16 **WHEREAS** there is not a standard method to hold advisors or colleges accountable for their
17 advising performance; and

18
19 **WHEREAS** evaluating advising performance would allow faculty to be rewarded for quality
20 advising and held accountable for inadequate advising; and

21
22 **WHEREAS** evaluating colleges on overall advising performance will encourage colleges to
23 implement proper standards and performance evaluations,

24
25 **BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

26
27 **SECTION 1.** The Kansas State University Student Governing Association demands that
28 colleges implement procedures to hold advisors, both faculty and professional,
29 accountable for their advising. This should include individual performance
30 evaluations.

31
32 **SECTION 2.** The Kansas State University Student Governing Association demands the
33 University administration to hold the colleges and/or departments accountable for
34 overall advising performance and assist them with further development where
35 needed.

36
37 **SECTION 3.** A copy of this resolution shall be given to University President Jon Wefald,
38 University Provost Jim Coffman, Academic Advising Task Force Chair Dr. Bob
39 Burton, Dr. Vickie Clegg, Faculty Senate President Mickey Ransom, and all
40 Kansas State University undergraduate college deans.

41
42 **THIS RESOLUTION PASSED**
43 **STUDENT SENATE BY UNANIMOUS**
44 **CONSENT ON 01/25/01**

Faculty Failing to Meet Minimum Standards

NAME	1997	1998	1999	2000
A	Action plan developed.	First action plan not met. Second action plan developed.	3rd consecutive year. Previous plans not met. Resigned.	
B	Attempted to develop action plan.	Failed to develop or meet first action plan. Attempted to develop second action plan.	3rd consecutive year. Previous plans not developed or met. Recommended dismissal. Given terminal contract.	
C*	Action plan developed.	Successfully met first plan.		
D*	Action plan developed.	Successfully met first plan.		
E	Retired.			
F	Retired.			
G	Resigned.			
H	Resigned.			
I	Action plan developed.	Successfully met first plan.		
J	Action plan developed.	Successfully met first plan.		
K		Action plan developed. Distribution of effort reallocated.	First action plan not met. Second plan developed.	Third consecutive year. Previous plans not met. Phased retirement. Reduced appt. to 25% time.
L		Action plan developed.	First action plan not met. Second plan developed.	Successfully met second plan.
M			Action plan developed.	Successfully met plan.
N**			Action plan developed.	First action plan not met. Second plan developed.
O			Action plan developed.	Successfully met plan.
P				Action plan developed.

* Chronic Low-achievement Policy was not in department document. Received a letter indicating that if the policy had been in place, they would not have met minimum standards.

** Chronic Low-achievement Policy was revised in department document. Received a letter indicating that if the policy had been finalized, the person would not have met minimum standards.

Source: Information compiled by Jane D. Rowlett, Office of Unclassified Affairs.

Sixteen faculty members failed to meet department minimum standards over the past four evaluation periods (1997-2000). Of those sixteen faculty members, seven improved their performance (developed action plans) and met department standards, two have developed action plans that will be evaluated in Spring 2001, two retired, one entered phased retirement, three resigned, and one was dismissed.

Introduction

Mediation is playing an ever-increasing role in the positive resolution of campus disputes by addressing the needs and interests of all parties and at the same time saving time and money. It is particularly effective when the disputing parties want or need to continue their relationship. It also allows the parties to look at ways to prevent conflicts in the future.

For purposes of this policy, mediation is defined as a voluntary process of facilitated negotiation in which a neutral third party, a professional mediator, sits down with the parties in conflict and helps them look for mutually acceptable solutions to work-related issues in dispute. The mediator does not make the decisions, but instead, works with the parties to identify their needs and interests and to develop creative options for resolving the conflict in a confidential manner.

Guidelines for Mediation

Mediation should be considered in any instance of serious or substantive dispute. It can be accessed at any point in the process of informal facilitation, appeal, grievance or litigation. Anyone can propose mediation; for example an ombudsperson, the next highest administrator, an affirmative action officer, or any of the parties to a dispute. The use of mediation will only occur with the concurrence of all of the disputing parties. Although any kind of dispute can be mediated, it is anticipated that common examples would include:

- o disagreement over salary adjustments
- o performance evaluations
- o promotion and tenure issues
- o workplace issues
- o instances of alleged harassment or discrimination which do not meet the legal standard for such but which include real or perceived problems requiring resolution

An "agreement to mediate" will be entered into by all parties. This agreement does not constitute an obligation to reach a binding conclusion.

Selection of a Mediator

A mediator is defined, for purposes of this policy, as a person who is certified by or is recognized as equivalently qualified by the Kansas Judiciary Branch, Office of Judicial Administration, and is included on an annually updated university list of approved mediators. This list will be developed through a screening and selection process based upon a recommendation of a committee appointed by the provost and comprised of two central administrators, one dean, one unclassified professional staff member, and two faculty members.

Coordination of Mediation Process

Responsibility for coordinating the mediation process and making information available to the university community will be assigned by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to a director who will operate from the Office of Faculty Senate. The University will be responsible for paying the fees for mediation unless an outside complaint or lawsuit has been filed.

This policy shall be reviewed for conversion to a permanent policy in the 2004-2005 academic year.

ATTACHMENT 4
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY AGREEMENT TO MEDIATE

This is an Agreement between _____ and _____
(hereafter referred to as the participants). The participants enter into mediation with the intention of reaching a consensual resolution of their issues. The provisions of this agreement are as follows:

PROCESS

- 1- Mediation is a voluntary collaborative process that is non-binding.
- 2- The mediator is a neutral facilitator who assists the participants in reaching their own voluntary, fully informed resolution concerning the issues.
- 3- A mediator's duties do not include decisions concerning "right" or "wrong" and the mediator will not make a decision regarding the issues for the participants.
- 4- In the event that the participants are already involved in an appeal, review, or grievance process for which a hearing has not convened at the time of this agreement, that process will be suspended until the conclusion of the mediation. Any timetables associated with such a process will be placed on hold until the mediation is ended.

DISCLOSURES

- 5- The mediation process can be successful only if all participants make full and complete disclosure of all information pertinent to the resolution of the issues. Each participant will make a full and complete disclosure of all relevant information and documents to the mediator and the other participant.
- 6- If either participant fails to make a full and complete disclosure of all relevant information and documents, then any formal, legal, binding Resolution Agreement that may be reached based on the incomplete set of materials may be set aside.

CONFIDENTIALITY

- 7- All written and oral communications, negotiations and statements made in the course of mediation will be treated as privileged settlement discussions and are absolutely confidential.
- 8- Participants agree that no tape record will be made nor will any participant cause the electronic recording of any portion of the mediation session or sessions or telephone calls among the participants and/or mediator concerning the sessions.

- 9- The mediator will not reveal anything discussed in mediation to anyone other than the participants.
- 10- The participants and the university will not at anytime, before, during, or after mediation, call the mediator as a witness in any legal or administrative procedure concerning these issues. To the extent that the participants or the university may have a right to call the mediator as a witness, they each waive that right.
- 11- The participants and the university agree not to subpoena or demand the production of any records, notes, work product or the like of the mediator in any legal or administrative proceeding concerning these issues. To the extent that participants or the university have a right to demand these documents, that right is hereby waived.
- 12- If a participant or the university subpoenas the mediator, the mediator will move to quash the subpoena.

TERMINATION/WITHDRAWAL

- 13- Either participant or the mediator may terminate the mediation at anytime. It will not be necessary that a participant or the mediator provide a reason for the termination of the mediation.
- 14- In the event that the mediation is terminated, the mediator will advise the participants of the termination in writing. No explanation is required regarding the reason for termination.

LEGAL REPRESENTATION

- 15- Participants may choose to seek the advice of independent legal counsel at anytime during the process. Attorneys representing participants can not attend mediation sessions with the participants.
- 16- The participants may have legal questions about either the Agreement To Mediate or the Memorandum of Understanding that may result from the mediation. Each participant may seek legal counsel regarding legal interests, rights and obligations.
- 17- In the event that a participant seeks legal counsel, the University will bear the cost for each of the participants up to a maximum of two hours of legal costs for this purpose.
- 18- The university will pay for the fees for mediation unless an outside complaint or lawsuit has been filed.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

- 19- The mediator will prepare a Memorandum of Understanding if that is appropriate. The mediator will provide the Memorandum of Understanding to each of the participants.

- 20- The Memorandum of Understanding is not an agreement. It is not binding upon the participants. It may form a basis for a formal legal binding Resolution Agreement, subsequently prepared and executed between/among the participants.

In Witness Whereof, the undersigned have read, understand and agree to each of the provisions of this Agreement to Mediate.

Participant	Date	Participant	Date
-------------	------	-------------	------

Mediator	Date	For the University	Date
----------	------	--------------------	------



Office of the Provost
106 Anderson Hall
Manhattan, KS 66506-0113
785-532-6224
Fax: 785-532-6507

February 7, 2001

Council of Deans:

This is a followup to previous discussions in which we analyzed the implications of the Governor's recommendations for FY2002, including the joint meeting on January 22, 2001, with Vice Presidents Krause and Rawson, and the members of the Faculty Senate Leadership Council.

Simultaneous with an all out effort on the part of the administration of this university, led by President Wefald, and that of each of the other Regents universities and the Board of Regents itself to get these devastating cuts restored, we must be taking steps to avoid creating compounding problems and to minimize long term damage to the institution. We all are hoping that these budget reductions will be restored during the present legislative session. However, against the possibility that they are not we must take some preliminary contingency steps.

Toward that end, it is clear that in order to find the amount of money at issue, we will need to obtain most of it from funds now attached to position lines. As a stark reminder of this, the entire OOE budget of the College of Arts and Sciences would not fund one third of what would likely be needed. Therefore, it is essential that we defer the interview stage of the hiring process for all positions now open until the fiscal environment clarifies, and not make offers that have not already been proffered. Concomitantly, action on the reclassification of classified positions also will be suspended if not completed by the end of business today, until further notice. Major capital equipment purchases on general use budgets also should be deferred pending the outcome of these budget uncertainties. We will do everything we can to clarify the situation as events develop.

Clearly, there will have to be room for exceptions at the discretion of the dean and provost. It is extremely unfortunate that this comes at a time of growth in the number of graduating high school students; in fact K-State's enrollment is at a historic high. It is inevitable that this will have a very negative impact on our ability to serve our students, and we must examine any exceptions against the priority of minimizing potential damage to their progress toward graduation.

Vice Presidents Krause and Rawson have agreed to implement a similar strategy for their units.

Yours truly,


James R. Coffman
Provost

cc: President Wefald
Vice President Krause
Vice President Rawson
Professor Ransom



Vice President for
Administration and Finance
105 Anderson Hall
Manhattan, KS 66506 -0116
785-532-6226
Fax: 785-532-6693

To: Jon Wefald

From: Tom Rawson 

Subject: General Fund Support for Fiscal Year 2002

Date: February 8, 2001

I am enclosing a pair of tables that examine the recommended General Fund support for K-State from two points of view. I hope the following comments will help interpret the information in those tables.

Table 1 views the recommendations from the Governor's point of view. As you can see, we are receiving a 0.3% increase in General Fund support appropriated to the university. This is considerably less than the 1.9% increase shown in the Legislative Research table we have recently discussed. When our share of the SB 345 faculty salary enhancement funding (which is appropriated to the Regents Office and transferred to us) is included, we will see a General Fund increase of 1.9%--which is the same as the apparent average for all state agencies.

Table 2 views the recommendations from the university's point of view. As you know, we have always operated on a base budget concept. In other words, the budget for the coming year is built on a fully-funded base for the current year. The recommendations for the coming year are inconsistent with that approach. From the university's point of view, we could view next year's budget recommendations as requiring us to re-direct existing funds to provide funding for such things as changes to the classified pay plan, fringe benefits increases and utilities expenses. For example, you could argue that the \$1 million General Fund match for our equipment budget this year is a part of the money that must be re-directed for next year. As you can see, from the university's point of view (i.e., from the traditional base budget approach), we are actually experiencing the equivalent of a 3.1% decrease in General Fund support for FY 2002.

Table 1
Summary of FY 2002 General Fund Support
From the Governor's Point of View
Kansas State University

	Amount
Part A. Funds Appropriated Directly to Kansas State University:	
Fiscal Year 2001 General Fund Appropriation	161,959,122
Fiscal Year 2002 General Fund Recommendation	162,400,395
Recommended increase in General Fund support	441,273
Percent increase in recommended General Fund support	0.3
 Part B. Funds Appropriated to Regents Office in our behalf:	
FY 2002 General Fund appropriation for faculty salary enrichment (our share of the \$8.4 million)	2,697,631
Grand Total of New General Fund support shown in Parts A and B	3,138,904
Percent increase in General Fund support for Parts A and B	1.9

Source: Governor's Budget Report and Board of Regents data related to KSU share of the \$8.4 million.

Table 2
A Summary of FY 2002 General Fund Support
From the University's Point of View
Kansas State University

	Amount
Part A. Funds Appropriated Directly to Kansas State University:	
Less impact of the re-direction of the \$1 million SGF equipment match	(1,000,000)
Less money that must be re-directed to finance the required revision of the classified pay plan	(400,000)
Less money that must be re-directed to finance additional utilities costs	(1,500,000)
Less money needed to finance fringe benefits and other ongoing base budget items	(2,100,000)
Net shortfall of General Fund relative to the FY 01 budget and FY02 obligations	(5,000,000)
Percent shortfall in General Fund support needed to fund the budget	(3.1)

Note: Imbedded in the figures in Part A is the re-direction of \$1 million of General Fund support for the equipment matching fund. Under the Governor's recommendation, these dollars must be re-directed so they fund other areas of the budget. Additionally, we must re-direct resources to fund modifications to the classified pay plan, pay utilities bills, fund fringe benefits, etc.

There is no Part B to this table because the additional funds appropriated to the Regents office and to be distributed to K-State are earmarked for faculty salary increases and are not available for funding the needs shown in Part A.