

MINUTES

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
November 14, 2000 3:30 p.m. Flinthills Room, K-State Union**

Present: Anderson, Brigham, Burton, Chenoweth, Cochran, Cox, Devault, Donnelly, Ewanow, Finnegan, Gehrt, Geiser, Glasgow, Gormely, Gray, Haddock, Herald, Holden, Hosni, Jurich, Karim, Kirkham, Krstic, Legg, Lynch, Maatta, McCulloh, McGee, Michie, Minton, Molt, Montelone, Mortensen, Mosier, Newhouse, Olsen, Oukrop, Owens-Wilson, Pesci, Peterson, Prince, Ransom, Reddi, Reeck, Rintoul, Roush, Schellhardt, Schmidt, Selfridge, Sheu, Shultis, Simons, Stewart, Takemoto, Verschelden, Weiss, S. White, W. White, Yagerline, Zabel

Absent: Exdell, Fjell, R. Flores, Fraser, Heublein, Higgins, Johnson, Lenkner, Liang, Mathews, Ramaswamy, Ross, Scheidt, Schumm, Sherow, Smith, Spears, Williams, Worcester, Youngman

Proxies: Atkinson, Bockus, Bradshaw, Clegg, S. Flores, Hopper, Keller, Nafziger

- I. President Mickey Ransom called the meeting to order at 3:35.
- II. It was moved and seconded to approve the Minutes of the October 10, 2000 meeting. Ransom made two corrections: Sen. Bockus was represented by proxy and the correct title for the position in the Graduate School is Associate Vice Provost.

Motion passed.

- III. Announcements - Ransom referred to announcements in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee minutes of October 30 (pp. 1 - 5) attached to the agenda. He said there are no additional announcements and asked for questions.

Ransom noted progress in selection of the Task Force to study the Constitution and By-Laws of Faculty Senate. All members have been selected, with the exception of representatives of the Colleges of Architecture, Planning, and Design, Technology and Aviation, and Veterinary Medicine.

- IV. Presentation on faculty evaluation workshops and AAHE grant - Ruth Dyer, Assistant Provost

Dyer reported on efforts to engage departments in examinations of their departmental missions and allocation of faculty assignments and rewards. Because the Provost wanted to promote discussion among departmental faculty about how these issues are addressed in annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, and chronic low achievement policies, he formed a working group

(Mickey Ransom, Buddy Gray, Jerry Frieman, Peter Nichols, and Larry Rogers) to develop strategies. Coffman and Dyer applied for and received grant support for this effort from the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE).

Joint departmental meetings will be held to allow for cross pollination among departments of ideas and approaches. Faculty, department heads, deans, and members of the working group will participate in these meetings over the next two years. The first meeting, involving Biology, Interior Architecture, and Mathematics, was held recently.

Sen. McGee asked about involvement of Salina faculty, and Dyer said they will be involved, possibly via teleconference. Sen. Verschelden asked if there will be records of the workshops. Dyer said that records of ideas and processes will be maintained and shared both with others at K-State and at other institutions. In addition, she plans to develop multimedia modules for faculty concerning professional development opportunities.

Sen. Krstic asked about the purpose of the workshops *vis a vis* chronic low achievement policies and expressed hope that those documents will encompass and encourage professional development. Dyer said it is critical that faculty update departmental documents reflecting missions, faculty activities, and rewards.

V. Presentation on activities of the Student Review Board and Student Tribunal - Tara Hull, Student Government Association Attorney General

Ms. Hull provided an overview of the three branches of student government, with special reference to the judicial branch. She said the judicial branch operates from an educational framework emphasizing mutual respect, student rights, and enforcement of positive behavior through educational sanctions. Both the Student Tribunal and the Student Review Board include Faculty Senate representatives. The Student Tribunal interprets the constitution, handles impeachment proceedings, hears cases without other jurisdictions, and hears appeals from other jurisdictions. The Student Review Board deals with cases on campus that do not involve residence halls. Other judicial functions include the Judicial Council, the Housing and Dining Board, and the Parking Citations Appeals Board. Hull emphasized that the judicial system is run by and for students and one of her goals is to facilitate Faculty Senate involvement.

Sen. Herald and Pres. Ransom thanked her for her active role as Attorney General.

VI. Presentation on K-State On-line - Vice Provost Beth Unger, Rob Caffey, and Andrew Barkley

Beth Unger explained the genesis and philosophy of K-State On-line as a course creation and management tool. K-State On-line was devsigned for ease of use, because no other system was sufficiently robust and flexible to meet faculty needs, and because existing programs were too expensive. The Division of

Continuing Education developed K-State On-line for all mediated instruction. This fall there have been more than 1/2 million "hits" on the system, there are currently 88,000 unique users, 350 KSU instructors, and 360 courses that are full or partial users of service.

Rob Caffey described the on-line tool kits, which are offered in a single interface designed for maximum flexibility and ease of use by instructors. Current tools include chat rooms, message boards, file sharing and uploading, audio and video content, student rosters, assignment management, and grade books. he urged faculty who would like to create an account faculty to contact him.

Andrew Barkley shared his experiences using elements of K-State On-line in three of his courses in Agricultural Economics - a graduate, distance education course, a senior-level course, and an introductory Ag Econ course. Barkley believes K-State On-line has helped him increase student learning. He commended Rob and his group for their responsiveness to questions and said they will come to faculty offices to help set up the program.

Several senators commented on their use of K-State On-line and asked questions.

VII. Reports from Standing Committees

A. Academic Affairs Committee - Tom Herald

1. *Course and Curriculum Changes*

a. **Undergraduate Education**

1. Herald moved approval of Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Business Administration September 14, 2000.

CHANGE:

MKTG 442 Personal Selling and MKTG 542 Sales Management to MKTG 542 Professional Selling and Sales Management

Motion passed.

2. Herald moved approval of Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Education September 26, 2000.

CHANGE:

Department of Secondary Education recommend adoption of BIOL 450 and BIOL 541 as core requirements for the major leading to certification (grades 7-12) in the biological sciences. Recommend dropping BIOL 410 and BIOL 400 to meet core requirements. Recommend elective hours change from 8 to 6.

Motion passed.

b. Graduate Education

1. Herald moved approval of Graduate Course & Curriculum Changes approved by Graduate Council October 3, 2000.

CHANGE:

LAR 898 Thesis Proposal Writing

Motion passed.

c. General Education

1. Herald moved approval of a course for general education approved September 2000 by the General Education Task Force.

HIST 330 History of East Asian Civilization

Motion passed.

2. *Additions to Graduation Lists*

Herald moved approval of the following additions to the August 2000 Graduation List:

August 2000

Kevin S. Brady, A&S, BS--Geology

Clyde A. Johnson, A&S, BS--Social Science

Jill Elizabeth Volland, A&S, Bachelor of Music--MUSAP-TH

Emie Wiechman, A&S, BA--Sociology-CR

Motion passed.

3. *Policy Agreement between Undergraduate Honor System and Registrar's Office* **ATTACHMENT 1**

Herald moved approval of ATTACHMENT 1. Sen. Phil Anderson moved to amend the document, changing "transcript" to "academic record" and adding "which will prevent the student from dropping the course" to the second paragraph. Motion was seconded and passed.

Sen Stewart offered a friendly amendment to add "member" after faculty in the first sentence. His friendly amendment was accepted.

Main motion passed.

4. Herald mentioned that the Provost's Office discovered that all of the paperwork had not been completed for 13 program options at K-State-Salina previously approved by Senate. Those options will coming back to Academic Affairs and then to Faculty Senate.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee - Jim Legg

1. Legg moved approval of the Report of the Task Force on Summer School Planning (**ATTACHMENT 2**) and to extend the present interim policy on summer school through the summer of 2003, with the condition that the comprehensive review mentioned in the last sentence of the report's short term recommendations be prepared by a Task Force with substantial faculty representation and reported to Faculty Senate by no later than Senate's March, 2003, regular meeting.

Sen. Owens-Wilson asked about the March, 2003 date for the next report. Legg said that date was set because the current policies continue through summer, 2003, and this would allow changes to be made before the current policies expire.

Gray reminded Senate that the reason for this task force was faculty concern that summer funding has been driving quality. Economic, rather than academic considerations, have prevailed. The goal of the university is to toward full funding of summer school

Motion passed.

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - John Johnson

1. On behalf of John Johnson, Ransom announced the focus group meeting regarding the Campus Master Plan on Thursday, November 16, from 3 - 5 p.m. in Union 206. Persons planning to attend should RSVP to 2 - 6377. Sen. Krstic encouraged senators to participate in this important meeting.

D. Faculty Senate Committee on Technology - Dee Takemoto

Takemoto had no action items. She reported that in the past the Information Resources Management Council has determined policies concerning technology use. However, in the future all policies will come through the Faculty Senate. Upcoming business will include policies on research and domain ownership. She also announced that aculty interested in tours of the Information Commons should contact Karen Cole in Hale Library.

VIII. Old Business - None

IX. New Business - None

X. For the Good of the University - None

XI. Adjournment. Sen. Finnegan moved that everyone drive safely and that the meeting be adjourned. Motion was seconded and passed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40.

**POLICY AGREEMENT
between
UNDERGRADUATE HONOR SYSTEM & REGISTRAR'S OFFICE**

If a KSU faculty member wishes to assign an XF for a course due to a student allegedly having violated the Honor Pledge, the faculty member must make the request of the Honor System Director and provide the appropriate documentation to be placed on file in the Honor System office.

The Honor System Director then notifies the Registrar to place a hold on the student's academic record which will prevent the student from dropping the course and also notifies the student of the faculty request for an XF. The Honor System Director provides the student five academic days from receipt of the letter to decide whether to appeal the request for an XF.

If the student does not appeal the XF, the Honor System Director notifies the Registrar to record an XF on the student's academic record. The F will remain permanently on the academic record; the X (which indicates a violation of the Honor Pledge) can only be removed by successfully passing the Academic Integrity Seminar, offered annually.

If the student decides to appeal the request for an XF, the Honor System Director appoints Honor Council Case Investigators to investigate the case. Following the investigation, the Director appoints an Honor Council Hearing Panel and Chair to adjudicate the case and decide whether or not there has been an Honor Pledge violation and whether the request for an XF should be upheld.

If the Hearing Panel decides to uphold the request for an XF, the Honor System Director notifies the Registrar and the XF is assigned to the student's academic record. If the Hearing Panel decides that there was not a violation of the Honor Pledge, the Honor System Director notifies the Registrar to remove the academic hold on the student's academic record.

Phil Anderson
Honor System Director

**Report of the
Task Force on Summer School Planning
May 5, 2000**

In the development of both short and long-term plans for summer school, we note the existence of a set of fundamental principles the members of the Task Force accept as crucial to the well being of the University, its faculty, and its students.

Principles

1. Summer school is an essential and integral part of the University's educational environment. It is not a stand-alone system. Since altering summer school may very well affect our current or future educational programs, summer school management and operations should be continuously evaluated.
2. Providing a quality educational experience for our students is our highest priority. No recommendation should be made that seems likely to result in a reduction in the quality of our classes or programs.
3. Any recommendation for funding summer school must comply with the faculty compensation guidelines in Section C-23 of the *Faculty Handbook*.
4. Any recommendation proposed should be based on achieving the maximum benefit for the entire University community. Alternatives that benefit one segment at the detriment of another would not be in the best interest of the entire University. Such recommendations should be avoided.
5. All recommendations should consider managing costs, while encouraging the creation of enhanced revenue and new sources of funds; summer school is presently both self-funded and underfunded.
6. Decisions about courses to be offered and faculty to be employed during summer school are academic decisions that are best negotiated among departments and the deans of the respective colleges.
7. Funding for summer school should retain the flexibility to use increased tuition revenues to fund growth. However, simply moving credit hour production from fall and spring semesters to the summer school, or among departments and colleges, is disadvantageous to the University's fiscal and academic well being.

Short-term Recommendations

The University has recently moved to a new operational model for summer school. In this model, the management of summer school has moved to the Deans' Council with the Director of Planning and Analysis providing data, informational, and staff support. Basic policy and funding recommendations to the full Council of Deans are made by a steering committee, chaired by the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

The Task Force recommends the current model be retained and evaluated across a significant enough time period to reasonably assess its effectiveness. Assuming the enrollment and resultant resource consequences of the application of this model meet the basic assumptions for financing summer school operations, or can reasonably be modified to do so, the test period should extend at least through summer session 2003. We assume the current model will be dynamic and responsive to the need for changes to better assure that fiscal and academic objectives are achieved.

This recommendation derives from the observation, although somewhat subjective at this point, that progress has been made on some long-term issues:

1. The University now follows more closely the guidelines of the *Faculty Handbook* regarding faculty pay for summer school, resulting in a somewhat greater level of equity in pay across colleges and departments. It should be noted that the faculties of some colleges with differing histories of summer

pay practices are reluctant to teach summer school under the application of present Handbook policies.

2. Summer school offerings seem to have more explicitly emphasized student need for courses over faculty preferences for teaching courses.
3. Academic decisions regarding courses and faculty are made more commonly as the result of discussions between departments and college deans.
4. While not yet tested in practice, the current system technically allows for a certain level of flexibility in the retention and use of tuition revenues in the colleges.
5. It appears the current model encourages academic units generally to more carefully and consistently plan to meet student demand during the summer session.

The Faculty Senate and the Central Administration have agreed to the operation of the current model on a temporary basis, in fact through the summer of 2001. At this point, while early indications seem positive, the model has not even been in operation for one summer session, and it is clearly too early to tell at what level it has been successful. In view of the substantial changes that have been made, the investment of time and energy by the Central Administration, the Faculty Senate, the Deans' Council, and the academic departments to understand and operationalize this model, the Task Force feels an extended amount of time is needed to properly assess its impact.

Clearly, data should be collected continuously regarding enrollment levels, student and program needs, staffing needs, faculty compensation levels, and impact on academic year course requirements. These data along with the principles delineated in the previous section should provide the basis for a further full-scale review at an appropriate time.

Long term Recommendations

While the trial period is likely to provide significant information leading to the improvement of approaches to the management of summer school, several recommendations related to long-term summer school matters should be considered.

- 1) When courses clearly must be offered to meet curricular needs of students, full implementation of the Faculty Handbook stipulation that faculty receive one-ninth of their academic year salary for each 3 credit hour class-taught should be pursued, even in those instances where tuition for specific classes may not equal a full salary.
- 2) Consideration should be given to developing a rationale supporting a formal request to the Board of Regents to pursue full legislative funding for summer school.
- 3) Attempts should be made to predict student course needs beyond those suggested by historic data to test and develop new markets and to assess the desirability of providing innovative offerings.
- 4) The assumption that summer school must be entirely self funded should be continuously examined. Other financial and employment models should be regularly explored, with consideration of new patterns such as 9 month contracts which include summer school and 12 month contracts for units, or individuals within units, whose instruction is crucial to summer school needs.