

**MINUTES**  
**Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**February 10, 2004 3:30 p.m. Big 12 Room, K-State Union**

Present: Ackerman, Adams, Anderson, Arck, Bloomquist, Brockway, Cauble, R. Clark, Clegg, Cochran, Cox, DeLuccie, Dubois, Eckels, Elder, Fairchild, Fick, Gehrt, Gormely, Grauer, Greene, Grunewald, Hosni, Johnston, Knapp, Maatta, McCulloh, Meier, Michie, Morrow, Murray, Nafziger, Oberst, Olsen, Quaife, Rahman, Ransom, Reese, Rietcheck, Rintoul, Rolley, Roozeboom, T. Ross, Schmidt, Schumm, F. Smith, M. Smith, Spikes, Stadtlander, Stewart, Stockham, Thompson, Trussell, Warner, Watts, Wilkie, Willbrant, Zabel

Proxies: Behnke, Brigham, Dodd, Gwinner, Hedrick, Jackson, Jones, Kirkham, Mack, Maes, Pacey, Prince, Simon

Absent: Baker, Chang, G. Clark, De Bres, Dhuyvetter, Dryden, Erickson, Fritz, Hamilton, Marr, McHaney, O'Hara, C. Ross, Rys, Schlup, Spears, Spooner, Staggenborg

Visitor: Bruce Shubert

Parliamentarian: Jerry Frieman

- I. President Bob Zabel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
- II. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 20, 2004 meeting. Motion passed.
- III. State funding for FY 2005 - Associate Vice President Bruce Shubert

Bruce Shubert, Associate Vice President for Administration and Finance, distributed a summary of the impact on K-State of the governor's budget recommendations for FY 2005. See **Attachment 1**. The Kansas Board of Regents and the K-State administration are pleased with the governor's recommended 3% salary increases for all employees and also funding for Senate Bill 345, faculty salary enhancements. They are also pleased with no FY 2004 cuts being proposed. The governor also recommended funding of a block grant increase for the Board of Regents institutions. The recommendations leave K-State with a total \$6.9 million projected shortfall in order to move this fiscal year's budget forward into next year and provide the 3% salary increases. An 8% tuition increase would be needed to fund this shortfall. Discussions regarding tuition increase strategies are well under way. The shortfall will be covered by realignments of budgets and tuition increases.

Senator Dubois expressed his concern about being pleased with a 3% salary increase since we had very little or no salary increases over the last few years and at the same time major increases in out-of-pocket health insurance costs. Senator Maatta asked about the legality of the state being allowed to tax restricted funds and SRO monies. The Regents

Business Officers met with the state budget director who assured them that it was legal. Senator Ransom brought up his understanding that the University of Kansas has a different arrangement with how SRO is handled on their campus. Bruce Shubert replied that KU's BEST reductions were \$3.2 million vs. KSU's at \$3 million which seem to be comparable figures. Senator Cauble requested that our administration ensure the legality of the BEST cuts and review how these cuts will be viewed by future research sponsors. Senator Fairchild asked about tuition increases for next year. Shubert replied that the increase has not yet been set. Senator Schumm asked about the impact to students on these BEST cuts and their reactions. Students are concerned about the cuts. Shubert stated at this time they are analyzing how the cuts have been calculated and are monitoring the legislature discussions. Senator Rintoul echoed concern on SRO fund "taxes". He also brought up the point of "tuition ownership" and how this proposal contradicts that concept. Senator Ransom asked about the Board of Regents reactions. Shubert responded that the Board has concerns about some of the recommendations, particularly the BEST proposals. They do, however, appreciate some funding of the block grant and salary increases. Senator Knapp asked if we need to pursue a similar model to the KU SRO model and move some of this money out of the state treasury.

#### IV. Reports from Standing Committees

##### A. Academic Affairs Committee - Pat Ackerman

Senator Ackerman reported that there are no course and curriculum changes this month. The old business that the committee is working on includes a revisit of the standard class meeting time schedule; a review of academic definitions; and learning outcomes.

##### B. Faculty Affairs Committee - Roger Adams

Senator Adams discussed a recruitment advertisement that was placed last month for an Organic Chemistry Assistant Teaching Scholar position. Faculty Affairs did not approve this Chemistry proposal for a new type of appointment that was presented to them for review last fall. The Provost had also not approved the new title. In October 2003 Adams received a draft of the proposed new Teaching Scholar designations that would be regular, non-tenure track appointments but would allow for promotion. Meetings ensued throughout the fall semester, including Faculty Affairs meetings with the Provost, Jane Rowlett, and Peter Sherwood, Chemistry department head. Faculty Affairs was continuing to deliberate on the proposal. After his discussion with the Provost, Jane Rowlett, President Zabel Al Cochran, and Adams the advertisement was pulled and replaced with another ad that clearly indicated the position was a non-tenure track, term administrative appointment.

Senator Ransom asked about the used of the Instructor title, instead. Senator Adams replied that it didn't appear to meet the needs of the Chemistry department. Senator Hosni asked if there is a loophole in the University Handbook. Senator Adams personally thinks there is a loophole. Senator Spikes expressed additional concern and suggested a motion be considered by Faculty Affairs to take a stance on the issue.

##### C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - Walter Schumm - nothing to report

##### D. Faculty Senate Committee on Technology - Mike Haddock - nothing to report

#### V. Announcements

A. Faculty Senate Leadership Council

President Zabel announced that the council met with the President's staff on January 30. The budget outlook was discussed.

The Compensation Task Force tuition waiver plan was discussed in light of the Board of Regents defeat of the Ft. Hays tuition proposal. The task force met last week and decided to forward their proposals to the administration. These include a salary proposal and a tuition waiver proposal. Senator Ransom reported that he and Jana Fallin testified as private citizens in support of the Representative Reitz bill that would provide for a system-wide tuition waiver for spouses and dependents. Reggie Robinson, President and CEO of the Board of Regents, testified after them and expressed adamant opposition to the bill by the Board of Regents. President Zabel has requested a copy of his testimony. He will also discuss this with President Wefald. Senator Michie requested that President Zabel write Representative Reitz thanking him for his support. Senator Smith stated that he would be curious to know what tuition waiver proposal they would consider because earlier the administration expressed support of the concept. Senator Adams stated that community colleges and Washburn already have tuition waiver programs. Senator Cauble said that we need to develop statistics on recruitment and retention costs related to tuition waivers and any other related data that could support the tuition waiver.

B. Kansas Board of Regents meeting

President Zabel reported that the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents is developing a morale survey.

C. Report from Student Senate

Laurie Quaife reported that students have met with the administration about the loss of \$50,000 of privilege fees as proposed in the governor's budget. The administration has told them that the university attorney has reviewed the charges and has determined them legal. They have been told that it is fully supported by the Board of Regents. They will be taking a resolution to the Board against this BEST tax on restricted fees. In tuition conversations, the 8% hike needed to cover budget reductions does not cover all of the needs for additional tuition increases. The increase will likely be much larger than 8%.

D. Other - None

VI. Old Business - None

VII. New Business

A. Big 12 Sports Reform Meeting Report - Mickey Ransom and Mary Molt

**ATTACHMENT 2**

Senator Ransom discussed Athletics Reform in the Big 12. Senator Ransom moved that the Faculty Senate of Kansas State University will continue to participate in the Meeting on Sports Reform in the Big 12 Conference. The Faculty Senate president will designate faculty representatives to attend the meetings and name a representative from the Faculty Senate to have authority to vote on issues of concern to the Faculty Senate of Kansas State University. Senator Hosni seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Graduate Honor System - Phil Anderson **ATTACHMENT 3**

Website: <http://www.ksu.edu/facsen/policies/honorsystem.htm>

Senator Anderson discussed the Graduate Honor System proposal that adds the graduate school to the current Honor System. He moved to adopt the constitution changes as presented. The motion was seconded and carried.

VIII. For the Good of the University

- A. President Zabel congratulated Senator Hosni for his recognition as a distinguished fellow by the University of Mississippi.
- B. Senator Adams is presenting a session on the K-State Cookery Collections on Founders Day.
- C. Senator McCulloh was surprised about the lack of discussion about the decline in the tenurable faculty numbers as presented at Executive Committee. This was discussed within the Arts & Sciences caucus and they have developed a paragraph of relative issues. He will forward that paragraph to President Zabel for review and possible future action.

IX. Adjournment - Meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

## ATTACHMENT 2

### Athletics Reform in the Big 12

#### Background

On January 13 and 14, 2004, Mary Molt (Chairperson of the Intercollegiate Athletics Council), Michael Holen (NCAA Faculty Representative), and Mickey Ransom (representing Faculty Senate) participated in a workshop in Kansas City, MO on Sports Reform in the Big 12. The meeting was called and organized by Gordon Christensen, Chair of the Faculty Council at the University of Missouri, with extensive support from Richard Wallace, Chancellor of the University of Missouri. The meeting included representatives from Baylor University, University of Kansas, University of Missouri, University of Nebraska, Oklahoma State University, University of Texas, and Vanderbilt University.

The meeting was highly informative and allowed for an open discussion of ideas. Virginia Shepherd, the representative from Vanderbilt University, organized a similar meeting of faculty representatives of universities in the Southeastern Conference in May 2003. Several of the participants at the Kansas City meeting are also members of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), a faculty group advocating for reform of intercollegiate athletics. Information about this group is available at the following web site:

<http://www.math.umd.edu/~jmc/COIA/>

The COIA Charter (see attachment) and resolutions concerning athletic reform passed by faculty representatives from the PAC-10 and the Big Ten are posted at this web site. Several representatives at the Big 12 meeting favored adoption of the COIA Charter. However, there was a consensus that the representatives did not have sufficient guidance from the faculty organizations of the universities they were representing. Therefore, the representatives agreed to meet again, and the following statement was adopted:

“As a group of faculty leaders from the Big 12, we see the need for reform of intercollegiate athletics.

To help achieve this goal, we propose that duly appointed representatives of the individual faculty senates of the Big 12 should continue to meet to discuss the issue of cooperative action to reform intercollegiate athletics within the Big 12 conference.

- We further propose that each Faculty Senate/Council name someone to speak for the faculty governing body at these meetings.
- We appreciate Dr. Wallace’s advocacy and we ask that he contact his counterparts at the other Big 12 institutions and ask them to participate and encourage the Faculty governance bodies to participate.
- We suggest that this meeting be within the next six months. We suggest that the meeting be held in Dallas to encourage input by the Big 12 conference administration.
- We ask the MU Faculty Council continue to coordinate this process and appoint a Steering Committee for the next meeting.”

#### Motion to K-State Faculty Senate

In order to continue participation in the discussion, the following motion will be made by Mickey Ransom in Faculty Senate on February 10, 2004:

“I move that the Faculty Senate of Kansas State University will continue to participate in the Meeting on Sports Reform in the Big 12 Conference. President Zabel will designate faculty representatives to attend the meetings and name a representative from the Faculty Senate to have authority to vote on issues of concern to the Faculty Senate of Kansas State University.”

# Charter of the Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics

March, 2003

**The Coalition.** The Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) is a group advocating for reform in intercollegiate athletics, created by and representative of faculty senate leaders at Bowl Championship Series conference schools.

**Origins.** The impetus for creating the Coalition was evidence of some sustained momentum towards reform, as indicated by a succession of national statements from groups such as the Knight Commission and the AAUP, a series of studies that provided new data and insight on relevant issues, and the formation of the Group of Six cooperative effort among BCS-conference presidents. In late 2002, the adoption of the initial set of Group of Six reform proposals and the appointment of Myles Brand at the NCAA reinforced this momentum.

**Goals.** The Coalition's purpose is to articulate a broad national faculty voice in support of reform efforts, to contribute ideas towards a successful long-term strategy for reform, and to work with other groups committed to ensuring that athletics enhances rather than undermines the academic mission. The expectation at the outset is for an initial period of several years of high Coalition activity, leading towards adoption of an acceptable comprehensive program of staged reform by the NCAA or by some alternative emerging structure, followed by a diminishing role tracking the success of the adopted program.

**Strategy.** The Coalition advocates a strategy of reaching consensus among groups interested in reform on the desired long-term outcome of comprehensive reform, and building an agenda of specific phased steps to accomplish that goal over time. While rapid elimination of negative aspects of athletics practices may be desirable, emphasis on speed may limit both the goals that can be set and the chances of success. Therefore, the Coalition's strategy balances goals of speed, comprehensiveness, and practicability.

**Membership.** The Coalition has been established on the basis of membership by individual faculty senate leaders, who have determined individually the degree to which they may seek sanction for their decision to participate from faculty leadership groups within their institutions. Its initial structure is ad hoc, and it makes no strong claim to represent faculty in a broad sense. To the degree that the Coalition is able to build legitimacy by developing a clear program that faculty may broadly support and accomplishing steps towards initial success, it may choose to

formalize issues of membership, engagement with local faculty leaderships, etc., to maximize the degree to which it can claim to represent a national faculty voice.

**Leadership.** The Coalition will initially be led by a Steering Committee that includes at least one and no more than three representatives from each of the six conferences that have participated in founding the Coalition. Committee members are nominated by faculty senate leaders within each conference, and appointed by agreement of those leaders. The committee will begin from ad hoc procedures, and formalize its governance principles to the degree this seems useful to the committee, or to the degree Coalition members indicate this necessity. Initially, the Steering Committee will attempt to draft a vision of long-term reform objectives and a tentative agenda for reaching them that Coalition members can respond to, refine, and perhaps adopt. The committee is also charged to undertake on its own activities intended to provide a foundation for the Coalition's organizational viability, and play a leadership role in the activities listed below.

**Activities.** The Coalition's activities may fall into the following categories:

1) Bringing together ideas from a wide variety of people, both within the Coalition and outside, faculty and non-faculty, and including campus NCAA faculty athletics representatives administrators, and trustees interested in reform, and national groups, such as the NCAA, AAUP and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB).

2) Drafting documents that articulate faculty viewpoints and that constructively contribute to reform efforts.

3) Organizing or participating in events, such as conferences, that can bring together people interested in reform, both to enlarge the coalition and to accomplish specific tasks efficiently.

4) Identifying key issues and proposals where developing additional data is critical to designing reform or effectively advocating for it, and working with other groups, such as the NCAA, AAUP, and AGB, to identify specialists and find funding to support necessary research.

**Scope of Reform.** The Coalition seeks comprehensive reform that would affect five broad categories of intercollegiate athletics activities (the examples below are not intended to be exhaustive and some bridge more than one of the five categories):

1) **Academics.** This includes issues of initial and continuing eligibility; admissions and student-athlete academic standards, etc.

2) **Student Welfare.** This includes issues of scholarship policies; academic advising and other forms of student support; equity concerning matters such as gender and race; athletics scheduling; training expectations and time limits; athletes' engagement in campus life, etc.

3) **Finances and Scale.** This points towards issues related to the athletics "arms race," and includes the cost structure of athletics departments and revenue/non-revenue programs financial planning, reporting, and monitoring; competitive equity within conferences and divisions; the relationship between winning programs and solvency; the constraints of anti-trust law, etc.

4) **Commercialization.** This concerns responses to financial imperatives that may lead to dependency on corporate and media funding, requiring various forms of commercial behavior that may conflict with academic missions or values, including corporate sponsorship contracts and branding control; media contracts and scheduling/marketing control; high-stakes dependency on revenue streams influenced by factors outside institutional control and not related to institutional priorities, etc.

5) **Governance.** This includes the shared governance roles among faculty, presidents athletics administrators and trustees on individual campuses over such matters as academic standards and support for student-athletes, athletics personnel decisions, supervision of financial planning and performance of athletics auxiliaries, programmatic athletics department decisions etc.