

AGENDA
KSU Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, December 13, 2005 3:30 pm
K-State Union, Big 12 Room

1. Call meeting to order
2. Approval of November 8, 2005 minutes
3. Reports from Standing Committees
 - A. Academic Affairs Committee – Alice Trussell
 1. Course and Curriculum Changes
 - a. Undergraduate Education
 1. Approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Arts and Sciences October 6, 2005:

COURSE CHANGES:

Department of Art

Change:

ART 201 Visual Communication Foundation
ART 290 Type and Design Principles
ART 576 Advanced Typography
ART 582 Internships in ~~Graphic Design~~ Visual Communication

Add:

ART 561 Intermediate Oil Painting

Drop:

ART 583 Visual Communication Portfolio

Department of Economics

Add:

ECON 524 Sports Economics

Department of English

Change:

ENGL 335 Film
ENGL 469 Special Topics in Creative Writing

School of Journalism and Mass Communications

Change:

MC ~~500~~ 303 Advanced News and Feature Writing
MC ~~590~~ 404 Public Affairs Reporting

Department of Statistics

Change:

STAT 510 Introductory Probability and Statistics I

CURRICULUM CHANGES:

Page 94, undergraduate catalog

Curriculum changes to the Pre-Health Professions Program

Page 11, undergraduate catalog

Changes to the undergraduate catalog regarding Pre-Health Advising. (See page 8 of the white sheets)

New Pre-Health Professions Program options:

Add three new options to the Pre-Health Professions Program: (See pages 9-11 of the white sheets)

1. Pre-Chiropractic medicine
2. Pre-dental hygiene
3. Pre-physician assistant

Department of Art

Page 98, undergraduate catalog

Curriculum changes to the B.A. degree in art. (See page 12 of the white sheets)

School of Journalism and Mass Communications

Page 119, undergraduate catalog

Curriculum changes to Print Journalism. (See page 14 of white sheets for rationale.)

Page 119, undergraduate catalog

Curriculum changes to Electronic Journalism. (See page 15 of white sheets for rationale.)

Department of Kinesiology

Page 121, undergraduate catalog

Changes to the undergraduate catalog under Kinesiology. (See page 16 of the white sheets.)

Page 121, undergraduate catalog

Curriculum changes to the Health Fitness Instructor Option.

Delete HN 320 from the list of course required for this option. (See page 17 of the white sheets.)

Department of Speech, Communication, Theatre and Dance

Name change to a Major:

FROM: ~~Rhetoric and Communication~~ TO: Speech Communication

Name change to a Minor:

FROM: ~~Rhetoric/Communication~~ minor TO: Speech Communication minor

Curriculum changes to the Speech Communication major. (Please see pages 18-19 of white sheets)

2. Approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Human Ecology October 9, 2005:

Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design

COURSE CHANGES:

Change:

ID 415 Computer-Aided Design and Drafting for Visual Communication in Interior Design (2) (3)
ID 545 Senior Interior Design Studio I. (3) (4)

Add:
ID 399 Interior Design Practicum

CURRICULUM CHANGES:

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in interior design. (See pages 4-5 of white sheets for details.)

School of Family Studies and Human Services

COURSE CHANGES:

Change:
FSHS 100. Family Financial Planning as a Career. (1) I, II.
FSHS 405. Advanced Personal and Family Finance. (3) I, II.

CURRICULUM CHANGES:

Page 218, undergraduate catalog
Family Studies and Human Services
Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in family studies and human services. (See page 8 of white sheets for further details.)

Page 219, undergraduate catalog
Life Span Human Development
Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in family studies and human services. (See page 9 of white sheets for details.)

3. Approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Agriculture October 14, 2005:

COURSE CHANGES:

Animal Sciences and Industry

Change:
ASI 325. ~~Conformation and Performance Appraisal of Horses~~ Beginning Horse Evaluation
ASI 504. Equine Reproduction Management (~~2~~) (3)

Add:
ASI 402. Calving
ASI 403. Foaling
ASI 404. Lambing
ASI 444. Equine Health
ASI 502. Principles of Equine Reproductive Management

Entomology

Change:
ENTOM ~~250~~ 301. Insects and People
ENTOM 312. General Entomology

Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources

Add:
HORT 235. Introduction to the Horticultural Therapy Profession

CURRICULUM CHANGES:

Curriculum changes to the Agricultural Education major. (See pages 12-13 of white sheets for details and rationale.)

Food Science and Industry

Curriculum changes to the Food Business & Operations Mgmt Option. Replace HN 400 with HN 132 and Delete FDSCI 694 from Core Course selection list because faculty are not available to teach the course.

Curriculum changes to the Science Option. Replace MATH 205 with MATH 220 to meet IFT requirements. Replace HN 400 with HN 132. Delete FDSCI 694 from Core Course Selection list because faculty are not available to teach the course. Reduction of Professional Electives by one hour to compensate for the change in hours of calculus.

Horticulture, Forestry and Recreation Resources

Drop a Major:
Drop the Horticultural Therapy Major.

Drop an Option:
Drop the Pre-Occupational Therapy Option.

Change an Option:
Move the Horticultural Therapy Option under the Horticulture Major.

Rationale: We are consolidating all our programs into one core with multiple options for uniformity. (See pages 17-20 of the white sheets for more details.)

Golf Course Management

Curriculum changes to the Golf Course Management Option. (See pages 21-22 of white sheets)

4. Approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Human Ecology October 24, 2005:

COURSE CHANGES

Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design

CHANGE:
ID 599 Interior Design Internship (3) (Variable 3-4)

ADD:
ID 440 Lighting for Interiors

DROP:
ID 440 Home Appliance Design and Evaluation

CURRICULUM CHANGES

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Interior Design. (Consult pages 3-4 of the white sheets for further details.)

5. Approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Education October 25, 2005:

COURSE CHANGES

Department of Elementary Education

CHANGE:
EDEL 310

CURRICULUM CHANGES

Department of Secondary Education

- Require all art education students to earn a “C” in all art content classes.
 - Require all art education students to participate in a portfolio review process after completion of the art foundation classes. (See white sheets for further details.)
- b. Graduate Education - Approve graduate course and curriculum changes approved by the Graduate Council on November 1, 2005:

CHANGES:

ART 623	Advanced Concepts in Computer Art and Design
ART 631	Contemporary Media Seminar
ART 650	Advanced/Senior Painting Studio
CS 753	Small Animal General Medicine
DMP 870	Seminar in Pathobiology (MS)
DMP 880	Problems in Pathobiology (MS)
DMP 899	MS Research in Pathobiology
DMP 970	Seminar in Pathobiology (PhD)
DMP 980	Problems in Pathobiology (PhD)
DMP 999	PhD Research in Pathobiology
GEOL 714	Rock Microstructures and Geologic Processes
HRIMD 621	Hospitality Law
HRIMD 640	Entrepreneurship in Hospitality Management and Dietetics
ID 645	Senior Interior Design Studio II
ID 651	Design for Supportive Environments
STAT 725	Introduction to the SAS Computing
Graduate Certificate in Academic Advising	
Department of Economics preliminary exam	

DROP:

ART 615	Figure Painting
ART 620	Water Media II
ART 649	Painting Seminar
ART 653	Senior Painting Studio
DMP 898	MS Research in Microbiology
DMP 998	Research in Microbiology
ID 740	Advanced Household Equipment

ADD:

ART 679	Color Experiments, Theory and Application
DMP 895	Topics in Pathobiology (MS)
DMP 995	Topics in Pathobiology (PhD)
FSHS 757	Financial Behavior Assessment Consulting
STAT 726	Introduction to Splus/R Computing
STAT 825	Numerical Methods of Statistics

- c. General Education -none

2. Approve additions to graduation lists:

May 2003

Jason Elker – AWS PP, Technology & Aviation

May 2005

Nicholas A Torres – AWS PP, PPIL – Technology & Aviation

Kyle Stephen Oswald – College of Arts and Sciences

August 2005

Bryce P. Trear – College of Arts and Sciences

Sarah K. Theimer – Graduate School, Master of Accountancy

Matthew B. Smith – Graduate School, Master of Accountancy

Timothy Martin Ratliff – BA – Arts & Sciences

William Lee Bennett – BS – Arts & Sciences

B. Faculty Affairs Committee – Frank Spikes

1. Professorial Performance Award Proposal – **Attachment 1**

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - Walter Schumm

D. Faculty Senate Committee on Technology – Michael North

4. Announcements

A. Faculty Senate Leadership Council - **Attachment 2**

B. Kansas Board of Regents Meeting - **Attachment 2**

C. Report from Student Senate

D. Other

5. Old Business

6. New Business

7. For the Good of the University

8. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 1

Professorial Performance Award

Faculty salaries at Kansas State continue to fall below NASULGC averages at all ranks. But by far the most significant deficit lies at the rank of full professor. In 2003-04, the salaries of the full professoriate at Kansas State averaged 19.8% behind that of the full professoriate of other NASULGC institutions, compared to an 8.4% deficit for associate professors and 8.6% deficit for assistant professors. At present, bringing full professor salaries up to average would require an infusion of some \$6.5 million, an impossibility under current fiscal conditions. Given both the compelling need to remedy compressed salary at this rank and prevailing financial constraints, the Salaries and Benefits Committee has produced a two-part plan to address full professor salary compression that is fiscally manageable now, encourages and rewards productivity, and will have increasing impact on full professor salaries in the future.

The first part of the plan, an increased promotion-based raise, has already been put into place. On April 12, Faculty Senate passed a proposal to amend the language to the University Handbook to enhance promotion-based salary increases. The new language revises the percentage of the general salary pool constituting these raises from 5% and 7.5% to 8% and 11% for associates and full professors, respectively.

However, while this first step brings more salary to the full professor rank, and may have some effect on inter-rank compression, it will likely produce greater intra-rank compression. New full professor salaries may in some cases be greater than those who have served many years in rank. Therefore, the committee considers it imperative that we follow up the increased promotion raise with a Professorial Performance Award, an opportunity to increase the base salaries of high-performing full professors who have been in rank six years or more. The Performance Award review, it is important to note, is not a form of promotion review. It does not create a "senior" professoriate. In fact, since it rewards continued performance at the level that merited promotion, it may have the effect of consolidating the identity rather than diminishing the significance of the highest faculty rank.

We recommend an award amount of 8% of the average salary of all University faculty, currently around \$5000. However, funding for the award cannot come out of the legislatively approved merit increment; it must be an infusion of additional money from tuition or other sources.

Implementation

The evaluation of candidates for Professorial Performance Awards follows a timeline for activities at the departmental and dean's levels similar to that outlined in the University Handbook for promotion. Also, as is the case for promotion, it is primarily the responsibility of departments to judge whether or not individuals qualify. However, the award review is a performance review, not a promotion review. Therefore it is not necessarily a peer review. Departments would be expected to develop their own mechanisms for review as they have for merit evaluation. As is the case in merit review, it may be that responsibility for the evaluation of materials involves personnel of any rank or several ranks.

Each department will also specify criteria for awarding the incentive according to its own disciplinary standards of excellence. Nonetheless, all such criteria will adhere to the following guidelines: 1. The candidate must have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or **professorial performance award performance review**; 2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and 3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to full professor according to current standards. The department should explicitly address these guidelines in their review, as well as any other criteria the department deems appropriate to specify. The deans would have responsibility for oversight of the process, assuring that departments have consistently followed their own guidelines for awarding the performance.

Cost

The number of full professors at the University who have been in rank for at least six years and who could therefore conceivably qualify for the Professorial Performance Award is higher than what can be allocated to awards in a single year. Therefore, we recommend a phased approach to the early years of the program if necessary. If the cost of the total number of awards exceeds what is possible to budget, each recipient will receive a set percentage of the total award amount, with the balance added to the base in the second, or at most the second and third, year. We anticipate that this will only be a problem in the first few years, and thereafter the number of awards will be both relatively predictable and fiscally manageable, as is the case with rank promotions.

Proposed Handbook Language for the Professorial Performance Award

C49.1 Significance of the Award. The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a ~~periodic~~ **base** salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. The Performance Award review, it is important to note, is not a form of promotion review. It does not create a "senior" professoriate.

C49.2 Development and Revisions of the Professorial Performance Award Process. Departments develop their own mechanisms for review as they have for annual merit evaluation. As is the case in merit review, it may be that responsibility for the evaluation of materials involves personnel of any rank or several ranks. Each department will also specify criteria according to which candidates qualify for the award according to its own disciplinary standards of excellence. Nonetheless, all such criteria for the award will adhere to the following guidelines: 1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or **professorial performance award** ~~performance review~~; 2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and 3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to ~~full~~ **professor** according to current approved departmental standards.

C49.3 The Professorial Performance Award document must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty in the department, by the department's administrative head, and by the dean. Provision must be made for a review of the document at least every five years as a part of the review of the procedures for annual merit evaluation or whenever standards for promotion to ~~full~~ **professor** change.

C49.4 Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award are considered annually.

C49.5 Responsibilities of Professorial Performance Award Candidates. Eligible candidates for review compile and submit a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department. The department head, in consultation with the personnel committee assembled for the purpose of the Professorial Performance award, when applicable, will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award.

C49.6 Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations by the department head and to the next administrative level.

C49.7 The department head must submit the following items to the appropriate dean:

- A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
- Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
- Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
- The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

C49.8 Responsibilities of the Deans. The dean will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with the criteria and procedures established by the department for the Professorial Performance Award.

C49.9 A dean who does not agree with recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award made by a department head must attempt to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the dean's recommendation will be used. If any change has been made to the department head's recommendations, the dean must notify, in writing, candidate of the change and its rationale. Within seven working days after notification, such candidates have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations to the dean and to the provost. All statements of unresolved differences will be included in the documentation to be forwarded to the next administrative level. All recommendations are forwarded to the provost.

C49.10 Responsibilities of the Provost. The provost will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that

- the evaluation process was conducted in a manner consistent with the criteria and procedures approved by the unit,
- there are no inequities in the recommendations based upon gender, race, religion, national origin, age or disability.

C49.11 If the provost does not agree with recommendations for **professorial performance awards** ~~salary increases~~ made by subordinate administrators, an attempt must be made to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the provost's recommendation will be used. The candidate affected by the disagreement must be notified by the provost, in writing, of the change and its rationale.

C49.12 The dean will consolidate the Performance Award with salary increases resulting from annual evaluation and issue the candidate a contract that includes the candidate's salary for the next fiscal year. **The performance award will become part of the professor's base salary.**

C49.13 Basis and source of the award amount. The Professorial Performance Award will be 8% of the average salary of all-University faculty. However, funding for the award cannot come out of the legislatively-approved merit increment; it must be an infusion of additional money from tuition or other sources.

ATTACHMENT 2
Faculty Senate Leadership Council and Board of Regents Announcements

Faculty Senate Leadership Council

1. Wayne Goins, Associate Professor in Music was selected to serve as ombudsperson from 2005 - 2008.
2. Appendix M and Appendix G hearings are active.
3. A new five-year tuition plan is under development.
4. Taxpayers Bill of Rights (TABOR). Colorado voters approved an amendment to place a moratorium on TABOR.

BOR Meeting

1. Council of Chief Academic Officers:

A draft of Rules and Regulations for Qualified Admissions/ACT Writing Requirements was worked on. ACT writing test cannot be used to deny a student, but could be used for provisional entry and as an advisory too. The regulations would state that the writing score would be at the institutions' discretion. There is an extra fee for the ACT writing component. The implementation date would be Fall 2007. The advantage of including the ACT writing score is the signal that it sends to the student and that it might be used for placement or for conditional admission.

Tilford Conference

The committee will be formed and charged to put more topic/content focus on the conference.

The Vetmed Clinical track appointment was approved.

2. Board meeting

The board will be more aggressive in requiring more challenging outcomes in the performance agreements. They will request more scope and stretch goals in future agreements.

The Ph.D. and M A. programs in Security Studies were approved.