

MINUTES
KSU Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, February 14, 2006 3:30 pm
K-State Union, Big 12 Room

Present: Adams, Alloway, Arck, Baker, Behnke, Bergen, Blythe, Bontrager, Brigham, Brockway, Burns, Cauble, G. Clark, R. Clark, Clegg, DeLuccie, Devore, Dodd, Fairchild, Foster, Fritz, Gehrt, Greene, Guzek, Herald, Hoag, Holcombe, Hosni, Kearns, Knapp, Lehew, Lovely, Lynch, Maatta, Maes, Martin, McHaney, Michie, Moore, Nagaraja, North, Potts, Rahman, Ransom, Rietcheck, Rintoul, Ross, Sachs, Schultz, Shubert, Shultis, Spears, Spikes, Spooner, Stadlander, Stewart, Stockham, Thompson, Trussell, Turnley, Turtle, Warner, Willbrant

Absent: Bhadriraju, Collins, Dhuyvetter, Gormely, Hamilton, Haub, Hedrick, Higgins, Johnston, Lee, Leitnaker, Oberst, Prince, Rys, Schumm, Simon, Staggenborg, Stokes

Proxies: Cox, Eiselein, Erickson, Grauer, Hohenbary, Nichols, Pacey, Rolley, Roozeboom, Smith, Ward, and Yahnke

Visitors: Al Cochran, Neil Erdwien, Cheryl May, Sharon Morrow, Pat Bosco

1. President Tom Herald called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.
2. The minutes of the January 17, 2006 meeting were approved.
3. Reports from Standing Committees
 - A. Academic Affairs Committee – Alice Trussell
 1. Course and Curriculum Changes
 - a. Undergraduate Education -
 1. Senator Alice Trussell moved to approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Engineering November 18, 2005:

COURSE CHANGES:

Architectural Engineering/Construction Science & Management

Changes:

ARE 590 Integrated Building System Design

CNS 200 Computer Applications in Engineering and Construction

Computing and Information Sciences

Changes:

CIS 543 Software Engineering Design Project

General Engineering

Changes:

DEN 160 Engineering Concepts

Add:

DEN 301 Creative Problem Solving in Engineering

CURRICULUM CHANGES:

Architectural Engineering/Construction Science & Management

Curriculum changes to Bachelor of Science in Architectural Engineering (see pages 4, 7, & 8 of white sheets for details).

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Construction Science and Management (see pages 4-6 of white sheets for details).

Changes to Academic Standards regarding suspension from the Professional Program for Unsatisfactory Progress (see pages 9-10 of white sheets for further details).

Department of Chemical Engineering

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering. The changes clarify requirements necessary to meet ABET criteria regarding engineering topics (see pages 12-16 of white sheets for further details).

Computing and Information Sciences

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science (see pages 18-20 of the white sheets for further details).

Electrical and Computer Engineering

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering (see pages 22, 23a, and 23b of the white sheets for further details).

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering (see pages 22, 23c, and 23d of the white sheets for further details).

Motion carried.

2. Senator Trussell moved to approve additions to a graduation list:

May 2005

Brian Dean Youngers – AWS PP, and Associate Degree in PPIL – Technology & Aviation

Bryce A. Esfeld – BS – Business Administration

William Scott Titus – AWS PP, and Associates Degree in PPIL – Technology and Aviation

Motion carried.

3. Senator Trussell reported the committee has been designing a format for submission of pre-requisite/co-requisite changes to be fast-tracked through Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate because of the new student system. She is also pursuing the establishment of a committee to develop an improved process to electronically route course and curriculum changes.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee – Frank Spikes

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

Senator Frank Spikes discussed the award program. He stated the award is not intended to reward for longevity nor for sub-standard performance. After this award was approved by Faculty Senate in December 2005, representatives from the Faculty Senate leadership and from the Compensation Task Force discussed implementation details with the Provost and members of his staff. The final version of the policy as agreed to by leadership and the Provost is included as Attachment 1. The intention is for the first awards to be made in spring 2007 for the 2007-2008 academic year. He stated that the changes to the language clarified the original intent of the policy. Senator Knapp expressed concern with changes to C49.12. Senator Spooner clarified that the language presented mirrors the same procedure that is used currently for merit increases. Senator Ransom stated that the language changes are substantive so requires re-approval of the policy by Faculty Senate. Senator Brigham stated that the clarification in language more clearly reflects the intention of the policy. Past-President Spears commented that the outcome of the language changes brings us more in line with current practice and clarifies the process. Senator Ransom moved to approve the changes as proposed. President Herald ruled that a motion to approve is not in order because the topic is on the agenda for information and not for action. Senator Lynch stated that the policy now includes administrators and the original proposal did not. Senator Brigham

replied that administrators should be included as eligible for the reward since they are also eligible for promotion and that this is consistent with the original intent. Senator Rahman agreed that there is a substantive change in the language. Senator Ransom moved to send the policy back to the Faculty Affairs committee to determine if changes have been substantive and to determine if the policy should return to Faculty Senate for re-approval. Senator Cauble stated that Faculty Affairs has already reviewed the language changes and has the opinion that there are not substantive changes. Past-President Spears stated that the Provost Office staff has bailed us out on this and we should let this program go forward without a need for further approval. She said if there is a concern on the process and the latitude provided to Faculty Senate leadership in working with the Provost on such matters, we should discuss that going forward. Senator Devore asked if the policy does allow for the award to be granted to department heads. Senator Spooner replied that department heads are considered eligible for the award. Senator Ransom withdrew his motion. Senator Hoag moved to suspend the rules. The motion was seconded by Senator Shultis. The motion passed. Senator Dodd moved that we accept the report from Faculty Affairs indicating the editorial changes rendered by the Provost Office. The motion was seconded by Senator Hosni. The motion passed.

2. Professor Spikes reminded the caucuses that elections should be in process. He also announced that the Appendix G Grievance Hearing process has been completed. It was the finding of the panel to uphold the denial of tenure and promotion of the faculty member and President Wefald has followed through with the denial and subsequent termination of the faculty member. He announced that the Board of Regents has approved the new Clinical Track/Clinical Educator Faculty position that Faculty Senate had approved during the June 2005 meeting. With the Board approval, the position type is now officially available for use by the College of Veterinary Medicine.

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - Walter Schumm
No report.

D. Faculty Senate Committee on Technology – Michael North
Senator Michael North reported that a new K-State web home page will be implemented on Monday, February 20. He introduced Neil Erdwien and Sharon Morrow who then demonstrated and discussed the new K-State web presence. Constructive comments should be directed to webmaster@k-state.edu. Senator North reported the committee has been discussing the Electronic Dissertation/Thesis project and Electronic Grade Submission project--an on-line system to allow all faculty to submit grades electronically for the current semester. The White Pages directory listing will change back to @ksu.edu from @k-state.edu on February 16. A large number of employees have not picked up their new Wildcat ID cards from the ID center. He will be inviting someone from the LASER project to update the committee on the status of this project. He reminded faculty to update any personal web pages or remove them. The committee is also looking at the \$50 charge for eID changes.

4. Announcements

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

President Herald reported for the current academic year the new tuition assistance program for spouses and dependents funded 272 undergraduate students for about \$225,000, 48 graduate students for about \$53,000, and nine Veterinary Medicine students for about \$16,000.

Senator Baker clarified that the guest housing problem is a concern for visiting scholars, not just international scholars.

B. Kansas Board of Regents Meeting - **Attachment 2**
President Herald referred to the Attachment 2.

C. Report from Student Senate

Senator Lovely reported the next five-year long-term tuition report will be released March 1. There were 47 pre-proposals received for the Student Fee Bond Surplus of which 16 have been selected to submit full proposals with a decision to be made by March 1.

D. Other - none

5. Old Business - none

6. New Business- none
7. For the Good of the University
Senator Baker stated that senators should check out the web site as listed in the Executive Committee minutes discussing changes in the higher education federal funding, particularly the increase in student and parent loan interest rates: http://www.tompaine.com/articles/20060125/bush_back_to_the_bubble.php Professor Hosni recognized the members of the Compensation Task Force for the efforts they have made in implementing the targeted salary enhancements, increased percentage in promotion salary increase and the professorial performance award program. Senator Baker recognized Christina Hauk and Jim Sherow who served as faculty advocates for the recent grievance hearing.
8. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 1
Professorial Performance Award – Revised

Proposed Handbook Language for the Professorial Performance Award (Approved by Faculty Senate 12-13-05)

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. **Furthermore, the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.**

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 **and by the provost**. 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~~. **will follow the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review outlined in the University Handbook.**

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 conjunction with whatever mechanism departmental procedures specify for the purposes of determining eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award,** ~~The department head, in consultation with the personnel committee which may have been 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 **his or her** ~~their~~ evaluations **by to** the department head and to the ~~next~~ ~~administrative level~~ dean. **A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.**

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

- a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
- b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
- c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
- d. 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 **the candidate**, in writing, ~~to the 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

- a. the evaluation process was conducted in a manner consistent with the criteria and procedures approved by the unit,
- b. 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 **decision will prevail.** ~~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~~ ~~C49.13~~ Basis and source of the award amount The Professorial Performance Award will be 8% of the average salary of ~~all University faculty.~~ **all full-time faculty (instructor through professor excluding administrators at those ranks)**. 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.~~

C49.13 Cost of Awards. In the event that financial conditions in a given year preclude awarding the full amount as designated in C49.12, the Provost shall in concert with the Vice President for Administration and Finance adopt a plan to phase in the full award for all that year's recommended and approved candidates.

C49.14 Upon official notification from the Office of the Provost, ~~the~~ dean will consolidate the Professorial 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 Professorial Performance Award will become part of the professor's base salary.

ATTACHMENT 2
Faculty Senate Leadership Council and Board of Regents Announcements

Faculty Senate Leadership Council

1. Review of current role of General Education.
2. Guest Housing for International Scholars.
3. Report on Tuition Waiver program.

Board of Regents announcements

The Council of Faculty Senate Presidents met with the Board of Regents for a working breakfast on January 19th. The BOR members reiterated their commitment to serving as advocates for higher education and faculty of the universities. The discussion between our two groups was excellent and touched on several issues of significance to all faculty. COFSP (Council of Faculty Senate Presidents) asked the BOR to help us with recruiting and retention of junior and senior faculty. All Regents institutions are reporting high numbers of failed searches for faculty positions. We are particularly concerned about salaries and fringe benefits not being sufficient to attract or retain younger colleagues, who increasingly leave for other universities (or who never get recruited to Kansas).

COFSP also asked about the status of several anti-TABOR campaigns. The BOR noted that several university faculty senates and student senates have passed anti-TABOR resolutions similar to their own. They encouraged us to continue to help educate our students and alumni about the consequences of a TABOR law in Kansas for higher education.

The BOR approved an amendment to the existing policy on clinical appointments. This now permits The K-State Department of Clinical Sciences in the College of Veterinary Medicine to appoint clinical personnel to full-time or part-time, non-tenure track positions with rank.

Respectfully,

Roger C. Adams
President-Elect