MINUTES
Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
March 24, 2009

In Attendance: Judy Hughey, Kaleen Knopp, Amy Schultz, Jennifer Askey, Mark Haub, Clyde Howard,
Donna Fullmer, Bill Hsu, Ellen Urton, Donita Whitney-Bammerlin

Agenda and minutes from March 3, 2009 were approved.

I. Announcements

   A. Administrative evaluation is on Faculty Senate Executive Committee agenda. It will be on
      the floor of FS next week

   B. Child Development Center resolution is also on Executive Committee agenda for inclusion
      on FS agenda.

      Schultz asked if the Kansas House votes for a 13% reduction in funding for higher
      education, where would funds come from?

      Hughey, Askey, and Haub responded that their understanding from previous FS meeting was
      that Bruce Shubert said funding for the CDC would come out of any Obama stimulus
      package “shovel ready” money for the state of Kansas and, thus, not come directly from K-
      State funds.

   C. Appendix G is on the FS agenda for April meeting; second reading and VOTE

II. Action Items

   A. Emeritus Status (D70)

      Proposed resolution would allow the university to recognize a larger # of employees (see
      rationale in document from Susana Valdovinos) for their service to KSU

      Motion and second to consider---approved unanimously

   B. Graduate student grievance policy—UH Appendix V

      There is a substantial difference between the FAC version of this document and the Grad
      School/Grad Council version on the matter of who is the last word on a student grievance. 
      Question remains whether FS should have a larger role in approving grievance procedures --
      or should that role fall to the Grad Council?

      Howard mentioned that the Univ. Attorney's rationale for locating “authority” with the Grad
      Council may have to do with legal challenges to University entities.

      Many FAC members remarked that the proposed changes in Appendix V do not at all reflect
      (a) FAC feedback on the original draft (i.e., reflect procedure of Appendix G and/or Honor
      Council) and (b) seem to run contrary to concept of academic freedom and shared
governance (and the role of faculty)

Noted that Grad Council's Student Affairs Committee is meeting today to discuss the issues remaining between FAC and the Grad Council on the grievance procedures.

Vote to reject attorney's version of Appendix V passed unanimously.

This vote means that we would like to see discussion between FS and Grad Council go forward.

FAC agrees that there is a serious breakdown of communication between FAC and Grad Council on the status of student grievances and that we should do what we can to foster better communication.

Fullmer mentioned that someone might point out to university attorney the history of Appendix G and the Honor Council procedures and how we, as faculty, would like the grad student grievance to fit into that pattern.

With the rejection of the attorney’s version of Appendix V, FAC would like FS leadership to visit with administrative and legal personnel to clarify not only the “authority” issue, but also the particulars of the grievance policy itself.

C. General Issues of Faculty Evaluations (Appendix C changes)

Revisions discussed (see attached)

Motion by Knopp to accept revisions and place on Executive Committee agenda; Haub seconded. Motion passed with one “nay” vote.

D. New faculty orientation. Agreed to take this up at future meeting, but suggestion that new faculty should have orientation that is more complete and contains greater structure. Perhaps comparable to monthly orientation sessions that Assoc. Provost Cochran does for new department heads.