Kansas State University Faculty Senate
Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes
November 19, 2013
3:30pm – 205 KSU Student Union

Attending: Jared Anderson, Charles Barden, Regina Beard, Andrea Blair, Betsy Cauble (chair)
Beth Davis, Eric Dover, Todd Easton, Katie Kingery-Page (secretary), Lotta Larson, Esther Swilley

Guest: Rebecca Gould-ombudsperson

❖ Call to Order
❖ Minutes
  ▪ Accepted, need to correct list of those attending noted
❖ Old Business
  ➢ Faculty and Staff Evaluation Issues; Appendix G
    ▪ Guest Rebecca Gould present for discussion
    ▪ Question of what is grievable? Cheryl Strecker drafted appendix G change that we need to consider
    ▪ Question of what is grievance process? Administrative appeal is first step (academic: department head, dean, provost)...then if not resolved, could go to grievance hearing panel
    ▪ We no not want to prevent grieving of a serious issue with evaluation; those evaluated as “low performance” should still disagree and gripe
    ▪ Term appointments: university not required to give cause due to “right to work” laws in Kansas; Rebecca notes that dismissal can happen at any time during the term of employment; such as after 6 months in a 12 month contract
    ▪ There is not a mechanism for term employees to resolve disputes the way that regular appointment employees can; ombuds will meet with these employees, but they have no recourse per say since they are on term appointments
    ▪ The question is, what disputes should stop at administrative appeal level?
    ▪ Should denial of promotion be added to the list of grievable issues? Currently reads “denial of tenure”
    ▪ Appendix M, how do we parse out from low achievement review disputes? We want to allow a grievance before a full panel for those who are in dispute about an evaluation that could set them on path toward chronic low achievement proceedings
    ▪ Rebecca Gould notes the large amount of resources involved in a grievance hearing
Cauble notes that grievance cases are rare, however: one per year on average since 1970

Could faculty be given an early notice of low achievement? .... Before an annual evaluation? Staff have mid-year evaluations which are about goal setting

Ombuds proposed the change to App G to eliminate grieving of “meets expectations”

Discussion seems to favor allowing grievance in annual evaluation disputes where a low evaluation was given, but not in disputes over “acceptable” or “meets minimum expectation” evaluations and above

Suggested language from this committee: “Administrative appeals can only move to grievance panel if they are: [add denial of promotion] add annual evaluation that could potentially lead to chronic low achievement, as such threshold as defined by department...”

Dispute resolution group is doing terrific job; very few disputes go to grievance

We are maintaining access of faculty and staff to a fair process

Even term appointees should remain eligible for the recourse of App G because their issues should be heard, even if the proceedings gives no employment recourse

Notices of non-reappointment for regular appointment unclassified professional: Notices of non-reappointment are not grievable, administrative appeal is the highest recourse unless procedure not followed. Rebecca will give discuss this issue with Professional Staff Affairs committee

Faculty staff evaluation issue: Currently, no standard practice for dean or department head to acknowledge receipt of disagreement on with annual evaluation

Reappointment process includes a letter from Dean; following tenure, there is no acknowledgement from Dean re your evaluation

Response could feed flames; or could be a valuable procedural step so the individual knows their disagreement has been received

If provost office worked with Deans in training or orientation to strongly suggest response to people as a best management process...would this do it?

Policy may be the wrong move; general counsel may discourage deans from acknowledgement of receipt type of letter, anyway.

Ask Deans what makes sense.

New Business

FSLC Meeting with Pat Bosco and Steve Dandaneau

Faculty senate leadership met with Bosco and Dandaneau re: committees they were creating re: undergraduates which were not inclusive of faculty
Growth of undergrads has boomed; undergrad faculty has not
Faculty advising loads have risen; faculty in some department even handle potential transfer student advising; faculty need to be on the Student success committee
Student Success committee is on hold; advising committee will go forward
Expert coming to campus to discuss enrollment management—how do we handle rising enrollment with static resources?....and meet obligations we have to serve students in state of Kansas?
Admission standards are changing in a few years (rising)
Room availability: ex English language program. They reserve hordes of classrooms and release them later if they cannot fill them.
Ayers St. Gross indicated during campus master planning process that we do have space available: often called departmental space and not made available to other units. Scheduling process is convoluted: how can it be streamlined?
Enrollment has become convoluted as well; so many sub-groups of students have to enroll through special programs (for good reasons), but it creates some confusion when we have so many first year/success programs.
Delivery of education: very little change has occurred over years. Could split schedule help with classroom crunches—not meeting physically every class time?
We need more professional advisors.
A professional staff member of this committee (rep for general university) proposes unclassified staff may be interested in helping to advise (with training). This proposal is for service commitment.

Appendix C
- Handbook Committee working through changes
- Provost asked to not change time for unclassified staff persons have following notification of non-renewal of contract. Currently one year.

Announcements
- We will have Post tenure review doc back from Provost office next meeting

Adjourned