

**Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes
May 20, 2008**

Attending: Ellen Urton, Regina Beard, Betsy Cauble, Jennifer Askey, Richard Hoag, James Nechols, Amy Schultz, Stacey Warner, Mark Haub, Kaleen Knopp

1. Call to order & introductions

New members & old introduced themselves.

2. Reception for incoming and outgoing members

Cake provided by Candace & Co at Faculty Senate

3. Approval of April 29, 2008 minutes

Knopp moved to approve: passed unanimously

4. Continuing Business

A. Appendix G—Betsy

FAC has been engaged in reformulating Gen Grievance procedures for years. Are close to having a document everyone can be happy with. Suzanne Valdovinos, having taken over as Director of Academic Personnel, is working well with FAC to resolve the remaining issues.

→ timelines within the document. Does the timeline begin with the point of filing of grievance or at the point of notification of the grievance? Cauble recommends that the timeline begins at the time of notification. Once the Gen Grievance Board chair has decided whether to go forth with a hearing, s/he issues notification and the timeline goes into effect.

→ language and regulation regarding having a security officer present during hearing. Cauble suggests that there always be a security officer present, as one cannot accurately predict the risk or the environment of the hearing.

Valdovinos is very busy at this time of year reviewing annual reviews, promotion and tenure documents, etc. The next meeting with her is scheduled next week so these issues can be resolved and the new Appendix G language put forth for an initial reading at the June Faculty Senate meeting. That language will be sent to us via email for an electronic vote prior to the June 10th Fac Sen meeting.

(Thoughts: a filing deadline of 30 days from most recent administrative action, with room for an extension. This is something we may want to talk to our departments/divisions about and gauge response.)

Is a longer lag time better or worse for the person filing? It may be better for the grievant to file as soon as possible—waiting a year is perhaps too long.)

B. Subcommittee Updates

1. Spoken English (Hoag) (C22.2)

Mary Wood, Dir of ELP, will speak with Hoag and Hsu during the summer on rewording the UH section on spoken English at K-State, to increase consistency across depts and between KSU and the BOR.

Issues: hiring and language training for instructors who speak English as a Second Language

2. Chronic Low Achievement (Nechols, Knopp) (C31.5)

Knopp: Subcommittee looking at definitions of Chronic Low Achievement across colleges and departments—data gathering.

Nechols: Before FAC makes recommendations on language in chronic low achievement, there will be a discussion with the Provost. The issue at the core is whether the person being evaluated for chronic low achievement is being evaluated in all areas of his/her assignment (research, teaching,

service—all combined) holistically, OR, whether each of those areas of work is being evaluated individually.

The wording proposed would define how chronic low achievement is evaluated uses the phrasing “essential duties”— so the question to the Provost is how his office views evaluation—holistically or individually across duty areas.

3. Administrative Evaluation (C41.4, B123, and C157)

Cauble: Ruth Dyer presented language changes to FAC at the beginning of last academic year. Those edits were put on hold during Ken Holland’s evaluation.

Now the committee needs to meet with Ruth Dyer and Clyde Howard (Dir. of Affirmative Action) as they move forward.

The language in the UH at present contains anachronisms (box in the library); as well as larger issues as to which administrators’ positions require an advisory committee to the Provost for their evaluation. FAC will have to consider guidelines for this as the process goes on.

Askey: the professionalism and design of the electronic instruments used is also something we need to keep in mind as we make our recommendations.

Hoag: Idea Center should perhaps come talk to us about the process of evaluation.

Nechols: depending on what level of administrator we are talking about, should the process be different—i.e., should there be a type of evaluation pyramid for different levels of admin?

Cauble: administrators w/various levels of responsibility across campus need to have an evaluation that more closely resembles that of a Dean. Those administrators who function as advisors to the Provost, but have no budget or portfolio of their own, deserve a more direct, task-driven evaluation.

Nechols: This issue is something that needs to be high on our priority list for the 2008-2009 academic year.

Knopp: We need to find a replacement for Cauble on this subcommittee. Knopp would be willing to participate to some degree, given her experience with Dean and Dept Head review teams.

4. Maternity/Paternity leave

Hoag: Speaking of Subcommittees—if we make the CDC issue into a subcommittee, he would be willing to work on it. FAC agrees that having this as a subcommittee is valuable.

Askey: willing to work on Maternity/Paternity leave subcommittee.

Rick McFarland wanted the committee to think long and hard about what it means to be a family-friendly university. Even though you cannot be denied this leave, it negatively impacts junior faculty when they take it. How can Fac Sen support family-friendly policies in a meaningful way?

Knopp: would it not make sense to have the maternity/paternity subcommittee and the CDC committee overlap to a certain degree?

Haub: family leave applies also to people taking care of parents, not only those taking care of children.

Quick fix for leave—reassignment of responsibilities, as established in policy. But it doesn’t address the “political” issues of taking that leave within their dept.

Askey: the quick fix doesn't address the financial implications of "reassigning" duties, either.

Haub: someone in Ag suggested using 5% of SRO to cover reassignment duties.

Nechols: one of the longer-term issues related to FMLA is shared leave. Shared leave cannot be easily changed, due to BOR language.

Cauble: Dyer gave documentation to include maternity/paternity leave in shared leave. FAC approved moving that forward for consideration, so it is likely somewhere up the chain.

Another bit of language Dyer put forth, which was adopted by KU and Texas, was a policy enabling people to reassign their duties to remain home for a longer period of time. At the end of the reassignment period, the faculty member would produce a project. FAC was skeptical about this as it isn't really leave, per se, as the faculty member in question is still working.

Nechols: will get clarification on where these resolutions are in the approval process and how they have fared.

C. Child Development Center

Nechols: a large portion of the April 29 meeting revolved around the changes in the CDC plan, principally the slots available for different constituencies in the city. (Review)

Debra Ring informed FAC that the slots allocated to KSU faculty and staff are fixed—they are not growing. The entities whose allotments are growing are those that are, essentially, purchasing those slots (Mercy, the military)

Knopp: reiterated her suggestion to form a task force to explore options for faculty.

Reiterated the importance of making clear that students purchased the slots they are getting. Faculty have not purchased the 33 slots we are "given."

Haub: last year there was a point at which the faculty might not have had any committed slots at all.

Hoag: the issue of slot reservation is potentially explosive. How slots for faculty are "reserved" or "purchased" needs to be done in an equitable fashion—not leaving it to the wealthy divisions of the university to reserve unequally for their recruitment of new faculty.

Knopp: shouldn't we revisit Hoag's idea that all colleges contribute to the salary of a full-time development officer dedicated to the CDC.

Nechols: another issue in the CDC portfolio is space. CDC has room for expansion, but in order to maintain their licensing and also their standards of care, they want to limit growth beyond a certain point.

Another question is demand. Do 33 slots leave us in a dire situation for the future?

Haub: with 7 Dolors closing, need for space is likely to increase.

Hoag: should someone speak up about the explosiveness of the "college/department purchase" of ten slots as suggested in the CDC plan? How are these purchased and for whom and with what resources?

5. New Business

Nechols: Rintoul in Biology has brought forth a question about how 9-month faculty are being compensated for summer teaching.

C23.1 in UH pertains to summer employment. “Faculty who are on 9-month appointments negotiate with their department heads or deans to determine their salary.”

There is a range of 70-100% of 1/9 of their full-time salary—for three-credit courses. Rintoul’s question pertains to faculty teaching four-credit courses. There is no specific language that allows for a sliding scale for larger credit-courses. This should perhaps be on our docket for the upcoming year.

Haub: the funding of summer courses is discouraging for faculty members w/research duties to take on summer teaching.

Cauble: Administration will argue that the # of students will have to increase in order to pay the faculty member more. Also, faculty don’t get compensated by the credit hour during the regular academic year.

Knopp: we need to worry also about being excessively specific, in addition to being excessively vague when crafting language for the handbook.

Nechols: what tuition is being paid for the course, and what is the enrollment? Together, these generate revenue. Is there a way to bring compensation in line with revenue generated?

Cauble: there are fewer students staying around for summer school, given the expense of tuition. The \$\$ for summer school is funneled through the colleges, so this is not a decision made on the departmental level. The Provost’s office is also taking more of the summer school \$\$ into its own budget—might be worth a question.

Nechols: given the questions raised here, it is worth examining in FAC? Also—is the formula given in the handbook a fair way of compensating faculty?

6. Other

Cauble: thank you to all for commitment to FAC.

Remember: we will be searching for a new president of the university next year. Jim has a duty to be the voice of FAC in the search process—to talk with candidates about the issues that we cover in FAC and see how s/he stands on faculty and shared governance. The candidates must spend time with FAC and Acad Affairs to talk about faculty issues (like child care, like haves vs. have nots)

7. Prioritization of our business for upcoming year

Nechols suggested tabling this for our next meeting, pending the revision of the master spread sheet for FAC activities.

Nechols will send out the spread sheet for us to review.

8. Adjourn 5:11pm