

Minutes
Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
April 7, 2009

In attendance: Jim Nechols, Donita Whitney-Bammerlin, Judy Hughey, Bill Hsu, Mark Haub, Amy Schultz, Clyde Howard, Ellen Urton, and Donna Fullmer

1. There was **approval of agenda** with the addition of 1) Student Life Handbook and 2) Idea Center Packet for Student Evaluations.

2. The **minutes** of the March 24th meeting were approved.

3. Announcements

a. Items for Faculty Senate Agenda

The Administrative Evaluation document was discussed. The proposed revisions were reviewed and it was decided to proceed in taking the document to Senate.

A resolution expressing support for the funding of a new Child Care Center was presented for a vote. There was discussion regarding if funding the childcare center would mean less funding for academic programs. Although there was concern about limited funds, the committee members expressed a need to communicate to the administration and community that child-care should be a priority. The resolution passed as an action item.

The Emeritus Status (D70) revised policy was reviewed again and passed as an action item.

Appendix G will be presented to Faculty Senate as an action item for a second (and hopefully final second) reading.

Faculty Affairs Committee has been requested by Heather Reed to review the Student Life Handbook. The FAC will provide feedback to the Student Life Office.

Committee members were provided with *Idea Center Packet for Student Evaluations*. Committee members may want to review them for future discussion.

b. The **Fringe Benefits Committee** has indicated an interest in the shared membership of one member with the FAC. The interest was initiated due to the shared responsibilities and dual topics discussed by both committees. FAC indicated much interest in collaborating and communicating with the Fringe Benefits Committee. However, there was concern and reticence to mandate a committee member's time to serve on an additional committee. Because members of FAC serve on Faculty Senate concurrently with FAC, it seemed unwise to require faculty to commit to one more committee. It was decided to invite a member to serve and let the members decide if they chose to serve on both committees.

c. It has brought to the attention of the FAC that there appears to be confusion, concern, and inconsistencies with the policy and implementation of the **Dependent Tuition Waiver**. Committee members were not certain of the precise wording and the objectives of the waiver. Additional questions included if the waivers were dual spouse benefits or a

dependent waiver; meaning should a married couple each be allowed to provide the benefit for one child or is the benefit for the child limiting it to one 3 hour credit. It was decided to investigate the wording of the policy and what the original intent of the policy was intended to be. Additional discussion included on the costs vs benefits factors. The committee discussed the research that supports the financial benefits of offering tuition credits to children of faculty members. A motion was proposed and seconded that the Faculty Affairs Committee support faculty waivers be granted to every individual full time K-State employee (as defined in the policy) as a benefit. Motion passed with one abstention.

d. Jim discussed the concerning issues regarding **Appendix V** with the Executive Committee. Jim will be meeting with the Provost to discuss the revisions and the implications of the delay in resolving the issues.

4. Electronic Faculty Portfolio

The committee expressed positive feedback regarding e-portfolios. Questions were asked about the specifics of the software, templates, and the requirements that would be mandated for the software packages. It was decided to invite the library representatives back to the committee for further discussion.

5. Faculty Evaluation Revision Requests

Following the meeting with Leadership Committee, Jim revised the faculty evaluation document. The revisions and rationale for the revisions were discussed and supported by the FAC. Much discussion was focused on the types or size of courses that would not be appropriate or a good fit for a standardized evaluation. Also, it was expressed that some professors prefer an open-ended evaluation with select courses with low enrollments that cannot be counted at the Center for Teaching and Learning. The committee continues to give thoughtful consideration to strategies of meeting the goal of faculty evaluation yet providing the latitude to professors who may wish to use alternative forms. The question of cost for IDEA and TEVAL was also raised. It was suggested that this issue be discussed at Dean's Council. A revised proposal will be presented to Executive Committee for review. Jim expressed that the Executive Committee felt it was their role to ensure that the proposal was in suitable form to be presented to Faculty Senate, not necessarily to determine the outcome of the vote.

6. Disability support update

Judy is preparing a survey to distribute to faculty regarding their perceived needs to teach students with disabilities. She also had a very successful meeting with Dr. Mike Lynch.

7. Other

Dean Shanklin and Jon Faubion, Graduate School and Graduate Council, respectively, will be present at the next FAC meeting to discuss Appendix A.