

Faculty Affairs Committee  
October 7, 2008

In Attendance: Jim Nechols, Richard Hoag, Jennifer Askey, Judy Hughey, Bill Hsu, Clyde Howard, Ellen Urton, Amy Schultz, Kaleen Knopp, Mark Haub  
Visiting: Fred Fairchild

Minutes of September meeting: approved  
Subcommittee update: see attached list, updated 10/7/08

CDC update:

- Bill Hsu submitted a list of talking points for individual discussions between FAC and our respective Deans (see attached). FAC members need to make appts with their Deans to discuss.
- Debra Ring to be invited to our meeting to check on flexibility of available slots for faculty in the new CDC. Our current assumption is that there is minimal opportunity for expansion of faculty slots, but we need to double check. (invite Debra and Mitsy Richards to November meeting)
- for Deans' discussions: any anecdotal evidence on faculty members who are leaving/have left because of lack of childcare; thoughts of where the \$\$ should come from; suggestions by FAC members to our Deans for taking up child care on the Deans' Council level. (Dennis Law would be willing to bring this up in council—perhaps we could find other Deans who could support it at that level)
- keeping track of “purchased” slots and to whom they go is an issue we need to keep in mind
- including the option of securing a daycare slot as part of the \$\$ start up package
- at the end of the day—it is not the FAC's job to figure out the nuts and bolts of any policy that gets developed. It is our job to represent the needs/wishes of the faculty.

Chronic Low Achievement:

- Al Cochran shared with Jim Nechols the last state of affairs on amending the Chronic Low Achievement policy were. (Summary: there was a draft proposal with changes in language that the FAC inherited sometime last year. Unclear as to who initiated the changes and why? Jim felt we needed to know whether the changes were in response to a BOR mandate or an internal discussion. Al's institutional memory tells him that this was an internal discussion. 2003-2004 Provost Coffman decided that he wanted to massage the wording in the CLA document. It doesn't appear that Coffman wanted to force all colleges to evaluate identically; he was, however, concerned with uniformity of procedure.)
- we do not need to do anything with CLA at this time. The last section in C31 deals with CLA and was drafted in 1996. It was a compromise at the time, giving control to the units of the university to determine how evaluation takes place.
- Cochran has asked FAC, in team with Valdovinos, to conduct a type of review of what evaluation procedures are across campus. (Jim thinks we should ask Susanne to do the review—even though it is a difficult, mechanical chore.) We would then look at that report. (Jim will meet with her soon.)

Graduate Student Grievance/Handbook:

- Jim met w/Carol Shanklin recently. The current plan is to make changes to the UH that will cross reference to the Grad Student HB, so that they are in sync.
- We need to look at the UB Appx V, and redraft language to describe student grievance and then

- refer them to the Grad Student HB, for the accurate language on current policy.
- Our job in FAC is to decide where in the UH we should alert faculty to the Grad Student grievance policy; and where we should insert the new wording. (Heather Reed with Student Life and Vet Med and Grad School and FAC all need to work together on this—so that the language in the UH reflects general assumptions about grievances and the entities such as Student Life and various schools can work on their own particulars)
- FAC and the UH Committee (Bill Hsu) should sit together and check in the HB to make sure where the language, besides Appx V, needs to be changed.

#### Dependent Tuition Waiver:

- applies to children, spouses, and other dependents
- Faculty Affairs approved a draft of increasing tuition waiver from 3 Credits/semester to 12 Credits/academic year in February 2008. (see at: <http://www.k-state.edu/facsen/facsenate/2008/documents/031108Attachment4DependentTuitionWaiver.pdf>)
- Jim will talk to Bruce Shubert & others in Admin and see if they have seen the above doc and how they have decided on it.
- our committee will all take a look at the current draft at the link above
- when admin has given their feedback and our committee has seen the current draft, it will be forwarded to Fac Sen leadership.
- recent Fac Sen leadership meeting revealed some apparent contradictions between the current dependent tuition waiver policy in theory and in practise. It might be the case that this benefit has been denied to faculty members in the past. Jim will follow up and make sure that the people administering this benefit know that it is a benefit applies to everyone.
- there also appears to be some confusion as to who administers this program and why some units believe that they have yes/no power of decision as to whether this benefit gets distributed or not.
- Jim will do some research on the history of denial of benefits; as well as move the new proposal forward.
- there is also a request for this benefit to be extended to retirees. That issue needs to be referred to Salary & Fringe benefits. Perhaps our amendment would need to be amended, after Salary looks at it, to reflect that kind of change. (administration doesn't seem to voice any opposition to it—but that is assuming the old tuition waiver of 6 credit hours per year)
- we would like to have administrative feedback on this asap