

**Minutes
Faculty Affairs Committee
March 2, 2010**

In Attendance: Kaleen Knopp, Judy Hughey, Jim Nechols, Jennifer Askey, Jim Bloodgood, Ellen Urton, Naqian Zhang, Bob Condia, Amy Schultz, Elaine Johannes, Carol Kellett
Visiting: Senior Vice Provost Ruth Dyer

- I. Approval of 02/02/2010 minutes
- II. Sr. VP Ruth Dyer—Modified Instructional Duties

Dr. Dyer shared the background and rationale for the Modified Instructional Duties Document. She then responded to questions from the committee.

- State of Kansas appears not to be open to discussions on expanding the availability of shared leave for maternity/paternity.
- Previous discussions with University Deans led to the wish for a pool of funds to pay for maternity/paternity leave. The budget crisis has necessitated the withdrawal of this proposal for funding. Any further plan has to happen without any extra funding.
- The current proposed plan is NOT a leave plan, but a plan for modified, full-time, on-campus appointment. This is currently targeted at only faculty with teaching appointments (not staff). The problem with expanding it beyond teaching faculty is that other job descriptions do not have portions of their job that can be modified. Nine-month and twelve-month faculty members are eligible.
- Nine-month faculty do not earn vacation leave, just sick leave. Those faculty would have to be in year six or seven in order to accumulate enough sick leave to use the FMLA. Twelve-month faculty don't earn leave fast enough.
- This proposal has been approved by the Dean's council.
- If FAC and FAC Senate approve this, it would become faculty policy.

Question & Answer:

--Why does this apply only to teaching faculty? (Knopp)
Since there is no option for a central pool of resources to cover duties that would be "modified" (away from desk), it is difficult to compensate classified staff for any leave.

-- What if you are research only or research and extension? Why can't they modify their workplace and duties? It might be easier for those faculty than for those who are in instruction. (Nechols)

There are some positions—depending on duties—that could certainly meet these criteria. But since not all jobs in one sort of classification would not necessarily meet these criteria, it is difficult to delineate participation for those jobs in this policy.

--Have-have/not departments? Authority resting on the shoulders of dept heads, who may or may not be interested in pursuing creative options for modification? (Askey)
Department heads are asked to take leadership in finding solutions, instead of putting the burden of proof that it is workable onto the shoulders of the faculty.
The language in the document does not address the have/have not disparity across departments. If a dept head and faculty member (instructional faculty) cannot come to an

arrangement that is to the benefit of all, then the Dean is the (understood, tacit) resource for solving the issue.

--Other than trading with other faculty members on teaching, what do the Deans have in mind for making up modified instruction? (i.e. NOT in the classroom this semester)
(Bloodgood)

Trades are the method Deans would possibly encourage. We will need to be creative. Team teaching; moving courses around would be possibilities in the academic year.

--Shouldn't we try to fund this? (Condia)

yes, if money were no issue and funding was available for all the initiatives on campus.

--The policy does not preclude the faculty from using their sick leave to address these issues. (Dyer)

--How would this proposal affect the conception of KSU as a community? (Johannes)

We are restricting this to teaching faculty because of the disparity in accumulation of sick and vacation leave.

This is going to be an agenda item on the March 23, 2010 meeting.

Nechols and Askey: would like to add a framing document that addresses (a) implementation issues (what scenarios departments might encounter as they try to work with this policy) and (b) frames the policy in terms of its strengths and limitations—acknowledge that this policy does not address every eventuality. Perhaps this type of document could go to Faculty Senate as part of the discussion and then in the PPM.

III. Announcements

Open Forum on Budget seemed to be favorably received by the faculty.

Karlene Varnadore, Chair of the Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefit Subcommittee, will attend the FAC in April to present the subcommittee's yearly report.

Appendix G revision update—Knopp and Hughey are interviewing various users of the new Appx G policy. Expect a subcommittee to work on the minor issues involved in the revision.

Gould: reported that the ombudspersons would like to participate in this discussion.

Faculty Senate Leadership Council meeting with BOR went quite well. There was lengthy discussion about faculty salaries, retirement benefits, importance of research responsibilities and sharing that knowledge with Kansas legislators and the public. Bloodgood: what was said about faculty salaries? Hughey: BOR realizes that our salaries are a problem and that salaries are tied to morale.

The revised Administrative Evaluation policy is now online and in the UHB. Take-home message: anonymity and confidentiality MUST be maintained in all administrative evaluations. Email is not allowed as an information-mining procedure.

(Schultz: what about non-faculty administrators? Student gov't leadership continues to get email requests for evaluations!

Nechols: Has the Office of the Provost disseminated this information to all deans and administrators?

Knopp: Yes, Provost Mason has assured FAC Co-chairs that this chain of communication is working.)

IV. FAC Subcommittee Work

- A. UHB Committee (Hughey)—The change in the language of 12.2, Clinical Sciences and Vet Med Clinical Appointments) is at the Provost's office for review.
- B. Tech and Textbook Committee—Faculty are to look on the course schedule to see the small textbook icon. We have until July 1, 2010 to link our textbooks via Varney's.
- C. Open Access Subcommittee—Urton, Askey, Nechols distributed a draft Open Access information sheet. The asked for feedback by the end of March. The committee would like to distribute to Faculty Senate in April.

V. Faculty Issues re: Students with Special Learning Concerns

Pre-Awards is sponsoring several upcoming webinars on topics that are consistent with the needs and concerns expressed in the professional development survey conducted this summer. Many of the webinars are regarding addressing the needs of students with special learning concerns, exactly what FAC has heard so much about the past two years. Please make your faculty aware and encourage them to attend the webinars. The original e-mail from Pre-Awards was sent out in an email from Paul Lowe. Hughey will resubmit this email to us with a subject line that makes sense to us.

Adjourn: 5:05pm