**Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee**
**Minutes for September 21, 2010**
**Secretaries: Fritch, Hsu**

In attendance: Kaleen Knopp, Judy Hughey, Rebecca Gould, Kyle Reynolds, Donna Potts, Donna Fullmer, Melia Erin Fritch, Valerie Evans, Karen Schmidt, William Hsu

Voted to approved minutes of 07 Sep 2010 meeting.  Archival and review of promotion, tenure, and evaluation (PTE) e-portfolio materials on K-State Online

Senator Gould presented findings of e-portfolio task force and discussed feasibility report in several sample documents including K-State Online (KSOL). There was discussion of the advantages of the availability of PTE materials to central administrators (president and provost). The committee discussed the technological issues and the enterprise of the integration of communications technology highlighted the discussion. There was further discussion on Appendix A of the e-portfolio report, a list of requirements in selecting an e-portfolio platform and what should an e-portfolio system do for us on campus?

Senator Knopp reviewed history of e-portfolio task force and listed issues (cost/benefit assessment) to be discussed by Faculty Affairs, then campus-wide since the task force completed their work. K-State hired a CIO and he comes from DU and they have an e-portfolio system.
Senator Gould showed an e-portfolio example from DU's homepage
Senator Gould and Rob Caffey met with a DU Rep and stated that DU would share their platform with KSU.
DU system has a public and private side to the e-portfolio. Senator Gould also showed an e-portfolio example that used K-State Online as platform. It was stated that it is a tool we already have on campus. It uses a guest eID and password to share with the committee so they can view the documents. KSOL could also be used to move to a repository system that President Schulz (or any committee member) could view rather than carrying a pile of portfolios.    Senator Hughey asked about compatibility for different types of documents being used from other departments. Other questions were raised about storage space/server space. Senator Gould stated that the platforms they examined did state they accepted all file types - server space is still a discussion item. There are issues of training and technology adoption.
There is a learning curve and stability of e-portfolio platform: will the platform change? What information systems are faculty tied to, and how durable are these commitments over the long term? There was discussion about value added: creation of templates and example forms as formatting aid "where we stand" with respect to best practices (Senator Gould - about average prior to this proposed improvement.
Senator Fullmer raised concern about animation files and use of models (physical). Senator Gould suggested adding an "additional material available in." statement    Benefits were discussed by various FA members and early indication of potential PTE issues. Senator Knopp discussed evidence supporting PTE decisions and feedback for use of Director of Academic Personnel and the Provost.
 Senator Potts discussed a potential to avert arbitrary or capricious decisions leading to future grievances. Senator Hughey discussed process of presenting e-portfolio proposals to faculty throughout campus for input. Senator Schmidt raised concern about outside letters of recommendation remaining confidential if viewable online; would the faculty member be able to see them? Would they be able to be kept private? There was discussion with Senator Gould about how to handle that situation. Senator Gould reminded FAC that there is no workflow built into K-State Online for this yet; it's just a tool that we already have on campus and we would have to work on these issues. Senator Hughey asked about cost comparisons between K-State Online and other platforms examined. Gould referred FAC to document that gives cost estimates
    Other issues:

- (various FA members) distribution of content: open vs. using an in-house system (ramifications include quality of K-State web presence)
- (various FA members) mandatory vs. optional
- (various FA members) what content is to be required: how/by whom it is to be specified (e.g., departmental policy, college-wide standards)
- (Senator Hughey) engaging all faculty in discussion; review of samples, collection of feedback across colleges
- (Senator Hsu) sharing best practices: for intra-department or intra-college mentorship; technology for anonymization?
- Senator Gould explained that the task force's recommendations deal with the possibility of using digital measures without specifying KSOL as the particular platform. Senators Hughey and Knopp recommended that the task force be recognized with thanks as having fulfilled its responsibilities
- Options:- resolution recommending that e-portfolios be adopted and that process of adoption proceed.
- same resolution with language specifying that departments have option to adopt different specific platforms.

Plans:
- It was decided to submit findings to Provost Mason.  A request will be made for Candace to place materials online and circulate to FS. Senator Gould will create e-portfolio module to KSOL.

Policy development process:  Motion at last meeting to discuss proposed revisions

- Concerns were expressed to Provost at last meeting with FS Leadership Council regarding salient changes to University Handbook        The University Handbook and Policy (UHP) committee felt unilateral changes to Appendix G were inappropriate and not in the best spirit of shared governance.  Provost agreed that changes were to be removed from online handbook.  Issues need for expedited changes that DO require FS review and FSLC consensus. FS Leadership Council supports need for points of information regarding expedited changes. There is a belief that FS review is still appropriate and necessary. The first two paragraphs ("Points of Information Regarding Policy Changes That Do Not Require Faculty Senate Action") were approved. The second section was clarified by Senators Hughey and Knopp as not Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) jurisdiction: therefore, within purview of shared governance. There was discussion of the history of UH revisions and who makes the determinations regarding necessity of expedited track changes (Sections 1 & 3). Questions were raised if KBOR or state law-mandated changes are made, if FS should be notified. Senators discussed if lead-time could be necessary for FA caucus.   Questions raised included why expedited changes are immediately necessary to avoid potential legal or financial issues, if these are not within KBOR jurisdiction or compliance issues how may we limit legal/financial liability, is there immediate necessity, exclusive of FS, only in view of Administration. "Policy Need"   will this really shorten process? 30 + 60 + 90 vs. "by 30th/60th/90th calendar day"?  Suggested revisions recorded by Senator Gould, by FA included list "from Faculty Senate" first, eliminate last sentence of Administration item 1 as non-neutral point of view assertion, alternatives, delete Administration item 3 ("Expedited Track") as problematic and unnecessary, amend to "exception to regular track - expedited"  Appendix G Revisions Update moved to next meeting (05 Oct 2010) Unclassified Professionals Promotion Processes - moved to next meeting (05 Oct 2010) New Business none at this time Adjourned at 5:15