

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate
Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes
November 19, 2013
3:30pm – 205 KSU Student Union**

Attending: Jared Anderson, Charles Barden, Regina Beard, Andrea Blair, Betsy Cauble (chair)
Beth Davis, Eric Dover, Todd Easton, Katie Kingery-Page (secretary), Lotta Larson, Esther Swilley

Guest: Rebecca Gould-ombudsperson

❖ Call to Order

❖ Minutes

- Accepted, need to correct list of those attending noted

❖ Old Business

➤ Faculty and Staff Evaluation Issues; Appendix G

- Guest Rebecca Gould present for discussion
- Question of what is grievable? Cheryl Strecker drafted appendix G change that we need to consider
- Question of what is grievance process? Administrative appeal is first step (academic: department head, dean, provost)...then if not resolved, could go to grievance hearing panel
- We do not want to prevent grieving of a serious issue with evaluation; those evaluated as “low performance” should still disagree and grieve
- Term appointments: university not required to give cause due to “right to work” laws in Kansas; Rebecca notes that dismissal can happen at any time during the term of employment; such as after 6 months in a 12 month contract
- There is not a mechanism for term employees to resolve disputes the way that regular appointment employees can; ombuds will meet with these employees, but they have no recourse per say since they are on term appointments
- The question is, what disputes should stop at administrative appeal level?
- Should denial of promotion be added to the list of grievable issues? Currently reads “denial of tenure”
- Appendix M, how do we parse out from low achievement review disputes? We want to allow a grievance before a full panel for those who are in dispute about an evaluation that could set them on path toward chronic low achievement proceedings
- Rebecca Gould notes the large amount of resources involved in a grievance hearing

- Cauble notes that grievance cases are rare, however: one per year on average since 1970
 - Could faculty be given an early notice of low achievement? Before an annual evaluation? Staff have mid-year evaluations which are about goal setting
 - Ombuds proposed the change to App G to eliminate grieving of “meets expectations”
 - Discussion seems to favor allowing grievance in annual evaluation disputes where a low evaluation was given, but not in disputes over “acceptable” or “meets minimum expectation” evaluations and above
 - Suggested language from this committee: “Administrative appeals can only move to grievance panel if they are: [add denial of promotion] add annual evaluation that could potentially lead to chronic low achievement, as such threshold as defined by department...”
 - Dispute resolution group is doing terrific job; very few disputes go to grievance
 - We are maintaining access of faculty and staff to a fair process
 - Even term appointees should remain eligible for the recourse of App G because their issues should be heard, even if the proceedings gives no employment recourse
 - Notices of non-reappointment for regular appointment unclassified professional: Notices of non-reappointment are not grievable, administrative appeal is the highest recourse unless procedure not followed. Rebecca will give discuss this issue with Professional Staff Affairs committee
- Faculty staff evaluation issue: Currently, no standard practice for dean or department head to acknowledge receipt of disagreement on with annual evaluation
- Reappointment process includes a letter from Dean; following tenure, there is no acknowledgement from Dean re your evaluation
 - Response could feed flames; or could be a valuable procedural step so the individual knows their disagreement has been received
 - If provost office worked with Deans in training or orientation to strongly suggest response to people as a best management process...would this do it?
 - Policy may be the wrong move; general counsel may discourage deans from acknowledgement of receipt type of letter, anyway.
 - Ask Deans what makes sense.

❖ New Business

- FSLC Meeting with Pat Bosco and Steve Dandaneau
- Faculty senate leadership met with Bosco and Dandaneau re: committees they were creating re: undergraduates which were not inclusive of faculty

- Growth of undergrads has boomed; undergrad faculty has not
- Faculty advising loads have risen; faculty in some department even handle potential transfer student advising; faculty need to be on the Student success committee
- Student Success committee is on hold; advising committee will go forward
- Expert coming to campus to discuss enrollment management—how do we handle rising enrollment with static resources?....and meet obligations we have to serve students in state of Kansas?
- Admission standards are changing in a few years (rising)
- Room availability: ex English language program. They reserve hordes of classrooms and release them later if they cannot fill them.
- Ayers St. Gross indicated during campus master planning process that we do have space available: often called departmental space and not made available to other units. Scheduling process is convoluted: how can it be streamlined?
- Enrollment has become convoluted as well; so many sub-groups of students have to enroll through special programs (for good reasons), but it creates some confusion when we have so many first year/success programs.
- Delivery of education: very little change has occurred over years. Could split schedule help with classroom crunches—not meeting physically every class time?
- We need more professional advisors.
- A professional staff member of this committee (rep for general university) proposes unclassified staff may be interested in helping to advise (with training). This proposal is for service commitment.

❖ Appendix C

- Handbook Committee working through changes
- Provost asked to not change time for unclassified staff persons have following notification of non-renewal of contract. Currently one year.

❖ Announcements

- We will have Post tenure review doc back from Provost office next meeting

❖ Adjourned