

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**January 19, 2016**  
**4:00 – Union 205**

- ❖ Attendance: Charlie Barden, Betsy Cauble, Gayle Doll, Todd Gabbard, Christina Geuther, David Lehman, Mindy Markham, Jackie Spears, Jessica Van Ranken, Loren Wilson (alternate), Brian Niehoff (provost liaison) and Gina Lowe (alternate for Charlotte Self, Human Capital liaison)
- ❖ The December 1, 2015 minutes were approved.
- ❖ New Business
  - Wording in Sections C12.6 and C13 vs. C81
    - Mindy Markham rewrote section C12.6 in the following manner based on previous discussion, especially regarding interpretation of the word “penultimate.” The committee approved of the change.
      - C12.6 Full-time tenure-track/tenured faculty members may apply to their department or unit head for a one-time, one-way transfer to one of the appointment categories specified in 12.1, 12.3, 12.4, or 12.5. See provisions regarding clinical track faculty in (12.2). A tenure-track faculty member must request the transfer prior to applying for tenure and promotion, and in any event must be made prior to but no later than September 1 of the **final year in which the faculty member would be considered for tenure penultimate year of the probationary tenure-track appointment.** All transfers must be approved by the college dean.
    - C13 vs C81, seems to be redundant. After discussion about probationary instructor definitions the committee gave approval to Mindy Markham to remove C81 and clarify C13 by adding some of the language from 81. She will complete this task and send to us for review.
  - GTAs and dismissal for cause
    - Handbook language is not clear for what could happen to GTAs in the middle of their service and administrator may wish to dismiss the GTA from the classroom. What recourse does the GTA have? Betsy Cauble thinks they have the same access that any instructor/faculty member has to redress but the handbook language does not address this. Mindy and Betsy are trying to meet with Carol Shanklin at the grad school. No dates have yet been provided by Shanklin. The committee wondered if this discussion should be in the graduate handbook rather than the faculty handbook. Mindy Markham was concerned that GRAs be included. This discussion will continue.
- ❖ Old Business
  - Social Media Storm Policy MOU
    - Mindy Markham brought drafts of an MOU (Agreement on Addressing Circumstances where Immediate Sanction of Faculty or Professional Staff is Contemplated by Central Administration: A Partnership between the Office of the President and Faculty Senate). Betsy had met with one of the attorneys from the General Counsels office who had said it would be very difficult to get handbook language regarding the social media storm to pass their office. A compromise came up as an MOU between Faculty Senate and the President. President and Provost are looking at it and deciding what they want changed. Cauble said that timing for the review process of this document needs to be discussed and would likely be quite frequent or every couple of years. There was a question about the ombudsmen in the 5<sup>th</sup> line up from the bottom on the terms of agreement. Their pay comes from the provost office—is it likely that they can represent the faculty fairly; doesn’t this represent a conflict of interest? Currently there is no clear faculty advocate in the system (i.e. union representatives). There is a desire to try to bring something forward yet this semester because faculty may have a lack of confidence that if they were in a similar

situation to Dr. Tracz they would be protected. The president and provost should have a response for executive committee next week. Should the faculty affairs chair serve in this advocacy role? Brian Niehoff suggested that a faculty member could select their own advocate. Do we need language about who is or is not appropriate? Just choosing someone on your own may mean that a person might pick someone who does not know the handbook language and there is little time to prepare. The language of the MOU puts more people at the table instead of just leaving this in the president's hands.

➤ Personal Conflict of Interest:

- We had asked how frequently this had been a problem. Travis Gill from Human Capital was looking into this and he was aware of two situations with a personal conflict of interest. He is coming to our next meeting on February 2. We are hoping to learn more about times when this policy would be beneficial and where it should be placed.

❖ From Committee Members

Jackie Spears polled faculty in her department and they said they were more concerned about bicyclists instead of guns. Other faculty members cited examples. Planning committee and campus police would be the ones to ask about this. Jessica suggested that a campaign to walk bikes more might be better received coming from student senate. She will take it to them.

The Meeting was adjourned.

❖ Next Meeting: February 2, 2016 Union 205 at 3:30