

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**September 1, 2015**  
**4:00 - 205 K-State Union**

Attendance: Charlie Barden; Betsy Cauble; Gayle Doll; Todd Gabbard; Christina Geuther; David Lehman; Ronaldo Maghirang; Mindy Markham; Jackie Spears; Jeff Stevenson; Loren Wilson, alternate for Scott Finkeldei; and Brian Niehoff, Provost's liaison.

Jeff Stevenson moved and Jackie Spears seconded to approve the minutes from the May 19, 2015 meeting. Motion passed.

**Old Business**

Brian Niehoff presented materials he had developed to help departments adopt policies for professional titles. He explained some editing changes to the flow chart, i.e. put "teaching" before associate professor, etc. While there has never been compensation attached to this proposal one advantage to the new titles would be the possibility of going up to three years on term appointments as persons go higher in the rankings. Niehoff suggested that we review the handbook language that specifically states that term appointments do NOT have to be evaluated annually and stated that more discussion was needed with Human Capital. Lehman asked for a discussion about how to determine "significant contributions" for professors of practice. It was suggested that significant contribution must be defined by discipline, department and/or college. How are "terminal" degrees determined? The committee agreed that we liked the language vague so it is adaptable for specific disciplines but that in the department all of these things suggested need to be well defined in documents. No salaries are attached to these levels. If a college has money to be able to provide raises, they should check in with Human Capital before they make promises. Once departments approve these policies they go to associate deans than on to provost's office.

**New Business**

- **Section C (Attachment)** We are reviewing section C for changes—taking a look at what the handbook committee did to make sure that we think it is fair and appropriate. Niehoff reminded us to involve legal counsel and ask them to attend meetings when we are reviewing critical issues. The committee decided that we would read through C16. Brian was asked to talk to general counsel to find out if there are things in the document we need to pay close attention to.
- Concerns regarding C46.1
  - C46.1 Responsibilities of evaluators. The unit head will prepare, by January 31, a written evaluation for each full or part-time regularly appointed faculty or unclassified professional person. Quantitative ratings may be used to summarize evaluative judgments, but the basis for these judgments must be explained by a narrative account. The evaluation shall provide succinct assessments of effectiveness in performing each responsibility and these statements must include summaries of the achievements and evidence which support these assessments. Performance reviews of faculty and other unclassified employees will include consideration of overall contribution or detriment to the department/unit, which includes citizenship and other personal conduct affecting the workplace. Faculty and other unclassified employees are expected to have cooperative interactions with colleagues, show civility and respect to others with whom they work and interact, show respect for the opinions of others in the exchange of ideas, and demonstrate a willingness to follow appropriate directives from supervisors. (Note 2. Those appointed to regular part-time positions must be evaluated; however, evaluations are not required for an individual on a term appointment, as defined in C11, even if that employee will be re-hired for another year.) (Revised FSM 4/10/12)

Mindy Markham suggested that we table this until we get to this section in our review. Betsy is working to determine how this got on the agenda and what is the specific concern.
- The following items were tabled for a later meeting:

- Ombuds Program Discussion: discussions about the structure of the program. What does that look like? We had mentioned retired faculty.
- Performance Evaluation Training: this comes from the ombudsmen, dispute resolution. Performance evaluations are not being done appropriately. The ombudsmen want the faculty affairs committee to think about a training program.
- Term Assistant & Associate Professors
- Conduct Questions on Admission Application: informational item. Admissions application for students has a conduct question. Doesn't disqualify them but it might raise a red flag—undergrads only
- Shared Services Draft Plan for sharing.

The meeting was adjourned.

Next Meeting: **September 15, 2015; Union 205**