

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**Minutes from meeting on March 5th, 2024, 3:30 pm**

- **Call to Order** - Brad Cunningham (co-chair) and Tareque Nasser (co-chair) called the meeting to order. Others in attendance included Rachael Clews, Amir Bahadori, Cliff Hight, Merta Scott-Hall, Ashley Noll, Grace Liang, Roger Adams, Tanya Gonzalez, Eve McCulloch, Paige Adams, Justin Kastner, and Anthony Ferraro.
- **Approve the February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Minutes** – The minutes were unanimously approved as submitted.

- **Committee Reports**

- ◆ **University Handbook and Policy Committee:** Cliff Hight, Paige Adams

Cliff reported that he had updated the “process flow chart” based on feedback received; the flow chart was shared with the committee. Brad highlighted a few details designed to make sure that the Faculty Affairs Committee’s co-chairs and more intentionally in the loop to ensure communication. Cliff also showed how the current flow chart appears on the Handbook website. It was agreed that some preamble language could be inserted above the flow chart image. Cliff noted that members of his committee would provide accessibility-related “alt” text to make sure the flow chart can be reviewed and used by all. Amir asked if Colby was involved with these flow chart changes; Tareque noted that Colby did make some comments, but it was Mishelle who had both provided feedback. Brad noted that Mishelle had been frustrated with the process/relationship between the Handbook committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee. Brad said that the new/revised flow chart clearly states that the Faculty Affairs committee has to be involved. Amir also asked about the comparative sizes of the arrows; Cliff agreed that the sizes should probably be the same, and he agreed to make that change to the graphic. Brad expressed thanks to Cliff for his work on this tedious work.

Cliff also noted that the pronoun-related edits have been shared with the committee. He reported that the Handbook committee members were satisfied with the pronoun edits. Brad suggested, and it was agreed, to have the Faculty Affairs committee take the time to review the changes at a future meeting. Cliff said he hopes the precision of the language will be to the satisfaction of the Faculty Affairs committee.

Cliff noted that, with regard to Appendix R, a big revision has been completed and is now doing a holistic review. He hopes it can be moved on by the April meeting.

With regard to Section E, he said progress is being made, too, and that all of the revisions can be presented to Faculty Senate by May.

Cliff noted that there will be some appendices-related work that will continue into the next year.

- ◆ **Salaries and Fringe Benefits Committee:** Justin Kastner reported that, earlier today, the SFBC elected to unilaterally go ahead and re-edit the Non-Tenure-Track Salary/Compensation report. Changes would address the 7.5% “floor” recommendation (and provide a statement

of rationale for that 7.5% figure) as well as the “negative” quotes (which could cause some hard feelings) that had been extracted from the climate survey data; a new, edited report will likely be approved in the next few weeks, and it will have those changes—that is, a statement explaining why the 7.5% floor is recommended and a report WITHOUT negative quotes from the survey data. In the next few weeks, Brian Lindshield (chair, SFBC) will send along the new, edited report once it is approved. Brad wondered if the new report would have an encouragement that the new consultant (which will be hired by HR) review the climate survey data, with the quotes. Justin noted that the SFBC’s Marci Ritter (who is involved with the hiring of the consultant) will make sure the consultant is encouraged to review the climate survey data/quotes. Additional discussion followed. Justin reiterated that the new report will be sent to the Faculty Affairs committee once the SFBC approves it. Justin also voiced frustration about redundancy/double-effort of HR hiring a consulting firm being hired (to study compensation issues) just as the SFBC and FAC had completed and approved the SFBC’s report, which required volunteer (i.e., not hired/consulting) effort. Since, technically, the FAC had already approved the previous SFBC report, Brad said he wanted to make sure that the FAC was fine with waiting for the re-edited/revised report from the SFBC. It was agreed to wait for the edited/revised report. The FAC voted unanimously to pull from the Faculty Senate agenda the previously approved SFBC report and await the new edited/revised report, which will then be voted on once approved by the SFBC. Additional discussion followed about how the simultaneous hiring of a consulting firm by HR had kind of hurt the morale of the SFBC, which had on its own time written its report. After additional discussion, Tanya provided some context/background of the hiring of the consulting firm by HR, and how the work of FAC and SFBC had helped prompt some of that. Roger Adams expressed thanks to Justin and the SFBC. Roger also lamented some of the challenges of shared governance, which he noted has been eroded in certain ways.

- **New and Continuing Business for 2022-2023**

- Revisions to University Handbook, D-40, D-41, and Appendix S – Cliff noted there were no further changes to D-40 and D-41. He then explained that the key action for the FAC to take today is to consider (and vote on) the final revised version of Appendix S, which has been slightly tweaked by Tanya. Tareque noted that there may be some additional discussion on the Faculty Senate floor; we can then work on any subsequent feedback. Brad said the comments he has been hearing is that it is a complicated process. Brad noted that the FAC has approved a previous version of Appendix S; the new version before the committee is merely slightly tweaked. Brad noted the new version has the Board of Regents’ conflict of interest policy and some definitions of “outside activity.” Amir asked about the intention behind the change regarding the definition of “outside activity.” Tanya said that a key follow-on step will be proper training/education on the policy. Tanya said that Cayuse is intended to make the process smoother. Amir then shared some of the comments he had received from his Engineering caucus members, and noted that he did not have concerns. Roger Adams asked why there has been some pushback on the policy from Faculty Senate exec. Brad explained that it was likely merely due to some being more policy- versus procedure-focused. Brad then called for a vote on Appendix S, and moving forward to Faculty Senate exec; it was unanimously approved.
- Issues with Handbook Section B95 – This discussion related to CCOP policies that had been gathered together. Brad said that a copy of B95 has been circulated. Brad said the next step for the FAC could be (a) have a subcommittee work on this and make some recommendations or (b) do something different or (c) simply say we are fine with the status

quo. Brad invited suggestions from the FAC committee members. A brief silence followed. Amir spoke up, asking if some colleges are not in compliance with the University Handbook as it relates to CCOP. Brad said that what is missing is “meeting cadence.” Paige Adams explained that K-State Olathe has never had a CCOP. She noted there is probably a lack of awareness of this matter. She said that, perhaps, an officially recognized CCOP might now be in order for K-State Olathe. Amir suggested that what should be done is give a reminder to the colleges to have a CCOP. Amir said it was probably unnecessary to suggest a meeting cadence, but he said the Handbook does require every college to have a CCOP. Tareque reported that Tanya had previously suggested that maybe we should suggest a minimum number of meetings/year a college should have. Tanya said she had prefaced that comment with the observation that CCOPs had not been routinely meeting, so she had simply wanted to point to the need for “regular” meetings of CCOPs. However, Tanya clarified that she was not saying the FAC must make a recommendation. She was simply making suggestions/observations of what might be useful. Tanya said that CCOP systems are important for maintaining faculty members’ voices in certain times. Noting, as an aside, that ROTC was marching past his office window, Brad then asked what the FAC wants to do or not do. Brad noted that the CCOP issue is a “shared governance” matter. Amir suggested that FAC should make a language revision of some kind. Brad asked the committee members to consider a meeting-cadence language. Amir agreed to take a stab at drafting language to reflect what “regular meetings” means. It was agreed that Amir would draft some changes and then pass those along to the committee for review. Amir signaled that “once/semester” probably makes reasonable sense.

- **Future Business**
- **From Committee Members**
- **Announcement(s)**

Roger shared the Article 2, A, of Faculty Senate constitution that needs to be clarified. Roger would like to remove “deans” from being eligible to serve and vote on faculty senate. Brad encouraged Roger to prepare some text on this and share with the committee.

Amir made an observation about shared governance: KSU’s (faculty senate vs administration) structure is different from the federal government’s balance of powers between the legislative and executive branches; a big difference is who controls the budget!

- **Adjourn**

The meeting ended, with Brad heading off to soccer practice.

- **Next meeting:**
  - ◆ Brad noted that the new Provost’s public presentation/meeting will be during the same time as our next scheduled meeting (2 April); therefore, he asked if the FAC should meet another date (other than 2 April).
  - ◆ It was agreed that a doodle poll would be circulated with a view to identify a different meeting time.

- **Upcoming meetings**

No 2<sup>nd</sup> March Meeting, FS meets b/c of Spring Break

April 2 - Zoom

April 16 - Zoom

May 7 - Zoom

May 21 - Zoom