

Kansas State University Faculty Senate
Faculty Affairs Committee
Agenda

WEDNESDAY April 3rd, 2024, 2:30 pm

Zoom <https://ksu.zoom.us/j/837797836>

- **Call to Order - Faculty Affairs** – Brad Cunningham (co-chair) called the meeting to order. Others in attendance included Tareque Nasser (co-chair), Amir Bahadori, Merta Scott-Hall, *guest* Don Von Bergen, LaBarbara Wigfall, Ashley Noll, Roger Adams, Tanya González, Sandy Johnson, Charlotte Self, Paige Adams, Eve McCulloch, Anthony Ferraro, Cliff Hight, and KC Olson. Absent members included Justin Kastner (secretary).

- **Approve the March 5th, 2024 Minutes** – The minutes were approved without objection.

- **Committee Reports**
 - ◆ **Salaries and Fringe Benefits Committee:** No report was provided.

 - ◆ **University Handbook and Policy Committee:** Brad Cunningham shared via screen the “flow chart” (drafted by Cliff Hight) of how policies are incorporated into policy publications including, most notably, the University Handbook. LaBarbara made a comment about it being slightly “busy” in its graphical layout, and Sandy suggested it might be helpful to have a title or legend that might be incorporated into the flow chart. Paige said that a *written* version of the flow chart would be drafted, too; the narrative would help enhance the clarity of the flow chart including, for example, the meaning of the “arrows.” Cliff remarked that he prepared the flow chart on the basis of the existing flow chart. LaBarbara asked about the arrows, and an explanatory discussion ensued; Cliff noted the “policy sources” areas of the flow chart are where policies oftentimes originate. Brad noted that the narrative/description for the flow chart would need to be drafted; Brad suggested that a few sentences would be sufficient. Brad said we would work on the narrative; Brad said he would work with Candace on that, and Cliff said that Sandra Brase would be a key person to involve in finalizing the narrative. Cliff noted the edits to the arrows; Amir had suggested that the bolding/weight of the arrows be the same for all arrows, regardless of the direction, and this change has been made. Brad agreed to work with Candace and Sandra to get the flow chart and narrative ready for FS exec to consider. The committee then voted on pushing this on to FS exec; the committee approved the motion to do so.
 - ◆ Appendix R: Intellectual Property Policy and Institutional Procedure – Cliff provided an update on this work, noting that he had shared some of it with the office of general counsel. Cliff said he welcomed feedback on this draft document, which he said was indeed quite different from the existing appendix R. Cliff said he needed to follow up with general counsel and see if they had any feedback on the draft.
 - ◆ Section E121 Contributing Programs at Kansas State University – Cliff noted his committee is making progress on this.
 - ◆ Cliff asked about the inclusive pronouns issue, and he reminded the FA committee that we all needed to review the draft changes. Brad said this matter would be placed on the next FA committee meeting (on April 16).

- **New and Continuing Business**

- Report and recommendations on promoted non-tenure track faculty compensation –
- Brad had shared the latest version of this report; the new version does not have any of the “quotes” that was of concern to some on FS exec. Brian Lindshield had worked to revise this document, while also incorporating some explanatory language for the recommended percentage compensation increases. The data tables in the report are unchanged. Brad invited the committee to vote to move this report on to FS Exec (at their end-of-April meeting. Amir wanted to make sure that Julia Keen’s input was considered in the latest version of the report; Brad noted that her concerns (which were about the quotes) were indeed considered—and the quotes were removed to allay this concern. Roger asked if gender disparity was tracked in the analysis in the report; Brad said he did not see any evidence of that in the tables and graphs, and Brad said he could go chat with Justin and Brian, and Roger expressed thanks for getting an answer to that (and Brad agreed to contact Justin and Brian about this). The committee then voted to move the Report on to FS exec; the committee unanimously voted to pass this motion. Brad said he would move the report to FS Exec.
- KBOR Faculty Award Criteria – The committee had a discussion about this initiative. Brad referred to the description of the KBOR award and its criteria for selection. Brad noted Fs President Don Von Bergen being in attendance, and emphasized that there was no real opportunity to modify the language as it is a template/KBOR document. We just need to vote on it. Roger voiced concern about this being a “one-size-fits-all” award formula. Sandy asked about how the award takes into account, for example, extension faculty. Roger echoed these concerns, saying that, for example, library faculty might be neglected in the award’s consideration. President Von Bergen acknowledged that the award template is a single document, and the thinking was this was a way to begin recognizing as quickly as possible faculty at the KBOR level. He noted that Blake Flanders was briefed on this, and President Von Bergen said that future revisions to the single document could perhaps be made in future years. He also said that we (KSU Faculty Senate) could make sure that extension faculty are considered for our university’s award; indeed, he said he was not worried about this—saying that the award is for faculty and it will be nominated and awarded by our own peers. President Von Bergen said we have a lot of deserving faculty, and this provides an opportunity to affirm/celebrate them. He also felt like this process would lay the groundwork for, in the future, creating awards for non-tenure track faculty and staff. President Von Bergen said the FS Senate would be in control of KSU’s nominating of candidates for this. Additional comments were made by LaBarbara and Amir, with Amir saying he supported this kind of award in principle, but he does not support adopting identical award criteria for all Regents institutions. Brad then asked President Von Bergen how easy it would be to customize the award for KSU. Amir questioned the adoption of uniform criteria first and then later customizing our own criteria. President Von Bergen didn’t disagree with Amir, but he asked Amir what would need to be significantly changed in the current draft and for this first round/year of the award. Others expressed concern that “in spirit” all types of faculty (e.g., extension and library) could be included, but the current draft of the award does not affirm those other types of faculty. Brad then pointed to the language that reads, “The criteria shall seek to identify faculty members whose teaching, research, and service over the preceding academic year have exemplified excellence and commitment to the mission of the institution,” and emphasized that we (KSU) would control who we nominate for the award. Amir reiterated his concern about adopting a uniform policy for the award. President Von Bergen said he and the other institutions’ faculty senate

presidents were simply trying to get this award established at the KBOR level. Tareque noted the validity of the various concerns, but he emphasized that we (KSU) would still get to “use our own criteria to a certain extent” in choosing who we nominate for this award. Tareque said it is still “up to us” who we decided is the most deserving for nomination from our institution. He was supportive of moving the award document forward for approval. Roger respectfully disagreed, and pointed to specific references in the document to “teaching *and* service *and* research,” which is the reason why 17 years ago this same kind of award was rejected. Brad asked President Bergen to give us a sense on whether or not KBOR would scrutinize our institution’s nominees for such criteria as “teaching *and* service *and* research.” Don said he could not say how the regents would react/ behave on this; however, he felt that if the nomination was well documented it would be well received by the regents. President Von Bergen noted that KU’s faculty senate has adopted this document. Brad asked for a commitment from both Don and the incoming FS president to return and amend/adopt some changes; if there was such a commitment, Brad was supportive of approving the KBOR document. LaBarbara asked why we could not go ahead and draft our own criteria now; Brad suggested that expediency is the reason. Brad said that, with a commitment to draft some criteria later, we could later make some fairly straightforward amendments to include, for example, “extension” and “library” faculty. LaBarbara asked if we were looking for someone excellent in all areas (e.g., teaching, research, and service) of faculty work, or excellence in a particular area of work. Tareque referenced how we all are evaluated in our annual reviews in light of our current apportionment of duties in the various faculty areas; similarly, this award would recognize excellence on the basis of the faculty member’s current apportionment/tasking of duties. Additional discussion ensued about the actual process by which KSU would make its recommendation for the award. President Von Bergen said that for this year he was proposing that FS leadership/exec (with the addition of an engineering faculty member, to make sure engineering was represented) would be the committee to make this year’s recommendation. In future years, there would be an established, dedicated committee that would have rotating membership. Brad then called for a vote, noting that KC Olson (who had to leave early) had provided his vote to Brad. The committee then voted on a motion to approve the KBOR criteria for faculty of the year; upon calculation, there was a *tie* of yes’s and no’s (6 to 6; a total of 12 votes). Charlotte suggested getting the absent committee members’ votes. Brad noted that we are missing only 2 voting members not present. Amir expressed his thought that for a motion to pass, it needed to be 50% plus one. President Von Bergen said he thought Amir was likely right. President Von Bergen expressed gratitude for the discussion, and he remarked that he took notes (including the preference to have a KSU-specific criteria document; the need to mention extension and library faculty; and concerns about linking together teaching *and* research *and* service). President Von Bergen offered to go to the board and get clarification/verification that the KBOR award would indeed link together of teaching *and* research *and* service; Don said that if one regents institution doesn’t approve this document, it (the KBOR award) would not move forward. Roger also noted a spelling issue (with council/counsel on the second page). In summary, the committee did not approve moving the criteria forward. Brad then offered giving those absent about 48 hours to cast a vote to move this forward (or not) to FS exec.

- **Handbook Section B95 revisions:** Brad then turned to Amir’s work on some of the issues with Handbook Section B95, and noting some proposed language for this section. Brad asked Cliff and the committee what action would make sense at this point. Amir said he would prefer that the language first be sent to the Handbook committee for review. The committee then unanimously voted/agreed to sent this revisions to the Handbook committee.

- **Future Business**
 - **Faculty Scholarly Activity Tracker** – Drs. Tanya González and Tim Steffensmeier
 - ◆ Brad noted that at the April 16th FA meeting, we will learn from them about investigating a partnership with PEARS (Canopy) to develop a Faculty Activity Reporting Tool specific to Land Grant Universities.
 - ◆ **Handbook F62 an F63 Excused Absence Policy Revision** – Brad noted that Andy Thompson has been working on this, and that the FA committee would vote on April 16 whether or not to send this to the Handbook committee. That same day (April 16), Academic Affairs would be voting on it, too.

- **Comments from Committee Members**
 - Tareque noted he has been invited to serve as caucus chair for the College of Business. Tareque also shared his own personal decisionmaking on whether or not he would be willing to serve again as co-chair for the FAC. Both Tareque and Brad voiced their support for Amir serving as a co-chair for the FAC. Brad reiterated that he was, in any case, stepping down.

- **Adjourn** - The committee adjourned.

- **Next meeting: April 16th, 2024, 3:30 pm**
 - ◆ Zoom available: <https://ksu.zoom.us/j/837797836>

- **Upcoming meetings**
 - April 16 - Zoom
 - May 7 - Zoom
 - May 21 - Zoom