

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**Minutes of the Meeting held Oct 3rd, 2023, 3:30 pm**  
**Zoom <https://ksu.zoom.us/j/837797836>**

- **Call to Order** - Brad Cunningham (co-chair) and Tareque Nasser (co-chair) called the meeting to order at 3:32. Others present included Anthony Ferraro, Ashley Noll, Even McCulloch, Amir Bahadori, Roger Adams, and Tanya Gonzalez. Those absent included Charlotte Self, Justin Kastner, Cliff Hight, Paige Adams
- **Approve the Sept 19th, 2023, Minutes** – The minutes from the 19 September 2023 were approved.
- **Committee Reports**
  - **Salaries and Fringe Benefits Committee:** Justin Kastner (absent) had no report.
  - **University Handbook and Policy Committee:** Cliff Hight and Paige Adams (absent) did not make remarks; however, Tareque, who attended a recent meeting of the Handbook Committee, did report that the Committee is working on several assignments, including Appendix R (Intellectual Property), and also the Workload Policy (which the FA committee will discuss later today).
- **New and Continuing Business**
  - **Workload Policy:** Brad summarized that the Provost provided some input on this, and this was distributed to the FA committee for review. There is also some Qualtrics-obtained feedback on the proposed policy; this feedback was distributed earlier today to the FA Committee. Brad shared his screen to go over a “Summary of main concerns with the Faculty Workload Policy & Adjustments/Revisions” document, which Tanya had kindly prepared. Brad encouraged everyone to review these comments.

Tanya explained that the survey (requesting feedback on the policy) was closed on 20 September. Some additional feedback was provided later by Extension faculty. Tanya explained that her group pieced together feedback from the University Distinguished Professors (UDPs), Deans, and others (including Extension) on campus. There was a big response—over 45 pages of helpful feedback. Tanya then sent the feedback to the Workload Policy Task Force, and then later the Task Force and Tanya synthesized some of the feedback, incorporating some new language into the latest DRAFT Workload Policy. All through this process, there was a lot of good conversation amongst members of the Task Force. In addition, the revised DRAFT document was sent by Tanya to the Provost and Office of General Counsel for their input.

The FA Committee now has a revised draft, along with feedback. She mentioned that the draft acknowledges the importance of having correspondence/harmony with the University Handbook’s sections (C1-C6) on instructional workload, while acknowledging the diversity of teaching roles at K-State. Tanya mentioned that changes were made with regard to differential allocations of *workload*, but not *effort*; she encouraged committee members to review this and provide feedback. Therefore, the goal was to address “workload balance.”

There is in the DRAFT policy an exhortation that, during annual reviews and discussions/evaluations about promotion and tenure, discussions of workload should be considered, too. The new DRAFT also uses the language of “college” instead of “general” to acknowledge the individual colleges’ role in all of this.

Amir asked Tanya to explain the DRAFT document’s difference between “workload” and “effort.” Tanya said that the Task Force wanted to focus on workload, because effort can be variable at different times for a given responsibility.

Tareque asked if “DAE” was going to be replaced with “DAW.” Tanya said that is up for conversation/discussion. Tareque agreed with this move, and Tanya said the Task Force agreed; DAW is a better term to use. Amir indicated he still didn’t understand the difference. Tanya said that she originally didn’t see a need to separate them, but based on the comments received, it seemed good to focus on workload, not effort. Ashley, Tanya, and Tareque then interacted with a discussion about how “effort” is really a matter of discussion during an evaluation, but workload is the subject at hand given this is a Workload Policy draft. Tanya then read some actual comments from the feedback, including this:

*Workload and effort are not the same thing, and this document consistently confuses, the 2... Workload leads to efforts which address and manage the workload. Workload should be defined as the actual amount of work assigned or expected to be accomplished by a worker. Stated percentage of effort is not a workload expectation, but is, instead, a simplistic and willfully ignorant and harmful attempt to document workload expectations.*

*Workload expectations should direct faculty efforts and assist in evaluating those efforts. But the actual effort, how much time faculty choose to spend when they spend it, and the processes they use should otherwise be unrelated to that workload expectation itself.*

*Effort is individual to the person; workload is generic to the unit or university.*

*So percentages of effort are at best and helpful in the context of considering workloads and evaluating work because they represent methods of getting work accomplished, not a way of defining or limiting the amount or types of work in question.*

Tanya explained that there are more comments on this.

Amir then remarked that, the comment’s argument, you can’t have a workload policy for an individual effort. Tanya then explained that the idea would be to have have a workload policy at the university level, but discussions about the effort required would be a factor only in the evaluation of that individual.

Tareque emphasized that the idea is to set a “baseline” for a workload policy. Departments can still tweak that, based on what a particular person is hired to do. Tareque says the new DRAFT policy still acknowledges (and leaves room) for individuals and their department heads to discuss the precise workload required. In instances of disagreement, then the dean

can get involved. Amir then asked, why are we setting a baseline, if there is always an opportunity to negotiate the workload. Tareque said he reason is because KBOR has required K-State to come up with a workload policy. K-State is trying to both respond to the KBOR requirement while building in sufficient flexibility. Amir asked if KBOR stipulated that there be a baseline, and Tanya said that KBOR was looking for such a baseline for teaching/instruction in particular. K-State wants to acknowledge other areas (e.g., research), too.

Tanya acknowledged that all of this does sound like a lot of work, which it is, but the aim is to have a policy that presented guidance for the institution, while acknowledging there will be differences. In addition, the latest draft acknowledges that “teaching” can include other non-classroom activities (e.g., mentoring of graduate students). These nuances are trying to be captured, Tanya said.

Amir voiced concerns that stipulate, for example, what 40% means, requires any deviation from that to be justified at the college level. Anthony said he was confused by the difference between workload and effort. He suggested maybe adding explicit definitions for “workload” and “effort.” Tareque then said that is why mention of “effort” is being dropped altogether in the draft policy.

Eve asked where non-tenure-track faculty fit into the policy. Tanya said that the policy draft originally asked for colleges to provide guidance on non-tenure-track workload, but there were concerns voiced about this. With a substantial population of non-tenure-track faculty, there may be a need for university-wide standards, some noted in the feedback. Tanya explained that another task force will be assembled to focus on non-tenure-track faculty; that will *not* be required by KBOR but seems to be needed.

Tanya continued to go through additional comments. Amongst these, Tanya mentioned that there are some online resources for the development of college- and department-level policies. Tanya emphasized that these resources address topics like how to address differences in class sizes, etc.

Tanya acknowledged comments about contact hours versus student credit hours. At the end of the day, KBOR provided directions (for legibility) to K-State, but K-State wants to add enough guidance to satisfy the mandate but also leaving things at the college level. Tanya noted that one Task Force member (associate dean, APD) remarked that her college uses contact hours in their current policy, so her college will be translating that as best they can in their college documents.

Tanya said we can always adjust the policy, but we needed to respond to KBOR’s requirement. Tanya also acknowledged that the changes won’t satisfy everyone, and that there will be more adjustments, too.

Brad thanked Tanya for all of her work.

Tareque asked that the Policy draft be sent to all caucus chairs, and Brad said he would disseminate the draft to the listserv.

Brad noted the “aggressive” schedule for this draft. He mentioned we needed to have this ready for an FA committee vote on October 17. He voiced gratitude for today’s discussion, and he recognizes this policy is a “sticky” topic for sure.

Eve asked when the latest version of the draft would be sent, and Brad said that he would send it out soon.

Later in the meeting, Eve asked about how, procedurally, the caucuses (and the FA committee) should proceed with considering the DRAFT policy. Tareque said he hoped to hear from all the caucuses by, say, October 10. Then, before the October 17 meeting, there would be a message to the committee with the feedback. Tareque hopes that this is enough time for feedback to be received and shared. Tanya thinks that it might be a helpful goal to incorporate the feedback from the caucuses into a draft (or summary) prior to the October 17 meeting. Brad cautioned that we might not get as much feedback as we would expect. Brad said that if we get a significant amount of additional feedback, we might not be able to take action on the 17<sup>th</sup>. But we will remain hopeful.

- **Handbook section C159 (Administrative Assignments and Five-Year Comprehensive Reviews):**  
Brad referred the committee to the relevant attachment, and said there was no need to take a vote today, but he did ask for feedback. He asked the committee to review the section’s proposed changes, including the transmittal sheet cover. He wanted to give everyone two weeks to review them.  
Tareque said that C159’s changes are simply a language change to “faculty and staff.” He encouraged everyone that the changes were not overly complex.
- **Report on Promotion and Tenure Document Sections for Community Engagement and Societal Benefit:** Tanya explained that the subcommittee (Tanya Gonzalez, La Barbara “L.B.” Wigfall) has prepared an official transmittal sheet regarding their proposals for the inclusion of “community engagement” in the University Handbook, specifically sections C1-6. Brad indicated that the FA committee would vote on this at the next meeting.
- **Inclusive Access K-State Student Union Follett textbook proposal:** Tanya explained that the Follett pilot now involves a meeting between the Follett implementation team and K-State IT group; that meeting will take place next week on 10 October. That will be the first meeting about the implementation of the pilot. Part of that meeting will be devoted to transparent communication with the campus. Tanya said she would continue to provide updates, including whether or not K-State Salina supports this effort. Roger Adams added that KSU Libraries is now back at the table discussing open access options, etc.
- **Handbook Approval Process:** Tareque has been working with Cliff and his group on the flowchart outlining this process to be followed regarding proposed changes to the Handbook. This will be taken to Faculty Senate for approval. Brad said this has produced a lot of great conversations.
- **Student ombuds:** With regard to possible changes regarding the Student Ombuds, there was a good discussion about the role FA should play, and how we confer with Faculty Senate Leadership. Brad mentioned he would also reach out to Kimathi Choma, and will also

continue to chat with Roger Adams. Brad will also find out who are the right people/committee to consider changes. Roger added that there seems to be misunderstanding about this; he emphasized that Dr. Choma was charged with creating a committee to investigate this and other issues. Roger brought this issue to Dr. Choma, and so Dr. Choma is aware of the contemplated proposal. Roger emphasized that FA has always been at the table on issues regarding dispute resolution; he said that since the days of Provost Coffman, FA was the place where dispute resolution was centered. Faculty Senate does run the grievance board; however, there is a process to solicit recommendations from Student Senate when formation of a board is needed. Roger thinks it was premature to bring this topic to Faculty Senate leadership. Brad said he was most concerned with making sure we have the right process/procedure to pursue any possible changes. Roger gave a bit of additional background on this issue, noting that there has been past involvement by the FA committee. Tanya explained that when she was Faculty Senate president, there was some activity on this issue. Tanya agreed that FA committee's co-chairs can be involved in this process.

- **From Committee Members**

- Amir had questions about Faculty Senate's involvement in the administration's constellation hiring plan. Part of these concerns related to unfilled faculty lines. Tareque invited Amir and others to pass along their concerns to him, to share with the Provost office. Tanya said she would seek an audience in her next meeting with the provost. Tanya said that the "cluster hire" committee/group had not yet met, but will meet on October 12. Tanya will voice Amir's concern regarding whether or not faculty affairs will have a voice in how the faculty members are going to be joining specific departments; Tanya asked that such concerns can be expressed directly with the provost when he visits Faculty Senate. Brad said he *has* conveyed this concern to the Faculty Senate leadership. Tanya said the Faculty Senate president has at least two opportunities to convey this to the Provost. Tanya said she will be in the meeting with the "cluster hire" committee/group, but the operational minutia of the process has not yet been established for how the hires would happen. Tanya reassured everyone that there would not be an effort to operate "outside of the bounds" of existing university policies. Tanya added she would voice the need for faculty senate representation in the operational piece of the "constellation hire" initiative. Finally, Tareque asked Amir to email him, Brad, and Tanya with a specific statement of his concern, so everyone is communicating clearly.

- **Announcement(s)**

Brad encouraged everyone to read their packets for the upcoming meeting on 17 Oct!

- **Adjourn** - The meeting adjourned.
- **Next meeting:** The next FA committee meeting will occur on October 17th, 2023, 3:30 pm