

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**Minutes from the Oct 17th, 2023 (3:30pm) meeting**  
**In-person 2047 Business Building**  
**Zoom <https://ksu.zoom.us/j/837797836>**

- **Call to Order - Faculty Affairs** – Brad Cunningham and Tareque Nasser (co-chairs) called the meeting to order. Those in attendance included LaBarbara Wigfall, Kimberly Kramer, Don Von Bergen (Faculty Senate President and guest today), Cliff Hight, Tanya Gonzalez, Justin Kastner (secretary), Eve McCulloch, Roger Adams, and Anthony Ferraro.
- **Approve the October 3rd, 2023, Minutes** – The minutes were approved without objection.
- **Committee Reports 3:32-3:37PM**
  - **Salaries and Fringe Benefits Committee (SFBC):** Justin Kastner reported that there was nothing new, but alerted the committee to the possibility of future action items coming from the SFBC.
  - **University Handbook and Policy Committee:** Cliff Hight reported that the committee has been making progress on many fronts. He noted that some of the Handbook Committee’s work would be the subject of later discussions today via other agenda items.
- **New and Continuing Business**
  - **KBOR Workload Policy**

Brad gave a brief history of this policy draft, and the fact that it was a KBOR mandate, and K-State is needing to respond by an extended deadline of December. Brad noted that appeals to secure more time (extend the deadline) were politely declined (and strongly discouraged) by the Provost. Brad noted that this was our committee’s opportunity to have input on the policy. Brad also noted that after our committee takes action, Faculty Senate itself will have the opportunity to discuss this.

Brad alluded to the most recent DRAFT University Workload Policy, which was emailed on 12 October. Brad invited comments and feedback from the committee.

Kimberly Kramer said she was representing the Engineering Caucus, and was equipped with information and comments from her College of Engineering colleagues (and fellow senators) Amir Bahadori and Julia Keen. She lamented the fact that several of the Engineering Caucus’s concerns were not addressed in the most recent version of the DRAFT policy. She asked if these concerns were brought to the attention of the committee. Brad said, “Yes, 100%” on the fact that they were considered and addressed, via a process that included Brad, Tareque, Don Von Bergen, Don Saucier, and Tanya Gonzalez, who considered each concern one-by-one, and made decisions on each as they attempted to incorporate the concerns into the latest draft.

Kimberly voiced concerns that their concerns were not responded to. Brad assured Kimberly that no concerns were disregarded, while also noting there were many pages (50+) of feedback. Brad emphasized that the working group did not provide a point-by-point reply for each and every concern, yet they did consider them all.

Kimberly asserted that her college’s feedback was unique in that it represented a *collective* compilation of feedback that had been collected and vetted within the College of Engineering departments.

Tareque emphasized that this committee meeting was a good forum and opportunity to raise any lingering concerns. Additional discussions ensued, with Kimberly expressing enduring concerns, and Tareque expressing that much diligence went into the draft.

Tareque emphasized the over-arching problem being that KBOR has tasked us with this requirement.

Kimberly specifically asked about the applicability of a 40-40-20 workload to a 9-month versus 12-month contracted faculty member. She explained that the application of the formula to a 9-month employee should be different from that of a 12-month employee. Tanya made several remarks. She thanked the College of Engineering for their comments, which helped with the most recent draft; she also noted the helpful feedback of the Colleges of Arts & Sciences and Agriculture. Tanya acknowledged that item-by-item responses were not provided for the Engineering Caucus's concerns. She also noted that much of the feedback would later feature in future guidance and FAQ document(s) about the policy's implementation by colleges. Tanya emphasized that the comments from Engineering were valued. Tanya said that, strategically, K-State wanted to reserve details (e.g., 9-month versus 12-month) so that its policy (for KBOR) would be generalized enough to allow the individual colleges to specify with their own details. By keeping the policy general, we reserve flexibility for the colleges.

Kimberly asked for her to expand on the 9-month versus 12-month issue. Tanya discussed the reality of different types of 9-month and 12-month faculty in terms of their funding sources, noting that KBOR was most interested in "typical" state-line-funded faculty. Tanya expressed concern that an effort to acknowledge, in the policy, the different types of appointments might inadvertently cause confusion.

Tareque made a comment that the objective of the DRAFT document we need to present is one that does not get too specific/draw too much scrutiny. Tareque said that individual departments and colleges would, true to the current practice, get to have their own say and practice in terms of implementation. Therefore, we want to not get too much in the "nitty gritty" in a general policy for KBOR.

Kimberly said that the College of Engineering still requests a definition/clarification of the 9-month versus 12-month contract.

Tanya said that Engineering's concerns about the 9-month versus 12-month issue was valid, and it would be good to include in the policy an acknowledgement of which type of appointment the policy "has in mind." Kimberly expressed gratitude for that, and Tanya said such language could be included to acknowledge which type of appointment the policy has in mind. Don Von Bergen expressed gratitude for Engineering's concern, and asked how the 9-month versus 12-month issue is currently handled in Engineering at this point.

An additional discussion focused on the need for an institutional workload policy for non-tenure-track faculty, and that undertaking will likely happen in Spring 2024.

Kimberly also asked about faculty members who are up for tenure and promotion in two different colleges/units; Tanya said that the existing Handbook policy seems to say that one unit makes the promotion decision, but with input/feedback from the other unit. Therefore, Tanya said that such existing Handbook policy needs to be referenced in the workload guidance documents.

Justin chimed in by thanking Tanya et al's work on the DRAFT, expressing appreciation for the DRAFT policy's acknowledgment that calculations of SCH equivalents could come from a variety of contact hours (e.g., advising, mentoring, etc.). Justin likened such flexibility to a "comfort blanket" and therefore feels comfortable moving the policy draft forward. He

emphasized that colleges will have options and flexibility. He also expressed gratitude that the document affirms multiple avenues by which faculty serve students.

Tanya expressed thanks for the feedback, noting that it was several people who contributed to the draft.

Anthony also expressed appreciation for the work that has gone into the draft policy. He also noted the likely need for Extension-specific guidance, etc.

Tanya said that a special work group would be assembled to work on the guidance documents.

Eve asked if her understanding about Engineering's concerns (and the next policy draft's amendment) was correct—namely, that the policy would state that a 9-month contract is what is in mind with the policy. Tanya said yes.

Eve also asked if the future guidance document(s) would be trafficked through Faculty Senate, too. Tanya said the guidance document(s) would be developed in the Spring, along with best practices, examples, etc. Tanya referred to a group (ACE?) that has developed resources on workload issues, etc. Tanya stressed, however, that guidance documents would not be completed prior to this DRAFT workload coming up for a Faculty Senate vote. Tanya said university-wide partnership will be helpful for the preparation of the guidance document, and the feedback/concerns provided to date would be considered then, too.

Eve then asked for clarification if amendments/discussions could still happen on the Faculty Senate floor, and Tanya indicated yes.

Eve commented that one issue that has not been addressed in the DRAFT policy was how differences/disagreements would be resolved/mediated. There are concerns about the fairness of this not being satisfactorily addressed. For example, how would a difference between a department head and a dean be resolved? Eve said that incorporating language for this issue seems to be merited. Tanya said she did look to the Handbook on this issue, and noted the department head-to-dean-to-provost process. There is also the opportunity for an ombuds intervention, as well as formal mediation. Tanya said that additional clarity in the Handbook might help with this. Tanya said she would mull over this issue and consider places to adding this in.

Kimberly also noted that, in the Engineering Caucus's view, the current policy underestimated the amount of time needed for the teaching load. There are considerable differences in terms of types of classes (e.g., studio, etc.).

Tanya emphasized that the colleges can provide more specificity on such issues as grading, the roles of teaching assistants, etc.

Justin made a motion to approve the DRAFT workload policy document and move it to the next stage of the process (i.e., to Faculty Senate). Anthony seconded the motion. Roger emphasized that a discussion/conversation needed to now happen. Roger emphasized that because this is a committee report, it would not in fact be amendable on the Faculty Senate floor. However, Brad said there was a way to still to pursue amendments that Faculty Senate insists on. However, Kimberly and Roger disagreed, saying that it would not be amendable; all that can be done is reject the committee's work and send it back. On the contrary, Brad said that in his experience, amendments could still happen. Justin emphasized that the "comfort blanket" of a general policy still allows the individual colleges to develop their own policies appropriate for their contexts. Justin noted it was only because of the looming KBOR deadline that we feel rushed. In the absence of having more time, Justin was in favor of voting to pass the policy. Justin asked for his vote (for the policy) to be counted, even though he was having to leave to teach. Brad thanked Justin for his comments. LaBarbara affirmed Justin's comment. Eve said she agreed with Justin's comment, but did express some worry

that the provost—and a future new provost—could potentially use this policy to enforce changes. Eve said that before she votes, she would like to know if the policy can or can't be amended on the Faculty Senate floor. She wonders about that issue, and asked for clarification. Roger asked who provides "oversight" for the policy. Additional discussion ensued, with Tanya explaining that individual colleges would, through their own documents, provide such information. Tanya recalled that, in a previous policy consideration/vote, Faculty Senate exec made a decision to allow for amendments/changes on the floor. She asked President Von Bergen to discuss with Dan Ireton such a process, so that we can make amendments. Brad volunteered to express this, too, to Faculty Senate exec. Tanya then shared her screen to show the very latest draft of the policy, which she actively updated to include this language to state what type of faculty member is in mind with the policy: "...for PhD granting units tenured and tenure-track faculty on nine-month contracts with research and instructional responsibilities."

LaBarbara moved to call the question for a vote; seven voted in support of calling the question, and a vote was then held on the motion that Justin originally made and which Anthony seconded (i.e., to move the DRAFT workload policy forward in the process), and it passed with 9 voting in favor and 3 voting against.

Eve requested that Faculty Senate exec continue to look into the next steps and whether or not amendments could be made post-committee, and Don Von Bergen reported that he had just spoken with the parliamentarian Dan Ireton, and according to both Don and Dan, a motion from a committee (including this DRAFT policy coming from Faculty Affairs) can indeed be further amended on the floor of Faculty Senate.

Brad reminded everyone that we would indeed have the opportunity to further discuss the DRAFT policy in Faculty Senate.

- Handbook Proposal(s) Review

The committee first considered the proposed changes to Handbook section D71 and emeritus faculty, which included a very minor language change ("as well as" addition). Brad asked if anyone has concerns. No one spoken up, so a vote was held on the proposed language addition, and it approved unanimously.

The committee next considered the proposed changes to Handbook sections C1-C6, which LaBarbara explained was designed to have more harmony with what faculty members actually do, including their engagement work, and make sure faculty members get credit for such work. She showcased a continuum of engagement involving RSCAD, teaching, and service. Eve complimented the work of LaBarbara and her group, and she caught one area for correction regarding dependent versus independent student organizations; LaBarbara and Tanya expressed gratitude for Eve catching this detail, and they agreed to make the correction/clarification, and remove the clause referencing "independent student organization." The committee then voted on the changes to sections C1-C6, and it was approved with the minor amendment included.

- Handbook Approval Process –  
Brad noted that this is still technically tabled by FS

- **Future Business**

- Undergraduate Grievance Board

- ◆ Review number of student ombudsperson positions – Brad reported on a recent conversation with Kimathi Choma, who indicated that the student ombudsperson position is in a good place right now, but he does aspire to grow the work of the position.
  - ◆ Explore Grievance Board options – Brad indicated he and Tareque intend to sit down with Roger to discuss this matter. Roger voiced concern about the current work of an *ad hoc* committee focused on grievance issues, and Brad acknowledged this, and Brad and Roger both recognized some of the bureaucratic challenges of what is going on. Roger said it would be okay to withdraw this matter from future business.
- 
- **Adjourn:** The committee adjourned at 4:59PM.
  
  - **Next meeting: November 7th, 2023, 3:30 pm**
    - ◆ 2047 Business Building
    - ◆ Zoom available: <https://ksu.zoom.us/j/837797836>