

AGENDA
Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, November 8, 2005 3:30 pm
K-State Union, Big 12 Room

1. Call meeting to order
2. Approval of October 11, 2005 minutes
3. Reports from Standing Committees
 - A. Academic Affairs Committee – Alice Trussell
 1. Course and Curriculum Changes
 - a. Undergraduate Education - none
 - b. Graduate Education - Approve graduate course and curriculum changes approved by the Graduate Council on October 4, 2005:

CHANGE

EDCEP 737. Drug Abuse Education
EDCEP 833. Creativity in Education

Curriculum changes in Ph.D. programs in Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering

NEW

FSHS 751. Conflict Resolution: Core Skills and Strategies
FSHS 752. Culture and Conflict
FSHS 753. Violence Prevention and Intervention
FSHS 754. Organizational Conflict
FSHS 755. Family Mediation

Graduate Certificate Program in Conflict Resolution (School of Family Studies and Human Services)

- c. General Education -none
 2. Approve the August 2005 graduation list and additions to that list:
August 2005
Lance Robert Miller –Technology & Aviation
David Clanton –Architecture
Megan Jeanne Meyer –Elementary Education
Tim Newcomb- Business Administration
Mary Elizabeth Creamer – Elementary Education
 - B. Faculty Affairs Committee – Frank Spikes
 1. Professorial Award Proposal - First reading with no comment – **Attachment 1**
 2. Study Abroad Compensation Proposal – **Attachment 2**
 - C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - Walter Schumm
 - D. Faculty Senate Committee on Technology – Michael North
4. Announcements
 - A. Faculty Senate Leadership Council - **Attachment 3**

- B. Kansas Board of Regents Meeting - **Attachment 3**
- C. Report from Student Senate
- D. Other

5. Old Business

- A. Ombudsperson selection
- B. Targeted Excellence

6. New Business

- A. Honor System

7. For the Good of the University

8. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 1

Professorial Performance Award

Faculty salaries at Kansas State continue to fall below NASULGC averages at all ranks. But by far the most significant deficit lies at the rank of full professor. In 2003-04, the salaries of the full professoriate at Kansas State averaged 19.8% behind that of the full professoriate of other NASULGC institutions, compared to an 8.4% deficit for associate professors and 8.6% deficit for assistant professors. At present, bringing full professor salaries up to average would require an infusion of some \$6.5 million, an impossibility under current fiscal conditions. Given both the compelling need to remedy compressed salary at this rank and prevailing financial constraints, the Salaries and Benefits Committee has produced a two-part plan to address full professor salary compression that is fiscally manageable now, encourages and rewards productivity, and will have increasing impact on full professor salaries in the future.

The first part of the plan, an increased promotion-based raise, has already been put into place. On April 12, Faculty Senate passed a proposal to amend the language to the University Handbook to enhance promotion-based salary increases. The new language revises the percentage of the general salary pool constituting these raises from 5% and 7.5% to 8% and 11% for associates and full professors, respectively.

However, while this first step brings more salary to the full professor rank, and may have some effect on inter-rank compression, it will likely produce greater intra-rank compression. New full professor salaries may in some cases be greater than those who have served many years in rank. Therefore, the committee considers it imperative that we follow up the increased promotion raise with a Professorial Performance Award, an opportunity to increase the base salaries of high-performing full professors who have been in rank six years or more. The Performance Award review, it is important to note, is not a form of promotion review. It does not create a "senior" professoriate. In fact, since it rewards continued performance at the level that merited promotion, it may have the effect of consolidating the identity rather than diminishing the significance of the highest faculty rank.

We recommend an award amount of 8% of the average salary of all University faculty, currently around \$5000. However, funding for the award cannot come out of the legislatively approved merit increment; it must be an infusion of additional money from tuition or other sources.

Implementation

The evaluation of candidates for Professorial Performance Awards follows a timeline for activities at the departmental and dean's levels similar to that outlined in the University Handbook for promotion. Also, as is the case for promotion, it is primarily the responsibility of departments to judge whether or not individuals qualify. However, the award review is a performance review, not a promotion review. Therefore it is not necessarily a peer review. Departments would be expected to develop their own mechanisms for review as they have for merit evaluation. As is the case in merit review, it may be that responsibility for the evaluation of materials involves personnel of any rank or several ranks.

Each department will also specify criteria for awarding the incentive according to its own disciplinary standards of excellence. Nonetheless, all such criteria will adhere to the following guidelines: 1. The candidate must have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or performance review; 2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and 3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to full professor according to current standards. The department should explicitly address these guidelines in their review, as well as any other criteria the department deems appropriate to specify. The deans would have responsibility for oversight of the process, assuring that departments have consistently followed their own guidelines for awarding the performance.

Cost

The number of full professors at the University who have been in rank for at least six years and who could therefore conceivably qualify for the Professorial Performance Award is higher than what can be allocated to awards in a single year. Therefore, we recommend a phased approach to the early years of the program if necessary. If the cost of the total number of awards exceeds what is possible to budget, each recipient will receive a set percentage of the total award amount, with the balance added to the base in the second, or at most the second and third, year. We anticipate that this will only be a problem in the first few years, and thereafter the number of awards will be both relatively predictable and fiscally manageable, as is the case with rank promotions.

Proposed Handbook Language for the Professorial Performance Award

C49.1 Significance of the Award. The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a periodic salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. The Performance Award review, it is important to note, is not a form of promotion review. It does not create a "senior" professoriate.

C49.2 Development and Revisions of the Professorial Performance Award Process. Departments develop their own mechanisms for review as they have for annual merit evaluation. As is the case in merit review, it may be that responsibility for the evaluation of materials involves personnel of any rank or several ranks. Each department will also specify criteria according to which candidates qualify for the award according to its own disciplinary standards of excellence. Nonetheless, all such criteria for the award will adhere to the following guidelines: 1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or performance review; 2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and 3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to full professor according to current approved departmental standards.

C49.3 The Professorial Performance Award document must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty in the department, by the department's administrative head, and by the dean. Provision must be made for a review of the document at least every five years as a part of the review of the procedures for annual merit evaluation or whenever standards for promotion to full professor change.

C49.4 Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award are considered annually.

C49.5 Responsibilities of Professorial Performance Award Candidates. Eligible candidates for review compile and submit a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department. The department head, in consultation with the personnel committee assembled for the purpose of the Professorial Performance award, when applicable, will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award.

C49.6 Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations by the department head and to the next administrative level.

C49.7 The department head must submit the following items to the appropriate dean:

- a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
- b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
- c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
- d. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

C49.8 Responsibilities of the Deans. The dean will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with the criteria and procedures established by the department for the Professorial Performance Award.

C49.9 A dean who does not agree with recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award made by a department head must attempt to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the dean's recommendation will be used. If any change has been made to the department head's recommendations, the dean must notify, in writing, candidate of the change and its rationale. Within seven working days after notification, such candidates have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations to the dean and to the provost. All statements of unresolved differences will be included in the documentation to be forwarded to the next administrative level. All recommendations are forwarded to the provost.

C49.10 Responsibilities of the Provost. The provost will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that

- a. the evaluation process was conducted in a manner consistent with the criteria and procedures approved by the unit,
- b. there are no inequities in the recommendations based upon gender, race, religion, national origin, age or disability.

C49.11 If the provost does not agree with recommendations for salary increases made by subordinate administrators, an attempt must be made to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the provost's recommendation will be used. The candidate affected by the disagreement must be notified by the provost, in writing, of the change and its rationale.

C49.12 The dean will consolidate the Performance Award with salary increases resulting from annual evaluation and issue the candidate a contract that includes the candidate's salary for the next fiscal year.

C49.13 Basis and source of the award amount. The Professorial Performance Award will be 8% of the average salary of all-University faculty. However, funding for the award cannot come out of the legislatively-approved merit increment; it must be an infusion of additional money from tuition or other sources.

ATTACHMENT 2
Compensation Options for Faculty Teaching Study Abroad Courses

Faculty members who desire to teach study abroad courses will sign a waiver that specifies the compensation arrangement that applies specifically to their study abroad courses. Options that might be implemented include the following:

1. A pro-rated salary (dollar amount/student credit hour) will be used to compute the compensation provided to a faculty member, regardless of rank, up to a maximum compensation that corresponds to one-ninth of a faculty member's nine-month salary for a 3-credit hour course. However, if a faculty member has agreed to a percentage between 70% and 100% of the one-ninth salary, as noted in the University Handbook, then the maximum compensation will reflect that agreed upon percentage. The maximum compensation also will be pro-rated for courses that are offered for less than 3-credit hours.

The Provost, in consultation with the Vice President of Administration and Finance, will establish pro-rated salaries for each fiscal year: one for undergraduate student credit hours (SCHs) and another for graduate SCHs. The SCHs in each category will be used in determining the total salary available for a given course. These two rates will be adjusted each year to reflect any increases in tuition rate.

If the enrollment in a 3-credit hour course is not sufficient to provide 70% of one-ninth of the faculty member's salary, housing and per diem for a maximum of two additional days outside the time frame of the course offering may be negotiated to allow faculty members to conduct research in their discipline. The days may be scheduled before or after the course offering.

Airfare, housing, and local transportation are typically provided to faculty members in addition to salary. These expenses are part of the program cost assessed to the students. Faculty members may choose to waive some or all of these expenses in order to lower the program cost to the students.

2. Same as 1, except that the pro-rated salary would include an adjustment for rank.
3. Faculty members may specify a minimum salary (at or below the maximum compensation allowed) that they will accept or indicate their willingness to negotiate a salary, if the number of student credit hours is not sufficient to generate the specified salary.
4. The faculty member may waive salary and be provided with or reimbursed for travel expenses, housing, and per diem for the time period of the course.
5. The faculty member may receive a Development Reserve Account (DRA) instead of salary, with the amount of the DRA computed using the same rates as those used to determine the pro-rated salary. The maximum compensation would correspond to one-ninth of a faculty member's nine-month salary for a 3-credit hour course. Smaller compensation would be associated with courses that were less than 3 credit hours.

A nine-month faculty member can receive no more than the equivalent of three months of support during the summer session (teaching and research combined), unless approved through the normal overload process. Faculty members with 12-month appointments would not receive compensation unless approved through the normal overload process.

The waiver must be signed prior to the advertisement of the course. If enrollment is not sufficient to meet the faculty member's salary specifications, the faculty member can choose to either cancel the course or negotiate a different compensation arrangement. Negotiations will involve the Associate Provost for International Programs, the department head, and the dean of the faculty member's college.

ATTACHMENT 3
Faculty Senate Leadership Council (FSLC) & Board of Regents (BOR) Announcements

FSLC

1. Executive Committee has reviewed the Ombudspersons applications and a recommendation will be submitted to the Provost.
2. FSLC is working with student senate to determine ways to reduce textbook cost i.e. buy backs.
3. Student Senate initiated deliberation for a five-year tuition plan.
4. Captain Troy Lane delivered a presentation on campus safety.
5. FSLC received a copy of the Counseling Service 2004-2005 Annual Report from Director Dr. Fred Newton.

BOR

1. System Council of Chief Academic Officers (SCOCAO)
Distance Learning Technologies for the Coordinated and Governed Kansas State Board of Regents Institutions. In SB 345 and 647 the Regent Universities were mandated to put in place a coordinated state plan for distance education. The plan will be incorporated into next year's BOR strategic plan. A draft plan will be discussed at the November meeting.

Core competencies (English and math) were discussed at a September meeting at WSU.
2. Council of Chief Academic Officers (COCAO)
Kansas and Missouri are working on a reciprocal agreement for Dental and Optometry student spaces in return for Architecture.

Qualified Admissions: Possible using ACT writing scores as a requirement. This may be used in a Campus-by-Campus basis.
3. BOR:
Capital Improvement Requests/Construction of a Parking Garage was presented by the Fiscal Affairs Committee.

KU and FHSU presented their report on efficiency measures.