

AGENDA
KSU Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, February 14, 2006 3:30 pm
K-State Union, Big 12 Room

1. Call meeting to order
2. Approval of January 17, 2006 minutes
3. Reports from Standing Committees
 - A. Academic Affairs Committee – Alice Trussell
 1. Course and Curriculum Changes
 - a. Undergraduate Education -
 1. Approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Engineering November 18, 2005:

COURSE CHANGES:

Architectural Engineering/Construction Science & Management

Changes:

ARE 590 Integrated Building System Design

CNS 200 Computer Applications in Engineering and Construction

Computing and Information Sciences

Changes:

CIS 543 Software Engineering Design Project

General Engineering

Changes:

DEN 160 Engineering Concepts

Add:

DEN 301 Creative Problem Solving in Engineering

CURRICULUM CHANGES:

Architectural Engineering/Construction Science & Management

Curriculum changes to Bachelor of Science in Architectural Engineering (see pages 4, 7, & 8 of white sheets for details).

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Construction Science and Management (see pages 4-6 of white sheets for details).

Changes to Academic Standards regarding suspension from the Professional Program for Unsatisfactory Progress (see pages 9-10 of white sheets for further details).

Department of Chemical Engineering

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering. The changes clarify requirements necessary to meet ABET criteria regarding engineering topics (see pages 12-16 of white sheets for further details).

Computing and Information Sciences

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science (see pages 18-20 of the white sheets for further details).

Electrical and Computer Engineering

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering (see pages 22, 23a, and 23b of the white sheets for further details).

Curriculum changes to the Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering (see pages 22, 23c, and 23d of the white sheets for further details).

2. Approve additions to a graduation list:

May 2005

Brian Dean Youngers – AWS PP, and Associate Degree in PPIL – Technology & Aviation

Bryce A. Esfeld – BS – Business Administration

William Scott Titus – AWS PP, and Associates Degree in PPIL – Technology and Aviation

- B. Faculty Affairs Committee – Frank Spikes

1. Professorial Performance Award update – **Attachment 1**

- 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 2**

- B. Kansas Board of Regents Meeting - **Attachment 2**

- C. Report from Student Senate

- D. Other

5. Old Business

6. New Business

7. For the Good of the University

8. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 1
Professorial Performance Award – Revised

Proposed Handbook Language for the Professorial Performance Award (Approved by Faculty Senate 12-13-05)

C49.1 Significance of the Award. The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a ~~periodic~~ **base** 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. **Furthermore, the Professorial Performance Award is not a right accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor. Nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate's routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.**

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 Professorial Performance Award ~~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 **and by the provost**. 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~~. **will follow the timeline associated with the annual evaluation review outlined in the University Handbook.**

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 conjunction with whatever mechanism departmental procedures specify for the purposes of determining eligibility for the Professorial Performance Award,** ~~The department head, in consultation with the personnel committee which may have been 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 **his or her** ~~their~~ evaluations **by to** the department head and to the ~~next~~ ~~administrative level~~ dean. **A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.**

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 **the candidate**, in writing, ~~to the 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 Professorial Performance Awards ~~salary increases~~ made by subordinate administrators, an attempt must be made to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the provost's **decision will prevail.** ~~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~~ ~~C49.13~~ Basis and source of the award amount The Professorial Performance Award will be 8% of the average salary of ~~all University faculty.~~ **all full-time faculty (instructor through professor excluding administrators at those ranks).** 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.~~

C49.13 Cost of Awards. In the event that financial conditions in a given year preclude awarding the full amount as designated in C49.12, the Provost shall in concert with the Vice President for Administration and Finance adopt a plan to phase in the full award for all that year's recommended and approved candidates.

C49.14 Upon official notification from the Office of the Provost, ~~the~~ dean will consolidate the Professorial 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. The Professorial Performance Award will become part of the professor's base salary.

ATTACHMENT 2
Faculty Senate Leadership Council and Board of Regents Announcements

Faculty Senate Leadership Council

1. Review of current role of General Education.
2. Guest Housing for International Scholars.
3. Report on Tuition Waiver program.

Board of Regents announcements

The Council of Faculty Senate Presidents met with the Board of Regents for a working breakfast on January 19th. The BOR members reiterated their commitment to serving as advocates for higher education and faculty of the universities. The discussion between our two groups was excellent and touched on several issues of significance to all faculty. COFSP (Council of Faculty Senate Presidents) asked the BOR to help us with recruiting and retention of junior and senior faculty. All Regents institutions are reporting high numbers of failed searches for faculty positions. We are particularly concerned about salaries and fringe benefits not being sufficient to attract or retain younger colleagues, who increasingly leave for other universities (or who never get recruited to Kansas).

COFSP also asked about the status of several anti-TABOR campaigns. The BOR noted that several university faculty senates and student senates have passed anti-TABOR resolutions similar to their own. They encouraged us to continue to help educate our students and alumni about the consequences of a TABOR law in Kansas for higher education.

The BOR approved an amendment to the existing policy on clinical appointments. This now permits The K-State Department of Clinical Sciences in the College of Veterinary Medicine to appoint clinical personnel to full-time or part-time, non-tenure track positions with rank.

Respectfully,

Roger C. Adams
President-Elect