

MINUTES
Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
April 28, 1998 3:30 p.m., Big 12 Room, K-State Union

Present: P. Anderson, D. Anderson, Atkinson, Baker, Benson, Bissey, Brigham, Conrow, Dawes, Deger, Delker, Dodd, Dyer, Farmer, Fenton, Fenwick, Foster, Gray, Hagmann, Hassan, Higgins, Holden, Jardine, Kassebaum, Keiser, Koelliker, Legg, Martin, Mathews, Michie, Miller, Ossar, Ottenheimer, Oukrop, Pence, Rahman, Reeves, Schapaugh, Taylor-Archer

Absent: Aramouni, Barkley, Behnke, Charney, Clegg, Devlin, Dubois, Eckert, Feyerharm, Fjell, Fritz, Grunewald, Guikema, Hamilton, Hightower, Johnson, Jones, Klopfenstein, Krstic, Lamond, Laughlin, Mann, McClaskey, McCulloh, McMurphy, McNamara, Peak, Raub, Reeck, Ross, Royse, Salsberry, Schroeder, Shultis, Smith, Stein, Stewart, White, Woodward, D. Wright, K. Wright, Zabel, Zschoche

Guest: John Struve

- I. President Legg called the meeting to order.
- II. Minutes of the April 14, 1998 meeting were approved as distributed.
- III. Announcements

The Board of Regents Task Force has developed a draft for an Intellectual Property Policy. It is posted on the Regents' web site <http://www.ukans.edu/~kbor/ipdraft.html>. A link is also available from the faculty senate home page. Action on it this spring would not allow sufficient opportunity for faculty input, so the Regents will have a May first reading of the document but will defer final action until their October meeting.

IV. Standing Committee Reports

A. Faculty Affairs Committee -- Brad Fenwick

1. The Committee proposes modifying Faculty Handbook section E 11 to clarify guidelines regarding scholarly leave and the tenure clock. The Provost agrees that this modification is within the Regents' guidelines. Senator Fenwick moved approval of the revision. Senator Ottenheimer seconded the motion. It was approved. **ATTACHMENT 1**

2. The Committee proposes modifying Faculty Handbook section C 153.1 to define the role and power of the college oversight committees on tenure and promotion. The new guidelines would stipulate that recommendations would be based on comparison of the candidate's credentials with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the candidate's department. Senator Fenwick moved approval of the revision. Senator Reeves seconded the motion.

ATTACHMENT 2

Senator Kassebaum expressed concern that the revision would leave the committee looking only at procedures, not the candidate's qualifications. She was assured that both would be important.

The motion was approved.

3. Senator Fenwick moved that the Senate receive the Salary and Fringe Benefits Report with thanks to the committee for their effort. Senator Matthews seconded the motion.

Located on Web @ <http://www.lib.ksu.edu/depts/govpub/senate.html>

While this year's report brings neither surprises nor new solutions, he is hopeful that this year the other Regents' campuses will generate similar reports. President Legg pointed out that this year's report looks more fully at fringe benefits and added that parts of the pre-release report were used by the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents in their report to the Regents. The result was the appointment of a task force to develop information to be used in the Board of Regents budget request. The goal of the task force is to bring salaries to full parity with our peers by requesting a base merit raise equal to that expected among the peers plus an additional amount for two or more years as needed to bring each Regents institution into equality with its peers.

Senator Ottenheimer questioned the information in the report regarding fringe benefits for faculty taking phased in early retirement. President Legg indicated that 100% of fringe benefits are paid and added that there is some uncertainty about the number of faculty who may participate in the program.

The motion to receive the report passed.

4. The Annual Faculty/Administrator Salary Comparison Report has also been prepared according to the same guidelines as before. The Faculty Affairs Committee realizes several changes need to be made for next year's report. The Committee would like to know why some individuals have been omitted. Administrators have been omitted if their responsibilities have changed, but faculty have not. Income from all revenue sources has been included, not simply state funds.

John Struve, who prepared the material, responded to a number of questions about the report.

He explained that each individual is defined for purposes of this report as either teaching or administration according to what budgeted service provides the majority of his/her salary. Funding for teaching faculty from Continuing Education or Summer School is not included because it is not in the base budget. In each instance, the person must have been in a comparable position in the budget last year and this. A person moving from a teaching to an administrative position, for example, would not be included. An administrator whose responsibilities have changed is omitted, while a faculty member who is promoted is included. In both groups, people who have received equity increases or extraordinary merit increases are included. Mr. Struve reminded the senators that he used procedures agreed to in the mid-80's and modified slightly in the late 80's when we were being given mid-year salary increases.

The report was accepted by the Senate.

5. The Faculty Affairs Committee has also prepared two additional changes to the Faculty Handbook which will be on the agenda for the May Senate meeting. One clarifies that requirements for tenure and promotion are established within the department instead of being university-wide, therefore the section requiring the individual to show "versatility" is not appropriate and should be deleted. The other is another modification to C 31.8.
6. The Appeals and Grievance Task Force is finishing its report. The report may be on the agenda for general discussion, then would be returned to the Faculty Affairs Committee for discussion.

B. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning -- Linda Brigham

1. The Senate asked for comparative figures across the Big-12 regarding SRO and OOE funding. FSCOUP is working with Tom Schellhardt on this.
2. The Library Committee and members of the Administration will meet to discuss alternatives for library funding now that the Student Senate has not approved a fee and less money than expected will be available from the Foundation this year.
3. The Provost met with FSCOUP to discuss the anticipated enrollment bulge in the next ten years and related curricular and funding concerns. The consequences are likely to include the use of more temporary labor and more technology and a very close evaluation of programs.

The primary source of information at present is a report prepared by Ron Downey and the Enrollment Management Committee listing courses and their enrollment or underenrollment. In addition, the report refers to "bottleneck" courses where there is insufficient space for students needing to take them. This is a crude report on productivity, so the Provost is seeking better information. The problem is how to generate this information. Uncertainty on the part of senators regarding how the criteria are set was evident in the discussion. Senator Martin suggested that Faculty Senate should provide the Enrollment Management Committee with current research showing that the quality of instruction decreases as the class size increases.

- IV. There was no old business.
- V. There was no new business.
- VI. For the Good of the University
 - A. President Legg reported that the Executive Committee had met and set the agenda for the May meeting. It is a long agenda.
 - B. Senator Dodd referred to the PILOTS Program proposal which Senate adopted at its last meeting. She is concerned about the small number of students involved and encouraged the university to plan ways to increase the pool of participants.
 - C. Senator Koelliker asked who has announced his/her candidacy for Senate offices. President Legg has no definite information.
- VII. The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Clarification of Faculty Handbook Policy related to
“Scholarly Leave and the Tenure Clock”

E11 A leave without pay of ~~one year~~ may be granted when such is judged *by the unit head with concurrence of the Dean and Provost* to be in the best interest of the University. *The bases for granting this leave are many but do not include simply extending the probationary period to make up for what clearly has been less than adequate prior performance.* Such leave will not be regarded as a break in continuous service; however, such leave without pay will not count toward earning sabbatical leave. ~~Scholarly leaves count toward tenure unless the faculty member and the department head agree, in advance in writing, to the contrary.~~ *Scholarly leave which alters the faculty member's yearly appointment below any of the conditions set forth in C83 will not count as part of the probationary period (see C82.2, C82.3).* ~~Approval of the Board of Regents of the leave without pay may be granted by routine minute, except when the proposed leave is to be with a private corporation and the intent of the employee to return is uncertain. In such case and in cases of other unusual circumstances, the executive director of the Board of Regents may grant a leave without pay for the second year. Leaves without pay shall be limited to a total of two years, but the executive director may grant an extension beyond the two years upon documentation of extraordinary circumstances by the KSU president.~~

Defining the Role of College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committees

Background:

C31.1 Criteria, standards, and guidelines. It is not possible at the University or college levels to establish detailed criteria and standards for annual merit salary adjustments, reappointments, promotion, and tenure. It is the provost's responsibility to ensure that the faculty of each academic department or unit, in consultations with the department head or unit director and the dean develop and periodically review the criteria, standard, and guidelines. (see A30: Equal Employment Opportunity)

C31.4 It is the responsibility of the deans and the provost to ensure that departmental criteria, standards, and guidelines are followed in making recommendations and decisions for merit salary adjustments, reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

Current Policy:

C153 Procedures for Promotion Evaluation

C153.1 College procedures. Each college will have an advisory committee to advise the dean on candidates proposed for promotion and/or tenure.

C153.2 The operation, composition, and procedures for selection of committee members must be approved by the faculty, dean, and provost.

Proposed Amendment:

C153.1 College procedures. Each college will have a tenure and promotion advisory committee. The advisory committee's specific charge is to assure that all applicable procedures have been followed and that the department/unit in arriving at a recommendation did so by fairly applying its established criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure/promotion (see C30-38, C102, C141). The committee, in advising the dean, will base its recommendation exclusively on a comparison of the candidate's credentials with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the candidate's department. The committee will report their findings in writing to the Dean who will forward them unedited to the Provost. The committee's report must specifically contain a statement as to whether or not all applicable procedures were followed. In addition, in those cases where the committee's recommendation differs from that of the department/unit, the report must also explain the rationale behind the committee's recommendation by providing a detailed evaluation of the candidate's credentials with regard to how they meet or fail to meet the specific criteria, standards, and/or guidelines of the candidate's department/unit. A minority committee report is required when the committee's recommendation is not unanimous. A vote of the committee is not required but is allowable if approved under C153.2.