

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting: November 29th, 2021 (12:30 PM – 1:45 PM)

Faculty Senate Meeting: December 6th, 2021 (12:30 PM – 1:45 PM)

**Faculty Senators in attendance**: Darina Lepadatu (Faculty Senate President, Sociology & Criminal Justice), Doug Moodie (Management & Entrepreneurship), Andrea Knowlton (Dance), Todd Harper (President Elect, English), Jim Davis (Theatre & Performance Studies), Austin Brown (Data Science & Analytics), Lantz Holtzhower (Construction Management), Ying Wang (Robotics and Mechatronics Engineering), Ann Mills (Library Resources), Jennifer Dickey (History & Philosophy), Paul McDaniel representing Susan Kirkpatrick Smith (Geography & Anthropology), Humayun Zafar (Information Systems & Security), Mary Beth Maguire (Nursing), Snehal Shirke (Technical Communication & Interactive Design), Lin Li (Industrial & Systems Engineering), Rebecca Hill (Interdisciplinary Studies), Cameron Greensmith (Social Work & Human Services), Steve Collins (Political Science & International Affairs), Cristen Dutcher (School of Accountancy), Diana Gregory (School of Art & Design), Jillian Ford (Secondary & Middle Grades Education), Heather Pincock (Conflict Management, Peacebuilding, & Development), Michael Perry (Part-Time Faculty), Hassan Pournnaghsband (Software Engineering & Game Development), William Griffiths (Mathematics), James Gambrell (Inclusive Education), Kenneth Hoganson (Computer Science), Chris Sharpe (Public Services), Dabae Lee (School of Instructional Technology and Innovation), Noah McLaughlin (Foreign Languages), Lei Li (Information Technology), Giovanni Loreto (Architecture), Jeff Yunek (Parliamentarian, Music), Jennifer Dickey (History & Philosophy), David Bray (Economics, Finance, & Quantitative Analysis), Daniel Rogers (Psychological Science), Peter St. Pierre (Health & Physical Education), Nicholas Ellwanger (Honors College), M. A. Karim (Civil & Environmental Engineering), Dan Ferreira (Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology), Glen Meades (Chemistry & Biochemistry), Randy Stuart (Marketing and Professional Sales), Mike Dishman (Educational Leadership).

**Ex-Officio Members:** LaJuan Simpson-Wilkey (ex-officio member, Assistant VP for Faculty Affairs), Kat Schwaig (ex-officio member, Interim President), Ivan Pulinkala (ex-officio member, Interim Provost).

**Guests**: Amy Buddie, Lesley Netter-Snowdon, Phaedra Corso, Christy Storey, Karen McDonnell, Thierry Leger, Tricia Chastain, Ron Matson, Chris Ziegler, Pete Rorabaugh, Aaron Howell, Rita Bailey, Nwakaego Nkumeh Walker, Anissa Vega, Julie Newell, Lisa Duke,

**Agenda**

# Opening Remarks

Welcome – Darina Lepadatu (Meeting called to order at 12:30 p.m.)

**Online Faculty Senate Meeting Expectations**

1. Please complete the attendance survey (link in the chat window) if you are a senator or a guest.
2. Voting will be carried out electronically (link will be available in the chat window) and will be tracked. **Please only vote if you are a senator.** A non-senator voting will result in an immediate permanent ban from the faculty senate.
3. Use the “Raise your hand” feature in order to be recognized. iv. As we move forward with our senate meetings, the FSEC has heard from its members and agrees on the need to hold to correct parliamentary procedure. Motions will be preferred over discussion items so that we typically have action items on the floor. We would like to point out that there will be less time in our meetings used to announce our business items, so it will be more important than even to be familiar with all documents pertaining to our meeting. To further promote discussion, the president of the faculty senate will begin by calling for dissenting opinions. If there are no dissenting voices, we will be able to call for a vote directly and increase efficiency in our meetings.
4. Please get familiar with Robert’s Rules of Order: <https://assembly.cornell.edu/sites/default/files/roberts_rules_simplified.pdf>

**New Business**

1. Transparency and Shared Governance at KSU- An Open Forum with President Schwaig and Provost Pulinkala (12:30-1:00)
   1. Faculty Senate President begins the forum with a quote on the necessity of shared governance from the *Chronicle of Higher Educatio*n.
   2. Interim President Schwaig: Grateful for opportunity to share her thoughts about shared governance with Faculty Senate. Wants to be transparent. Important where there is so much expertise to have systems of checks and balances and to collaborate across the university. There is no set template for all universities, so context is important. Who are the stakeholders? Faculty, administration, students, staff. It is imperative to think of governing boards, as well. In the USG, we have 26 institutions. The 19 members of the Board of Regents have “ultimate authority.” Our context is set within that ultimate authority that the BOR delegates to the university president. It may have been different in other institutions or periods of time. New lens that has arisen in the last 10-15 years, especially in the context of enormous student debt many students are graduating with. Must consider legislators, Board of Regents, taxpayers, etc. Nevertheless, we have a significant amount of leeway to share in governance within the university. Talking about roles is extremely important. Dr. Schwaig focuses on *mission* of the institution. She does not think primarily of any constituent body, but rather focuses on the *mission* of the institution. Wants to work on defining roles and improving communication, structures, and opportunities.
   3. Interim Provost Pulinkala: Grateful for having this dialogue with the Faculty Senate. He echoes comments by Interim President Schwaig. Shared governance makes us stronger. Whether someone is serving as a chair, dean, provost, president, the *context* is very important. It is the role of the Faculty Senate to advocate for faculty *and* the mission of the university. Administration advocates for the critical mission of the university throughout all constituents.
   4. M.A. Karim (Civil & Environmental Engineering): What are the governing bodies to ensure that practices of shared governance are enforced? Dr. Pulinkala: We have bodies—DFC, CFC, FS, Deans council. All of these bodies exist to ensure shared governance and varied representation. The system is set up to guide these conversations.
   5. Todd Harper (English): Would you expand on what you see as the role of the Faculty Senate? What makes us different than the CDA or Deans Council? Dr. Schwaig: You have elected representatives to come together representing the various fields and expertise throughout the university. The broader the view of the university, the faculty voice brings in disciplinary perspectives and the Faculty Senate is powerful at the university level of bringing out the mission of the university.
   6. Mike Dishman (Educational Leadership): The idea of looking at shared governance and looking at a *mission*. The most recent version of our mission was created while faculty were not on campus during the summer by a strategic consulting/communications company. Mission would be precisely something that would benefit from shared governance. Can you both ensure us that this will not happen in the future? Dr. Schwaig: She thinks more of the R2 Roadmap as the mission rather than the official university mission statement when discussing “mission.”
   7. Steve Collins (Political Science & International Affairs): What is your sense of roles and true sharing that you see faculty as having in influencing the decision-making of the university? Dr. Schwaig: You used the term “role” and I believe that context and roles are important. Rather than going against the voice of the faculty, she hopes that faculty will know what the decisions are before they are made, as they collaborated all along. What would help with faculty feeling more engaged is to learn how to come to the table and how to participate.
   8. Dr. Pulikala: Shared governance—some of the roles are defined and others need to be discovered. He enjoys working with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee because these discoveries and dialogues are often shared there and he would like to see more *dialogue* across the whole university. All decisions must be made in the lens of the academic mission. We can improve communication and the rhythms of communication. He is hoping that if shared governance is dialogic and collaborative, then there will be no surprises even if the decision goes a different way than what faculty hope.
   9. Darina Lepadatu: Where are the areas where we as faculty have autonomy to create our own governance? Dr. Schwaig: All governance fits within the absolute authority that is given to the USG through the BOR. The R2 Roadmap is one area where we have had a lot of autonomy and collaboration.
2. Approval of Faculty Senate November 2021 Minutes. (James Gambrell 1:00)
   1. **Approved by voice vote.**
3. Election results for the PTR and Administrators’ Review Committee (Darina Lepadatu 1:00-1:10). **Please complete the Qualtrics Vote till Sunday, December 5 at midnight. (Only senators are eligible to vote).** 
   1. Results of votes for PTR committee: **Sumit Chakravarty, Meghan Burke, Steven Collins, James Gambrell, Doug Moody**
   2. Results of Administrative Review Committee: **Andy Pieper, Randy Stuart, M. A. Karim**
4. Grade Appeal Process (Ron Matson & Academic Standing Committee 1:10-1:25)
   1. See motion/update in the appendices.
   2. A task force has looked into and define the process of grade appeals. [Sound kept going in and out during Dr. Matson’s presentation]. It was a background to why the policy was needed.
   3. Randy Stuart (Marketing and Professional Sales): This says that the “Provost’s decisions is final.” She wonders if there is a way to clarify the language, because it says that a student can take it to the USG after the Provost. She recommends having the idea of “final” stay with whomever is final.
   4. Matson: Will go back and discuss with the committee.
   5. **Motion approved: 38 yes, 1 No**
5. Reminder: Course Evaluations Fall 2021: Nov. 15- Dec. 21 (Darina Lepadatu 1:25-1:35)
   1. Opt out system is meant to increase the response rate.
   2. David Bray (Economics, Finance, & Quantitative Analysis): Disagrees with allowing them to see the grades and still fill out evaluations. He believes this provides an avenue for students to retaliate against professors for their grades. He does not believe it increases response rates. Do the students opt out of courses individually? Or all around? Several FS members share that they agree with Dr. Bray.
   3. Dr. Matson: is not positive of what the students see or if they opt out individually. But will find out.
   4. Several faculty senators voice support for considering alternative measures of teacher effectiveness (Dr. Rebecca Hill; Dr. M.A. Karim; James Gambrell)
6. Update from Interim President Kat Schwaig (1:35-1:40)
   1. Football team was very successful this year.
   2. Taskforce to work on opioid addiction and recovery was recognized at a state event.
   3. Gratitude to Ron Matson. He is retiring for real this time. He will be missed and has brought so much to our campus over the years.

# Update from Interim Provost Ivan Pulinkala (1:40-1:45)

* 1. Adds to Matson gratitude.
  2. Thanks FSEC for setting up working groups. One for administrative review and one for PTR review. Thanks collaboration.
  3. Encourages faculty to attend graduation.

**Motion to adjourn meeting at 1:41 p.m. Seconded and approved by voice vote.**

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1. Informational Item: Policies Under Review at KSU (https://policy.kennesaw.edu)
2. Informational Item: Updates from Chairs and Directors’ Assembly (Daniel Rogers)

**Supporting Documents:**

**4. Nominations for the Post-tenure Review Committee and Administrator’s Review Committee**

The committee shall include five tenured faculty members selected by the Faculty Senate, the Assistant Vice President for Faculty Affairs, a dean representative, and a chair/director representative. The committee shall be chaired by the President of the Faculty Senate - or other member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) - serving in an ex-officio capacity. The committee will be advisory to the Senate.

Todd Harper, English, Radow College of Humanities and Social Sciences, President Elect Faculty Senate and Chair of Committee, (ex-officio)

**Please vote for a minimum of one representative from the Marietta campus (You may select 2 reps if you prefer):**

Hussein Abaza, Construction Management, College of Architecture & Construction Mgt

Sumit Chakravarty, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Southern Polytechnic College

**Please vote for a minimum of three representatives from the Kennesaw campus (You may select 4 reps if you did not select 2 reps in the previous category ):**

Megan Burke, Department of Mathematics, College of Science and Mathematics

Stephen Collins, School of Gov and Intl. Affairs, Radow College

James Gambrell, Inclusive Education, Bagwell College of Education

Doug Moodie, Management, Coles College of Business

Heather Pincock, School of Conflict Management, Peacebdg. And Dev., Radow College

Terri Powis, Geography and Anthropology, Radow College

Chris Ziegler, Psychological Sciences, Radow College

**Administrators’ Review Committee**

The committee shall include five administrators selected by the Provost (in consultation with the CDA and Dean’s Council), the Faculty Rep to Administrative Review and two tenured faculty. The committee will be chaired by the CDA chair or chair elect- serving in an ex-officio capacity.

**Please vote for the following faculty reps with a minimum of 1 rep from the Marietta campus and 1 rep from the Kennesaw campus:**

Andy Pieper, School of Gov and Intl Affairs, Radow College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Faculty Rep of Administrative Review

**Kennesaw Rep:** Randy Stuart, Marketing, Coles College of Business

**Marietta Rep:** M.A. Karim, Civil and Env. Engineering, Southern Polytechnic College

**3. New KSU Grade Appeal Processes**

**(DRAFT - 12 Nov 21, Ron Matson’s annotations). Please also find the attached proposed new form.**

A student’s rights to grade appeals are defined in the University catalogs. Each faculty member must specify their grading policy in the syllabus at the beginning of the course. The faculty member may change the grading policy for cause after that time but must do so uniformly with ample notification to students.

The grading policy must be specific, in writing and distributed or otherwise provided to the class at the beginning of the course. Some departments may also require faculty members to file grading policy statements in the departmental office. Because the student can submit a grade appeal to the Department Chair within 20 business days after the first day of classes of the next academic term after the academic term in which the final grade was awarded to the student (see Grade Appeals Procedure), it is strongly recommended that instructors retain any student papers, tests, projects, or other materials not returned to the student for 90 days after the end of a semester or if an appeal is filed until the appeal is resolved.

**Grade Appeal Policy**

Kennesaw State University is committed to treating students fairly in the grading process. A student may appeal a final grade awarded for a course. Interim grades or grades on specific assignments are not appealable. An appeal must be based on one or more or the following:

* an allegation that the faculty member has violated the stated grading policy,
* an allegation that the faculty member assigned a grade using a different standard than was used with other students in the same course,
* an allegation that the grade was miscalculated.

The student has the burden of proving these allegations. All formal appeals under these procedures will be based only on the written record.

This process does not address academic integrity allegations, faculty misconduct, or discrimination/retaliation. If the student alleges their grade is based on discrimination or retaliation because of their membership in a protected class, the student may file a complaint with the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE).The OIE is responsible for ensuring the KSU campus community complies with all applicable laws and policies regarding Title IX and discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex (including sexual harassment and pregnancy), sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, ethnicity or national origin, religion, age, genetic information, disability, or veteran and military status.  If the student believes they have experienced discrimination based on any of these protected classes, they may file a report here: <https://discrimination.kennesaw.edu/index.php>.

**Please note**: Complaints filed with the OIE are independent of the grade appeal process and are not reviewed by OIE as an appeal of a grade. This means, if an OIE complaint is filed, the grade, whether assigned by the instructor, or amended through the grade appeal process, will remain the final grade. Upon receiving a finding from the OIE as to whether there is a violation, the Dean will determine whether a change of grade is warranted.

**Filing a complaint of discrimination/retaliation with the OIE regarding a grade does not change the time requirements for filing a grade appeal based on this policy.**

**Grade Appeal Procedure**

The following steps must be followed by any student seeking to appeal a grade:

**Informal**

The student is encouraged to discuss concerns and disputes over final course grades with the faculty member, prior to filing a formal grade appeal, to understand the basis of the grade. The faculty member is expected to be available to the student, to respond to emails, and to discuss grades so that, if possible, grade disputes can be resolved informally. If pursuing a grade appeal using the informal process, students and faculty must keep in mind the deadline for filing a formal appeal. An informal appeal does not change the deadline for filing a formal appeal.

**Formal**

DRAFT

In situations where an informal resolution does not occur or is not successful, the student may appeal the final course grade to the Department Chair of the department offering the course. The appeal must be in writing and describe the precise basis for the appeal (see list of allegations above). Any pertinent information must be submitted with the appeal in order to be considered in this or subsequent appeals, for example:

* + course syllabus,
  + instructions for assignments indicating grading procedures/expectations including grading rubrics and grading scales
  + emails or other communications between the student and faculty relevant to the allegations.

The appeal must be submitted within 20 business days after the first day of classes of the

next academic term (fall, spring, summer) after the academic term in which the final grade

was posted in Banner/D2L. The Chair will provide the faculty member who assigned the grade with the opportunity to respond in writing to the student’s appeal. The Department

Chair (or the Chair’s designee) will review the allegations, conduct any additional fact

finding as needed and then provide a decision in writing to the student. The decision

should be issued within 20 business days of the receipt of the complaint in the Department.

The Chair’s written decision will specifically address the relevant issues raised by the

student. If there is a delay in issuing a decision by the deadline, the Chair/Chair’s designee will notify the student and faculty member explaining the reason for needing additional time to issue a decision. The maximum amount of additional time to issue a decision is ten (10) business days.

The student may appeal the Department Chair’s decision within 20 business days of being

notified of the Chair’s decision. Such appeal will be made, in writing, to the Dean of the

College in which the Department is located.

At the Dean’s discretion, the Dean can appoint an advisory panel, consisting of two (2)

faculty members from outside the department where the grade was awarded and one (1)

student to review the written documentation and make a recommendation to the Dean. The

advisory panel may invite the student and the faculty member who awarded the grade to meet

with the panel to share each party’s position on the grade dispute. The panel will provide a

written recommendation to the Dean within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the

appeal.

The Dean will issue a decision to the student, in writing, within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the report from the advisory panel or within twenty (20) business days of the receipt of the written complaint from the student if no panel was appointed. If there is a delay in issuing a decision by the deadline, the Dean will notify the student and faculty member explaining the reason for needing additional time to issue a decision. The maximum amount of additional time to issue a decision is ten (10) business days.

DRAFT

The student may appeal the Dean’s decision to the Provost or Provost’s designee, in writing, within twenty (20) business days of being notified of the Dean’s decision.

If the grade appeal involves a graduate course, the student will direct this written appeal to the Dean of the Graduate College, and the Graduate College Dean will issue a decision to the student, in writing, within twenty (20) business days of receiving the appeal. Within twenty (20) days of that decision, the student may then appeal to the Provost as described in this section].

In either situation, the Provost/Provost’s designee will issue a decision to the student in writing within twenty (20) business days of receiving the appeal. The Provost/Provost’s designee will notify the student and faculty member and provide a justification if there is a delay in issuing a decision by the deadline. The maximum amount of additional time is 10 business days.

**The Provost’s decision is final. Decisions regarding grades may not be appealed to the Board of Regents per BOR Policy Manual, Section 6.26.**

Nothing in this grade appeal process prohibits the parties from settling this matter at any stage. However, any attempt to settle the matter through mediation does not affect the deadlines assigned to each level of the grade appeals process.

It is University policy that students filing grievances and those who are witnesses are protected from retaliation.

**Current KSU Grade Appeal Processes**

<http://catalog.kennesaw.edu/content.php?catoid=54&navoid=3971#gradeappeals>

Grade Appeals

A student’s rights to grade appeals are defined in the University catalogs. Each faculty member must specify the grading policy in the syllabus at the beginning of the course. The faculty member may change the grading policy for cause after that time but must do so uniformly with ample notification to students.

The grading policy should be quite specific and should be distributed to each class in written form. Some departments may also require faculty members to file grading policy statements in the departmental office. Because the student can submit a grade appeal to the Department Chair within 20 business days after the first day of classes of the next academic term after the academic term in which the final grade was awarded to the student (see Grade Appeals Procedure, section B), it is strongly recommended that instructors retain any student papers, tests, projects, or other materials not returned to the student for 70 days after the end of a semester or if an appeal is filed until the appeal is resolved.

Grade Appeal Procedure

Kennesaw State University is committed to treating students fairly in the grading process. A student may appeal a final grade awarded for a course. Interim grades or grades on specific assignments are not appealable. An appeal must be based on an allegation that the faculty member has violated the stated grading policy or/and that the grade was a result of discrimination or retaliation. The student has the burden of proving these allegations. All formal appeals under these procedures will be based only on the written record.

**Informal**

* The student is encouraged to discuss concerns and disputes over final course grades with the faculty member, prior to filing a formal grade appeal, to understand the basis of the grade. The faculty member is encouraged to be available to the student to discuss grades so that, if possible, grade disputes can be resolved informally.

**Formal**

* In situations where such informal resolution does not occur or is not successful, the student may appeal the final course grade to the Department Chair. The appeal must be in writing and describe the precise basis for the appeal. Any pertinent information must be submitted with the appeal in order to be considered in this or subsequent appeals. The appeal must be submitted within 20 business days after the first day of classes of the next academic term (fall, spring, summer) after the academic term in which the final grade was awarded to the student. The Chair will invite the faculty member who assigned the appealed grade to provide a written response to the student’s appeal statement. The Department Chair (or the Chair’s designee) will review the allegations and conduct any additional fact finding as needed and will provide a decision in writing to the student, within 20 business days of the receipt of the complaint in the Department if there is no allegation of discrimination or retaliation that impacted the grade. The Chair’s written decision will specifically address the relevant issues raised by the student.
  + If the student alleges that the grade was a result of discrimination or retaliation, the following procedures will be followed. The Chair will consult with the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) if there is an allegation that discrimination or retaliation based on status in a protected class has an impact on the grade. Please see <http://equity.kennesaw.edu/titleix/non-discrimination.php> for the University’s Non-Discrimination Statement. The Director of Institutional Equity or designee will review the information provided by the Chair to determine jurisdiction, routing, and whether an investigation is warranted, or if more information is needed. If the OIE determines that an investigation is warranted, the OIE will investigate. The general time frame for the investigation is 60 business days, absent any special circumstances. The OIE will issue an investigation report to the Chair. The Chair will use the OIE investigation report to make the grade appeal decision and communicate the decision to the student within 20 business days after receipt of the OIE investigation report. The Chair’s written decision will specifically address the relevant issues raised by the student.
* The student may appeal the Department Chair’s decision within 20 business days of being notified of the Chair’s decision. Such appeal will be made, in writing, to the Dean of the College in which the Department is located. At the Dean’s discretion, the Dean can appoint an advisory panel, consisting of two (2) faculty members from outside the department where the grade was awarded and one (1) student to review the written documentation and make a recommendation to the Dean. The advisory panel may invite the student and the faculty member who awarded the grade to meet with the panel to share each party’s position on the grade dispute. The panel will provide a written recommendation to the Dean within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the appeal. The Dean will issue a decision to the student, in writing, within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the report from the advisory panel or within twenty (20) business days of the receipt of the written complaint from the student if no panel was appointed.
* The student may appeal the Dean’s decision to the Provost, in writing, within twenty (20) business days of being notified of the Dean’s decision. [However, if it is a graduate course, the student will direct this written appeal to the Graduate Dean, and the Graduate Dean will issue a decision to the student, in writing, within twenty (20) business days of receiving the appeal. Within twenty (20) days of that decision, the student may then appeal to the Provost as described in this section]. The Provost will issue a decision to the student in writing within twenty (20) business days of receiving the appeal.
* The Provost’s decision is final, and decisions regarding grades may not be appealed to the Board of Regents per BOR Policy Manual, Section 6.26.

Nothing in this grade appeals process prohibits the parties from settling this matter at any stage. However, any attempt to settle the matter through mediation does not affect the deadlines described for this grade appeals process.

1. **8. Policy Updates from the Policy Process Council** (Kevin Gwaltney 1:20-1:30). Please check the following policies at: <https://policy.kennesaw.edu>.

**Records and Information Management Policy**

**Human Resources:**

ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy

Attendance Policy

Conduct Guidelines

**Inclement Weather Policy (to be reviewed during the January meeting)**

Performance Management Policy

Relocation Policy

Salary Administration Policy

Staff Grievance Policy

Staff Teaching Policy

Student Employment Policy

Substance Abuse, Random Testing, and Post-Accident Policy

Talent Acquisition Policy

Teleworking/Alternative-Work-Schedule Policy

Workers’ Compensation Policy

Worksite Lactation Policy

**Fiscal Services:**

Consulting Services Policy

Monitoring Internal Controls over Financial Transactions Policy

**9.Faculty Senate Liaison Report**

**Chairs and Directors Assembly (CDA)**

**December 1, 2021**

My notes/summary from the 12/1/21 CDA meeting appear below. These reflect my understanding of the meeting contents and discussion.

Respectfully Submitted,

Daniel Rogers, Faculty Senate Liaison to CDA

▪ Multiple policies that have been developed or revised were presented.

* Minors – Programs (e.g., conferences, mentoring, internships, field trips) that serve minors must be registered, staff must have training, permissions obtained, etc. Programs must follow all requirements. Details are available at [https://protectingminors.kennesaw.edu/.](https://protectingminors.kennesaw.edu/)
* Records and Information Management – Declares KSU’s intent to manage all records to comply with USG policies and determines schedules for records retention.
* ADA Reasonable Accommodation – New policy documents what KSU has been doing in practice.
* Attendance – New policy documents what KSU has been doing in practice. Managers retain some leeway in overseeing attendance within their units.
* Conduct Guidelines – New policy documents what KSU has been doing in practice and is designed to offer guidance to and expectations for employees and managers.
* Inclement Weather – New policy documents what KSU has been doing in practice.
* Salary Administration – Changes length of time, from 12 months to 6 months, that an employee with a recent status change can make a subsequent change.
* Staff Grievance – New policy documents what KSU has been doing in practice.
* Staff Teaching – New policy documents what KSU has been doing in recent practice, including which staff can teach and the limits.
* Student Employment – New policy documents what KSU has been doing in practice, including limits on hours and positions.
* Substance Abuse, Random Testing, and Post-Accident – New policy adds information to existing drug and alcohol policy.
* Talent Acquisition – New policy documents what KSU has been doing in practice, including timeframe for position postings.
* Teleworking/Alternative-Work-Schedule – This policy combines previous guidelines for alternative-work and teleworking in light of how these practices have evolved recently.
* Workers’ Compensation – Policy updated on post-accident drug screening and newer requirements from USG.
* Worksite Lactation – New policy reflects existing requirements in federal law.
* Consulting Services – Policy updated to reorganize some procedural steps.
* Monitoring Internal Controls over Financial Transaction – Policy updated to combine operations under a single office and reorganize some procedural steps.

▪ Ron Matson presented on proposed revisions to the grade appeal policy. The changes focus on:

* general reorganization
* differentiate the grade appeal process (i.e., student claims about errors, violations of grading policies) from student complaints that fall under the Office of Institutional Equity
* clarified what is expected in terms of documentation from student
* created a form for submitting appeal that is electronic, which UITS is currently exploring

▪ LaJuan Simpson-Wilkey provided her regular update:

* The multi-year review timelines/schedule are being updated to facilitate workflows, including completion of external letters within the system.
* Spring 2022 hires must be finalized by 12/8/21.
* ARD and FPA workflows will launch to faculty in mid-December.
* In position announcements, be sure to use the provided templates.
* A new position announcement template is being created for the part-time pools. Existing ones will have to be closed out and new ones created once the template is created.