

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

March 20, 1989
3 p.m.

Note: NUNN Room 426

AGENDA

- I. Approval of Minutes of February 27, 1989
- II. Agenda Deletions and/or Additions
- III. Old Business
 - Assessment (General Studies)
- IV. Committee Reports
 - A. Curriculum
 - Department of Education
 - 1) New Minor - Athletic Training (voting)
 - B. Professional Concerns
 - 1) Academic Council (voting)
 - 2) Student Appeal and Hearing Process (voting)
 - C. Benefits
 - 1) Interaction between Faculty Benefits and Office of Research, Grants and Contracts. (voting) (Sent in February packet)
 - 2) Health Care Report
 - D. Budget
 - E. Handbook Revision
 - F. Space Committee Report
- V. Status of Senate Recommendations
- VI. Senate President's Report
- VII. New Business
- VIII. Adjournment

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University

Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES Meeting of March 20, 1989

MEMBERS PRESENT: Carol Bredemeyer, Andrea Cornuelle, R. Kent Curtis, David Dunevant, Sandy Easton, Lynn Ebersole, W. Vernon Hicks, J. Lynn Jones, Mike Klembara, Nancy D. Martin, Art Miller, Marjorie Muntz, Margaret Myers, Lou Noyd, Phil Obermiller, Dennis O'Keefe, Terry Pence, Fred Rhyhart, Fred Schneider, Frank Stallings, James Thomas, David Thomson, Bill Wagner, Robert Wallace, Richard Ward, Ted Weiss, Emily Werrell, Macel Wheeler, Geraldine Williams.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Barry Andersen, Tom Brossart, William R. Jones, Denise Robinson, Chris Stiegler.

GUESTS: Carol Futhey, David Jorns, Kelly Maran from Student Government, Lynn Langmeyer, Jerry Legere, Bob Bussom, Linda Marquis, Tom Cate.

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. The Senate met in Nunn Room 426 because the Law School requested the Executive Committee to change because of their necessary use of the University Center Ballroom.

- I. Corrections to the minutes of February 27, 1989 included correcting spelling of requested in the fifth line on page 2 and changing released to reassigned in the second full paragraph. A sentence was added to the second full paragraph. Comment was made about payment to the Senate President for summer responsibilities being unprecedented at Northern. In the last sentence under item 2 on page 4, pressure was changed to preparation. The adjournment time was changed to 5:35 p.m.

Carol Bredemeyer moved approval of the minutes as corrected. Frank Stallings seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

- II. Under the Benefits Committee, item 1 was pulled from the agenda due to the need for the full committee to meet on this item.

Nancy Martin suggested time limits on discussion:

- 15 minutes on assessment
- 10 minutes on the athletic training minor
- 30 minutes on the Academic Council
- 10 minutes on the student appeal and hearing process
- 15 minutes on health care

In addition, she will limit the status of Senate recommendations and Senate President's Report to 5 minutes each.

Fred Schneider moved approval of the time constraints. Bill Wagner seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The Parliamentarian will call time.

- III. Assessment was moved first on the agenda so the Senate can complete today. Nancy Martin apologized for the delay in getting to assessment at the last meeting. Other actions took longer than expected. Resolution is needed on where assessment of general studies should be housed and who should handle. Discussion is needed on what the UCC should do with the assessment of general studies. The UCC feels it is the appropriate place for discussion with the general studies subcommittee handling the assessment of general studies questions.

The floor was opened for discussion and/or motions.

As a point of information Ted Weiss stated that the Professional Concerns Committee is studying a proposal broadly dealing with outcomes assessment. It is currently being discussed in committee. It is a broader overview which tangentially deals with outcomes assessment.

A point of clarification, no subcommittee work has taken place in the UCC until the Senate takes action. Discussion of how to handle has occurred. The Provost sent the charge to the UCC in December. The Executive Committee requested delay of action until assessment could be discussed in Senate.

The discussion in Professional Concerns is with assessment in total, not General Studies. It is a philosophical statement about outcomes assessment and NKU. It suggests work be done within certain guidelines as part of a response to the strategic plan.

Fred Schneider moved that the University Curriculum Committee be authorized to begin study and make recommendations on the assessment of general studies. Fred Rhyhart seconded.

It was suggested that it would be preferred to authorize investigation of assessment of general studies rather than recommendations.

A question of a deadline on the assessment was raised. Mike Klembara saw several months work (7 or 8 months study) on assessment. Some general discussion took place at the committee's January meeting.

The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Committee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee - Mike Klembara

Sandy Easton moved approval of the new minor in athletic training. Andrea Cournelle seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Professional Concerns - Ted Weiss

1) The rationale and composition of the academic council are explained in the memorandum from the Governance Subcommittee. A question was raised as to whether this would replace the current academic council. Confusion exists about the current academic council which Rob Snyder chairs. It was last convened in 1987 and was not done through the Senate. The proposed academic council would replace the current one.

The College of Law is not included in council nor is Steel Library.

Emily Werrell moved to add the Director of Steely Library to the administrators under 2a and a faculty member from Steely under 2c. Sandy Easton seconded.

Dick Ward made a friendly amendment to add Chase Law to both categories. Margaret Myers seconded.

It was pointed out that the representative from Chase to Professional Concerns never expressed concern that Chase was not included in the proposal.

Concern was expressed that by increasing the number of committees the dialogue would not be as effective.

With the additions to 2c, the number of faculty do not add up.

Question was raised...does that mean eight administrators and eight faculty? Suggestion was that the faculty remain at six the way it is written. The initial idea was that with a smaller group discussion would be better.

An attempt was made to make the representation an even balance between faculty and administrators.

Another suggestion was made that if the Executive Committee and the administration already have an ongoing face to face discussion, the creation of an Academic Council was not needed. What would be its purpose? It would provide another vehicle to improve communication and understanding among all facets of university discussions.

Opposition to proposal was expressed. A formal mechanism already exists in the Faculty Senate. Ad hoc groups focus on various issues. Concern was expressed about adding another element which when formalized could eventually replace the Faculty Senate.

It is felt that fewer committees are needed not more. Several senators said that in department discussions their faculty are against the proposal. Faculty Senate needs to be more active instead of adding another layer.

When proposal passed Professional Concerns, it was not felt that the Academic Council would replace the Faculty Senate. The need was seen for the university to have representatives from different bodies to get together to allow for a freer exchange of ideas. Problems could be anticipated and all bodies would gain from discussions in the same room.

In discussion of topic at COSFL, it was expressed that be careful you do not create a monster. The representatives of other Kentucky colleges indicated that other such bodies which were formed supplanted the Senate. Plenty of means for discussion currently are in place.

The Academic Council was seen as a method to increase communication and the flow of information. It would provide a clear means of communication.

Discussion against proposal continued. The Senate is a body which can function with a purpose.

Communication would increase with council. Issues would be brought back to Senate. The Academic Council if adopted would no way be intended to become a legislative body. If it became something it shouldn't, action could be taken to stop it.

Already too much informal networking exists. Decisions are made in informal groups. If such a council is created to whom is it responsible? The Senate could set up such a body. Another level is not being created. If proposal is read carefully, the Senate are the representatives of the faculty on the Council. The council would provide an opportunity for dialogue. It would set up a mechanism for discussion. Concern about council taking on a larger role is a legitimate concern. Ways to prohibit this are present. It also could not happen. It may increase dialogue. Question was raised that why do we need to formalize informality. Invite people to sessions for discussion. It was pointed out the University Council--President of Faculty Senate, President of Staff Congress, President of Student Government, and President of University is currently in place and does not function as intended.

Dr. Jorns has been very happy with Senate discussions in spirit but the time factor is a problem. The level of information is not always what it should be. An example is the budget which took months. The same thing is happening with assessment. Less time needs to be taken in making collegial decisions. Suggestion was made to put in a time line. Give the Academic Council six months.

Time on discussion was called by the Parliamentarian. Macel Wheeler moved to extend time to include the people who requested recognition before time was called and were on the Senate President's list. Frank Stalling seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Time limits are a problem for full discussion of issues. There is no process for discussion to take place in an informal way. For instance, accreditation in colleges has not been addressed.

Theoretically the Academic Council is a good idea, but a concern is present that finding people to serve on such a committee would be difficult. Discussion in smaller groups could lead to better understanding.

Concern was expressed about weakening the role of the Senate in governance. A more active means for dialogue is needed and need not set the stage for weakening the Senate. Suggestion was made that this be an ad hoc committee but not a council. Invite individuals as participants in dialogue.

Andrea Cornuelle called for the question on the amendment to add the law school and library representatives. The motion on the amendment passed unanimously.

This might be seen as an innocuous document, but it is seen as a way to undermine the Senate as it currently functions. The Council of Chairs was formed first to informally discuss items. Now the Council is making recommendations. Campus governance groups are articulated by the Board of Regents--The Presidents of Staff Congress, Student Government and Faculty Senate. Concern is present about growth and role of the Academic Council.

The entire proposal was formulated with good intent. The Senate currently goes back to the faculty for discussion. The chairs should disseminate information. The current University Council could function better. There has been a big opening up of Communications. A lot of progress has been made. The Senate is a deliberative body at the subcommittee level then full committee before coming to Senate for action. It needs to work. If the Senate doesn't work, it should be disbanded.

Frank Stallings called the question. The Academic Council proposal was defeated - 7 for and 21 against.

The suggested idea for dialogue is important. Maybe something could be formed within the Senate and responsible to the Senate.

Suggestion was made that the Senate might meet twice a month for less time. Full votes are needed. Credibility is lessened when numbers of Senators present to vote are small. Purpose of proposal was to increase dialogue. Some ideas need to be generated on how to do it. Suggestions could be taken to Executive Committee.

Changes in the Student Handbook on appeals and hearing are proposed to emphasize informal resolutions and to take into account occasions when faculty member may not be present on campus.

Dick Ward called the question. The motion passed unanimously.

Information packets on evaluation of administrators have been distributed. The evaluations need to be back to Ted Weiss by March 27th. Request was made to see that all faculty in your department received a packet.

Recommended changes to the strategic plan from the Professional Concerns Committee were distributed at the meeting. Concern is present in the new strategic plan on the section on planning committees and lack of faculty representation. Committee is concerned with interpretation. The Provost is invited to the next committee meeting.

C. Benefits - Marjorie Muntz

Dr. Scholes presented information on the changes in PruCare Plus and answered questions. Department representatives to the Benefits Committee should have the charts presented by Dr. Scholes. Changes are in PruCare Plus and not PruCare HMO. Open enrollment meetings will be held on March 22, 23, 24 and 27. Colleagues should be encouraged to attend these open sessions. Contact Barb Herald or Mike Hickman in Personnel with any questions.

D. Budget Committee - Sandy Easton

Ray Fortunato, the Compensation Consultant, has been on campus and is preparing report.

COSFL letter on athletic funding is being discussed in committee.

E. Handbook Committee - Fred Schneider

Changes have been referred to Professional Concerns. It is unrealistic for Professional Concerns to do it all this semester. Time in committee is needed.

F. Space Committee - Ted Weiss

Some faculty do not know that the Chair of Professional Concerns is on this committee. If you have concerns on space matters, let Ted know. The new building will be complete by August. Actual classes will be held in the spring of 1990. Space is being vacated on the fourth floor of the Science Building.

V. Senate recommendations - Nancy Martin

A supportive response has been received on the complimentary textbook recommendation. It is being held until further review by administration.

No response has been received on budgeting requests passed at the February meeting.

No response on the salary appeal process has been received.

Supplementary Compensation recommendation is being studied by University Legal Counsel.

No formal response or action has been received on the governance, faculty workload, and titles recommendation.

No response or action has been received on the revised early retirement policy recommendations passed in April 1988.

VI. Senate President's Report - Nancy Martin

An open house sponsored by the Chemistry Department and Faculty Senate will be held March 29th from 3 to 4:30 on the second floor of the Science Building.

The Annual Foundation Fund Drive is currently being held. It is very important that a large percentage of the faculty donate.

Rumors have sprung up about the 7% salary pool. 7% of the base of the salary pool went to each college. How the Deans distributed is not known.

Current salary policies for departments are not on reserve in the library. The latest is from 1986. Changes since that time are not included. Nancy will pursue this.

Summer undergraduate research stipends from funds for visiting scholar are being given. Information is available from Dr. Jorns or department chairs.

Several recommendations for Senate appointments to committees have been made for the following searches: VP for University Relations/Development; Assistant Provost; Director of Media Services; Acting Dean of Continuing Education. Faculty have also been recommended to the five year planning committee for the purchase of equipment.

A representative from the Professional Concerns will serve on the Outstanding Professor Award Committee.

Candidate for the Director of Admissions will be on campus March 27, 28 and April 5. An open meeting will be held from 1:30 - 2:30 on each day.

Senators are requested to keep Monday, May 1, open as a possible extra Senate meeting. It will only be called if necessary.

Recommendations from the Elections Committee on changes to the Senate constitution will be discussed at the next Executive Committee meeting.

Information is being sent out on the COSFL Annual Conference on March 31 and April 1. Anyone interested in attending should contact Carol Bredemeyer.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.