

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Monday, February 22, 1988
U.C. Ballroom 3:05 p.m.

- I. Approval of Minutes of January 25, 1988
- II. Agenda Deletions and/or Additions
- III. Senate President's Report
- IV. Committee Reports
 - A. Benefits
 - Time Table for Development Grants (voting item)
 - B. Budget & Commonwealth Affairs
 - 1988-90 Budget Priorities Recommendation (voting item)
 - C. Curriculum
 - 1) Co-op Proposals (voting item)
 - a. CEP 300 should be graded on a pass/fail basis rather than the current letter grade system.
 - b. Only the first six hours of CEP 300 may be applied to the 45-hour upper division requirement.
 - 2) The UCC supports the content of the memorandum written by the associate deans on January 20, 1988 concerning SIS status and recommends that the full Senate do likewise. (voting item)
 - D. Professional Concerns
 - 1) Faculty compensation for independent studies course. (voting item)
 - 2) Recommendation for Part-time faculty. (voting item)
 - F. Faculty Handbook Revision
 - G. Faculty Development
- V. Status of 1985-86, 86-87, 87-88 Senate Recommendations
 - A. Tuition Waiver Recommendation (May 12, 1986)
 - B. Advising Recommendation (January 26, 1987)
 - C. Women's Center Recommendation (November 16, 1987)
- VI. Old Business
 - 1) Parking Issues/Reserved Lot "N"
 - 2) Budget
- VII. New Business
- VIII. Adjournment

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES Meeting of February 22, 1988

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scottie Barty, Rebecca Britton, Carol Bredemeyer, Gary Cole, David Dunevant, Lynn Ebersole, Allen Ellis, Andrea Gauthier, Jim Gray, Lynn Jones, William Jones, Mike Klembara, David Lavery, Nan Littleton, Nancy Martin, Dennis O'Keefe, Jan Prickett, Tom Rambo, Fred Rhynhart, Fred Schneider, Linda Sheffield, Dennis Sies, Barbara Thiel, David Thomson, Robert Vitz, Bill Wagner, Bob Wallace, Ted Weiss, Donald Welte, Geraldine Williams.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Margaret Myers, Sharlotte Neely, Lou Noyd, Susan Hollis Nakao, Macel Wheeler.

GUESTS: Bob Bussom, Marty Huelsman, Peter Moore, Darryl Poole, Jerry Legere, Martha Malloy, Dennis Taulbee, Bob Bell, Peg Goodrich.

I. Nancy called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Bill Wagner noted that the last sentence of the Benefits report from the January 25 minutes needs correcting.

Mike Klembara noted that the new curriculum forms are now in the dean's office.

II. Agenda Deletions and/or Additions

Delete VI.2 Budget Cuts - This information was covered in the University Budget meeting.

Add new VI.2 Report on Faculty Development Issues.

Add under New Business: 1) Marty Huelsman introducing Bob Bell for Advocates for Higher Education and 2) Fred Rhynhart for political action idea.

III. Senate President's Report:

Nancy reported the provost search is underway. Green and Pearson have been on campus. Applebaum and Jorns will be here next week. Please attend and give comments to any search committee member.

Peter Moore, Chair of the Elections Committee, reported on the Faculty Regent election. Nominations are due next week and ballots will be sent out March 14.

The "Social Hour" last week was attended by over 100 faculty. The next one will be in April in Rad Tech.

Michelle Graves is no longer the Affirmative Action officer. Affirmative Action questions are now being answered by Sheila Bell.

The Handbook Revision Committee has accepted the resignation of Jonathon Bushee. The committee will decide whether to add another member at the next meeting.

The Commonwealth Affairs Committee of the state met last week with several NKU representatives who talked to the legislature about the financial needs of higher education. Marty Huelsman reported on the need to write legislators with a copy to the governor on the need for funds for higher education. He distributed a copy of a letter he sent with a plea for more letters to be sent before February 29, 1988. Carol Bredemeyer noted that the governor does not have the votes to pass his budget as submitted, but the senate does not have the votes to override a veto.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Benefits - Bill Wagner

18 project grants have now been funded rather than the 17 earlier reported. One faculty member accepted a Research Development Grant and had to turn down the project grant. This freed up enough money for 2 more project grants.

The Faculty Senate Scholarship Committee is looking for applications from children of NKU faculty who will be full-time students at NKU.

A new timetable for Development Grants passed unanimously:

Development Grant proposals due October 1

Chair evaluation and eligibility verification due October 8

Final FBC rankings to provost due December 1

All applicants notified in writing by provost due December 24

B. Budget & Commonwealth Affairs - Macel Wheeler

The Budget Committee recommended 4 points for Budget Priorities. Barbara Thiel moved we vote on the four items separately. Lynn Ebersole seconded. Item 1 had all but 2 yes votes (2 nos). Item 2 had all but 2 yes votes (2 nos). Item 3 and Item 4 passed unanimously.

Carol Bredemeyer - COSFL will hold a reception Wednesday, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. in Frankfort. See Carol if you wish to attend. KET shows highlights of the Senate in session each evening at 7:00 and 11:30 p.m.

C. Curriculum - Mike Klembara

1) Co-op Proposals

a) CEP 300 should be graded pass/fail rather than the current letter grade system. Passed unanimously.

b) Only the first six hours of CEP 300 may be applied to the 45 hour upperdivision requirement. Students may take up to 12 credits.

Discussion as to whether this would reduce enrollment in CEP 300, and whether this was an academic rather than experimental course ensued. Tom Rambo asked whether student teaching experiences were comparable. Mike Klembara replied that student teachers are supervised by educators in the field as well as from NKU (and are unpaid). Senators reported that co-op experiences range from being

messengers to being very valuable. Quality control was questioned. Peter Moore noted that the program originally allowed 6 credits at the 200 level and 6 credits at the 300 level. David Lavery moved we take the discussion. Motion defeated. (9 yes - 5 no)

Motion to pass 1b. (10 yes - 14 no). Curriculum Item 1b was defeated. Students may continue to take 12 credits at the 300 level.

2) The UCC supports the content of the memorandum written by the associate deans on January 20, 1988 concerning SIS status and recommends that the full Senate do likewise.

Dr. Poole noted that some other things must be done before these in memo can be done and that current amount of time and money may not allow these items to be substituted for others on the current work schedule. Questions were raised about the amount of money already spent. Vote on motion - 20 yes and 0 no. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Professional Concerns - Dennis O'Keefe

Marty Huelsman introduced Bob Bell, the president and founder of the Advocates for Higher Education. Bob Bell reported he first attended a Governor's address in 1948 with Governor Clements. Current reports haven't changed much. Kentucky is 50th in % of students attending college and 48th in college graduates. We lead the nation in teen-age pregnancies and are 2nd in production of marijuana. We need to make a quantum jump in elementary, secondary and higher education. Money invested in higher education is the best investment in state government. University graduates immediately begin to repay the money the state has invested in them. At 100% of the funding formula for higher education we would only achieve the median level of benchmark institutions in surrounding states. In Wilkinson's Kentucky First plan, he believed higher education has enough money and raises can be given through better management of funds. Last Fall Governor Wilkinson noted all the fat was out of university budgets and he would not let the funding formula fall below 88%. Wednesday is the last day candidates may file in opposition to incumbent legislators. The Revenue and Tax measure proposed by Clark and Maloney will go to the legislature this week. The bill would simplify the Kentucky Income Tax and bring it in line with the Federal Tax code as well as eliminate the lowest 400,000 taxpayers in the state. The legislature will also vote on whether to authorize a lottery and whether to authorize gubernatorial succession. An enormous crowd attended the rally last Tuesday which demonstrated the unity in higher education and raised the visibility of the higher education issue. The event was covered by over 50 newspapers, tv stations and radio stations across the state. Fifty-one house members and twenty senators will determine the outcome of the tax measure. These are the number needed to pass the budget or override a veto. Contact your legislators. Higher education seems to be the hottest issue in the legislature right now. Over 25,000 people have registered as advocates and are now entered into a computer. In three to four weeks these people will receive a card asking them to write or call their legislators. The toll-free number is 1-800-372-7181. If you do not know your senator or representative, call your county clerk and get the names. Then call and leave a message for the legislators saying you want more money to be found for higher education. Also write a personal letter to your legislators with a copy

to the governor and lieutenant governor and the editor of the local paper, being positive and including anecdotes about colleagues who have left, impact on students, impact on supplies, etc. The governor is not invincible. The next six weeks are a pivotal time. Dennis O'Keefe has the cards to add your name to the advocates list.

1) Faculty compensation for independent studies course. The committee recommend \$25 per credit hour per student with a cap of \$400 per semester. Questions were raised about where the money would come from. Ted noted that some departments allow faculty to bank independent studies and receive release time after a certain number of hours. This proposal would not allow for that. Fred moved to table the motion and refer it back to the committee for further discussion. The motion carried with 3 nos. Nancy apologized for not notifying the provost about this motion earlier.

2) Recommendation to increase part-time faculty salaries by \$100 per level. Motion carried with 1 no.

E. Faculty Handbook Revision Committee - Fred Schneider

The committee will meet Wednesday and should have a hearing with the general faculty on part of the revision this spring after meeting with the administration.

F. Faculty Development - Ted Weiss reported the committee is working on a booklet describing all faculty development opportunities. They will meet further on the improvement of teaching.

V. Status of 1985-86, 86-87, 87-88 Senate recommendations.

1) Tuition Waiver. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will discuss Dr. Boothe's reply at its next meeting.

2) No response on advising recommendation.

3) No response on Women's Center recommendation.

VI. Old Business

1) Parking Issues. Dr. Scholes indicated he would be willing to attend the next meeting. Questions about Lot N, reserved spaces and faculty spaces in Lot J, were raised. Dr. Scholes replied that no additional provisions were made for approximately 20-30 faculty slots cut out of Lot J. Lot N is sold out and there are people on the waiting list. The regents, visitors and handicapped slots are not always filled in Lot N. There are 2,800 parking spaces on campus and 110 reserved spaces. There is a waiting list for every reserved slot. There is a faculty parking lot planned in the future with a gate requiring a card.

2) Budget. Faculty Development questions were raised about the money the provost returned to the deans rather than funding more faculty development proposals. The Faculty Benefits Committee returned the \$5,000 given to the provost to distribute to the deans. Questions were raised about criteria for distributing the funds in the colleges. Questions were also raised about the notice received today from Dr. Shisler about reserved development grants. Faculty should be encouraged to submit proposals to their chairs and deans for the expenditure of these funds. \$30,000 has been reserved by the provost for 88-89 sabbaticals. Nancy noted that the unfunded faculty development proposals

were all approved and only the must fund list was funded. Fred noted that in the past the provost funded some special projects and this money is now in the dean's offices.

VII. New Business

Fred Rhynhart asked to discuss the concept of a voluntary political action committee at \$5 per month with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Carol Bredemeyer reminded everyone they can join COSFL for \$10 per year.

VIII. Adjournment - 5:05 p.m.

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

VOTING ITEM
from
Faculty Benefits Committee

for the
Faculty Senate Meeting
February 22, 1988

Development Grant timetable	Current Handbook (Aug. '87)	Defacto timetable	Proposed timetable
Development Grant proposals due	Oct. 15	Oct. 15	Oct. 1
Chair evaluation and eligibility verification	Nov. 1	Nov. 1	Oct. 8
Final FBC rankings to provost	Jan 10	Dec. 1	Dec. 1
All applicants notified in writing by provost	Feb. 1	Dec. 24	Dec. 24

Voting Item: A proposal change in the time table for Development Grants.

RESULTS: Yes _____ No _____ Abstentions _____

WW/pg

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Budget Committee *Macel Wheeler - chairperson*

RE: Budget Priorities Recommendation

DATE: February 9, 1988

The Budget Committee recommends the following statement on budget priorities to the Faculty Senate. The four points are concerned with the 1988-1990 budget.

1. Since faculty salaries are significantly below those at the benchmark institutions, it is recommended that salaries be increased by at least 5% in each of the next two years. The total number of faculty, administrative or staff positions should not be increased unless the aforementioned recommendation is accomplished.
2. Because of the anticipated budget constraints, available monies should be used to support existing programs. Any new initiatives requiring a material financial commitment (e.g. Student Information System, A.A.C.S.B. accreditation) should be discussed by all constituencies of the University (i.e. Faculty Senate, Staff Congress, Council of Deans, Council of Chairs). A cost analysis, which includes the full disclosure of the source and uses of funds and the relationship of those initiatives to the missions of the University, should be addressed.
3. The importance of maintaining the academic quality of the university requires that the academic programs be given the highest priority in the distribution of available monies.
4. If the budget requires a significant reallocation of monies, all constituencies of the University (i.e. Faculty Senate, Staff Congress, Council of Deans, Council of Chairs) should have input into the reallocation process.

Passed by the Budget Committee on February 8, 1988



Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076
(606) 572-5100

MEMO

To: Mike Klembara
Chair, UCC
Fr: Angie Lipsitz
Chair, Experimental/Non-Traditional Course Subcommittee
Da: November 30, 1987
Re: Co-op Proposals

At the October 22 UCC meeting, you asked our subcommittee to look into the grading of Co-op courses and the number of Co-op courses that could be used to satisfy the 45-hour upper-division requirement. We met, discussed these issues, talked with people involved with Co-op, and passed the following proposals:

- 1) CEP 300 should be graded on a pass/fail basis rather than the current letter-grade system.**
- 2) Only the first six hours of CEP 300 may be applied to the 45-hour upper-division requirement.**

The committee felt that these changes would improve the overall quality of the Cooperative Education program. Currently over 90% of the grades received in CEP 300 are A's. In many cases, distinctions between A and B work or B and C work is difficult, if not impossible. Furthermore, although grades are determined by faculty coordinators, students' work is primarily monitored by employers; thus, faculty members are awarding letter grades based partially on limited and/or second-hand observation. Presently, CEP 300 may be taken four times. Consequently, a student may now use 12 Co-op hours to satisfy the 45-hour upper-division requirement. This would seem to defeat that requirement's original purpose.

Martha Malloy, Director of the Career Development Center, which houses Co-op, has endorsed the first proposal and has stated that, although she had not given a great deal of thought to the second, a number of students do take CEP 300 only to fulfill the 45-hour requirement. She thought that both proposals could potentially reduce enrollment in the program, but that students sincerely interested in a Co-op experience would not be deterred.



Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076
(606) 572-5100

January 20, 1988

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Bussom, John Johnson, Carl Slater

Fr: Gary ^{AS} Scott, Tim ^{TS} Serey, Jerry Warner ^{JW}

Re: SIS Status

We are writing this memo to you to express our strong concern about the ineffective priorities being implemented in the proposed SIS system. The attached memoranda from Warren Spencer dated November 9 and 19, 1987, correctly indicate that many issues of highest concern to effective academic administration are being deferred. During September 1987, the three of us plus Ron Williams met with Darryl Poole, Rose Stauss, and Gene Scholes to express our concerns about these deferrals. We have received no response since that meeting.

With the recently announced resignation of Mr. Spencer from the project, we feel that it would be appropriate to reassess SIS priorities. We are especially concerned about the present status of the prerequisite checking and complete on-line advising/degree audit sub-system. At present they are included in the "enhancement" categories. We strongly feel that these sub-systems should be included in the initial SIS package. It is our judgment that this recommendation would have overwhelming support by the faculty if they were informed of its significance.

The administration of this University has expressed concern about the attrition rate which we experience. However, it appears that we are ignorant of extensive studies which identify academic advising as the major characteristic linked to the attrition rate at many institutions (Noel, Levitz, & Saluri, 1987-page 245). We think this to be true here at NKU also. Our collective experiences in advising matters lead us to believe that prerequisite checking and on-line advising/degree audit systems should be integral parts of an effective advising system. Considering the administration's stated emphasis on retention and with their desire to promote Northern as an institution where students are placed first, it is difficult to understand how these sub-systems can be thought of as optional expansion items rather than primary components of the Student Information System.

Given a scenario where chronic budget short-falls are likely to continue, we believe that it is essential for top administrators

to insist that the advising and prerequisite systems be a major priority for initial SIS introduction. If we fail to do this, it is likely that the disarray in the advising system and unsystematic method of counseling students will continue. On the other hand, if we reorder priorities to use resources and to make policy changes, we can make this happen now. It will be an effective contribution to serving and retaining students through better advising. Since we recognize that this alone will by no means solve all of our advising problems, we will soon provide you with a memorandum expressing additional concerns about the advising system which we currently have and some recommendations as to how it might be improved/restructured.

The current (and previous) three Associate Deans have emphasized these two priorities over the last eighteen months. We again reiterate our belief that NKU students, faculty, and administrators would not be best served if the prerequisite and advising/degree audit systems are deferred. We hope you agree with our recommendations and forward this memo to Provost Poole with your strongest concurrence for immediate action.

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

VOTING ITEMS
February 22, 1988

ITEM #1.....

The Professional Concerns Committee approved the following proposal for compensating faculty for directing independent studies.

A faculty member directing an independent studies course shall be compensated at a rate of \$25 per credit hour per student. Total compensation for such courses shall not exceed \$400 per semester.

Voting Result: Yes _____ No _____ Abstain _____

ITEM #2.....

The Professional Concerns Committee recommends for Senate consideration the following proposal for part-time faculty pay increases.

In view of the lack of pay raises for part-time faculty for many years and the difficulty some departments have had in recruiting part timers, we recommend that the administration raise salaries by \$100 for each of the three categories of part-time faculty. The following amounts would constitute the new pay schedule:

Level I	\$1,000
Level II	1,100
Level III	1,300

Voting Results Yes _____ No _____ Abstain _____

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Leon E. Boothe

FR: Nancy D. Martin

DA: February 25, 1988

RE: Recommendation for Part-time Faculty Salaries

With only one dissenting vote, the University Faculty Senate on February 22 approved the following proposal for part-time faculty pay increases.

In view of the lack of pay raises for part-time faculty for many years and the difficulty some departments have had in recruiting part timers, we recommend that the administration raise salaries by \$100 for each of the three categories of part-time faculty. The following amounts would constitute the new pay schedule:

Level I	\$1,000
Level II	1,100
Level III	1,300

The Faculty Senate asks for your endorsement of this recommendation and respectfully requests your written response by our next meeting on March 21st.

NM/pg

CC: Dennis O'Keefe, Chair of Professional Concerns
Senate Executive Committee
Senate Professional Concerns file.



Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076
(606) 572-5100

MEMORANDUM

February 10, 1988

TO: Nancy Martin

FR: Leon E. Boothe

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'L E Boothe', is written over the printed name 'Leon E. Boothe'.

RE: SENATE RECOMMENDATION FOR TUITION REMISSION

I am now in a position to respond to the Senate recommendation for a tuition remission program for spouses and children of faculty members. As you are aware, this topic is something in which the Staff Congress has also had some historical interests. All along, the whole issue has been and is complicated by the fact that any remission of tuition has to be funded with actual dollars rather than treated simply as a loss of revenue.

Because my staff and I are basically empathetic to the request, we have tried to look at every conceivable way as to a possible implementation of the program. Based on the extensive review, the Provost and my staff have recommended that the recommendation not be supported as submitted, but reviewed in the total context of priorities within the funding available. I concur with that position.

In the hope of being of some help to you, I submit the following points and analysis:

A tuition waiver program for the families of employees must be treated institutionally as a scholarship program rather than an employee benefit program since families are not employees and as such are not entitled to benefits. The current employee tuition waiver program permits University employees to enroll for six hours of undergraduate or four hours of graduate tuition per semester. This program is funded through Faculty/Staff Development along with other training and development programs. This employee training program costs approximately \$65,000 annually. All other training opportunities for faculty and staff are funded through organizational budget units and are limited because of financial constraints.

Council on Higher Education regulations place responsibility for scholarship programs with the institutions. The Board of Regents could legally develop a scholarship program for families of employees or any other group. Council requirements also clearly require all scholarships to be expensed in the financial statement of the institution. The reasons for the reporting requirements are twofold: (1) since the taxpayers of Kentucky are paying a

Nancy Martin
February 10, 1988
Page 2

significant portion of the cost of each student's education, there is a general concern as to how much of that cost should be borne by the students and how much should be passed on to the taxpayers, and, who should be excused from paying their share of the cost; and, (2) the Council believes that scholarships represent "lost opportunity costs" and as such should be reflected in the financial statements. This practice is consistent with standard accounting requirements.

It is impossible to gauge the cost of a scholarship program for families of employees without extensive survey work or several years of experience. The University does not keep records on married employees and numbers of children and their ages. But, a program whereby six undergraduate credit hours are available to each family per semester could potentially be very expensive, particularly as our employee complement matures and their children reach college age.

Another approach often suggested is to place a limitation in dollars on the size of the program. Such an approach would cause more difficulty and would create pressure for an open-ended program. It would be better to start with an open-ended program than to deal with the frustration, disappointment, and bitterness from those who do not receive an award because the money has run out.

Since a scholarship program for the spouse/children of an employee does not come under the training rubric of the tuition waiver program, such a scholarship program would need to compete for expansion funding against salary increase, new positions, and operating expansion. A spouse/child scholarship program should, therefore, compete with other requests for whatever expansion money is available for the next fiscal year.

I, therefore, request that the recommendation concerning a spouse/child scholarship program be reviewed by the Senate in the context with all other budgetary demands of the faculty and that the Faculty Senate share with the administration their sense of priority in helping to shape future budgets.

Should you have questions, please do contact me.

sc

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

PROPOSAL AS A VOTING ITEM FOR FACULTY SENATE:

Spring 1987

The Faculty Senate recommends to President Boothe that the current policy of six undergraduate or four graduate credit hours per semester free tuition for faculty/staff members be extended to cover spouses ^{or} and children of faculty/staff members.

RATIONALE:

We, the members of Faculty Benefits Committee, believe that such a policy would be useful in its own right as well as being a confidence builder and morale booster, especially in light of the recent inadequate salary increments.

There is certainly some precedent for such a policy among NKU's benchmark institutions. A letter was previously sent to each of the 32 benchmark institutions. Twenty-eight responses were received. Of these 28, five offered full tuition remission for spouses and children of faculty/staff members, seven offered partial tuition remission for same, 16 offered no tuition remission for spouses and children, one was developing a proposal to address this issue, and one was referred to another department. The complete breakdown is as follows:

FULL

1. Miami U.
2. Ohio U.
3. Central State U.
4. Wright State U.
5. Southwest Missouri State U.

PARTIAL

1. Northeast Missouri State U.
2. Northwest Missouri State U.
3. Old Dominion U.
4. Indiana State U.
5. Western Ky. U.
6. U. of Louisville
7. Southeast Missouri State U.

NO

1. Ball State U.
2. Austin Peay U.
3. Eastern Tenn. State U.
4. Murray State U.
5. Tenn. Tech. U.
6. Western Caroline U.
7. Marshall U.
8. Appalachian State U.
9. East Caroline U.
10. Kentucky State U.
11. Middle Tenn. State U.
12. Eastern Illinois U.
13. Radford U.
14. Eastern Ky. U.
15. Cleveland State U.
16. Morehead State U.

No response:

- Western Illinois U.
Kent State U.
Memphis State U.

Proposal pending:

- Illinois State U.

Acted on April 20, 1987

Approved: 26 yes, 1 no