



Faculty Senate

HIGHLAND HEIGHTS KY 41099 606-572-6400

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING
WEDNESDAY MAY 13, 1998
MEETING 12:45 P.M.
(IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING NOON LUNCHEON)
UC BALLROOM**

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Adoption of Agenda
- III. Approval of Minutes from the April 20, 1998 meeting
- IV. Committee Reports
 - A. Professional Concerns Committee
 - ◆ Post-tenure review (**Attachment**)
 - ◆ Proposed Revision of Handbook – Peer Review (**Attachment to 4/20/98 agenda – voting item**)
 - B. Budget and Commonwealth Affairs Committee
 - C. Curriculum Committee
 - 1. ENG 201 general studies course (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - 2. ENG 367 general studies course (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - 3. Computer Literacy standard (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - 4. Discipline specific writing courses criteria for general studies (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - D. Faculty Benefits Committee
- V. Business
 - ◆ Proposed amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution: Reassigned time for faculty governance and for the Faculty Regent (**Attachment – voting item**)
- VI. Adjournment



NORTHERN
KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate

HIGHLAND HEIGHTS KY 41099 606-572-6400

Faculty Senate Meeting (Corrected)

Wednesday May 13 1998

UC Ballroom

"Fama nihil est celerius."

Vergil

"Partial truths aren't hard to come by."

Natsuki Ikezawa

Senators present: Agard, D.; Cortez, S.; Datta, Y.; Desai, T.; Ebersole, Filaseta, J.; Frank, C.; Furnish, C.; Hewan, C.; Holt, H.R.; Jang, M.; Kelm, D.; Kempton, R.; Lorenzi, B.; McCartney, P.; McGill, D.; Mittal, B.; Pence, T.; Ragsdale, G.; Roeder, J.; Schneider, F.; Schulte, V.; Shaw, R.; Smith, D.; Thiel, B.; Thomas, J.

Senators absent: Garns, R.; King, M.; Lassiter, C.; Olasov, L.; Pennington, R.; Ragahavan, V.; Reno, B.; Scott, G.; Seed, A.; Verderber, K.

Guests: Albert, L.; Andersen, B.; Appleson, B.; Gaston, P.; Mckenney, J.; McNeil, R.

I. Call to Order

A. Meeting was called to order at 12:17 P.M.

II. Adoption of Agenda

A. The agenda was adopted as presented.

III. Approval of Minutes from April 20 1998

A. Minutes from 4.20.98 were accepted as presented

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Budget and Commonwealth Affairs: No report

B. Faculty Benefits: No report.

C. Professional Concerns:

1. Proposed Revision of Handbook re: Peer Review/Voting Item. Proposed Revision passed (Voice Vote)

2. A draft outline for post-tenure review was presented as an information item.

D. University Curriculum:

1. ENG 210 General Studies course Passed w/ 2 abstentions

2. ENG 367 General Studies course Passed w/ 2 abstentions

3. Computer Literacy Standard: Dealing w/ skill sets. Individual departments will determine specific requirements for their majors. Passed w/ 2 abstentions

4. Discipline specific writing courses criteria for General Studies.

Passed w/ 2 abstentions

V. Business:

A. Proposed Amendment to Faculty Senate Constitution: Reassigned time or Faculty Governance

1. A proposed amendment to Article VII., Section C. of the Faculty Senate Constitution was presented. This dealt with Reassigned Time for Faculty Governance and for the Faculty Regent. The Senate Constitution at present allows for reassigned time for the President of Senate (50%), the chair of University Curriculum committee (25%), semester). The proposed amendment changes reassigned time for the UCC chair to 50%, eliminates reassigned time for the chair of Faculty Benefits, adds reassigned time (25%) to the chair of Professional Concerns, and makes official a long standing informal arrangement allotting 25% reassigned time to the Faculty Regent. The amendment passed 22 For, 2 Against. This will go forward for approval by the President and the Board of Regents.

VI. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 1:40 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Don Kelm

MEMORANDUM

To: All Faculty Senators
From: Fred Schneider, Vice President
Re: Proposed Revision of the Peer Review Policy
A Faculty Handbook Matter
Date: April 8, 1998

ACS

Enclosed in this packet of material for the April Faculty Senate meeting is a copy of the proposed revised Peer Review portion of the NKU Faculty Handbook. I was asked to write an explanation of why this is here and what changes are made.

In many past years I was a member of the Peer Review Hearing Committee, and for two years, a member of the Peer Review Advisory Committee. I am also a current member of the Peer Review Hearing Committee. This proposal grows out of that entire experience. I put the original proposal to the Professional Concerns Committee last Spring, but the work of discussion could only begin then. It has been completed this academic year.

As a member of both Peer Review committees, I have always sought to find the truth of what happened, the truth of why the faculty member made an appeal to the Peer Review process. I have not always thought that the full story was told. Everything relied upon the faculty member providing information and witnesses, and the Committee, especially the Hearing Committee asking for other information and witnesses. There is sometimes another side of the story. That is the part about which I grew increasingly concerned. I thought that sometimes there was a University side, a Department side or an RPT Committee which might not be made known. There was due process for the faculty member but not for the University.

And so I thought about that for a long time. I reached the conclusion that there needed to be an opportunity for others to participate in the proceedings, for the "other side" to be presented where appropriate. It seemed best that some University Representative be charged with taking that role, a role designed to help the Committees find the whole truth. Accordingly, I proposed a draft which allowed written responses from RPT Chairs, Department Chairs, Deans and even the Provost, in cases where they thought a response was appropriate. These responses would go to the Peer Review Advisory Committee to help it decide whether there was a prima facie case to go forward.

The second new idea was the possibility of informal settlement of particular cases. I originally proposed a mediation process, but in the deliberations and considerations this has been changed to a negotiation process. It is not mandatory. Instead, it is there for use in cases where it is thought it might be possible to resolve the case informally.

Lastly, I proposed that if the case reached the Peer Review Hearing Committee there be

a University representative involved in a more formal way. This person could ask questions of witnesses, present witness, and present other evidence. All designed to help the Committee find the truth.

I sat with the Professional Concerns Committee and its sub-committee throughout their deliberations. In its final form, the proposal more fully lists those matters which can go to Peer Review, and allows responses to the faculty member's written petition to be considered by the Peer Review Advisory Committee. If the Provost decides the case is appropriate, negotiation may be attempted. When a matter goes to the Peer Review Hearing Committee, the proposal provides that a University Representative will participate.

The rest of the policy remains essentially unchanged. Some wording is changed for clarification. Committee membership is determined as before. The ultimate decisions to be made remain unchanged. The Peer Review Hearing Committee was already charged with holding a hearing, and that remains. The work of each Committee remains the same - the Advisory Committee to determine whether there is a prima facia case to go forward, and the Hearing Committee to determine, based upon the full evidence, whether a case is proven.

This is presented as a completely revised document. There is no longer a "marked up" copy. The proposal was recommended to the Professional Concerns Committee by a sub-committee, and is recommended to Faculty Senate by the Professional Concerns Committee for full approval.

DRAFT OF PROPOSED REVISION OF HANDBOOK - PEER REVIEW
(as approved by the Professional Concerns Committee on March 26, 1998)

B. PEER REVIEW PROCESS.

The Peer Review Process is confidential except as agreed to by the grievant faculty member and the University, through its appointed representatives, or as provided herein, or as may be required in a court of law.

1. MATTERS SUBJECT TO PEER REVIEW

Only the following matters, all of which affect a faculty member's professional employment at the University, may be appealed to or heard by the Peer Review Process:

1. denial of reappointment, promotion or tenure;
2. cases involving alleged illegal discrimination, except for cases of alleged sexual discrimination which are covered in Part Two, Section IX., SEXUAL HARASSMENT/GENDER DISCRIMINATION, of this Handbook;
3. cases involving alleged violation of professional ethics and responsibilities, as set forth in Part Two, Section II, PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, in this Handbook;
4. termination for medical reasons, as set forth in Part One, Section X. F., Termination For Medical Reasons, in this Handbook;
5. program reduction and faculty reassignment, as set forth in Part One, Section X. G. in this Handbook; and
6. termination for cause, as set forth in Part One, Section X. J., Termination For Cause, in this Handbook.

The Peer Review Process will deal with appeals and grievances of matters listed above only for persons who receive a faculty contract; no person who receives an administrative contract may utilize the Peer Review Process. Section XIV(C), COMPLAINT PROCESS, applies to all other complaints, grievances and appeals by faculty members.

2. COMPOSITION OF PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES

a. There shall be two peer review committees. The Peer Review Advisory Committee shall consist of five members and five alternate members. The Peer Review Hearing Committee shall consist of five members and five alternate members. In the event that there is an insufficient number of alternate members as to any case, alternate members of the other Peer Review Committee may serve, provided that no person may serve on both the Peer Review Advisory Committee and the Peer Review Hearing Committee on any one case. If it is necessary, and to constitute a full committee, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall appoint persons to serve on these committees. Committee membership is for two year terms beginning on a January 1 and ending after December 31 two years later, provided that committee

membership shall continue in the event that no replacement member(s) have been elected, and no member shall be removed from a Committee until the conclusion of a proceeding which has already begun.

b. The members of the Peer Review Committees will be elected at large by the full-time faculty of the University eligible to vote for Faculty Senators. The election shall be conducted by the Faculty Senate Elections Committee. Nominations shall be sought from all full-time faculty eligible to vote for Faculty Senators.

c. Members of the Peer Review Committees must be tenured full-time faculty. They shall serve staggered two-year terms to provide continuity of membership.

d. Elections shall be held during the first full week of November to fill membership terms which expire at the end of December 31 of that year. Members shall be elected by frequency of votes. Membership on the Peer Review Committees should be from a broad representation of the University faculty; therefore no Department will be represented by more than one faculty member on each Committee.

e. Each committee will elect a chair who shall serve for one year.

f. No member of either Peer Review Committee shall serve in the appeal or review of any matter arising from the department(s) of his/her appointment, in any case in which the member participated in any way prior to referral to the Peer Review Committee on which the member participates, nor in any matter in which the member may legitimately be called as a witness. It is the responsibility of committee members to exclude themselves from participating on a committee in any proceeding in which they have any other conflict of interest.

3. PROCEDURE

a. Any faculty member wishing to initiate a review by the Peer Review Process must file a written petition with the Provost and Executive Vice President. The petition must:

- i. state the nature of the grievance and any/all attempts which the faculty member has made to resolve the grievance;
- ii. be filed within the time limits prescribed by the applicable section of this Handbook; if no time limit is prescribed elsewhere in this Handbook, the petition must be filed no later than 60 days of the date of the alleged grievous conduct;

If a petition is filed after the prescribed time, it shall be dismissed.

b. An aggrieved faculty member may withdraw a petition for Peer Review at any time prior to the completion of the Peer Review Process. The faculty member must file a written request with the Provost and

Executive Vice President, asking that the petition be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the petition shall be effective on the date the written request is received in the office of the Provost and Executive Vice President, and all further consideration of the petition shall cease immediately.

c. Upon receipt of a timely filed petition, the Provost and Executive Vice President will forward the petition to the Chair of the Peer Review Advisory Committee and the Dean of the College in which the aggrieved faculty member resides within five (5) University working days.

d. Upon receipt of a petition for Peer Review, the Chair of the Peer Review Advisory Committee will notify the faculty member of its receipt and schedule a meeting of the Committee for consideration of the appeal. The faculty member shall provide one copy of the petition and any supporting evidence to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President, which in turn will provide copies, as appropriate, to the Peer Review Advisory Committee, the Dean of the College in which the faculty member resides, the Department Chair and the Chair of the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee of the grievant faculty member's department, and/or any other legitimate respondent to the grievance, all at least twenty (20) University working days prior to the date of the scheduled meeting. The Dean of the College in which the faculty member resides, the Department Chair, the Chair of the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee, and/or other respondents may each file a written response to the petition, including supporting evidence, with the Peer Review Advisory Committee within ten (10) University working days of receipt of the faculty member's documentation. The grievant faculty member may respond in writing within ten (10) University working days of receipt of the response(s) from the Dean, Department Chair, Chair of the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee, and/or other respondents. The Committee may request copies of these responses from the grievant and the respondent(s) for each Committee member, which will be provided by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President.

Normally the Peer Review Advisory Committee will meet no more than ten (10) University working days after receipt by the Committee's Chair of the petition and all of the responses described in the previous paragraph.

The Chair of the Peer Review Advisory Committee will convene the meeting of the Committee. A quorum of the Committee shall consist of four of the five members. Alternate members may be used as necessary. Based upon the written information it has received, the Committee members will determine whether a *prima facie* case for a hearing by the Peer Review Hearing Committee is presented. All committee members present shall vote. The Committee's determination shall be conveyed in writing to the petitioning faculty member and to the Provost and

Executive Vice President, all within three University working days of the committee's decision. If the Committee determines that no *prima facie* case was presented, the petition will be dismissed by the Committee, accompanied by written reasons explaining the Committee's decision. If the Committee determines that a *prima facie* case was presented, the case shall be returned to the Provost and Executive Vice President for further action. If there is a tie vote, the grievant faculty member's petition shall be forwarded to the Provost and Executive Vice President for further proceedings with a finding that a *prima facie* case is presented. The entire Committee file and record, including the petition and all copies of written statements and documents, shall be forwarded to the Provost and Executive Vice President. If the petition has been dismissed, there shall be no further Peer Review proceedings. The Provost and Executive Vice President is responsible for safekeeping the record.

e. In the event that the Peer Review Advisory Committee determined that a *prima facie* case was presented, the Provost and Executive Vice President may review the entire record to determine whether the petition might be resolved by negotiation. The Provost and Executive Vice President may consult with his/her staff, the Deans of the University's Colleges, and/or other appropriate persons while making this decision. In that event the entire record may be reviewed by those consulted so that proper advice may be given.

If the Provost and Executive Vice President determines that negotiation might resolve the matter, he/she or his/her designee shall negotiate with the grievant faculty member for the purpose of seeking a mutually agreeable settlement. If such a settlement is reached, it will be reduced to writing and signed by the Provost and Executive Vice President and the faculty member. Such an agreement shall not become binding on either party until approved by the University President and Board of Regents, if required. Approval of the Board of Regents is required only as to matters which the Board of Regents must approve, such as reappointment, promotion and grant of tenure.

f. If the petition for Peer Review is resolved by negotiation, there shall be no further Peer Review proceedings. If negotiation was not pursued by the Provost and Executive Vice President or the matter was not successfully resolved by negotiation, the Provost and Executive Vice President shall expeditiously forward the petition to the Chair of the Peer Review Hearing Committee.

g. The Provost and Executive Vice President may designate him/herself, a Dean of a College within the University, but not the College in which the grievant faculty member is assigned, or a Department Chair, but not the Chair of the department in which the grievant faculty member is assigned, to be the University representative before the Peer Review Hearing Committee.

h. The Peer Review Hearing Committee shall proceed expeditiously to schedule a hearing and reach a decision.

i. Scope of Review

(i) When hearing a case involving denial of reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, the Peer Review Hearing Committee may receive evidence and consider only the following in order to determine whether or not the faculty member's rights have been violated:

(aa) whether or not the policies and procedures set forth in Part One, Sections IV (Evaluation), V (Reappointment), VI (Promotion), VII (Tenure), and/or VIII (Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure for Librarians) of this Handbook were correctly followed in reaching a decision affecting the faculty member's professional appointment;

(bb) whether or not the faculty member received a reasonable opportunity to present his/her side of the matter at issue; and/or

(cc) whether or not the decision affecting the faculty member's professional appointment was made in a fair and/or reasonable manner, i.e., whether there was some rational basis to support the decision.

(ii) When hearing a case involving alleged illegal discrimination (except cases of alleged sexual harassment/gender discrimination which are covered by different procedures and not within the purview or responsibility of the Hearing Committee), the Hearing Committee shall determine whether there was illegal discrimination which affected the decision from which the appeal is taken, and if there was illegal discrimination, make a recommendation for a remedy.

(iii) When hearing a case involving alleged violation of professional ethics and responsibilities, the Hearing Committee shall be guided by Part Two, Section II. of this Handbook. The Hearing Procedures provided below apply.

(iv) When the Hearing Committee is hearing a case of termination for cause, the Committee shall be guided by Part One, Section X. J., Termination for Cause. The Hearing Procedures provided below are modified in Part One, Section X. J.

(v) When the Hearing Committee is hearing a case of termination for medical reasons, the Committee shall be guided by Part One, Section X. F, Termination For Medical Reasons. The Hearing Procedures provided below apply.

(vi) When the Hearing Committee is hearing a case of program reduction and faculty reassignment, the Committee shall be guided by Part One, Section X. G., Program Reduction and Faculty Reassignment. The Hearing Procedures provided below apply.

j. Hearing Procedures

(i) A quorum of the Committee shall consist of four of the five members. Alternate members may be used as necessary.

(ii) Hearings involving non-reappointment or termination shall be given preference over all other cases.

(iii) The Committee must request a written statement of the grievant's case and a written list of witnesses. The University representative must be given an opportunity to respond with a written statement of the University's case and a written list of witnesses. These statements and witness lists must also be exchanged between the grievant and the University representative.

(iv) Hearings will be closed unless both the grievant faculty member and the University representative agree to an open hearing. That agreement must be in writing and signed by both the grievant faculty member and the University representative, and will be subject to approval by the Provost and Executive Vice President and the University President.

(v) The grievant faculty member may bring a person, including an attorney, to serve as an advisor. This shall be at the grievant faculty member's expense. If the grievant faculty member intends to bring an advisor, that fact shall be communicated to the Hearing Committee and to the University representative within five University working days of the day on which the grievant faculty member is asked to give the Committee a list of witnesses. If the grievant faculty member brings an advisor, the University representative may bring an advisor, including an attorney if the grievant's advisor is an attorney. Neither advisor may address the Hearing Committee nor question any witness(es); the sole role of the advisor shall be to advise the person to whom they are the advisor.

(vi) Hearings shall be non-adversarial in form and procedure. The Committee shall seek to learn the truth. The rules of evidence binding upon courts of law are not to be observed; however, the Committee shall seek to keep the evidence received pertinent to the issue(s) raised in the proceeding.

(vii) The grievant faculty member may present evidence and call witnesses and submit documentation, all of which must be pertinent to the issue(s) raised. Thereafter the University representative may present evidence and call witnesses and submit documentation, all of which must be pertinent to the issue(s) raised. The Committee may call any witness(es) and request any documentation it deems appropriate and pertinent to its investigation. The grievant, the University representative, and the Committee shall all be given the opportunity to question each witness before that witness is excused.

(viii) A complete transcript of the hearing shall be made, including all written documents submitted by any person or witness. The transcript shall be reduced to writing.

k. Following completion of the hearing and upon receipt of the complete transcript, the Peer Review Hearing Committee shall promptly meet to deliberate and reach a decision. The decision shall be determined, following discussion, by simple majority vote, which may

be by secret ballot, including the vote of the Committee Chair. A tie vote must be reconsidered. In the event the final committee vote is a tie vote, the grievant faculty member's petition shall be dismissed. The Committee may make the recommendation(s) it deems appropriate, within the scope of its charge as stated above. The decision and recommendations shall be in writing. The decision and recommendation(s) must be based upon written findings of fact, which may be a separate document or included in the decision and recommendation(s).

l. The Peer Review Hearing Committee's written findings of fact, decision and recommendation(s) shall be delivered to the University President and to the grievant faculty member within five (5) University working days of reaching its decision. The President and faculty member shall each receive a copy of the complete transcript of the hearing, including all documents received in evidence.

m. If the matter does not have to be presented to the Board of Regents for a decision, then upon receipt of the written findings of fact, decision and recommendation(s) of the Peer Review Hearing Committee, the President shall make a decision. If the matter requires action by the Board of Regents, the President shall formulate a recommendation to the Board of Regents. In doing so, the President may consult with the Provost and Executive Vice President, and with the Deans of the University's Colleges, and in that event the Provost and Executive Vice President and the Deans may have access to the complete transcript, documents received in evidence, and to the written findings of fact, decision and recommendation(s). The President shall communicate his/her decision or recommendation to the grievant faculty member, to the Provost and Executive Vice President, and to the Board of Regents.

n. If the decision must be made by the Board of Regents, the President shall forward his/her recommendation and all previous recommendations pertaining to the hearing to the Board of Regents for final action. The Board of Regents shall deliberate the case and reach its decision. The Board of Regents shall communicate its decision to the President, the Provost and Executive Vice President, and to the faculty member, which may be through the President. The President shall implement the Board's decision.

o. In the event that the case provides instruction to any aspect of the University and its procedures, the President may provide a means for that instruction to be communicated to appropriate persons, with confidentiality of the Peer Review Process otherwise maintained.

p. The President is responsible for safekeeping the record.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FR: Barbara Thiel, Chair, University Curriculum Committee
DA: April 28, 1998
RE: Voting items

The UCC has four voting items: two general studies courses, criteria for the computer literacy requirement, and criteria and procedure for discipline-specific writing courses.

General Studies

Two courses, ENG 210 Survey of African American Literature, and ENG 367 Topics in African American Literature are being proposed for general studies credit in the Literature category and in the Race and Gender category. The course descriptions are enclosed.

Computer Literacy

There is now a SACS requirement that all graduating students must demonstrate competence in the use of computers. Last fall the UCC and the faculty senate decided that this would be a graduation requirement (not part of general studies), and that each discipline would decide what was required for their students, but that there would be minimum standards that all departments must meet.

A committee was formed to develop these standards. The committee identified six skill sets as the minimum that each student must have. These are on the enclosed memo. These six skill sets constitute the voting item. Notice that these are the minimum and that individual disciplines may require higher standards for their students.

The committee also suggested five methods to implement these standards. Departments could also develop other methods. As long as students are competent in the skill sets, a variety of methods could be used for teaching the skills or testing the students.

Discipline-Specific Writing Courses

According to the new general studies requirements that were approved last fall, any department may teach courses that substitute for ENG 291, but these courses must meet certain criteria. Because these courses are substituting for ENG 291, they must have a writing content similar to ENG 291 and a majority of the course grade must come from the written assignments.

The requirement is not designed for a departmental course that is primarily a content course, but also requires a term paper or other written assignments. The requirement is designed for courses that teach writing and require substantial written assignments, but the writing style and/or types of writing are appropriate to the discipline.

A committee was formed to develop criteria for these courses and a procedure for approval of these courses. These criteria and procedure are enclosed and constitute the voting item.

Appendix H

Catalog Information & New Course Form

Sheet 1 of 3

1. PROPOSED CATALOG INFORMATION: (To be exactly as it is to appear in the catalog; limit course description to 50 words. If course has been taught previously as an experimental course, the experimental course must be discontinued.)

ENG 210 Survey of African American Literature (3,0,3) Writings of many genres by male and female African American authors from pre-Civil War to the present; ~~Subject matter will include~~ cultural, political, economic, and social issues. A general studies course (literature and race/gender).
PREREQ: ENG 101 or equivalent and sophomore standing.

2. JUSTIFICATION

University Editor Signature

JWT 15 Apr 98

ENG 210 will provide an introduction to the works of black writers in the United States, while focusing on issues of ethnicity/race and sex/gender. The field of African American literature is dynamic and one in which students have a growing interest. There is currently no introductory level African American literature course. ~~This is an important area of American literature, which should be covered in our curriculum.~~ Additionally, the course will allow another option in the Ethnicity/Race and Sex/Gender perspective category.

- 3.

x	Insert an X to denote that the required syllabus is attached (independent study/topics courses excluded -- enter NA in the box).
---	--

x	If general studies credit is requested, insert an X to denote that a completed transfer equivalency form is attached.
---	---

4. THE PROPOSED COURSE IS A (Check where appropriate):

University Honors		Departmental/Program Honors	
Major/Minor Requirement		Free Elective	
Major/Minor Distribution Area		General Studies Credit	x
If general studies, please specify area(s): (Be sure to note if non-western, historical, or race/gender perspective)		Literature and Race/Gender	

5. SPECIFY SEMESTER/YEAR COURSE INSTRUCTION IS TO BEGIN:

Semester	Year
Spring	1999

Summer 1998

Appendix H

Catalog Information & New Course Form

Sheet 1 of 3

1. PROPOSED CATALOG INFORMATION: (To be exactly as it is to appear in the catalog; limit course description to 50 words. If course has been taught previously as an experimental course, the experimental course must be discontinued.)

ENG 367 Topics in African American Literature (3,0,3) ~~Study of various periods and kinds of African American literature; with a focus on issues of ethnicity/race and sex/gender; Various topics will include cultural, political, economic, and social issues.~~ May be repeated when topics vary.
 PREREQ: 3 semester hours of literature.

A general studies course (literature and race/gender).

2. JUSTIFICATION

University Editor Signature

JWT 15 Apr 98

This course (a replacement for the old ENG 366) would provide more advanced study in African American literature. Focus of the course will be on specific issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality. Additionally, this course will allow students another option in the Ethnicity/Race and Sex/Gender category.

- 3.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Insert an X to denote that the required syllabus is attached (independent study/topics courses excluded -- enter NA in the box).
-------------------------------------	--

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If general studies credit is requested, insert an X to denote that a completed transfer equivalency form is attached.
-------------------------------------	---

4. THE PROPOSED COURSE IS A (Check where appropriate):

University Honors	Departmental/Program Honors
Major/Minor Requirement	Free Elective
Major/Minor Distribution Area	General Studies Credit x
If general studies, please specify area(s): (Be sure to note if non-western, historical, or race/gender perspective)	Literature Race/Gender

5. SPECIFY SEMESTER/YEAR COURSE INSTRUCTION IS TO BEGIN:

Semester	Year
Spring	1999

Summer 1998

MEMORANDUM

TO: Barbara Thiel, Chair
University Curriculum Committee

FR: Niaz Latif
Leslie Turner, Co-Chairs
Computer Literacy Committee Members

DA: March 23, 1998

RE: Minimum Standards and Implementation Recommendations

The computer literacy committee recommends the following skill sets as the minimum set that students must have. Students must have the ability to:

- use a windowing operating system such as Windows 95 or MAC/OS
- browse the internet
- send and receive e-mail
- conduct library research using electronic resources
- use Dial NKU or a comparable internet service provider
- use a word processor such as Word

It is imperative to recognize that these standards represent a *minimum*. Individual disciplines could obviously maintain higher standards.

The committee also suggests alternative methods to implement these minimum standards.

1. A discipline department specific course that meets the requirements above. The department or discipline would have to require this course as part of the major.
2. A new, one credit-hour course could be developed for those disciplines or departments who currently have no course meeting the requirements above.
3. One credit-hour within the existing UNV 101 devoted to computer literacy.
4. A university-wide test out procedure for (2) above. Academic computing has suggested that it is possible to develop a Web-based test out.
5. A departmental test out for (1) above.

Discipline-Specific Writing Courses
Revised April 9, 1998

Procedure For Approval of a Discipline-Specific Writing Course outside of the ENG prefix:

1. Review Criteria for Discipline-Specific Writing Courses
2. Draft syllabus
3. Consult with and receive a written recommendation from the Writing Across the Curriculum director (currently, Paige Byam in the Literature and Language department). The syllabus will be reviewed by members of the WAC Advisory Committee, currently:

Allied Health/Hum SVC--Anthony Mazzaro
Art--Steve McCarthy
Biology--Debra Pearce
Chemistry--Julia Bedell
Communications--Cady Short-Thompson
Economics-Finance-Info--Louis Noyd
History & Geography--Jeffrey Williams
Learning Assistance Center--Paul Ellis
Literature & Language--Tom Zaniello
Management & Marketing--Margaret Myers
Math/Computer Sciences--Dan Curtin
Music--Diana Belland
Nursing Administration--Margaret Anderson
Physics & Geology--Charles Hawkins
Political Science--Dennis O'keefe
Psychology--Perilou Goddard
School of Education--Esther Green-Merritt
Sociology, Anthro & Phil--Rudy Garns
Technology--James Gray
Theatre--Mike King

in order to:

- a) ensure coordination/consistency with ENG 291 and other writing courses
 - b) discuss writing textbook options within the specific course discipline
 - c) confer on ideas for structuring assignments
 - d) discuss methods of responding to writing assignments and handling the paper-grading load
 - e) consider ways of grading both content and writing skills
-
4. Submit final syllabus, along with positive recommendation from the WAC Director, to UCC for course approval.
 5. WAC director meets with UCC or General Studies Committee to review recommendations.
 6. All subsequent offerings of each course should submit current syllabi to the WAC Director to keep on file in order to ensure course consistency.

Criteria for a Discipline-Specific Writing Course

Instructors developing a Discipline-Specific Writing Course should review and comply with the **Course Goals and Requirements**:

I. Course Goals for ENG 291 and Equivalent Discipline-Specific Writing Courses:

1. To write formal analytical essays, including term paper/research-based essay.
2. To read and analyze non-fiction from a variety of sources and/or disciplines.
3. To develop strong research skills using a range of information sources (e.g., libraries, computer data bases, interviews, public events, class visitors).
4. To apply one or more major styles of documentation.

II. To ensure consistency, quality, and comparable work-load in writing instruction at NKU, all Discipline-Specific Writing Courses must include the following requirements, as must ENG 291 equivalent writing courses:

1. Instruction in research methods--use of a variety of sources including computer data bases, evaluation of sources and use of a specific discipline-based citation format, resulting in an extended essay or research paper (typically 8-15 pages).

2. In addition to the research component (see #1 above, often an 8-15 page essay), a typical class would feature at least 3 to 5 other graded writing assignments, usually between 3 to 5 pages each. A typical class would also assign a variety of informal, ungraded writing activities.

3. Several class sessions focusing on different types of readings, with significant time devoted to class discussion of these readings.

4. Several class sessions focusing on writing skills. Sessions should illustrate and require practice in different types of writing skills, such as summary, argument, research, and analysis. Development of the writing process (prewriting, drafts, revision possibilities, peer reviewing/writing) should also be emphasized.

5. Classes should use a variety of formal and informal writing assignments and exercises. Examples of formal writing might include persuasive essays, case studies, literature reviews, research papers, etc. Examples of informal writing might include journals, short response papers, collaborative writing, etc.

6. In order to combine content and writing in the course, instructors are encouraged to use a variety of teaching methods and classroom activities such as class lectures, class discussions, in-class writing practice and/or projects, small group projects and reports, individual conferences, peer editing, and portfolios.

****A majority of the grade given for these classes must be based on evaluation of writing skills separate from mastery of discipline-specific content.**

****Class size should be limited to a maximum of 24 students**

****The course should be 200 level or above. The pre-requisites for ENG 291 are ENG 101 or equivalent and sophomore standing; each discipline should decide if it wants to set its own additional prerequisites.**

**** The course title should reflect that this is a Discipline-Specific Writing Course and the fourth character in the course number should be a W (History 340W, for example)**