FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Monday, April 18, 1988 U.C. Ballroom - 3:05 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. Approval of Minutes of March 21, 1988 and Special Meeting on the Budget, April 4, 1988
- II. Agenda Deletions and/or Additions
- III. Senate President's Report
- IV. Committee Reports
 - A. Benefits
 - 1) Early Retirement Recommendation (voting item)
 - B. Budget

 Budget Priorities 1988-89

 Response to University Budget Proposal, 1988-89
 - C. Curriculum General Studies Course Change ANT 130 American Culture (voting item)
 - D. Professional Concerns
 - E. Faculty Handbook Revision
 - F. Faculty Development
- V. Status of 87-88 Senate Recommendations
 - A. Advising Recommendation (January 26, 1987) (Response from Dr. Darryl Poole enclosed)
 - B. Women's Center Recommendation (November 16, 1987) (Response from Dr. Darryl Poole enclosed)
 - C. SIS Priorities Recommendation (February 22, 1988) (Responses from Drs. Boothe and Poole enclosed)
- VI. Old Business
- VII. New Business
- VIII. Adjournment

NDM/pg

FACULTY SENATE MEETING Minutes of April 18, 1988

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scottie Barty, Carol Bredemeyer, David Dunevant, Lynn Ebersole, Allen Ellis, Andrea Trigg for Andrea Gauthier, Jim Gray, Lynn Jones, Mike Klembara, David Lavery, Nancy Martin, Margaret Myers, Sharlotte Neely, Lou Noyd, Dennis O'Keefe, Jan Prickett, J. Michael Thomson for Fred Rhynhart, Linda Sheffield, Dennis Sies, Barbara Thiel, David Thomson, Robert Vitz, Bill Wagner, Bob Wallace, Ted Weiss, Donald Welti, Macel Wheeler, Geralding Williams.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Rebecca Britton, Gary Cole, Nan Littleton, TOm Rambo, Fred Schneider, Susal Hollis Nakao.

GUESTS: Mike McPherson, Physical Sciences; Rebecca Sturm, Steely Library; Ray Rappold, History & Geography; Bob Bussom, Business; Roy Silver, Social Sciences, Dennis L. Taulbee, Budget & Planning; Jim Hopgood, Social Sciences; Linda Olasov, Education; Garrison M. Hickman, Personnel Service; Paul Mollman, State Manager for Ky. Employee Deferred Compensation.

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

- I. Corrections to Minutes of March 21, 1988.
 IV D. Paper Trial should be paper trail. University 100 should be University 101. "Inviting responses" under IV C. not inviting reponses. IV G. Ted Weiss not Fred Weiss. March 21th minutes approved as corrected. April 4th minutes approved as written.
- II. Agenda Additions/Deletions

Agenda Item 4B is a voting item.
Under New Business add Report on Faculty Benefits by Paul Mollman.
Under 4A - revote on time table for Faculty Benefits Committee.

III. President's Report

Dr. Poole has sent a memo requesting approval of departmental name changes. In the past, some of these name changes have gone through the Curriculum Committee. Faculty Senate has no problems with the proposed name changes: Social Sciences to become Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Philosophy and the Department of Human Services and Social Work to be changed to Department of Allied Health, Human Services and Social Work.

The SACS Committee has completed its work and have been dismissed. Some faculty have noted concern about meetings SACS recommendations. Dr. Boothe will publish the final SACS report for the university at large.

The University Planning Committee will meet April 25. Their work will probably not be completed for faculty discussion this semester.

The "Open House" in Rad Tech will be in September, not April 27.

On April 4, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met with Drs. Boothe and Poole about various college proposals and individual directons regarding work loads and governance issues such as that of the College of Business designation of Active Scholars and a 9 hour teaching load. This was discussed again today and will be again on the May 2nd agenda for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Executive Committee believes that the Senate has been left "out of the loop" on important university governance issues.

Election of Faculty Regent - A faculty member has questioned the legality of the election and whether some faculty have been disenfranchised. The ballots were impounded last week pending today's meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive meeting. Sheila Bell has requested more time to gather information. The Executive Committee has recommended that the election continue with the counting of the ballots. Peter Moore was commended on the thoroughness of his work on all election procedures this year. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee recommends that the President seek the opinion of the Attorney General before next year's election. Questions include who are listed as faculty, tenure-track requirements, and the status of Military Science and Special Faculty appointments Dr. Boothe noted that the Attorney General's opinion does not carry the weight of law in Kentucky.

IV. Committee Reports:

- A. Benefits Bill Wagner of bookgol all markanals A Jenbus sedius I de la compa
 - 1) Early Retirement Recommendations.

The current plan has a 3 year incentive time. The recommendation is to leave a 3 year incentive and to change the current plan of 20% per year to being proportionate to the number of years of service. The "rule of 70" and retaining faculty in group health, dental and life insurance are the same. Dr. Boothe noted the difficulty of any new early retirement plan meeting the new tax code.

Scottie Barty moved we separate the preamble and items 1, 2 and 3 and vote separately. Margaret Myers seconded and the motion passed. Dr. Boothe noted that we have two faculty retiring from NKU this year on the current early retirement plan.

The first paragraph passed unanimously. Item I that retiring faculty be retained in group health, dental and life insurance passed unanimously. Item 2 that retiring faculty be rewarded proportionate to number of years of service at NKU passed 23 to 4 Item 3 that no age limitation other than the "rule of 70" be used passed 26 to 1.

Margaret Myers noted that the committee will meet tomorrow to discuss health care issues. It does not appear as though NKU will have flexible benefits in the near future. The committee will recommend one HMO. one traditional indemnity plan and one dental plan to keep costs as low as possible. The committee recommendation will carry a 30% weight. The administration will carry a 70% weight based on costs. The committee has not seen any informaion on costs. Lynn Jones was commended for her work on the committee. Proposals are being rated on qualitative dimensions such as range of care and range of physicians available. Mike Hickman noted that the state purchasing regulations require that proposals be evaluated before costs are known and that he himself does not know the costs. The director of purchasing has noted that the top 3 plans are within budget requirements. The faculty, staff and Mike Hickman have all voiced concern about not knowing the costs. The committee did discuss in general the proportional amount for single vs. 2-party vs. family so that a disportionate amount could not be placed upon families.

Nancy suggested the Executive Committee discuss the 30%-70% split. Margaret suggested that the faculty be notified that they will need to choose a health plan in the next month which may not include the current family physician. Macel asked if the faculty would be notified before contracts were up. Mike Hickman stated that all employees will be notified of an open enrollment period for the first week in May. All pre-existing conditions would be carried over in any new indemity plan. Nancy thanked Margaret and Lynn for their work.

ReVote on the Benefits Committee Timetable - This iten was passed unanimously in February but was held up because of the Faculty Handbook Revisions. It now appears as though the Handbook revisions will not be voted upon this semester. Nancy will forward the recommendation to President Boothe.

B. Budget - Macel Wheeler and Mark Springer at done at notice dealth motors

Budget Priorities 1988-89 response to University Budget Proposal. The Budget Committee has had two special meetings on the 1988-89 budget and are bringing their priorities statement for a vote. Fred Schneider sugggested (through Carol Bredemeyer) that the Faculty Senate consider a 2% raise instead of 3% and the remaining 1% be used for SACS recommendations.

The Budget Committee proposal passed with 1 no vote.

C. Curriculum - Mike Klembara

ANT 130 proposal to allow non-Western students taking the course for a non-Western requirement passed unanimously.

The General Studies Subcommittee has recommended a change in the general studies requirement which will go to all faculty tomorrow. Two meetings are being held to discuss this on:

April 25, 3-4:30 p.m. BEP 120 April 27, 2:30-4 p.m. BEP 120

This will be voted upon April 28 at the UCC meeting.

D. Professional Concerns - Dennis O'Keefe

Sexual harrassment policy for the handbook revision committee is being discussed.

- E. Faculty Handbook Revision no report
- F. Faculty Development No report
- V. Status of '87-'88 Recommendations.
 - A. Advising Recommendation (January 26, 1987)

Dr. Poole wrote a memo stating this would be considered in relation to SACS recommendation. Dennis noted concern that specific recommendations from over a year ago were not addressed.

B. Women's Center Recommendation (November 16, 1987)

Dr. Poole has reached an agreement with Cindy Dickens to move the responsibilities from Academic Affairs to Student Affairs. Roy Silver from Sociology expressed concern that the program might be lost in Student Services, especially since no one from Student Services came to any meetings concerning Women's Week. He noted that the Women's Center currently services faculty and staff as well as students. Sharlotte Neely noted the importance of the Women's Center to the retention of nontraditional students, especially older women. Bob Wallace noted that the committee studying the Women's Center did not agree with this move in which the Women's Center would lose its independent identity. Margaret Margaret Myers moved we forward to the administration a condemnation of the action regarding the Women's Center. Sharlotte Neely seconded the motion. That action is not in accordance with the Senate recommendation of November 16, 1987 as stated in Item 1 and 2 of Dr. Poole's memo of March 14, 1988. Motion carried 13 yes, 3 no. Dr. Poole will be invited to the May 9 meeting to continue the discussion on the Center.

C. SIS Priorities (February 22, 1988)

Response from Drs. Boothe and Poole. Dr. Boothe had initially concurred with the Senate's recommendation on SIS but now states that all current work on SIS must continue before the work on Senate priorities is begun. No Senate response.

VI. Old Business - None

VII. New Business.

Paul Mollman, State Manager for Kentucky Employee Deferred Compensation distributed a brochure on new fringe benefits now available because of new federal and state laws. He described benefits available to state employees due to deferred compensation. Benefits of Plan I and Plan II were discussed. This year only both plans may be used with a maximum of \$14,813. The plans must be available to at least 70% of NKU employees or used by at least 56% of the employees. It must be available to lowest paid as well as highest paid. Currently 30-35% of state employees participate in one or both plans.

Dennis Sies asked Mike Hickman about University planning for other 401K plans which may be offered. Kentucky had a 401K plan before 1986. Other public entities which did not have plans before 1986 may not now add plans.

VIII. Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

LS/pg



VOTING ITEM

Faculty Benefits Committee for Senate Meeting on April 18, 1988

The Faculty Benefits Committee understands the University has retained a tax attorney to study the University's Early Retirement program. The Faculty Benefits Committee desires the opportunity to review and discuss the results of the attorney's findings.

We also recommend that any Early Retirement Program that is devised contain the following:

- Retiring faculty should be retained in group health, dental, and life insurance plans.
- Retiring faculty should be rewarded proportionate to number of years of service at NKU.
- 3) No age limitation other than the "rule of 70", i.e., retirees years of service at NKU plus his/her age must equal 70 years or greater.

llad 3 ga mention period.

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Budget Committee Macel Wheeler, Chair

Meditale

RE: Budget Priorities--1988-89

DATE: April 12, 1988

The Senate Budget Committee wishes to acknowledge the considerable effort put forth by Dr. Boothe in his reply to the Senate Budget Priorities recommendation. It is appreciated that he made both oral and written responses to the original recommendation. This activity is seen as vital to healthy communications between the administration and the faculty.

The following are offered in reference to the Senate's recommendation and Dr. Boothe's April 1, 1988 response.

- We believe that although Dr. Boothe's response does not meet our expections we believe he has done his very best given the constraints of the current Kentucky budget. We recognize his position but continue to disagree. The faculty and staff should not have to subsidize program expansion by having money which could be used for increases transferred to expand programs and open faculty lines. Our recommendation was that the total number of faculty, administrators, and staff positions should not be increased unless salaries could be increased by at least 5% in each of the next two years. President chose to create three new faculty positions and as a result our pay increase is proposed to be 3%. We are glad the new positions are faculty lines and we are particularly happy that two positions will convert part time to full time. We also support his position to increase part-time faculty salaries. additionally propose that one-third of the newly available \$74,000 be used for another part-time position conversion.
- 2. We wish to encourage President Boothe to prepare a speedy written response to point two.
- 3. We recognize that Dr. Boothe has agreed with the Senate's point three of the recommendation. We appreciate the priority given to academic programing in the proposed budget.
- 4. We recognize that Dr. Boothe has agreed with point four and are pleased to see that he has pledged "that should such reallocations prove necessary all constituent groups will be involved in and informed about the processes and decisions concerning reallocations".



MEMORANDUM " OTHE THE TIME TIME TO THE TEST THE TEST TO THE TEST T backgrounds. This exposure is not particularly necousary for students

Mary Carol Hopkins

FR: Duane Allread, Coordinator, International Student

alternative for them, since it does their them to understand

December 18, 1987 DT:

Proposal for Anthropology 130 RE:

I read with interest your proposal regarding Anthropology 130 as an alternative to a non-western course for international students from non-western countries.

who originate in non-Wastern cultures. The American Culture course is

aken this course in the page

I strongly concur with a measure to allow international students to compensate for the non-western requirement. This requirement, although guite rational for most students (all Americans), contrasts paradoxically for non-western students.

A primary goal of newly arrived international students is to learn as much as possible about the environment which surrounds them, to extract immediate cues concerning local and national culture, and eventually to receive as much exposure as time permits to the Western world.

Anthropology 130 would seem to be an excellent structured focus on needed topics to assist in orientation to non-western students with gradual extensions into further western culture depth.

Anthropology 130 should therefore be acceptable as a general studies course which is necessary to fulfill graduation requirements as an approved alternative to the current non-western requirement.

mjr

Rationale:

The rationale for the non-Western requirement is to expose American students to ideas and cultures different from their own Euro-Americans backgrounds. This exposure is not particularly necessary for students who originate in non-Western cultures. The American Culture course is an excellent alternative for them, since it does help them to understand "ideas and cultures radically different from their own." Additionally, students who have taken this course in the past experience less stress and culture shock and are able to better understand some of the perplexing behaviors and customs they meet up with. This course would not be required of foreign students, nor would they of course be prevented from taking regular non-Western courses. It would merely be a more useful alternative then, for example, a Chinese student taking Chinese history, or an African student taking Peoples of Africa.

I read with interest your proposal requiding Anthropology 130 as an atternative to a non-western course for international students from non-western countries.

1 strongly concur with a messare to allow international students to compensate for the non-western requirement. This requirement, although quits rational for most students (all Americans), contrast paradoxically for non-western students.

A primary coal of newly arrived international students is to learn as much as possible about the environment which actional culture, and extract immediate cues concerning local and national culture, and extract immediate cues concerning local and national culture, and eventually to receive as much exposure as time primits to the eventuality to receive as much exposure as time primits to the feetern world.

Nextern world.

Anthropology 130 would seem to be an excellent structured focus on gradual extensions into further western culture depth.

Anthropology 130 should therefore be acceptable as a general studies course which is necessary to further acceptable as a general studies course which is necessary to further acceptable as a general studies course which is necessary to further.

CATALOG INFORMATION - COURSE CHANGE FORM

| 1. | | | Culture (3, 0, 3) Examination of | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| con | temporary American | culture through comparative s | tudy and American and international | | | | | |
| stu | dent interaction; u | use of observation, interviewing | ng, recording, and analysis; body | | | | | |
| lan | quage, food, dress, | rites of passage, race, ethn | ic groups, sex roles, and social | | | | | |
| org | anization. PREREQ: | consent of instructor or red | commendation of the advisor for | | | | | |
| | ernational students | | 1800 | | | | | |
| 2. | Current CIP Code Proposed CIP Code | | | | | | | |
| 3. | PROPOSED COURSE C | HANGE(S) INCLUDE(S): | | | | | | |
| | 1) Number | 4) Prerequisite/Corequisite | | | | | | |
| | 2) Title | 5) Descriptionx | 7) Deletion of this course | | | | | |
| | 3) Hours | 6) Designator | 8) Addition of computer usage | | | | | |
| | | e: Any two of the first five Three or more of the first five | University Curriculum (Millish) | | | | | |
| 4. | PROPOSED CATALOG INFORMATION: (To be exactly as it is to appear in the catalog, double-spaced, complete, etc.; limit course description to 50 words) ANT 130 American Culture (3,0,3) Examination of contemporary American culture through | | | | | | | |
| | comparative study and American and international student interaction; use of | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | observation, interviewing, recording, and analysis. PREREO: consent of instructor | | | | | | | |
| | or advisor for international students. Satisfies non-Western requirement for | | | | | | | |
| | students from non-Western cultures (Asia, Africa, Latin America, Middle East, if in | | | | | | | |
| | the U. S. 12 months or less). | | | | | | | |
| | University Editor Signature | | | | | | | |
| | DISTRIBUTION: Pagistrar, Printer, Department Chair, Dean, Provost, University Curriculum Committee Ct | | | | | | | |
| 5. | JUSTIFICATION: | (see attached) | and/or University Editor. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| 6. | To be filled out by Office of Academic Computing (if needed): Status of computing resources for the course. | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | Hardware: | Excellent | Adequate | Poor | | n/a | | |
| | Software: | Excellent | Adequate | Poor | Academic | Computing Director Sign | ature Date | |
| 7. | SIGNATURES | 10.2 (2.5 °C) | 4.4 | | 1 00 | DATE RECEIVED | DATE APPROVED | |
| | Original Prop | ooser . | Mary (| and H | pkin Il | 1/26 /88 | 1/28/88 | |
| | Department | Chair . | ALC) | Hyga | rf | 28-Jan. 88 | 28 Jun 88 | |
| | Teacher Educ Committee C (if appropria | hair | | | :(6): | RSE CHANGE(S) INCLUD | PROPOSED COU | |
| | College Curr Committee C | | fiel. | NR | lylint | 2/12/88 | 2/26/88 | |
| | Dean | omputer usagno | Jemy M | W-W | ame | 26FS.88 | Ze Fes, 8 | |
| | University C | | Micha | JAK6 | ban | 29 Eeb 88 | 31 Han 88 | |
| | Graduate Cor (if appropria | | uso ara ni tar | ings of all fill | sa vilosxa ed di | NLOG-IMFORMATION: (T | PROPOSED OAT | |
| | Provost | Amortona . | va s vogmed a | og lg not | den mess. (E. | .0.0) nwith2 oast | iena nii Twa | |
| | | | dal sessos | a lancita | | | | |
| 8. | NUMBER OF COPIES OF THIS FORM REQUIRED FOR A COURSE WHOSE NUMBER LIES BETWEEN: | | | | | | | |
| | 090 thru 49 | | | 00 thru 699 is | | General Studies/Re | | |
| 9. | | TO NKU CURF | | | | Squaths or less). | | |
| | | | | | University Edit | or Signature | Date | |
| 10. | DISTRIBUTIO | N: Registra | | partment Ch | | ovost, University Curricu | ulum Committee Chai | |



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

and be prepared to comeal sufficient resources to serve the needs of the

Memorandum

March 14, 1988

TO:

Nancy Martin

President, Faculty Senate

FROM:

Darryl G. Poole;

Acting Provost

RE:

Faculty Senate Advising Recommendation

For some time I have considered but not acted upon the Faculty Senate's recommendation of January 26, 1987 regarding advising. My reluctance to act has been based, as I told Dennis O'Keefe in our discussion about the matter on my disagreement with portions of the recommendation and my subsequent uncertainty about how best to act to improve advising on campus. With the completion of the SACS self-study, the university now has before it a charge to review the advising system on campus more fully. The attached pages reprinted from the self-study outline what should be done, and the President has asked the major department heads to develop and submit plans for addressing these suggestions. I will see that the Faculty Senate's recommendation is included in these wider deliberations, but I do not feel that it is appropriate to enact such changes without making them part of the broader discussion. Such action will, unfortunately, delay treating the concerns of the Senate even further, and for that I apologize, but in hopes of getting a more workable system, I believe that is the best course.

enclosure

cc: Leon E. Boothe Cynthia Dickens

Dennis O'Keefe

DGP/kac

12. Recommendations and Suggestions

a. Recommendations

(None)

b. Suggestions, Priority One

(1) The University should thoroughly review the current advising programs in all departments and units and implement a more effective advising program where needed.

(2) The University should conduct an assessment of the Office of Financial Aid-including specifically the number of available staff, their qualifications, and student concerns and be prepared to commit sufficient resources to serve the needs of the users as appropriate.

(3) The University should commit more resources to the Advising, Counseling, and Testing

Center, including space, storage areas, and clerical assistance.

c. Suggestions, Priority Two

(1) The University should restore the half-time counseling psychologist to the Advising, Counseling, and Testing Center, or establish other appropriate options.

(2) The University should review student appeals processes with a view toward clarifying and simplifying them.

d. Suggestions, Priority Three

(1) The division of student affairs should conduct a study to determine the types of health care services used by other similar commuter universities for their nontraditional population and conduct an internal study of the health care needs of NKU students during the hours of 4:30 p.m. and 8:30 a.m. and make appropriate recommendations.

(2) The Office of Financial Aid should enforce the requirement for a bachelor's degree for

the position of "counselor" in the future.

(3) The Office of Financial Aid should provide a complete listing of University scholarships, with eligibility and application requirements, which should be compiled and distributed with the Student Financial Aid Application Packet.

(4) The Advising, Counseling, and Testing Center should require all undeclared majors to report to that center for an advising session at least once each semester.

Pages 208+209



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

see as duplicated services which we can ill ifferd

most important thing that is lost by this challen

Memorandum

March 14, 1988

TO: Nancy Martin

FROM: Darryl Poole

Acting Provost

RE: Women's Center

After reviewing the recommendations of all organizations involved, but most prominently that of the Faculty Senate, I have taken the following action:

- 1. I have reached an agreement with Cindy Dickens and have presidential approval to move the Women's Center responsibilities to Student Affairs. This will include the transfer of the existing secretarial position and operating budget. Ms. Dickens has agreed that the primary functions and services to students as I outlined them in the attached statement will be carried out in Student Affairs though the organizational form will likely incorporate the current Women's Center into the Adult Student Services program. This action is in concert with the general intent of your recommendation of November 16, 1987.
- The provision of "adequate" resources for the Center's activities, which is the subject of your second recommendation, is difficult to accommodate. The Women's Center Review Committee Report of May 1, 1987 proposed a full time director who would also be a faculty member, a secretary, 20 hours of work study time per week, internships linked to Social Work and other departments, and, in the future, a counselor. The recommendation for a faculty member/director makes little sense given the move to Student Affairs I am recommending, and the subsequent action of the Senate recommending support for faculty positions as a priority, and the financial circumstances of the institution, make it difficult for me to support any additional positions. I have informed Ms. Dickens, however, that I would be willing to support her request for such a position should she choose to seek one in the future. More than that I cannot do.

3. The location of the Center in a central spot such as the University Center will likely come to pass if it is reorganized with Adult Services and I have so recommended to Ms. Dickens.

I believe that this change will allow NKU to better serve women students, particularly non-traditional ones, and will eliminate what I see as duplicated services which we can ill afford. While there will be those who object to this change I believe it will ultimately mean better service to students and that should be our primary goal. The most important thing that is lost by this change, I believe, is an organization for whom advocacy for women in the university is a primary purpose but it is my hope that other existing organizations, both within and outside academic affairs, will move to fill that void.

My thanks to you and the Senate for your recommendations and your patience.

DGP/kac

Functions of Women's Center

Assistance to students with primary needs -- safety, food, and shelter

Provide information on local and federal assistance programs

Provide support services to women students, including acting as a drop-in center

Provide specialized programs and services for and about women.

Serve as a referral center for women to other available services on campus and in the community.

Serve as a participant in organizing and carrying out the annual Women's Week



MEMOR ANDUM

April 5, 1988

To: Nancy Martin

President, Faculty Senate

Fr: Leon E. Boothe

Re: SIS



In my haste to respond to a Senate recommendation regarding the SIS in my memorandum of February 29, I failed to elaborate more fully in my responsive memorandum as evidenced in Provost Poole's notice to you on March 31. When discussions began several years ago regarding the SIS Project, one of the things that was high on my list of priorities was prerequisite checking and on-line advising subsystems. As Dr. Poole has well described in his memorandum to you, I became convinced that there were certain areas that had to be taken care of sufficiently before this could be done in the way that we would all want it to exist. In giving my approval to the Senate proposal, I am acknowledging my agreement that this is a high priority and should occur as soon as possible after we have developed a system of what the University initially needs. I regret if there was any confusion in my prior memorandum.

mjh

cc: Darryl Poole Gene Scholes Cynthia Dickens



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

Memorandum

March 31, 1988

TO: Nancy Martin

President, Faculty Senate

FROM: Darryl G. Poole

Acting Provost

RE: SIS

The President, in a memorandum of February 29, indicated that he had referred to my office the February 25 memorandum concerning the Senate's vote on SIS priorities. I have reviewed the position taken by IMPC and considered the Faculty Senate's position, as well as that of the Associate Deans, and have concluded it is appropriate to stand by my previous position that the IMPC priorities are the appropriate ones for the university. Attached for your reference is a memorandum I sent earlier to Bob Bussom for the Associate Deans explaining my position. Should the President wish to take a different position on the matter once he has reviewed my statement, I am sure he will be in touch with you.

enclosure

DGP/kac



MEMOR ANDUM

March 4, 1988

TO: Nancy Martin

FR: Leon E. Boothe LEB

RE: CURRICULUM CHANGE AND SIS PRIORITIES

In regards to your memo of February 24 concerning curriculum change for CEP 300 and you memo of February 25 concerning status of SIS priorities, I am happy to give my concurrence.

for a while without concurrently grappling with those additional

SC



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

Memorandum

February 5, 1988

TO:

Bob Bussom

Dean College of Business

FROM .

Darryl G. Poole

Acting Provost

RE:

SIS Work Schedule and a second of the second state of the second s

I have given much thought to the arguments for altering the current work schedule of the SIS project in order to move academic interests, particularly prerequisite checking and on-line advising subsystems, to a higher priority in the work schedule. As the Associate Deans mentioned in their memo, I did, in fact, listen to their discussion of the same concerns in a meeting in September, and, frankly, did not know how to reply. At that time, the Information Management Policy Committee did not seem to me to be able to tackle the issue forthrightly, and I did not know enough, myself, to decide which way I thought it best to go. I have finally concluded that the current schedule is sufficiently in accord with our needs in Academic Affairs that it should be supported, and I have held that position in recent meetings of the IMPC and with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. My rationale for this position is as follows:

- There are some subsystems which simply must, by their nature, be developed prior to prerequisite and advising subsystems. These include, among others, the scheduling and on-line catalog systems.
- 2. The amount of time likely needed to develop the prerequisite and advising systems is greater than the amounts of time available to complete the other subsystems which they would replace. Such change would, therefore, necessitate extending further the projected time of completion of the baseline system.
- 3. The baseline system currently envisioned will provide information resources Academic Affairs currently does not have. I believe we will have sufficient work and new information to keep us occupied for a while without concurrently grappling with those additional systems for advising and prerequisite checks.

- 4. As best I can determine we do not know whether we have the computer capability to handle an on-line prerequisite check. We would need to stop and analyze our computer needs and that would simply slow the process down further.
- 5. I think that we have much to do in reviewing and altering the system of advising and our conceptualization of it on campus before we try to develop a computer system which will support what we want to do. In my estimation it will take us at least two years to be able to rectify that situation and to know what it is we really want. Clearly, it is better to develop a system based on one's needs than to create a system before we know what we want.
- 6. I have met with the IMPC enough to know that the other vice presidents are interested in seeing that more than just their areas are served, and I think Academic Affairs should do likewise even though I recognize, as do the other vice presidents, that it represents the central function of the university. The IMPC has supported a proposal for system enhancements that I made which puts advising as the first priority in such an enhanced list and some sort of prerequisite check, more likely a batch than an online system, as a second priority. I fully believe there will be support for doing these when the time comes. Clearly the vice presidents are interested in beginning the second and third major systems, which are the human resources and financial systems, but they also appreciate our student needs as well.
- 7. The coming of a new project director is not necessarily a time to to re-invent the wheel and reschedule the priorities. This would mean shelving systems that have already been started. It is rather a time for reaffirming that priority and moving on as rapidly as possible.

I appreciate that there are many in Academic Affairs who do not share these views, including the Associate Deans, but having reviewed the available information, and having sat through IMPC meetings, I have decided that we should maintain our current work schedule for SIS.

cc: IMPC

Bob Bussom

Carl Slater

John Johnson

Mary Ellen Elsbernd

Steve Stephens

Tim Serey

Jerry Warner

Gary Scott