FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MONDAY MARCH 23, 1998
MEETING 3:00 P.M.
UC BALLROOM

AGENDA

I.   Call to Order
II.   Adoption of Agenda
III.   Approval of Minutes from the February 23, 1998 meeting
IV.   Assessment of the Learning Communities Pilot Program Report – Fran Zaniello &
       Stephanie Baker
V.   President's Report
       ◆ Collegial Governance Document
       ◆ Environmental Sciences degree program
VI.   Committee Reports
       A. Professional Concerns Committee
          ◆ Handbook coordination
          ◆ Student evaluations
          ◆ Post-tenure review subcommittee report (**Attachment – voting item**)
       B. Budget and Commonwealth Affairs Committee
          ◆ Budget priority recommendations (**Attachment – voting item**)
       C. Curriculum Committee
          ◆ Program changes in B.S. in Finance (**Attachment – voting item**)
       D. Faculty Benefits Committee
VII.   Adjournment

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
~~February~~ MARCh 23, 1998
U.C. Ballroom

Senators present :
D. Agard, S. Cortez, Y. Datta, T. Desai, L. Ebersole, J. Filaseta, C. Frank, (Bredemayer for) C. Furnish, R.Garns, C. Hewan, H.R. Holt , M. Jang, D. Kelm, B. Kempton, P. McCartney, D. McGill, T. Pence, G. Ragsdale , B. Reno, J. Roeder, F. Schneider, V. Schulte, R. Shaw, D. Smith , B. Thiel, J. Thomas
Senators absent :
S. Lassiter, B. Lorenzi, M. King (sabbatical), B. Mittal, L. Olasov (sabbatical) , R. Pennington, V. Raghavan, G. Scott, A. Seed, K. Verderber
Guests:
L. Albert, P. Gaston, M. Gorbandt, R. McNeil

I. Call to Order:
  A. Meeting called to order at 3:03PM
II. Adoption of agenda:
  A. Adopted a presented
III. Approval of the minutes:
  A. Minutes of the Senate Meeting 2.23.98 were accepted as presented.
IV. Assessment of Learning Communities Pilot Program
  A . Fran Zaniello and Stephanie Baker gave an overview of the Learning Communities program. Prognosis was positive and the intent is to the program with larger enrollment.
V. Senate President's Report:
  A. re: Collegial Governance Document: President Votruba has accepted the collegial governance document and will present it to the Board of Regents as an informational item,--not a voting item. His intent is to make a distinction between those matters which are agreed upon between him and the faculty and those in which the Regents have direct participation.
  B. Environmental Science Degree Program: Proposal has been submitted to COPSE and application has been made for its approval by Assoc. Provost Appleson in light of the fact that NKU appears to have been judged by a set of rules different from other commonwealth schools.
VI. Committee Reports:
A. Budget and Commonwealth:
    1. Budget Priority Recommendations were submitted to the Senate. the overall recommendation was that a greater percentage of the university budget be allocated to academic functions with a corresponding decrease in the percentage of the university budget allocated to non-academic function. Specific recommendations in abbreviated form were:
    • Provide a salary pool on the basis of the average increase in the cost of living. This included all teaching personnel.
    • Provide funds to compensate the "average" faculty member at 100% of CUPA salary standard.
    • Provide a benefits package at a level no lower than '97-'98 without an increase in employee contribution.
    • Increase the number of full-time faculty and support staff in all areas to reduce reliance on part-time faculty to levels recommended by SACS.
      [An amendment to the above with rationale was introduced/T.Pence/ to add the statement "and meet the student demands for General Studies courses." The amendment failed}
    • Increase academic units' operating budgets by 6%.
    • Increase the funding for NKU Libraries to develop a core collection of books, periodicals, and electronic resources to support teaching and research.
    • Substantially increase funding for faculty development programs.

- Support programs and initiatives ;leading to improved teaching, improved evaluation of teaching, greater professional development.

2. The following were reported as being among likely outcomes of the new budget:
- 4% allocation of monies for raising faculty and staff salaries; 10% raise for part-time salaries (as part of a plan to raise PT salaries 30% over the next three years)
- Allocation of $400,000.00 to adjust staff salaries.
- a 3% increase in department operating budgets.
- Creation of the office of the V.P. for Multi-cultural Affairs
- $850,000.00 funding for Student Affairs

B. Curriculum Committee:
    1. Changes in the B.S. in Finance were presented. Passed w/ 2 abstentions

C. Faculty Benefits:
    1. The office of the Provost is working on a benefits package for 10 month, part-time faculty which will include an insurance option.

D. Professional Concerns:
    1. A need has been recognized to coordinate statements in the Faculty, Student and Chair Handbooks to create uniforms policies and so prevent potential lawsuits--as we live in this litigious age.
    2. Dennis O'Keefe will be in charge of a subcommittee dealing with student evaluations of faculty.
    3. A Post-tenure Review document was presented for adoption.
    Motion to Amend /F.Schneider: by deleting the section of the document entitled "Required Improvements in the Present Performance Review System" Motion: Passed
    Motion to Amend/F.Schneider: by striking the first part [i.e. 1. completion of comprehensive cost benefit analysis ...prior to policy development of the section] from the section "Required framework for Consideration and Development..." Motion: Passed
    Motion to Amend: by adding the following bracketed items to statement no. 4: "review by deans [and provost] to assure consistency and fairness within and between departments [and colleges].

VIII. Meeting adjourned at 4:07 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Don Kelm, Sec'y.

Northern Kentucky University
Learning Communities Project

March 23, 1998

A **learning community** is "any one of a variety of curricular structures that link together existing courses—or restructure the curricular material entirely—so that students have opportunities for deeper understanding and integration of the material they are learning, and more interaction with one another and their teachers as fellow participants in the learning enterprise." The main idea is to have a single group of students share in the same schedule of classes and thus promote a community of learners who actively integrate knowledge and develop intellectual and social bonds with their peers and instructors.

During its May 1996 meeting the Faculty Senate voted to establish a Learning Community Implementation Team to "begin the process of (1) disseminating information about learning communities to the general faculty and engage them in a discussion of the idea, (2) articulating the varieties of learning communities appropriate for our institution and identifying potential target groups, cluster themes, etc., (3) identifying and recruiting faculty candidates to teach courses in a pilot program for learning communities, (4) developing a procedure for submitting and evaluating proposals for learning communities, (5) developing a plan for recruiting and enrolling students in the groups, and (6) developing a means by which we can assess the pilot program."

In our November 1996 report, which the Senate approved in December of 1996, we outlined the Learning Communities Pilot Program for the fall of 1997 and the spring of 1998.

Primary goals

- Improve the recruitment and retention of first year students.
- Improve student learning.
- Provide a more satisfactory integrated intellectual and social environment for students and faculty at NKU.
- Build a stronger sense of community and attachment to the university.

Objectives:

Students who participate in the learning communities will be more likely than non-LC students to:

- build support groups that enhance their academic experience.
- increase interaction with faculty.
- improve their GPAs.
- develop effective study habits.
- persist through the semester.
- persist into the next year.
- have better attendance records.
- actively participate in the classroom.

- show faster intellectual development.
- get more involved in NKU social activities.
- make better use of NKU services and facilities.
- report greater satisfaction with their work in general studies.
- report a more positive attitude toward NKU.

Faculty who participate in the learning communities will be more likely than non-LC faculty to:
- participate in professional development opportunities.
- engage in active and collaborative learning strategies.
- observe better prepared and more active students.
- interact with students out of class.

We proposed...

Faculty development opportunities and resources for LC students:

1. Participating faculty will be invited to bi-weekly brown bag lunch meetings at which issues and concerns related to the pilot can be discussed. These will also be occasions for faculty to share teaching successes and challenges. Some meetings might be devoted to topics of special interest to faculty teaching in learning community clusters. Though participation in the pilot does not require faculty working within the same cluster to integrate their course material or assignments, our hope is that these informal discussions will encourage and facilitate some interaction.
2. Articles and idea papers regarding helpful teaching strategies and techniques will be distributed on a regular basis to participating faculty. These materials may serve as the bases for the regular lunch meeting discussions.
3. Throughout each semester several workshops will be held for all faculty. Topics will be of special interest to learning community participants (e.g., active and collaborative learning, designing and evaluating writing assignments).
4. At least once during the year we would like invite a speaker to campus for a general faculty workshop/conference on some topic related to teaching in learning communities.
5. We hope to identify a space on campus (perhaps in the library or in the student center) where students in the learning communities can gather informally for study or conversation.
6. The pilot should provide resources for two or three social events for each cohort group and its three instructors.

The Learning Communities Implementation Team included John Alberti (Literature), Marjorie Artzer (Education), Stephanie Baker (Health-Counseling-Testing Services), David Emery (Academic Advising), Rudy Garns (Philosophy), Maria Falbo-Kenkel (Physics), Carrie McCoy (Nursing), Melinda Miller (Math), and Fran Zaniello (Director, UNV 101).

May 1996 Report: *http://www.nku.edu/~garns/lc_senate.html*
November 1996 Report: *http://www.nku.edu/~garns/lc_report1.html*
Fall 1996 Freshman Year Initiative: *http://www.nku.edu/~garns/fyi.html*

I.   WHAT STUDENTS SAID ABOUT THE LEARNING COMMUNITIES:

1.   The entire transition from high school to college was made easier by a learning community. I have made at least 26 new friends and I have plenty of study partners. This is a great idea and I think it should be a requirement for all freshmen.

2.   In most of my other classes it took awhile to meet people in the beginning. It wasn't until the middle of the semester that I could ask those people questions about homework.

3.   I was able to bond with 3+ students on an academic, personal and professional level. We met outside of class to study and chat informally. We created a sort of academic challenge amongst ourselves to do well and supported each other. Did not feel like a stranger.

4.   That I have friends to hang out with, help with homework.

5.   I love the learning community. I was lucky I guess. I enjoyed and made some new friends and kept some old ones.

6.   Being with the same people all day has helped me stay caught up.

7.   The thing I found most positive is that I was able to make friends and not feel like I'm alone on this campus.

8.   Meeting new friends and having a sort of "support system" not only on Tuesdays and Thursdays but whenever I need them or see them on campus. My community has been absolutely awesome!

9.   Students that are in a learning community somewhat "bond together." Basically, it makes you feel as though you belong here.

10.   It makes you feel more confident about doing something if you're with 25 others who have never done it either.

11.   Every aspect of the learning community has been very positive and beneficial for me. It gave me a chance to meet new people which has also helped academically. Meeting new people in the learning community has made my first semester great and lots of fun.

12.   I learned a lot about the campus that I would not have learned by myself. I also loved being with the same people for three of my classes. I believe we've grown up as a group.

II.   WHAT FACULTY SAID ABOUT THE LEARNING COMMUNITIES

1.   Much more class participation. Students eager to help each other. Reduction in speech anxiety.

2.   No one dropped the course. The students made friends and seemed to enjoy being at school more. There was more discussion asking them about how their classes were being conducted.

3.   The sense of community and cooperation in the class. Students helped each other regularly with their papers and also continued meeting in book groups in reading workshop class to a much greater extent than I have witnessed before.

4.   I believe it did create a cohort group/community that the students came to rely upon, learn from and enjoy. We had all kinds of diversity also, even though they were all 18.

5   Sometimes these friendship groups could get a little rowdy or talked to each other lecture, but they responded when I asked them to cut it out.

6.   Their attendance was better and drop-out rate was virtually nil.

7.   Some students might have been better off dropping the class instead of "hanging in there."

8.   They developed their style of relating based on the same norms as high school students use. There were cliques and not much effort to include the quieter (more mature) students. There was more open expression of hostility (toward faculty and other groups who were different).

9.   Some upperclassmen who already knew how to study and had learned to ask questions would have set an example for the others.

10.   They didn't use their association for studying.

III.   WHAT FACULTY AND STUDENTS SAID ABOUT IMPROVING THE LEARNING COMMUNITIES

1.   Do more outside of class activities with the class as a whole. (S)

2.   I think that we should have interacted with the other learning communities so we could have met those people. Also, we should have had more recreational activities like the volleyball tournament earlier in the year. (S)

3.   Need to relate classes to one another. Need more assignments relating classes together. (S)

4.   Have all three teachers know each other and what the others are going to be talking about. (S)

5.   We need more training for faculty re: group dynamics and process. (F)

6.   Base course should probably be a UNV 101.(F)

7.   Instructors need to have higher expectations socially and academically. (F)

8.   Coordinate some assignments and even use the time blocks for field trips and special events. (F)

LEARNING COMMUNITY PILOT REPORT
FALL 1997

NKU'S NEW LEARNING COMMUNITIES PROVE TO BE A SUCCESSFUL ENDEAVOR! Preliminary data analysis and faculty and student evaluation has yielded positive results for the pilot Learning Communities Project. Demographic and performance data was collected on 200 first-time freshmen (FTF) Learning Communities students and compared to a FTF control group. The control group was established by matching LC students to other FTF on the following characteristics: gender, race, composite ACT, date of registration, admission status, number of hours enrolled, and enrollment in UNV 101 course.

	LC	Control Group
Gender M	36%	36%
F	64%	64%
Avg. Composite ACT	19.33	19.34
Restricted Admission Status	44%	44%
Returned spring semester	91%	86%
Fall Semester GPA	2.50	2.51
# of Courses Dropped	34	39
N	200	200

Although there were no differences in fall semester grades, greater numbers of students in blocked classes (91%) returned for spring semester as compared to the control group (86%), and Learning Community participants dropped fewer courses. Learning Community students tended to drop those classes outside of the Learning Community block.

To assess student response to the program, two surveys were administered during the fall semester. The first survey, a University-developed instrument, was administered to students (170 respondents) in Learning Community classes. The survey polled students on their satisfaction with the LC Program and NKU in general and solicited information about students' University involvement. The second survey, the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, was administered to 806 freshmen enrolled in freshman composition classes. The nationally normed survey (over 90,000 students were surveyed during Fall '97), assessed students' perception of importance and level of satisfaction on 83 campus issues. Data were used to compare Learning Community students' satisfaction and importance scores to students who did not participate in freshman programming.

Responses to the University-developed survey questions reflect a high level of satisfaction among Learning Community participants. The percentages which follow indicate agreement or strong agreement with each statement.

% of Students Who Agree/ Strongly Agree

I feel a sense of belonging at NKU	85%
I'm proud to be an NKU student	86%
NKU is committed to academic excellence	90%
I found it easy to establish friendships in my Learning Community	90%
I participated in social and academic activities with LC classmates	77%
I have met with other NKU students to work on class assignments or study for exams	76%
If I had it to do over, I would enroll in a Learning Community	95%
I would recommend enrolling in a Learning Community to incoming freshmen	89%

LC students indicated that they were active in campus life outside of the classroom. To assess out-of-class experiences, students were asked to report the number of times they utilized services or participated in student activities. The percentages of students who participated in these activities two or more times are reported below.

% of Students With Two or More Contacts

I met with my academic advisor	39%
I visited the instructor's office for assistance	34%
I visited Steely Library on campus	90%
I participated in social activities on campus	38%
I have met with other NKU students to work on assignments or study for exams	60%
I talked informally with faculty members outside of class	86%

Although some of the activity levels indicated above may not seem impressive, the LC students' out-of-class involvement exceeds our general perceptions of first-semester freshmen on this campus.

Student comments on the questionnaires were overwhelmingly positive. Themes that students reported were that their LC experiences facilitated the transition from high school to college, made it easier to make friends and find study partners, provided a more comfortable classroom environment (increasing classroom participation), and made it easier to share notes and get help with homework. A few of the numerous positive responses to "What aspects of the LC program have you found to be most positive" demonstrate these themes:

"The entire transition from high school to college was made easier by a learning community. I have made at least 26 new friends and I have plenty of study partners. This is a great idea and I think it should be a requirement for all freshmen."

"I was able to bond with 3+ students on an academic, personal, and professional level. We met outside of class to study and chat informally. We created a sort of academic challenge amongst ourselves to do well and supported each other. Did not feel like a stranger."

"The thing I found most positive is that I was able to make friends and not feel like I'm alone on this campus."

"You are with the same people three times a week. It helps because you know everyone and are comfortable to speak up in class."

"It makes you feel more confident about doing something if you're with 25 others who have never done it either."

"Every aspect of the Learning Community has been very positive and beneficial for me. It gave me a chance to meet new people which has also helped academically. Meeting new people in the Learning Community has made my 1st semester great and lots of fun."

"I learned a lot about the campus that I would have not learned by myself. I also loved being with the same people for three of my classes. I believe we have grown up as a group."

"Students that are in a Learning Community somewhat 'bond together.' Basically, it makes you feel as though you belong here."

Although most students indicated that they would not change anything about Learning Communities, when asked how to improve the program, some wanted a wider variety of classes in the LC blocks and second-semester offerings. Others recommended having more group projects and out- of-class activities.

The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey results indicated that LC students were more satisfied with their college experiences than those students who did not participate in freshman programming. Learning Community students reported higher satisfaction levels on 60 out of 83 items on the inventory. LC students were statistically more satisfied with support services, the commitment the campus demonstrates to meeting commuter students' needs, and with the registration process. Additionally, LC students had statistically higher satisfaction scores on the item "I have found a community of other students who helped me make a smooth transition into college."

Learning Community faculty members were more cautiously enthusiastic about the program. Faculty reported increased class participation, better attendance, less attrition, and a sense of community in the classroom. Less positive comments included faculty concerns about a relatively low maturity level in the group, the formation of class cliques, and the lack of a heterogenous class mixture including upperclassmen and nontraditional students. Most faculty indicated that they were interested in learning strategies to address these concerns. Of the 17 instructors who returned surveys, 15 would recommend the program to their advisees and would be willing to teach in the program again.

Initial review of the data suggests that the Learning Community project experienced success during the first semester. Students were retained at a greater level, and were significantly more satisfied with their first-semester college experiences. Most students reported that the Learning Community helped them find their niche at NKU and facilitated their transition from high school to college. Ongoing research will track LC and control students through their academic careers at NKU.

The LC program will be expanded from ten to fifteen clusters in Fall 98, and plans are underway for Spring 99 clusters which will be offered to all students enrolling in General Studies courses. Efforts will be made to address some of the concerns that surfaced this first year. Those efforts will include scheduling LC faculty meetings and offering faculty development workshops on group dynamics, integrating course content, and active learning strategies.

Many thanks to the following faculty who taught in the Pilot year project: Wanda Crawford, Prince Brown, Judy Bechtel, Beth McMillan-McCartney, Perilou Goddard, John Alberti, Don Krug, Jim Thomas, Sam Lapin, Steven Gores, Tony Mazzaro, Joyce Bauer, Joan Ferrante, Fran Zaniello, Debra Pearce, Stephanie Baker, Sharon Crawford, Mary Jo Beresford, Michael Adams, Norleen Pomerantz, Macel Wheeler, and Carol Connor.

Any questions or concerns about the pilot project report should be addressed to:
Stephanie Baker, Learning Communities assessment coordinator, Health, Counseling, and Testing
John Alberti, Literature and Language
Rudy Garns, Philosophy Department
Fran Zaniello, First-Year Programs

BUDGET PRIORITIES RECOMMENDATION
FOR THE 1998-1999 FISCAL YEAR

PREAMBLE:

In cooperation with the new strategic planning initiatives proposed by President Votruba, and within the spirit of collegial governance, the Budget and Commonwealth Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate expresses a willingness to participate in the budget planning process once it is formalized. Until then the Budget and Commonwealth Affairs committee submits its budget priorities for the coming fiscal year as enumerated below. In order to achieve the goals set forth in these budget priorities and better to support teaching at NKU, we recommend that a greater percentage of the university budget be allocated to academic functions with a corresponding decrease in the percentage of university budget allocated to non-academic functions.

1. Provide a salary pool amount for full-time faculty, part-time faculty, temporary lecturer positions and staff, at the very least, on the basis of the average increase in the cost of living.

2. Provide funds to compensate the "average" faculty member at 100% of the current CUPA salary standard in a manner consistent with the recommendations from the Budget Committee that were approved by the full faculty senate in May 1997.

3. Provide a benefits package including health, life, and dental insurance and the Wellness Program at a level of quality no lower than the package existing in 1997-1998, without an increase in the employee contribution.

4. Increase the number of full-time faculty and support staff in the academic departments and in the library to reduce reliance on part-time faculty to levels recommended by SACS and other accrediting agencies. Such increases should be based on previous planning efforts that occurred at appropriate academic units.

5. Increase operating budgets of the academic units by 6 % to accommodate past gains in enrollment.

6. Increase the funding level for the NKU libraries to develop a core collection of books, periodicals, and electronic resources supporting teaching and research.

7. Substantially increase funding for Faculty Development Programs (i.e., summer fellowships, project grants, and sabbaticals).

8. Support programs and initiatives leading to improved teaching, improved evaluation of teaching, and greater professional development in teaching as suggested in the 1997 report submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Student Evaluation Task Force.

Amendment to budget priorities list

Priority number 4 of the Budget priorities list (changes are in **bold**):

4. Increase the number of full-time faculty and support staff in the academic departments and in the library to **(1)** reduce reliance on part-time faculty to levels recommended by SACS and other accrediting agencies **and (2) meet the student demand for General Studies courses**. Such increases should be based on previous planning efforts that occurred at appropriate academic units.

This amendment adds another purpose for increasing full-time faculty.

<u>Why increase General Studies faculty?</u>

• One of the strategic assumptions President Votruba makes in the Strategic Planning Process document is this:

> As competition increases, colleges and universities offering programs in the region will become **much more "user friendly"** in terms of convenient access to programs, courses and services. Student choice of a University will be influenced by degree of convenience.

NKU far and away leads the regionals in complaints from seniors that their graduation was delayed because of course unavailability. There is reason to believe that much of this is due to the unavailability of General Studies courses when less than 2400 seats per 3 hour requirement are available each year. We are not user friendly or competitive if our degrees take additional time.

• The problem of course availability was significant enough to be one of the problems to be addressed in our SACS self study. One of the recommendations SACS self study report is to hire more faculty.

• It is consistent with the new General Studies Model the Faculty Senate passed last Fall which requires additional hiring to make it work. At the time it was noted that at least 7 more full-time faculty would be required to be hired to bring the Race & Gender Perspective up to user friendly levels. It would inconsistent for the Senate not to support this amendment ("If you will the end, you will the means.").

• It is consistent with faculty priorities of the past. In 1994, for example, our budget priorities list contained the following:

> University hiring of faculty should consider the requirements of meeting the student demand for courses in the Race/Gender category in General Studies. Priority in hiring should go to those disciplines contributing toward satisfying this need.

Salary Policies Approved by the Faculty Senate May 1997

1. Colleges should be raised to 100% of CUPA (or equivalent) and the Deans should distribute the monies equitably among their disciplines such that the overall result would be that the average performing faculty member with an average number of years in rank is at 100% of CUPA (or equivalent) and that faculty members who measure up to a greater or lesser degree would be either above or below the CUPA (or equivalent) average.

The approximate amount needed to accomplish this is $1,338,377. To raise all Disciplines to 95% of CUPA (or equivalent) is $672,927. To raise all Disciplines to 91.5% (the University average) of CUPA (or equivalent) is $347,375. (See Table 8) [Salary Analsis Committee Report Summary p.3]

2. The faculty salary raise pool should be allocated to the Colleges as a percentage of their base adjusted to equal the College with the highest CUPA (or equivalent).

3. Upon the granting of rank promotion, the faculty members will be compensated with the customary fixed dollar amount for rank promotion plus the dollar difference between his/her salary and 100 % of the CUPA (or equivalent) average for the rank the person is leaving. This will apply if the Faculty member has served at least the average amount of time in the rank he/she is leaving (currently: 4 years for Assistant and 8 years for the Associate) and it is not a case of early tenure.

4. Minimally, new hires should be compensated at the national CUPA (or equivalent) average for new hires).

**NORTHERN
KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY**

Economics, Finance, and Information Systems
College of Business
(606) 572-6581

TO: University Curriculum Committee

FR: Anju Ramjee
        Chair, ECO/FIN/IFS

DT: January 16, 1998

RE: Proposed Changes to Bachelor of Science in Finance program.

This memo is a request for approval of program changes, by Finance faculty, of the baccalaureate degree program in Finance. The proposed changes are:

1.   To make the mathematics requirement more meaningful for finance majors and in line with other disciplines in the College of Business;
2.   To provide opportunities for finance students to concentrate in specific areas in Finance (both for a major and a minor) through two tracks - Corporate Finance & Investments Track and Financial Services Track;
3.   To offer four new courses to service the Finance major;
4.   Change pre-requisites for FIN 305 to support the changes in the Minor in Finance to make the minor comparable to other minors offered in the College of Business.
5.   Change the title of FIN 355 from Principles of Insurance to Principles of Risk Management & Insurance to accurately reflect the course content.

The changes in the Finance program are expected to be effective Fall 1999 for the 1999-00 academic year.

1.   <u>Changes in Mathematics Requirements:</u>

Current Math Requirements:	
MAT 102	Business Mathematics
MAT 111	Introductory Linear Mathematics
MAT 112	Calculus for Business Applications
MAT 212	Statistics for Business Applications I
Proposed Math Requirements:	
MAT 102	Business Mathematics
MAT 111	Introductory Linear Mathematics
MAT 212	Statistics for Business Applications I
MAT 213	Statistics for Business Applications II

2. **Changes in Major in Finance Requirements:**

Current Major Requirements: 33 hrs.

FIN 305	Principles of Finance
FIN 315	Financial Management
FIN 325	Capital Budgeting
FIN 335	Working Capital Management
FIN 345	Investments & Security Analysis
FIN 405	Derivative Securities
FIN 415	International Finance
FIN 425	Quantitative Techniques in Finance
FIN 435	Case Studies in Finance

Electives: *two from the following*:

FIN 205	Personal Financial Management
FIN 355	Principles of Insurance
FIN 365	Financial Markets & Institutions
FIN 375	Commercial Bank Management

Proposed Major Requirements:

Required Courses for both tracks: 21 hrs.

FIN 205	Personal Financial Management
FIN 305	Principles of Finance
FIN 315	Financial Management
FIN345	Investments & Security Analysis
FIN 405	Derivative Securities
FIN 415	International Finance
FIN 425	Quantitative Techniques in Finance

Corporate Finance & Investments track requirement: 12 hrs.

Choose two from the following courses: 33 hrs.

FIN 325	Capital Budgeting
FIN 335	Working Capital Management
FIN 390	Selected Topics in Finance
FIN 435	Case Studies in Finance

Choose two from the following courses:

FIN 355	Principles of Risk Management &Insurance
FIN 365	Financial Markets & Institutions
FIN 375	Commercial Bank Management
FIN 390	Selected Topics in Finance

Financial Services Track requirement:		**12 hrs.**
FIN 320	Financial Planning Process & Taxation	**33 hrs.**
FIN 355	Principles of Risk Management & Insurance	
FIN 385	Financial Planning Process & Estate Planning	
FIN 445	Retirement Planning and Employee Benefits	

Changes in Minor in Finance Requirements:

Current Program Requirements:

ACC 205	Financial & Managerial Accounting
	(or ACC 200 and ACC 201)
ECO 200	Principles of Macroeconomics
ECO 201	Principles of Microeconomics
FIN 305	Principles of Finance
FIN 345	Investments & Security Analysis
FIN	Elective in Finance
FIN	Elective in Finance

Proposed Program Requirements:
Required Courses for both tracks:

FIN 305	Principles of Finance
FIN 345	Investments & Security Analysis
FIN 405	Derivative Securities

Corporate Finance & Investments Track:
Choose three from the following:

FIN 325	Capital Budgeting
FIN 335	Working Capital Management
FIN 365	Financial Markets & Institutions
FIN 375	Commercial Bank Management
FIN 435	Case Studies in Finance

Financial Services Track
Choose three from the following:

FIN 205	Personal Financial Management
FIN 320	Financial Planning Process & Taxation
FIN 355	Principles of Risk Management & Insurance
FIN 385	Financial Planning Process & Estate Planning
FIN 445	Retirement Planning and Employee Benefits

MEMORANDUM

January 15, 1998

TO: Professional Concerns Committee

FR: Post-Tenure Review Subcommittee

RE: Framework for Further Consideration of Post-Tenure Review

The items which follow this introduction are intended as a statement of position on the matter of post-tenure review. If adopted by the Faculty Senate, they would govern the further consideration of post-tenure review and the development of a policy, if any, establishing a system of post-tenure review at Northern Kentucky University.

The first section of this statement identifies improvements in the current system of evaluation that we believe are necessary before additional policies or procedures regarding performance review can be considered. The second section lists the additional conditions that we believe must be satisfied for the consideration and development of a post-tenure review process. The final section specifies the principles that should be embodied in any such post-tenure review process to assure its fair, effective, and appropriate use.

Required Improvements in the Present Performance Review System

1. statement of standards for satisfactory performance, developed at the department level and adjusted as appropriate to the distribution of effort of the individual faculty member

2. adoption and use of valid and reliable measures of assessment of performance in teaching, including all major elements: syllabus, content, organization, presentations, assignments, tests, grading, supplemental materials and resources, and student evaluations

3. development of a policy on peer review of teaching, a policy on the use of student evaluations, and an improved student evaluation instrument

4. adoption and use of valid and reliable measures of assessment of performance in other areas of professional responsibility, including quality as well as quantity of effort

5. review by deans to assure consistency and fairness within and between departments

6. increased support (allocation of funds, release time, other resources) for faculty development

7. administrative enforcement of existing options and policies, e.g. unsatisfactory performance evaluations and termination for cause

Required Framework for Consideration and Development of a Post-Tenure Review Policy

1. completion of a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, including potential effects on faculty morale and collegiality, prior to policy development

2. faculty development of the policy

3. implementation of a developmental, as opposed to punitive, process with peer involvement

Required Elements of an Acceptable Post-Tenure Review Process

1. adoption of standards and procedures that protect academic freedom and the quality of education

2. use of the same categories of professional responsibility that are used for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and performance review

3. statement of standards for satisfactory performance, developed at the department level and adjusted as appropriate to the distribution of effort of the individual faculty member

4. review by deans to assure consistency and fairness within and between departments

5. adoption of a triggering mechanism: consecutive unsatisfactory performance reviews or faculty request

6. peer involvement in the formal review process

7. adequate opportunity and means for faculty response

8. at least three possible outcomes or levels of recommendation from the review process: satisfactory performance, minor deficiencies, deficiencies sufficient for formulation of development plan

9. chair, peer, and faculty involvement in the formulation of the development plan, outcomes, and means of assessment, and in the identification of resources

10. ongoing consultation between faculty member, review committee, and chair during plan implementation, with up to three years for completion of the plan

11. use of current mechanisms and standards for punitive action by university: incompetence or neglect of duties as a tenured faculty member for termination (dismissal for cause), with burden of proof on the University