

MEMORANDUM

To: All Faculty

From: Janet Miller, Faculty Senate Secretary

Date: November 13, 1978

Re: FACULTY SENATE MEETING

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held Monday, November 20, in the University Center, Room 108, at 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. President's Report
- II. Old Business
- III. Committee Reports
 - A. Faculty Benefits
 - B. Professional Concerns
 - C. Budget
 - D. Curriculum
- IV. New Business
 - Report on Faculty Development Coordinator

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

November 20, 1978

Senators present: J. Johnson B. Lindsay C. Mulligan-Nichols
F. Rhynhart T. Cate J. Bushee
L. Sutherland B. Dickens E. Goggin
T. Rambo S. Newman J. Williams
F. Steely J. McKenney J. Hopgood
K. Beirne R. Singh J. Fouche
M. Clark R. Peterson J. Miller
B. Oliver L. Giesmann A. Miller

Others present: G. Scholes
Aaron Miller

President Miller called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Minutes of the last meeting were approved. President Miller then recognized Janet Miller, secretary of the Senate, who expressed thanks to Rose Abrahamson and other students from the Model Office Lab, as well as Professors Ann Visnic and Gary Scott of the Business Administration Department, for their help in typing, duplicating, and distributing the agenda and minutes of the meetings.

President's Report

The next meeting of the Senate will be held on December 11, 1978, at 3:00. President Miller reported that Dr. Ralph Pearson, Dean of Community Research and Services, is organizing a Search Committee for a Director of Continuing Education. He wishes to have a representative from each of the major divisions of the University on the Committee. Senators of the various programs should submit names in writing for nominations by Monday, November 27, 1978. An election will then be held. Dr. Pearson wants to meet with this committee before the holiday break.

President Miller reported he had met with the Kentucky Congress of Faculty Senators in Elizabethtown. They have developed a kind of constitution for the group and will be called the Kentucky Congress of Faculty Senate Leaders. Each institution is to be represented by two senate leaders-President of the faculty senate and one other designee. Dr. Miller asked for a motion of support in these efforts. Frank Steely moved that Senate support the President in his work with the Kentucky Congress. Raman Singh seconded the motion. Motion passed. The next meeting of the Congress will be in Louisville on December 8, 1978, when the group will meet with several candidates for public office. Dr. Miller invited any other Senators who are interested to attend with him.

At this point, the President announced a change in the order of the agenda. He had invited Dr. Gene Scholes to the meeting to describe work on the University Ten-Year Plan which includes a study of faculty governance. President Miller reminded Senators he had, at the beginning of this semester, called attention to the importance of considering the issue of various models of University governance and the role of faculty in university governance. Further, he reported that Executive Committee had appointed Ed Goggin chairman of an ad hoc committee to study various structures of University governance.

President Miller introduced Dr. Gene Scholes, who explained the past years work on the University on planning. Under the auspices of the Academy for University Development, President Albright formed a University Planning Council with

representatives from the faculty, students, community, and the management of the institution. The Council's responsibilities are:

1. To oversee the development of a quantitative and qualitative predictive description of the University for 1988.
2. To serve as an advisory committee to the president to develop year by year integrated planning by the University.
3. To provide leadership and visibility to institutional planning efforts and coordinate the work of task force.
4. To serve as resource persons for other specific planning efforts.
5. To serve as a review panel for any planning document which will ultimately be presented to the Regents.

The Council met one time when they initiated their activities. Since then, university management and various others have proceeded in several ways:

1. They have developed a management information report system to produce a yearly document in January, preceding the budget cycle.
2. They are organizing a book detailing program goals and objectives for each sector of the University to help integrate plans and make budget decisions.
3. The developing of a master plan or portrait of the institution about ten years from now.

The Council is looking closely at several issues in terms of ten-year planning:

1. The development of graduate programs at Northern Kentucky University.
2. The relationship of Northern's future graduate programs to the Graduate Education Center.
3. The use of the Covington campus after the Law School moves to Nunn Hall.

Another issue which has arisen is university governance. The kind of university governance structure which would best serve Northern Kentucky University must be determined. Several structures or models are available, including a Faculty Senate, Student Senate, Administrative Senate with some kind of linkage, a University Senate, or something much like we now have. In the process of beginning to look at various models, Professor Bill Oliver, a Danforth Associate, became aware that the Danforth Association was interested in funding studies of various models of university governance. Drs. Scholes and Oliver thought it would be good to get Danforth to underwrite a workshop in order to explore all the models of governance which are available. Danforth's support would enable the University to bring in some outside consultants. Since the Senate has already begun a study of University governance structures, Dr. Scholes noted he would like to involve the Faculty Senate in these plans and in the development of the proposal in particular. Bill Oliver stated his role in the project was to merely help in the writing of the proposal since Danforth Associates have to be involved. Although not a lot of money is involved, he believed the money would be available to Northern. He noted, however, that the workshop would have to include students since that is the only way Danforth would support it. Dr. Scholes remarked that he realized those involved in existing governance structure might have some concern about any study of governance structure. He stated that there is no hidden agenda, but in terms of planning, it is important to explore all the possibilities to try and insure that we develop the best possible structure for Northern Kentucky University.

Scholes then called for questions. Dr. Al Pinelo noted that AAUP has made a series of studies concerning university governance over the years. He wondered

if we would call upon them for assistance in some way. Dr. Scholes suggested that kind of helpful information should be sent in through President Miller, since the committee would welcome any ideas for consultants or workshop participants. Ed Goggin asked about the number of faculty who would be involved in the workshop. Dr. Scholes replied they hoped to involve various leaders of organizations on campus, four or five Faculty Senators and some students ending up with approximately 20 to 25 people. President Miller asked about the kind of assurance Senate might have that the faculty role would not be changed without faculty consent. Dr. Scholes said if at any time there was some consensus that Northern ought to change its governance structure, that suggestion would be brought before the faculty. Arthur Miller asked if any recommendations might conceivably be taken to the Regents without the approval of the faculty. Dr. Scholes did not think that was conceivable. Jim McKenney then asked who would make the decision about whether there would be a change. Dr. Scholes replied that the Regents would have the ultimate responsibility to make a decision after recommendations by President Albright as a result of any proposal which might come out of the workshop. The workshop may result, in fact, in a decision that there should be no change. The Senate should be informed and involved throughout the process. Bill Oliver stated he believed any change in government for the faculty would have to be based on a vote of the entire faculty. Dr. Bushee, noting that the University and the administration, he hoped, had become more democratic, asked what Dr. Scholes, as an administrator, saw as the role of faculty in the decision-making process realizing, of course, that administrators had to make the final decisions. Dr. Scholes replied he hoped the administrative pattern of behavior during the past few years had demonstrated that they are indeed democratic. He then discussed the decision-making process in light of the need for management to make certain decisions, but based on recommendations from faculty. Dr. Fouché asked about the time sequence of the Ten-Year Plan. Dr. Scholes replied, in so far as the workshop and study of governance was concerned, they hoped to be at least close to some decision by fall of 1979. The proposal for the Danforth support would be made by the first of the year. Dr. Pinello asked if the faculty would have the right to veto a decision. Dr. Scholes said he saw no problem in this, since the Faculty Senate and faculty in general would be involved in the development of any proposals for any change. Russell Yerkes asked about the criteria upon which any Ten-Year Plan would be based. Dr. Scholes replied that the master plan involved three components, one of which would be a planning assumptions component. This would be a projection or prediction about enrollments and other influences on the institutions. They will use the figures in their planning but would not be held rigidly to them. Art Miller asked about the work of the Planning Council in regard to any forthcoming document. Dr. Scholes replied that the first draft of any document would be available to the Faculty Senate. He noted, although the Planning Council has not met recently, various task forces and committees have been engaged in developing some documents which will then be used to initiate discussion among all sectors of the University. Janet Miller asked about the makeup of the Planning Council. Dr. Scholes replied that the Planning Council included the following individuals:

Dr. Compton Allyn
Mr. Gene Archbald
Mr. Jack Burleson
Dr. James Claypool
Mr. John DeMarcus
Mr. Dan Dressman
Mr. Walter Dunlevy

Mr. Robert Knauf
Dr. Joe Ohren
Mr. Clarence Tabor
Mr. Dennis Taulbee
Dr. Ralph Tesseneer
Dr. Janet Travis
Dr. Arthur Miller

When appropriate materials are available, the Planning Council will be called back into a meeting. This completed Dr. Scholes report. Jeffery Williams presented a motion on behalf of the Executive Council that, while the Faculty Senate supports the general idea of the workshop on types of university governance, in so doing it does not necessarily imply, (1) dissatisfaction with the present structure; or (2) either support or opposition to any proposals for change. Bill Oliver seconded the motion. Williams clarified this motion by stating the Executive Council wanted to make it clear that the motion did not imply any criticism or prejudice towards the workshop, and that indeed they felt the discussion was a good idea.

Fred Rhynhart proposed an amendment to Williams' motion in that any proposals which might come out of the workshop would come first to the Faculty Senate and that any proposals to change faculty governance would go to a vote of the general faculty. Bill Oliver seconded the motion. The amendment was accepted by the Executive Council.

Dr. Rhynhart, when asked to clarify his amendment, stated that he meant any proposal would come first to the Faculty Senate for recommendation and then would go on to the general faculty. There would therefore be a vote in both bodies, thereby excluding the possibility of the Senate blocking the vote by the general faculty. Al Pinelo raised a question about any changes in the constitution. He believes that it requires a vote by the entire faculty. Ed Goggin responded that changes in the constitution require two-thirds vote of those voting, not two-thirds of the faculty. Motion by Dr. Williams passed.

Committee Reports

President Miller announced a new policy to help keep meetings from exceeding time minutes. The committee chairman have been asked to restrict their status reports to 5 minutes and then move on to reports of actual action by the committee.

Faculty Benefits

Jonathan Bushee, reporting for the faculty benefits committee, stated that decisions on faculty senate fellowships had been made, and should be announced today. The committee continues their work on proposals for sabbatical leaves. Proposals for a project grant are due in January. The tank issue is probably dead. The handbook appears to be in the final proofing stage, while last minute changes apparently were made. Drs. Miller, Fouche, and Bushee found that most of these improved procedures by cutting down on paper work for grants. Dr. Albright inserted in the handbook that the faculty benefit committee will develop and maintain by-laws on the implementation and supervision of summer fellowships, sabbatical leaves, and project grants, with the approval of the president. The faculty benefit committee has a subcommittee working on by-laws for this purpose and they should bring these to the faculty senate before the end of the year. Dr. Bushee talked to Gene Scholes about changing the pay period and was assured that Dr. Albright will make a statement about this soon.

Professional Concerns Committee

Dr. Fouche' brought two items to the senate. He reported the committee had provisionally approved a document on promotion and tenure for librarians which was provisionally inserted in the new handbook. He distributed copies of the original document along with changes that have been suggested by the committee. The document reflects university procedures and meet guidelines accepted nationally

on the promotion and tenure of librarians. The committee recommends approval with the additions as presented to the senate. Tom Cate asked for additional time to read the documents carefully before voting. Jim McKenney asked if the committee looked at the proposed document with the assumption that librarians should be considered the same as other faculty. Dr. Bushee said the committee merely responded to the document not to the issue of the type of appointment librarians should have. Connie Mulligan-Nichols, from the library, questioned the definition of instructor as written in the document. Further discussion centered on provisions for tenure and the definition of scholarly activity for librarians. Jim McKenney suggested that the Senate ought to delay action on this document. Dr. Bushee noted that the handbook already had the provisional statement on tenure for librarians and so there was no time pressure. Additional questions were raised about the authors and various versions of this document. Ken Beirne moved that the senate postpone action until the next meeting, Fred Rhynhart seconded the motion. Jim Hopgood asked if the senate could expect a clarification from the library staff at the next meeting. Connie Mulligan-Nichols replied that they could. Motion passed. Dr. Fouche' reported the committee had talked with the Provost about guidelines for the selection and retention of academic administrators and they have developed a statement of policy which they hope to present to the Regents. Bill Oliver asked about progress on developing procedures for the evaluation of administrators, and progress on the study of possible grade inflation at NKU. Dr. Bushee replied that a committee on academic standards was studying grade inflation. President Miller noted that AAUP guidelines, which the committee is following, call for significant faculty involvement in the selection and retention of administrators. Procedures for doing this would probably include the evaluation of administrators. The committee is working first for a statement of policy to be accepted and then will follow-up with the development of procedures. Dr. Bushee remarked that there already are procedures established to evaluate chairman.

Budget Committee

Professor Raman Singh reported the budget committee continues to work on the development of priorities regarding the budget. Ed Goggin noted that a recent consumer index guide showed increases in cost of living in the Northern Kentucky area. He hoped future salary increases would reflect any cost of living increases. Deborah Pearce asked if the budget committee could do something to cut the red tape currently involved in purchasing materials. After a brief discussion on this topic Dr. Pearce moved that the senate budget committee look into the matter of purchase orders, and the rationale behind procedures. It was seconded by Ed Goggin. The motion passed.

Curriculum Committee

Jim Hopgood distributed a summary of policies and procedures for experimental programs, which had been acted on previously. He then distributed a summary of actions taken at the last meeting of the curriculum committee. Dr. Hopgood suggested that the Senate act on three issues as a group - (a) Teacher Preparation Curriculum Proposal from the Department of Literature and Language; (b) Contract Major Proposal; (c) two new courses (Military Science and Geography). Professor Oliver called attention to the wording in the Contract Major Proposal that according to the consensus of opinion in the Curriculum Committee the statement should read "Unanimously approved with the stipulation that majors in "General Studies" not be considered acceptable as a contract major", instead of "suggestions that", etc. Others expressed agreement with this point of view. Professor Oliver moved that the Senate approve all three items with the wording changed in

item 2 to stipulation instead of suggestions. This was seconded by Larry Giesmann. Motion passed. Professor Hopgood then suggested the Senate defer action on Item Three, dealing with the issue "Topic or independent study courses not in being counted for general studies requirements." Dean Aaron Miller, who had to leave, would like the opportunity to comment on the recommendation. Larry Giesman moved to defer action on this item. Bill Dickens seconded the motion. In the discussion which followed, Jim McKenney called for immediate action. Professors Williams and Bushee expressed concern, because of the importance of the issue and stated they felt the Senate should delay action until it has time to give the matter thoughtful consideration. Deborah Pearce asked whether experimental courses could be accepted for General Studies before they are approved by the Curriculum Committee. Dr. Hopgood said he believed they can be if they are approved by the department offering or recognizing the course. Dr. Dickens suggested that the Senate may be taking prerogatives away from the individual departments if they begin to tell them what can or cannot be accepted as general studies in each department. Ken Beirne noted that the Senate had already begun to change curriculum procedures by not referring experimental programs back to departments. Professor Hopgood replied the department still had the right to approve and disapprove courses. Professor Williams called for the question on the motion to defer action on this issue until the next meeting. Motion passed. At this time Professor Oliver raised a question about another item from the Curriculum Committee. He believes the Curriculum Committee was not within its authority in referring the issue of Honor Programs to the Curriculum Committee. As he recalled, the Senate had refused to endorse the concept of an Honors Program. A lengthy discussion followed regarding the intent of the motion on the Honors Program proposal and further study of a program that failed at the previous meetings. When asked about the motion that was tabled, the Parliamentarian said this could be removed by a motion from the main body. The motion that was tabled, however, involved turning over specific information to the Senate, not the issue of an Honors Program proposal or further study of an Honors Program. The motion that was defeated referred to further study of the Honors Program. The senate discussed whether it meant to defeat the specific motion or the concept of an Honors Program. Dr. Williams stated he recalled arguing against the particular motion not the concept. Further, since that meeting a number of faculty at large had expressed concern about an Honors Program. Deborah Pearce recalled the confusion of the discussion at the previous meeting as well as the lateness of the day when the vote was taken. She believes the matter should be brought up before the Senate adjourns to see if there is enough interest in Honors Programs in general to continue to look into the proposition of establishing a program at NKU. Bill Oliver, however, asked the Executive Committee to withdraw their actions. Fred Rhynhart moved that the Senate instruct the Curriculum Committee to form a sub-committee to study the Honors Program further, and to report back through the Curriculum Committee to the Senate as a whole. The Senate at that time would determine if they want a specific recommendation or proposal brought forward. This would put the Senate on record in support of the idea and give them more time to consider the issue and decide whether they want to develop a specific proposal for an Honors Program. For a lack of a second the motion died. At this point Bill Oliver moved that the Senate reject the actions of the Executive Committee in referring the Honors Program to the Curriculum Committee. Motion was seconded by Ken Beirne. In the discussion which followed, Dr. Williams again stated that the intent of the Executive Committee was to respond to issues brought to their attention by various faculty members. Beirne noted that he felt the Executive Committee exceeded their authority. On a role call vote, 12 voted in favor of the motion, 7 against the motion. The motion passed. Jonathan Bushee moved that the Faculty Senate refer the issue of Honors Programs to the Curriculum Committee. They should take a new look at the possibility of an Honors Program and

and bring forth a specific recommendation. This was seconded by Fred Rynhart, motion passed.

New Business

President Miller introduced Mike Klembara, whom he had asked to inform the Senate about the new position of Faculty Development Coordinator. Dr. Klembara described the position which resulted from a recommendation of the Teacher Effectiveness Study Committee at Northern. This committee has been looking into the issues of teacher effectiveness for approximately two years. The administration responded with the approval of a half-time reassigned time appointment. The Committee called for applications. After receiving a number of applications, the Committee reviewed them and found none acceptable. Now they have called for more applications and are in the process of reviewing those. The individual who will assume this position, Dr. Klembara noted, will be in a position to have a significant affect on the quality of students' experiences on campus. The Committee has put as many safeguards as possible to prevent any punitive aspects associated with the position. It is housed under the Experimental Dean and officed in the library. The new appointee will be there if teachers want them and will probably not be in contact with the faculty in general. Tom Cate noted the Committee had raised the issue of input and how that was evaluated. He wondered how the Committee felt about the quality of output and how that is measured. Klembara responded there are many ways to measure teacher effectiveness. The Faculty Development Coordinator position, he said, will be a difficult one to administer and the individual might well be more of an ombudsman. Oliver noted the importance of getting a good person or none at all. The chemists, he said, are not necessarily in favor of the position but if such a position is filled it is important that it be a highly effective person. Klembara responded that teaching effectiveness is especially important at Northern because of the potential public relations benefits. As chairman of the Committee, he assured the Senate that his Committee looks upon this as a very important position and will make every effort to get the very best person.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

4.5 Promotion and tenure for Librarians

Librarians at Northern Kentucky University have faculty status and rank. The master's degree in library science is considered to be the appropriate terminal degree and it is necessary for appointment to a library faculty position.

Policies and procedures concerning appointment, promotion, tenure and termination as outlined in the faculty handbook apply to librarians. Librarians have responsibilities different from other faculty, work on twelve month contracts, and devote specified hours a week to their professional assignments in the library. Therefore, certain modifications in criteria used in evaluation for tenure and promotion as presented in the handbook have been made. Effective performance on the job is substituted for teaching, and the definition of scholarly activity has been broadened. Detailed standards are presented below.

Librarians are evaluated for tenure and promotion on the basis of a continuing record of achievement and evidence of professional development. A strong performance in the first category (4.5.1) is mandatory. The other categories are supplemental to job performance. It is the quality and value of the contribution made in the activities of these categories (4.5.3 and 4.5.4), not the number of activities, which influence the decision of the tenure and promotion recommendations of the department.

4.5.1 Effective performance of the library position.

Effective performance requires

4.5.1.1 Meeting the responsibilities of the position successfully and efficiently.

4.5.1.2 Demonstration of job performance in:

Innovation and initiative.

The ability to determine and assign work priorities and/or staff duties.

The ability to handle increased or new responsibilities.

4.5.1.3 Integrating the area of responsibility with the library as a whole by demonstrating

An understanding of overall library operations;

A commitment to the library's goals of education and service;

A knowledge of new developments in library science and technology;

A willingness to use suggestions, criticisms and evaluations to improve performance.

4.5.2 Ranks for Librarians:

Instructor of Library Services. Sound educational background for position including significant progress in completion of terminal degree (M.L.S.) with definite plans for continued professional study leading to that degree; teaching potential or appropriate experience in academic work at the elementary, secondary or college level, including university assistantship or comparable experience in business, industry, or government service;

Assistant Professor of Library Services. Sound educational background for the position including the appropriate terminal degree (M.L.S.); demonstrated potential for librarianship including appropriate academic course work and/or comparable experience. An assistant professor may expect to be considered for promotion at any time and must be considered for promotion after a period of not more than six years in this rank.

Associate Professor of Library Services. Qualifications of the previous rank plus appropriate terminal degree; a record of effectiveness as a university librarian; a record of participation in professional organizations; service on library or university committees; a record of scholarly activity. An associate professor may be considered for promotion at any time and must be considered for promotion after a period of not more than eight years in this rank.

Professor of Library Services. Qualifications of the previous rank plus appropriate terminal degree; achievement of full maturity as an effective and creative university librarian; a record of significant contributions as a member of library and university committees; regional or national recognition in special professional field; a record of significant scholarly productivity; indication of respect and esteem of colleagues and support staff; recognition and respect for participation and service in worthy community, state, or nationwide activities; professional recognition at the regional or national level.

4.5.3 Scholarly activity in the library profession.

Examples of such activity which contribute to the growth of the individual and the profession are:

Activity in publication as an editor or author of monographs, journal articles, review or teaching materials.

Activity in professional organizations and meetings including service as a speaker, officer, panel member or committee member;

Activity in library education including formal classroom instruction, serving as a consultant, and conducting workshops, conferences or other informal education activities;

Activity in research, study and special projects including research applied to library programs and extension of professional knowledge and competency through formal and informal education.

4.5.4 Significant service to the department, the University and the community.

Evidence of such service includes effective participation in:

Department committees and other responsibilities as a department member;

Faculty Senate and its committees;

University committees and functions and activities of university-related groups;

Community activities and public appearances which involve the faculty member in a professional capacity.

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Meeting of 9 November 1978 - Summary of Actions

- 1) Teacher Preparation Curriculum Proposal from the Dept. of Literature and Language: unanimously approved
- 2) Contract Major Proposal: Unanimously approved with the suggestion that majors in "General Studies" not be considered acceptable as a contract major
- 3) Jim McKenney introduced a motion that "the Curriculum Committee recommend to the Faculty Senate that 'topic' and independent study courses not be counted for General Studies requirements." Motion seconded by J. Warner. After considerable debate, the motion passed 5 to 4.
- 4) X The following new courses were approved:
 - MSC 224 Today's Army (1,0,1)
 - GEO 2__ Maps and Map Interpretation (3,0,3)
- 5) Other business: The chair announced an action of the Executive Committee of the Senate which referred the question of an honors program at NKU to the Curriculum Committee "for further study, and a specific recommendation." The chair requested volunteers to serve on an ad hoc committee to consider this y issue and to report back to the full committee. The following persons volunteered:
 - Jim McKenney, chair
 - Bill Dickens
 - Paul Bishop
 - Terry McNally

SUMMARY OF POLICIES & PROCEDURES, EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS

The following items constitute the major policies and procedures of the Office of Experimental Programs relating to experimental academic work at the University. All items have been endorsed by the Experimental Programs Advisory Committee and, with the exception of item 9, which is more a guideline for action than a definitive policy or procedure, have been approved by vote by the Faculty Senate and the University Curriculum Committee.

Summary of Policies & Procedures, Experimental Programs

1. The Experimental Programs Advisory Committee, to consist of four faculty members, two students, and one representative of academic support services, will assist the Dean in the development of policies and procedures and will screen, approve (or disapprove), and assist in the evaluation of all experimental courses.
2. Advisory Committee members will be appointed each year by the Student Government Association (2), the Faculty Senate (1), and the Dean of Experimental Programs (4).
3. Experimental courses may be offered twice with the approval of the Advisory Committee. If, after the second offering, a course has not been absorbed into the curriculum of an existing department/program, and its author wishes to offer it again and the Advisory Committee considers it worthy of continuation, it will be submitted to the University Curriculum Committee for approval as a continuing EXP course, subject to periodic review.
4. All Experimental courses are offered for regular academic credit as electives.
5. Departments/Programs are encouraged to consider cross-listing any EXP course which bears sufficient content to be considered worthy of elective credit toward the respective major.
6. As many as three co-sponsored, cross-listed EXP courses may be used by students to satisfy the General Studies requirement(s) in the appropriate subject-area(s). The prerogative and responsibility for deciding which cross-listed courses may be used for General Studies credit rest with the Chairperson(s) of the cooperating department(s) or program(s). In unusual cases, a student may petition the appropriate chairperson and disciplinary Dean for permission to use a fourth such course for General Studies credit.
7. Enrollment figures (both headcount and FTE) in Experimental courses will be attributed to the departments/programs of the faculty members teaching the courses. Counts accruing to EXP courses taught by members of the administration and staff will be placed in a University pool, except in cases in which such a course is co-sponsored and cross-listed by a department/program. In those cases, the count will be attributed to the co-sponsoring unit.

8. New academic programs originating or developing under the administrative aegis of Experimental Programs will be submitted for review, approval and accreditation to the authorized faculty and administrative bodies which bear institutional responsibility for these procedures.
9. In addition to fostering experimental courses and related programs, the Dean of Experimental Programs will encourage and, as his resources permit, will support experimental projects undertaken within the existing departments and programs of the University.

MEMORANDUM

May 10, 1978

TO: The Faculty

FR: Teaching Effectiveness Task Force and
Dr. Janet Travis, Provost *JT*

RE: Faculty Development Coordinator

A "Teaching Effectiveness Task Force" was organized last spring by Provost Travis. The basic mission of this Task Force is to provide support for the continuing improvement of teaching. Members of the Task Force are Janet Johnson, Thad Lindsey, George Manning, Kent Curtis, Russell Yerkes, Jerry Carpenter, Mike Klembara, Jack Wann and Lyle Gray.

Activities of the Task Force to date have included surveying literature and resources available through specialists in faculty development. Initial sessions have addressed themselves to the various situations that involve teaching at N.K.U., skills or approaches involved in effective teaching, and other factors relevant to teaching. In addition, a bibliography of N.K.U. library resources has been compiled.

Throughout our exploratory work, the necessity for this program to evolve from the faculty has been stressed. The responsibility for teaching improvement, both in content and teaching process, rests with the individual faculty member. The role of the Task Force has been to assist the faculty member.

To help provide this assistance, a half-time coordinator of faculty development with a small operating budget has been approved for the 1978-1979 academic year. This memo is to solicit applications from teaching faculty for the position of Faculty Development Coordinator. A position description is attached. All applications should be submitted to Janet Johnson, Nunn 544, by Friday, June 9, 1978. Task Force members will serve as the selection committee, and questions may be addressed to them.

5/10/78

CALL FOR APPLICATIONS

Position: Faculty Development Coordinator

Position Description: The Coordinator will be selected by the Task Force. Neither the Task Force or the Coordinator have any judgmental or evaluative purposes related to teaching effectiveness. Rather, the Coordinator will be strictly a resource person.

Duties will include: to identify and make available resources for continuing improvement of university teaching, to identify faculty requests and needs for resources, to provide assistance directly or indirectly to individual and groups of faculty members as requested, to plan and implement activities based on faculty input. Examples of activities may include seminars on writing for publication, workshops on topics such as innovations in teaching, evaluating student outcomes, organization of courses.

Requirements: Full-time N.K.U. teaching faculty member with interest in and knowledge of faculty development resources. Credibility as an effective teacher, ability to interact effectively with colleagues, ability to organize and direct appropriate activities.

Compensation: One-half reassigned time, opportunity to attend conferences and visit other universities.

Application Data: Vita, Statement of how and why applicant considers him or herself a viable candidate for the position.

Submit to: Janet M. Johnson, Nunn 544, 292-5236

Application Deadline: June 9, 1978