



Faculty **S**enate

HIGHLAND HEIGHTS KY 41099 606-572-6400

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

MONDAY APRIL 20, 1998

MEETING 3:00 P.M.

BEP 461

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Adoption of Agenda
- III. Approval of Minutes from the March 23, 1998 meeting
- IV. President's Report
 - ◆ Faculty Leadership Award
 - ◆ Health Insurance
- V. Committee Reports
 - A. Professional Concerns Committee
 - ◆ Proposed Revision of Handbook – Peer Review (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - B. Budget and Commonwealth Affairs Committee
 - C. Curriculum Committee
 - 1. Program change in Accounting major (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - 2. Program changes in Anthropology major (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - 3. Program changes in Radiologic Technology (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - 4. Race and Gender criteria (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - 5. Prerequisites for upper division courses (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - 6. Policy on program changes (**Attachment – voting item**)
 - D. Faculty Benefits Committee
- VI. Business
 - ◆ Vacation Accrual Handbook Changes for Department Chairs and Twelve (12) Month Faculty (**Attachment – voting item**)
- VII. Adjournment



Faculty Senate

HIGHLAND HEIGHTS KY 41099 606-572-6400

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

April 20, 1998
BEP 461

Senators present:

D. Agard, S. Cortez, Y. Datta, T. Desai, L. Ebersole, J. Filaseta, C. Frank, (C. Bredemeyer) for C. Furnish, R. Garns, C. Hewan, R. Holt, M. Jang, B. Lorenzi, P. McCartney, D. McGill, T. Pence, G. Ragsdale, B. Reno, J. Roeder, F. Schneider, G. Scott, A. Seed, R. Shaw, D. Smith, B. Thiel, J. Thomas

Senators absent:

D. Kelm, B. Kempton, M. King (sabbatical), S. Lassiter, B. Mittal, L. Olasov (sabbatical), R. Pennington, V. Raghavan, V. Schulte, K. Verderber

Guests:

M. Ferrante, N. Campbell, B. Andersen, P. Reichardt, R. McNeil, M. Huening

I. Call to Order:

A. Meeting called to order at 3:03 PM.

II. Adoption of Agenda

A. Adopted as amended.

III. Approval of the minutes

A. Minutes of the Senate meeting 3.23.98 were approved as amended.

IV. Senate President's Report

A. Faculty Leadership Award was presented to Carol Bredemeyer, Chase Law Library.

B. Health Insurance: Chuck Frank gave an update on the upcoming rebid process and Margo Ferrante was available to answer questions. The Health Alliance is being eliminated by the state legislature, so we must rebid for a health insurance provider for 1999. The university is investigating three avenues: bidding for a single provider (with multiple plans), self-insuring (with a third party administrator), or participate in the state's offered plans (this has not been favorably viewed by the state before). The Health Care Utilization Committee will be looking a five values:

- Affordable coverage that includes HMO, POS, PPO and, possibly, fee for service.
- Access to an extensive primary care physician and specialist network with attention to pediatric groups, female physicians, mental health providers and pharmacy access.
- A regional hospital network.
- Out-of-service area coverage that addresses international coverage.
- Timely and extensive claim reporting.

Pre-existing conditions should be waived for open enrollment. The committee will include this provision in their values. Formulary practices of carriers will be carefully examined also.

V. Committee Reports:

A. Professional Concerns:

1. Post-tenure review subcommittee has begun its work based upon the adoption of the Post-tenure review document by the Senate last month.

2. Proposed revision of the Peer Review policy was presented by F. Schneider. The new key elements are: include a University Representative to present the "other side" of the story; and allow the possibility of informal settlement in particular cases.

Motion to postpone the vote until the May 13th meeting: Filaseta/Shaw. Motion passed.

B. Budget:

No report.

C. Curriculum:

1. Changes in the Accounting major were presented. **Passed** with 2 abstentions.
2. Changes in the Anthropology major were presented. **Passed** with 2 abstentions.
3. Changes to the Race and Gender criteria were presented. **Passed** with 2 abstentions.
4. Changes in the prerequisites for upper division courses were presented. **Passed** with 2 abstentions.
5. Changes in the policy on program changes were presented. The proposal voted on was:
Significant program changes must be approved by the Faculty Senate after approval of the UCC. Minor program changes do not need Senate approval. The UCC will decide whether a change is minor or significant. The decision must be unanimous. If even one UCC member disagrees, then the change will be sent to the Senate.
Proposal **passed** with 2 abstentions.

D. Benefits:

1. A workshop for applicants of faculty development programs will be held on Tuesday, April 28 at 3:00 in AC 722.

VI. Business:

- A. Vacation accrual handbook changes for twelve month faculty were presented. **Passed.**

VII. Adjournment:

- A. Meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

D. Smith
Donna Smith

Health Insurance Values Statement

1. Affordable coverage that includes HMO, POS, PPO and, possibly, fee for service.
2. Access to an extensive primary care physician and specialist network with attention to pediatric groups, female physicians, mental health providers and pharmacy access.
3. A regional hospital network that covers Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky, particularly inclusive of St. Elizabeth and St. Luke, as well as emergency room service.
4. Out-of-service area coverage that addresses international coverage.
5. Timely and extensive claim reporting.

Frank
DRAFT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Chuck Frank
Ms. Cheryl Torline

DATE: March 30, 1998

RE: 1999 Health Insurance ReBid

The passage of HB 315 eliminates the Kentucky Health Purchasing Alliance through a phase-out approach. While the Alliance will remain operational through early 1999, NKU will not be in position to renew our coverage effective January 1, 1999. In anticipation of this change in coverage, the Health Care Utilization Committee is beginning immediately to plan for the rebid of health insurance. The following calendar is anticipated:

May 15	Complete plan components and values inventory
June 1	Complete first draft of health insurance Request for Proposal
July 1	Issue Request for Proposal
August 15	Open proposals for health insurance coverage
October 1	Award contract
November 10	Begin open enrollment
November 30	Close open enrollment and begin payroll deduction process
January 1	Begin first year of coverage

The participation of the Faculty Senate and Staff Congress Benefit Committees in reviewing and commenting on the plan components and values inventory. Attached is a list of NKU values for health care coverage. Your reaction by May 1 would be appreciated. A list of plan components will be forthcoming.

Carla S. Chance

cc: President James Votruba
Vice Presidents/Budget Director
Members, Health Care Utilization Committee

Date: Thu, 02 Apr 1998 11:43:43 -0500
From: Margo Ferrante <FerranteM@NKU.EDU>
Subject: Health Care values
To: adamspe@NKU.EDU, frank@NKU.EDU
Cc: chance@NKU.EDU

Chuck and Peg,

Thank you for meeting with me today regarding the health care values. We agreed on the following issues in priority order:

1. Affordable coverage that includes HMO, POS, PPO and possibly, fee for service.
2. An extensive primary care physician and specialist network with attention to pediatric groups, female physicians, mental health providers and pharmacy access.
3. A hospital network that covers Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky. Particularly inclusive of St. Elizabeth and St. Luke as well as emergency room coverage.
4. Out of service area coverage that includes foreign locations.
5. Timely and extensive claim reporting.

We agreed that these would be the "core" issues on which we would screen providers. Secondary items, used as a possible second screen to the review process include:

Formulary practices relating to pharmacy services. This would include generic vs. brand pharmaceuticals and physician recommended vs. less costly brand issues.

Durable or expendable goods coverage. This includes coverage for items such as diabetic supplies, compression hose, shoe inserts, etc.

Definition of emergency and emergency room usage, both in the coverage area and outside the coverage area.

The final items we agreed would be used via calls to references provided by the health care providers:

Bill payment in a timely fashion, particularly for those who choose the POS or PPO plans.
Referrals provided in a timely manner.

Member services response time to phone calls (do you have to wait for a human voice) as well as timeliness in solving the problem (more than one call, talking to different people, etc.)

If I have missed anything, please contact me. Otherwise, feel free to share this with the relevant groups for feedback.

Thanks again,
Margo

MEMORANDUM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DRAFT OF PROPOSED REVISION OF HANDBOOK - PEER REVIEW
(as approved by the Professional Concerns Committee on March 12²⁶, 1998)

B. PEER REVIEW PROCESS.

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

1. MATTERS SUBJECT TO PEER REVIEW

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

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

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

2. COMPOSITION OF PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. PROCEDURE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

i. Scope of Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

j. Hearing Procedures

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

p. The President is responsible for safekeeping the record.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FR: Barbara Thiel, Chair, UCC
DA: April 2, 1998
RE: Voting items

The UCC has six voting items: three program changes, changes to the Race and Gender criteria of general studies, the institution of mandatory prerequisites for upper division courses, and an item concerning what types of program changes should go to the senate for approval.

Program changes:

1. Accounting major. The following will be added to the requirements for the major: 6 hours of a foreign language or high school equivalent.
2. Anthropology major. There are two additions to the requirements for the major:
 - A. In the core courses the student must have at least a 2.5 average and no course grade lower than a C.
 - B. Add ANT 490 Advanced Anthropological Concepts to the required courses. This course will serve as part of the anthropology program assessment.
Course description: Assessment testing, directed readings, and individual projects in anthropology. PREREQ: anthropology major, senior standing, at least 24 hours in anthropology (at least 9 of these at the 300 or 400 level), and consent of instructor. Should be taken in the student's last semester. (1 hour credit)
3. Radiologic Technology. Two changes will be made to the requirements:
 - A. Delete RAD 227 Radiographic Practicum VI. This information is now covered in other courses.
 - B. Add RAD 290 Radiography Seminar. Comprehensive review and assessment of essential concepts in radiography; preparation for ARRT.

Race and Gender criteria.

As part of the new general studies requirements that were approved last fall, a committee was to be formed to review the race and gender category criteria to see if they should be changed. The committee and the UCC has decided to leave the criteria essentially as they are. The committee's rationale is on the enclosed page. The following changes were made: "race" was changed to "race/ethnicity" and "gender" was changed to "sex/gender". The criteria are on the enclosed page.

Another change approved last fall was the elimination of the restrictions on certain department's ability to offer race and gender courses. Because of this, more courses can now be added to this category.

Prerequisites for upper division courses.

Currently, the UCC has an informal policy that upper-division courses must have a prerequisite, but there is no formal policy in the curriculum manual. As a result of the SACS self-study, the executive committee of the faculty senate asked the UCC to look into this issue to see if we should have a formal policy. The UCC has decided that all upper division courses should have a prerequisite. The following should be added to the Curriculum Manual and therefore will be mandatory:

All upper division courses must have a prerequisite.

Prerequisites may be of three types:

- 1) a specific course is specified: e.g. SOC 100
- 2) a number of hours in a discipline is specified: 3 hours in sociology
- 3) a specific student standing is specified: junior standing.

To handle special cases "or consent of instructor" may be added to the prerequisite listing.

Policy on program changes.

According to current policy, all program changes (changes to the requirements for a major or minor) must be approved by the faculty senate after they have been approved by the UCC. Even if the change is very minor, such as adding one course to a distribution list, or substituting one course for another, it still must go to the senate. The UCC does not think this is necessary. UCC approval should be sufficient for minor program changes.

Also, senate approval lengthens the approval process for departments. This is particularly important in October, when the catalog deadline must be met. This is also a concern in

the senate, because so many changes come to the senate before the catalog deadline. If we can cut down on the approval process, there will not be such a large number of curriculum items at the senate in October.

The UCC proposes the following change to the UCC regulations:

Significant program changes must be approved by the faculty senate after approval by the UCC. Minor program changes do not need senate approval. The UCC will decide whether a change is minor or significant. The decision must be unanimous. If even one UCC member disagrees, then the change will be sent to the senate.

Category Title: Ethnicity/Race and Sex/Gender Perspective

Criteria:

1. Make ethnicity/race and sex/gender the central focus of the course. Courses that include consideration of ethnicity/race and sex/gender issues as part of some other topic shall not be included.
2. Deal with ethnicity/race and sex/gender in an integrated fashion. "Integrated fashion" means to concentrate on interrelationships between ethnic/racial groups or the intersection of ethnicity/race and sex/gender, and on the overlap of ethnicity/race and sex/gender and cultural, political, economic, and social institutions.
3. Incorporate historical understandings and contemporary issues. The course should, for example, address the legacy of enslavement and the subordination of women and their impact on current human experience.
4. Focus primarily on the United States.

Expansion:

All departments are encouraged to develop and submit courses for approval in this category.

Rationale:

The category remains essentially the same, due to the intent of the committee to maintain the present academic rigor and sound theoretical content of the courses.

The committee did not suggest the addition of specific areas to be discussed because:

- 1) It would be restrictive to demand that certain additional topics be included (the addition of specific areas of interest and relevance are left to the discretion of the professor), and
- 2) The body of work in the areas of ethnicity/race and sex/gender is expansive, and sufficiently covering those works in an integrated fashion consumes a large amount of time.

We, the Ethnicity/Race and Sex/Gender Subcommittee, fully recognize the importance of exposing Northern Kentucky University students to the issues of ethnicity/race and sex/gender. Therefore, we believe that the continuation of this general studies requirement is imperative.

NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM
Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President
Administrative Center 812
Telephone (606) 572.5360
FAX (606) 572.5565
RYANM@NKU.EDU

April 1, 1998

TO: James C. Votruba

FROM: Paul L. Gaston *PLG*

SUBJECT: Vacation Accrual Handbook Changes for Department Chairs and
Twelve (12) Month Faculty

As an element of the of the decision to have NKU remain open during Spring Break, I am seeking your approval for handbook changes for the Handbook of Department Chairs (Page 13) and the Faculty Policies and Procedures Handbook (Page 73) for twelve month faculty.

As we discussed earlier, it was your intention to increase vacation accruals for each group of twelve month staff to accommodate the Spring Break decision. I have prepared the revisions (attached) for approval by you and the Board of Regents on a retroactive basis, effective January 28, 1998.

I am available to discuss these changes should you wish to do so.

Cc: Deans' Council
Margo Ferrante, Personnel Services
Chuck Frank, Faculty Senate
Steven Weiss, Chair of Chairs

Attachments

DRAFT

V. Vacation Leave

A. Vacation leave begins accruing on a monthly basis from the effective date of appointment to the position of chair and will be credited at a rate of one-twelfth of the annual leave allowance **(25 days)** on the first day following completion of each month of employment.

B. The maximum number of vacation days a chair may use during any year of employment may not exceed the number of days **(37.5)** that can be accrued in 18 months.

C. Vacation will continue to accrue each month for any chair who has accumulated, as of any point in time, the maximum number of days that can be accrued in 18 months. In no case, however, may an employee carry over into an ensuing year of employment more than 20 vacation days.

DRAFT

73
effective 1/28/98

emergency leave for faculty. The terms and conditions of such leaves will be mutually agreed upon by faculty and administration. All normal compensations will continue during the special or emergency leaves.

K. MANDATORY LEAVE

The President may place a faculty member on temporary, paid mandatory leave under appropriate circumstances.

L. FACULTY ON FISCAL-YEAR CONTRACTS

(See Section XI.B., Sabbatical Leaves.)

Full-time, tenured or tenure-track faculty on fiscal-year contracts, except for chairs, deans, vice presidents, the President, and any other administrative officer who holds faculty rank, may request all the leaves set forth above. In addition, these faculty accrue annual leave at the same rate as other fiscal-year employees, i.e., 2.8 days each month for a total of twenty-five (25) working days for a calendar year. These faculty members may use no more than twenty-five (25) working days of annual leave in any calendar year. No more than twenty (20) working days of annual leave may be carried into any calendar year. The dates of annual leave shall be mutually agreed upon by faculty and immediate supervisors. Annual leave time does not accrue while a faculty member is on any unpaid leave. Fiscal-year faculty should be on campus when the University is open for business after the end of the semester and prior to commencement.

Faculty who anticipate termination due to resignation, retirement, or other reason must use all accumulated annual leave prior to the date of termination. In the event of death of a faculty member who has accumulated annual leave, the final salary payment will include payment for such earned annual leave. Other payment of annual-leave time will not be made in the event annual-leave time is unused at termination unless use of the annual leave would result in undue hardship to the University.

XIII. FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICY

The credit hour is the recognized standard by which faculty teaching load is measured. The traditional twelve (12) semester credit hours is the maximum required undergraduate teaching load for all full-time tenure-track faculty. Individual departments may propose their own credit hour equivalencies and reassigned-time policies. Such policies must be in writing and must be approved by a majority of the tenure-track departmental faculty, the chair, the appropriate dean, and the Provost.