



Faculty Senate

HIGHLAND HEIGHTS KY 41099 859-572-6400

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

May 10, 2001

11:30 A.M.-U.C. Ballroom

NOTE: TIME CHANGE

AGENDA – Revised*

Call to Order, Adoption of Agenda

Approval of Minutes – April 16, 2001 Meeting

Faculty Leadership Award

Guests

Dr. James C. Votruba

Officer Reports

- | | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| ▪ President | Carol Bredemeyer |
| ▪ Vice-President | Jeff Smith |
| ▪ Secretary | Ted Weiss |
| ▪ Parliamentarian | Steve Weiss |

Committee Reports

- | | |
|-------------------------|------------|
| ▪ Professional Concerns | Ray McNeil |
|-------------------------|------------|
- VOTING ITEM:** Student Honor Code

VOTING ITEMS:

- Amendments to Faculty Handbook
- Resolution regarding the status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

- | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|
| ▪ Benefits | Clinton Hewan |
| ▪ Budget | Chenliang Sheng |
| ▪ Curriculum | Michele Roszmann-Millican |

VOTING ITEM:

- New program - Architectural Engineering Technology (Requires 2/3 majority)
Further information found at: http://access.nku.edu/ucc/ucc_2000/proposals/AET.htm

***VOTING ITEM:**

Philosophy/Religious Studies – New courses, General Studies credit
http://access.nku.edu/ucc/UCC_2000/agenda/0426.htm

Report on General Studies progress

Old Business

(Continued on other side)

New Business

VOTING ITEM: Online syllabi (see back of original agenda)

VOTING ITEM: COSFL Governance Document

VOTING ITEM: Resolution in support of President Votruba

The Faculty Senate of Northern Kentucky University unequivocally supports the statements made by President James Votruba in regard to the comments attributed to Professor Clinton Hewan at a forum on campus on April 19, 2001.

Adjourn

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FACULTY HANDBOOK

Proposed language to be added to the Handbook is shown in **boldface** type.

Section IX.B. CRITERIA (PERFORMANCE REVIEW)

The criteria for evaluation set forth in Section IV.B., Criteria, as modified by Section VIII.E. (Criteria for Effective Performance) and Section VIII.F. (Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure) in the case of librarians, shall be the criteria upon which a performance review is based. **Any judgment, by a chair or director, that the overall performance of a tenured faculty member is unsatisfactory for the review period will be based upon and consistent with the statement of expectations for adequate performance approved by the faculty member's department or program.**

Section X.F.2. THE REVIEW PROCESS (POST-TENURE REVIEW)

..... However, the review should normally be completed by the end of the spring semester.

The P-TR committee will make judgments based on the department's written statement of expectations for adequate performance. However teaching effectiveness may not be excluded from consideration. Upon reaching its decision, the P-TR committee will

Section IX.C. PROCEDURES (PERFORMANCE REVIEW)

The faculty member may use his/her copy of the performance evaluation to support applications for reappointment, promotion, tenure, or any combination of them, or in grievance procedures. Otherwise, the chair or director, dean, and Provost must keep the contents confidential. **In the event that a post-tenure review is triggered, the faculty member's annual performance review materials from the two most recent reviews, including the chairperson's own evaluation letters, will be made accessible to the P-TR committee and can be used in evaluating that individual's performance and must remain confidential.**

If circumstances change during the year, the faculty member

Rationale: The proposed language assures consistency between the section of the Faculty Handbook dealing with PERFORMANCE REVIEW (Section IX.) and the more recently added section dealing with POST-TENURE REVIEW (Section X.). Specifically, the language requires that the same set of standards, set forth in a department's narrative statement of expectations for adequate performance, be used as the standard for satisfactory performance for both post-tenure review and performance review (the outcome of which may trigger the post-tenure review process). The language also allows a chair to provide performance review materials (as required by Section X.F.2.) to a P-TR committee without violating the requirement of confidentiality for performance review materials originally included in Section IX.C.

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE STATUS OF NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The Professional Concerns Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate appoint a committee, consisting of representation from non-tenure-track faculty, Council of Chairs, Faculty Senate, and the administration, to study and recommend a revised, tiered salary and benefit structure for non-tenure-track faculty.

Rationale: The resolution is an initial response to concerns raised by faculty regarding the status and compensation of non-tenure-track faculty. This course of action is recommended, in part, as the result of reports that some full-time, non-tenure-track, temporary faculty are being employed beyond the three-year limit imposed by the Faculty Handbook without the extended benefits provided to full-time, non-tenure-track, renewable faculty and other full-time University employees. The broader language of the resolution, extending beyond this one example, is intended to make possible a full and complete review of the general situation applying to non-tenure-track faculty.

VOTING ITEM

The Executive Committee offers the following motion:

The Faculty Senate endorses the concept of an online method of presentation of syllabi, thus empowering the Professional Concerns Committee to submit a new version during the 2001-2002 academic year.

VOTING ITEM

The Executive Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate endorse this COSFL document. This document does not replace the Collegial Governance at NKU document passed by the Faculty Senate (available from the Senate website, www.nku.edu/~senate), but rather is intended to provide an expanded context for those statements."

COSFL Position Paper on University Governance Adopted 3/24/01

The Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL) endorses the "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in 1966 (see AAUP Policy Documents & Reports, 8th Ed. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors, 1995, 179-185).

COSFL believes: that a collegial system of academic governance adds value to higher education; and that collegial governance both sustains and extends the missions of a college or university in teaching, research, and service to the institution and to the wider communities it engages.

Academic governance derives its authority from the institution's mission. It is rooted in the responsibility all members of the academic community bear in achieving the purposes of the college or university. The academic community includes: students, faculty, staff, administrators, members of governing boards and alumni. A collegial system is based upon the participation of all stakeholders, each in their own way, in the discourse from which policy and practice are constructed.

Collegial governance is characterized by:

- * the recognition of and respect for the many and varied roles that members of the academic community perform in a complex institution;
- * the timely disclosure of information needed to participate meaningfully in the discourse that makes good policy and practice, wherever those conversations take place;
- * the opportunity for members of the academic community to provide input before decisions are made;
- * the principle of dissent.

In a diverse academic community, the participants will not and should not always be of one voice on matters of policy and practice. It is imperative that dissent from the majority view be respected by all involved.

As a practical matter, collegial governance is seldom exercised in the committee of the whole. Rather, the various authorities in a complex institution speak through groups or offices: governing boards, administrative officers, students, faculty and staff and their representative bodies. Whatever an institution's structure, however, the spirit and practice of collegiality calls for either the election of these people or their appointment with the broadest possible consultation, representing diverse points of view. Moreover, the spirit and practice of collegial governance requires these people, once having been elected or appointed, to maintain their discourse with their institutional constituents. In a spirit of full and open disclosure there is little that should be excluded from community discourse. While, for example, it is the traditional responsibility of a collegiate faculty to establish admission and graduation requirements, to approve academic programs, or to approve changes to program curricula, that faculty best does so when it consults with the students, staff, and administrators. Additionally, the primary responsibilities of administrators can best be accomplished when they consult with other members of the academic community. Since academic institutions are primarily made up of people engaged in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service to the institution and the wider community, no realm is more sensitive to the spirit and practice of collegial discourse than the appointment and review of personnel.