

MEMORANDUM

To: All Faculty  
From: Janet Miller, Faculty Senate Secretary  
Date: October 5, 1978  
Re: FACULTY SENATE MEETING

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held Monday, October 16, in University Center, Room 108 at 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. President's Report
- II. Old Business
  - Allocation of Library Funds
- III. Committee Reports
  - A. Faculty Benefits
  - B. Professional Concerns
  - C. Budget
  - D. Curriculum
- IV. New Business

# MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

October 16, 1973

Senators present: A. Miller B. Oliver C. Mulligan-Nichols  
R. Singh T. Rambo T. McNally  
K. Beirne S. Neely F. Rhynhart  
B. Lindsay F. Steely L. Giesmann  
S. Newman J. Fouche' D. Pearce  
J. McKenney J. Johnson J. Bushee  
B. Dickens J. Williams J. Hopgood  
R. Toblen L. Sutherland  
T. Cate R. Gardella

Others present: B. Holloway J. Ohren  
B. Schneider K. Gilliam  
L. Noyd

President Miller called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Minutes of the last meeting were presented for approval. Frank Steely noted a correction of the previous minutes on page 4, in that his motion to disclose faculty salaries included the point that student evaluation of faculty should also be publicized. Motion to approve the minutes was then passed.

## President's Report

In order to facilitate procedures at the meetings, President Miller requested that all Senators secure recognition from the chair by raising their hands. The following recommendations to various university committees have been made by the Faculty Senate:

### Calendar Committee

Mike McPherson, Physical Sciences

### General Education Task Force

Don Kelm, Fine Arts  
Terry McNally, Literature and Language  
Jeff Williams, History  
William Oliver, Physical Sciences  
Jeffery Paul, Social Sciences  
Marion Stroud, Education  
Ed Wheeler, Math

### Public Safety Advisory Committee

David Bishop, Education  
Fred Schneider, Law

### Publication Board

William Worley, Fine Arts

### University Library Committee

Mercedes Ballou, Education

President Miller reminded the Senators that applications for nomination to the Danforth Associates Program are due November 31, 1978. He noted that two members of the Faculty Senate, Frank Steely and Bill Oliver, are presently Danforth Associates, in addition to Jerry Richards and David Payne. Announcements regarding these nominations to the program have been distributed to the Deans and Program Chairperson. Nomination forms may be obtained from Professors Steely, Oliver, Richards, and Payne, as well as the reserve desk in the library. These nominations are to be forwarded to UK and from there to the National Office.

The president announced that the disclosure of faculty salaries issue, which was not resolved at the last meeting of the Senate, would be explored further by the Executive Committee.

Bob Holloway, who was invited to address the Senate regarding funds, was introduced. Mr. Holloway explained the way funds were allocated for the current fiscal year, as well as future plans for such allocations. During the past eight years, he noted, various Library Committees had tried to determine a reasonable formula. Generally, every program or department ended up receiving the same amount. The library staff currently is trying to determine a workable formula for the allocation of funds. This year they have used an arbitrary point system based on majors and minors, inter-disciplinary minors associate degree, etc. All the points based on these majors and minors, were added together and funds distributed accordingly. Several exceptions to the formula were made, however. Biology would not, on the basis of points, have had enough money to cover the cost of serials and would have been given too much of the entire budget. The staff hopes to develop a formula which takes into account additional factors such as library usage, newness of major or minor programs, contact hours, cost of books, and so forth.

Mr. Holloway was asked about the way minors were determined since they often were not declared until the end of their work. This might, as in the case of secondary minors in education, work to the detriment of some departments. Professor Bill Oliver asked whether a summation of the assignment of points could be sent to each program. Mr. Holloway responded that he did not know whether he would agree to do this or not. Other questions were raised about the differential expenditure between natural sciences and the arts, the number of people who take courses without a given major, and money to replace mutilated or stolen books. Mr. Holloway replied on the last point that there is no extra money available to deal with that particular problem. Bill Lindsay raised a question about the business allocation, since they have a large enrollment. Mr. Holloway replied that the library, particularly this year, could not afford to give the Business Department \$40,000, which would have been according to the formula. The library had only \$325,000 in their budget. Serials cost \$145,000, so they therefore had only \$135,000 left to divide. He added again that they would continue to look carefully at all factors. Further, he stated, that the library was trying to serve the entire university through the application of a formula which would involve a wide number of factors.

Additional questions were raised about library usage which apparently is based on books checked out, where the formula discussions were taking place, the role of the faculty in the discussions, the possibility of forming a committee to deal with allocations of library funds, and the distribution of funds among various fields. Bob Holloway pointed out that committees were involved in the past in dealing with allocations and that did not solve all the problems. He reminded the Senators that the library staff was concerned about the overall development of the library and was trying not to play favorites. He noted that Northern Kentucky University



was not necessarily comparable to other institutions because it was in the process of building a collection rather than just maintaining a collection.

Terry McNally raised the question again about the process of determining allocations and informing the faculty about the process. He felt that it would be preferable to clear up doubts among faculty by informing them of what was going on. At this point, Bill Oliver moved that the Senate ask the library staff to submit a report of the analysis results of their determinations about allocation of funds to the Senate. Lois Sutherland seconded the motion. Ken Beirne, who had been on the Library Committee for several years, noted this issue had come up time and again as the committees tried to make allocation of funds in an equitable manner. The amount that was to be divided, he noted, was small and it is difficult to make it equitable. Bill Oliver responded that he knew the library staff would try to do a good job, of course, but that they should make their deliberations available to all of the programs at the University. Jim McKenney then asked a question about the allocation of funds on the basis of first and second majors. Mr. Holloway noted most would be assigned on the basis of first majors, but that such details had not been completely worked out. He also pointed out that the Library Committee might have difficulty finding all of the information they needed in order to make their decision about the allocation of funds.

After Mr. Holloway left the Senate meeting room, the Senators continued the discussion of the allocation of library funds. Jim McKenney questioned the propriety of Bill Oliver's motion in that the Senate perhaps ought to ask the Provost to make such a report to the Senate. Following continued discussion, the motion to ask the Library Director to make a copy of procedures and final allocation of library funds available to the Senate, passed.

#### Committee Reports

Faculty Benefits: Jonathan Bushee, reporting for the Faculty Benefits Committee noted that funds are available for ten summer fellowships and ten Sabbatical leaves, as well as \$16,000 to \$17,000 for faculty project grants. Twenty-one applications for faculty summer fellowships have been submitted. The committee will review these and forward its recommendations to the Provost on or before the end of the month. A number of faculty members are eligible for Sabbatical leaves, he noted. Applications for leaves were technically due in to the chairperson on this date. Five such applications have been received. Faculty project grants applications are due in January, and he wanted all faculty to be aware of the \$16,000 to \$17,000 available.

On the sixth of the month the Administration received approval in Frankfurt for the funding of the service contract with Meidinger and Associates, Inc. for a review of fringe benefits. In a few months the Faculty Benefits Committee should have the report from this company, which they will then review. They will then be able to make a full report to the Senate on faculty benefits. Meanwhile, the committee is looking at educational and non-educational institutions in the local area in order to have data with which to compare fringe benefits. Professor Bushee called attention to the copies of proposals from last year's summer fellowships and faculty grants which are available in the Reserve Room of the library filed under Faculty Benefits Committee. Greg Schulte, he noted, is continuing to study the legality of the TANK tax. Campbell, Kenton, and Boone counties have made provisions for applications for reimbursement on these taxes if necessary.

The University Counsel is looking into matters of liability protection for faculty members.

The Faculty Policy and Procedures Handbook is apparently at the printer's office. Professor Bushee has one copy of the handbook which he has reviewed. Portions of the handbook on leaves and faculty development appear to be the same as in earlier additions reviewed by the Professional Concerns Committee and the Faculty Benefits Committee. There are some changes about faculty evaluations. Jeffrey Williams asked when the Faculty Handbook actually was to be printed. Professor Bushee replied that he had only been told it was at the printers.

Professor Bushee completed his report by noting some questions had been raised about whether NKU as a group could pull out of Social Security. The committee is looking into this. Bill Oliver moved to accept the report. Larry Giesmann seconded. Motion passed.

Professional Concerns: Professor Jim Fouche' reported that subcommittees of the Professional Concerns Committee had met and were involved in a variety of activities. The Student Affairs Subcommittee was studying the Student Code. The Peer Evaluation Subcommittee is gathering data on peer evaluation at other institutions in order to study possible procedures which might be adopted at NKU. Academic Standards Subcommittee has secured computer print outs of grades from past semesters in order to try to get an accurate picture of grades and deal with the possible issue of grade inflation. The Handbook Subcommittee is cooperating with the Faculty Benefits Committee in reviewing final copy of the handbook. In addition, they have drafted a statement on the appointment, retention and dismissal of academic administrative officers. It is a brief statement and the next step will be to meet with Dr. Travis in order to work out a procedures section to that statement.

Finally, Professor Fouche' noted he had received a copy of a document on promotion and tenure policies for the library just a few days before his committee meeting. This was to be presented to the Board of Regents at their next meeting. The committee voted to table the document, since they had no idea about where the document came from, or whether faculty or staff at the library had been involved in developing it. The Professional Concerns Committee had no involvement. In addition, they felt they had not had sufficient time to appropriately review the document. Professor Fouche' sent a letter to President Albright informing him of the committee's deliberation and vote. Apparently the document will nevertheless be presented to the Board of Regents for provisional approval. Professor Fouche' added that, subsequent to the committee meeting, he had received a letter from the library representative of the Professional Concerns Committee which said that the library faculty had been involved in drafting the original document, and that it was currently being circulated among library staff. President Miller reported that Bob Holloway had indeed informed him that Bob Schneider and Jean Tatalias from the library, had participated in drafting the document during the past year, and that it had been circulated among the library faculty before it went to the Provost.

Ken Beirne moved to accept the Professional Concerns Committee report. Raman Singh seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Budget Committee: Raman Singh reported that a letter was sent to all faculty members asking them to forward any concerns regarding budget to the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee itself has begun to identify major concerns.



Meanwhile, it is working on developing a workable scheme to tie cost of living into the salary structure, establishing respectable increases for promotions, analyzing the distribution of funds among the various areas of the University for travel, strengthening existing programs, analyzing support staff, and developing a system for utilizing funds for equipment replacement and maintenance. The committee hopes to develop a position paper on all items.

Professor Cate questioned one of the assumptions of the Budget Committee letter regarding too few faculty and too many non-faculty appointments. He stated he felt one could not assume that was a sign of a problem. He personally did not care how many non-faculty there were as long as what they did was done efficiently. Professor Singh responded that the committee was concerned about looking into the rate of increase because of the fear that faculty positions might suffer at the expense of administrative positions. Jim Hopgood moved to accept the Budget Committee report. Motion was seconded and passed.

Curriculum Committee: Professor Hopgood reported that the Curriculum Committee met with Dean Miller regarding the Experimental Programs Policy and Procedures Statement. Professor Hopgood replied he asked Dean Miller to issue a summary of the Policy and Procedures Statement for distribution to all faculty members. Further, he noted, the actual statement had been drawn up by the Experimental Programs Advisory Committee which includes two representatives from the Senate, two other faculty members, two students, and one support-staff representative. Frank Steely asked for a clarification on the approval of programs on an experimental basis, particularly as to whether the Experimental Dean approved Experimental Programs. Professor Hopgood replied that programs were not approved by the Experimental Dean, but had to go through the same procedures as all other programs. Experimental courses are approved by the Advisory Committee but go to the Curriculum Committee for review. Experimental courses are not approved or disapproved by the Curriculum Committee. Professor Steely expressed concern that the Advisory Committee, which approved experimental courses, was not a committee of the Senate but a committee of the Experimental Dean. Professor Hopgood again replied that the Advisory Committee, not the Experimental Dean, approved experimental courses and that such experimental courses could be offered only two times. In addition, they are not put in the catalog. Professor Steely again expressed concern that the Senators should be aware that the prerogative of the Curriculum Committee of the Senate had been taken over by the Dean of Experimental Programs. At this point, Jim McKenney noted that he was more concerned about what happened after the courses had been offered a few times. At that point the Curriculum Committee will have to be carefully involved.

Fred Rynhart questioned the rationale for an apparent change in procedures for course approval. Professor Hopgood replied that the Dean felt he could encourage more experimental courses and new approaches if the Advisory Committee were given the opportunity to approve or disapprove the courses. His office, he felt, would be able to offer incentives to professors to try to experiment. Professor Rynhart moved to reconsider the question. Ken Beirne seconded the motion. During the discussion which followed, Professor Rynhart noted that his motion was made because of concern for the future role of the Curriculum Committee, and for the lack of specific information available before the vote. Jeffrey Williams called for clarification on the move to reconsider. Professor Oliver replied that if the motion to reconsider passed, the motion would be back on the floor of the Senate for consideration. Professor McNalley noted his concern about chances for experimentation at Northern since he believes experimentation might

well be hampered if the procedure is too complicated. He suggested that senators and the faculty needed to give Dean Miller and his Advisory Council a chance, as well as trust, in order to do a good job. On the question for reconsideration of the issue, 11 voted for, 12 against. Motion failed.

Professor Hopgood reported that a new proposal for a B.S. in Law Enforcement, a revision of the one presented last spring, was approved by the Curriculum Committee, 6 to 4, with one abstention. Jonathan Bushee asked for a summarization of the differences between the proposal presented last spring and the current proposal. Professor Hopgood deferred to Joe Ohren who was given administrative responsibility for the Law Enforcement Program. He noted that both the four-year B.S. degree program and the two-year associate degree program had been redefined. They strengthened the content course requirement for the bachelors while they reduced the number of content hours and added several skill courses for the associate degree. In addition, they tried to make the mesh between the associate and the bachelors degree program better so that it would be a two-plus-two program.

When asked about funding, Professor Ohren replied that the proposal presented this year would result in the need for one additional person as opposed to two, which would have been required last spring. Further, he noted, if the Council of Higher Education can vote to approve the program by January of this coming year, there is a good possibility of getting external funding. NKU must, however, get the proposal into the Council of Higher Education by November 1 of this year. That would give them enough lead time in order to make the grant application.

Further discussion related to the number of students who have already expressed an interest in the program, changes in the program so that there would be an effective utilization of current resources at the University, the loss of students Eastern State University since NKU does not have a bachelor degree in law enforcement, prospects for approval by the council, problems students had in scheduling law enforcement courses from Eastern in the Northern Kentucky area, concern about funding the need for law enforcement type programs and relying on outside funding. Professor Ohren noted the concept of a four-year law enforcement program had already been approved by the regents.

At this point, Terry McNally pointed to the impact a good law enforcement program could have on the quality of law enforcement and the quality of life in the community. He urged the Senators to vote for a law enforcement program. Jim McKenney expressed opposition to the program because he believes the program should have grown out of or through an existing discipline. Tom Rambo expressed concern about the one-at-a-time way programs are submitted for approval at NKU with no overall planning.

On the vote for approval of the law enforcement program, 15 senators voted for, 7 against, with 2 abstentions. The law enforcement program was approved.

Professor Hopgood next reported that the Curriculum Committee voted to reject the specific proposal for the honors program which was presented at the September 18 Senate meeting. The vote in the Curriculum Committee was 11 to 2. Ken Beirne moved, and Bill Oliver seconded a motion to accept that report from the Curriculum Committee. A lengthy discussion followed the vote regarding the possibility of making other suggestions for an honors program, background on the discussion and vote in the Curriculum Committee, and the difficulty one would experience in making revisions in the proposal since there were so many different reasons people



were opposed to the honors proposal as presented. Bill Oliver noted that the honors program proposal had not been a report or proposal from the Senate so he felt the Senate was under no obligation to make suggestions. Dr. Hopgood reviewed a few of the opinions expressed during the committee meeting. Jim McKenney noted people generally were opposed to the packaging of the honors proposal, not the idea. He felt the honors program proposal, which had been under consideration, was not specific enough. Debra Pearce replied that the document was purposely left vague until the Senate had approved the concept. At this point, Professor Hopgood was asked to restate the recommendations from the Curriculum Committee. He said the Curriculum Committee recommended that the Senate reject the specific proposal for the honors program. Bill Oliver called attention to the fact that the committee worded the recommendation very carefully to deal only with that specific honors proposal.

On the vote to accept the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee, 13 Senators voted for the committee recommendation, 4 against, and there were 6 abstentions. Report was approved. Following this vote, Fred Rhynhart moved that the Senate support further study of an honors program. Jim Hopgood seconded the motion. Discussion followed on Procedures for the appointment of some committee and ways they might proceed. Ken Beirne noted that special consideration for honor students is not the same thing as an overall honors program. He suggested a feasibility study on the issue and expressed reservation about voting on the concept of an honors program rather than special consideration for honors students through individual courses. Further discussion concerned the vagueness of the motion and the possibility that the Faculty Senate was opposed to many such recommendations because they appeared to call for the establishment of another administrative position and more funding. On the vote for the motion to support further study of an honors program, 9 Senators voted for the motion, 10 Senators voted against the motion, and 4 Senators abstained. Motion failed. At this point, the chair denied a motion to adjourn.

Terry McNally moved that the Senate request that the original honors program committee turn over to the Senate specific information which supported their proposal. Debra Pearce seconded the motion. Jim McKenney called for clarification of the motion. James Hopgood moved to table the motion. Bill Oliver seconded. Motion passed.

#### New Business

The Senate was asked to elect four faculty members from which President Albright would choose one to serve on a search committee for the Dean of Law School. Nominations included Mac Osborne, Literature and Language; Bill Holloway, Business; Bob Lilly, Sociology; Ed Theodory, Literature and Language. Bill Oliver moved to accept these nominations. James Hopgood seconded the motion. The motion passed. The names will be forwarded to President Albright.

Professor Miller noted that Ralph Tesseneer has asked the Faculty Senate to discuss NKU Foundation's plans to establish a distinguished teacher award. He will form an ad hoc committee to consider this.

Bill Oliver requested a more specific agenda in the future so that Senators would be alerted to new business items. Professor Miller accepted the suggestion.

Bill Oliver moved for adjournment. Meeting adjourned.