

MEMORANDUM

To: All Faculty
From: Janet Miller, Faculty Senate Secretary
Date: Dec. 1, 1978
Re: FACULTY SENATE MEETING

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held Monday, December 11, in the University Center, Rooms 303-305, at 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA

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

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

December 11, 1978

Senators present:

J. Johnson	B. Lindsay
F. Rhynhart	F. Steely
J. Bushec	M. Clark
L. Geisman	J. McKenney
R. Singh	S. Newman
T. McNally	J. Hopgood
K. Beirne	J. Fouche'
B. Dickens	J. Williams
B. Oliver	T. Mazzaro
D. Kelm	E. Goggin
B. Mullen	B. Miller (for L. Sutherland)
R. Schneider	B. Craig
T. Cate	B. Schneider (for C. Mulligan-Nichols)

President Miller reviewed procedures he wished Senators to follow in gaining recognition from the chair. Jeffrey Williams added that committee chairpersons should directly handle questions addressed to them when they give reports.

President Miller asked for any corrections to the minutes of the last meeting. There were several corrections. On page 5, for the report of the Professional Concerns Committee, in several places it should read Dr. Fouche' rather than Dr. Bushee. Bill Oliver called attention to a motion by Debra Pearce asking the Budget Committee to check into procedures for making purchases orders. He thought it had included the suggestion that the Budget Committee try to bring about more simplified procedures. However, records of the meeting show that while the discussion by Dr. Pearce did include the suggestion that purchase order procedures should be simplified, the actual motion was to ask "that the Senate Budget Committee look into the matter of purchase orders and the procedures through which purchase orders must go." On page 6, in relation to the discussion of the Honor's Program, the discussion should include two sentences reading: "Dr. Williams stated he recalled arguing against a particular motion, not the concept. Further, he said, since that meeting a number of faculty at large had expressed concern about an honest program." Fred Rhynhart called attention to the roll-call vote, which had been taken about the motion as to whether the Executive Committee exceeded their authority. He asked that the Secretary enter the specific vote of the Senators on that issue. That roll call vote was as follows: Yeas - K. Beirne, J. Bushee, T. Cate, M. Clark, W. Dickens, L. Giesman, J. McKenn', J. Miller, S. Newman, W. Oliver, F. Rhynhart, C. Mulligan-Nichols. Nays - J. Fouche', E. Goggins, J. Hopgood, J. Johnson, D. Pearce, R. Singh, J. Williams. Also, on page 6, line 21, the minutes should read: He believes "the Executive Committee", not "the Curriculum Committee", was not within its authority.

President Miller moved that the Senate approve the minutes as corrected. Motion passed.

President Miller announced that on Wednesday the faculty would have the opportunity to talk with Dr. Keith High, from the University of Dayton. He is a candidate for the Dean of the Law School. The meeting will take place in Science 400, at 11:00a.m., on Wednesday. This will probably not be announced generally, so Senators were asked to spread the word of this meeting. President Miller announced the established of an Ad Hoc Committee to work with Dr. Tesseneer, President of NKU Foundation, on guidelines for the selection of a Distinguished Professor Award. Frank Steely has been asked to serve as Chairman of this Committee. Other members of the Committee are to include Debra Pearce, Jonathan Bushee, Larry Giesman, and Bill Lindsay.

Dr. Miller announced that Bob Vitz, current Chairman of the Public Safety Appeals Committee has asked to be replaced while he goes on leave during the spring semester. President Miller called for a volunteer from the senators present to serve in Bob Vitz's place during the spring semester. No one volunteered.

The Senate has been asked to nominate individuals to serve on a search committee for the Director of Continuing Education. It was hoped that there could be one representative from each division. Nominations, which were forwarded to the President, included: from Basic Disciplines - Ken Beirne and Ed Theodoru; from Law - Dave Elder; from Human Development Program - Glen Smith. President Miller asked for any nominations from the floor, keeping in mind the need to have each division represented. No nominations were made. Motion to elect candidates from the Law School and Human Development Program by acclamation passed. The Senate then voted by ballot for the Basic Disciplines representatives. While the ballots were being collected, Frank Steely asked Ken Beirne, who previously carried out the duties related to Continuing Education, to review some details about the position. Dr. Steely questioned the addition of another administrator to carry out these duties. Ken Beirne explained the position. Ramon Singh raised the question about the role of the Senate in the continuing appointment of committee members, and wondered if, in the future, someone asking for committee members could come to the Senate and explain positions before the Senate sent out people to work on the various committees. Bill Oliver commented on the eventual addition of staff positions whenever new positions were created. Ken Beirne suggested that the Senate might make the current nominations provisional and request some additional information. He, in fact, moved that (1) the nomination of the members of the search committee be made provisional and (2) the appropriate administrative officers, either Dr. Pearson or Dr. Travis, come before the Senate and explain the nature and rationale of the position. The motion passed. At this time the election results were announced. Ken Beirne - 16 votes and Theodoru - 4 votes. Ken Beirne was elected to the search committee.

President Miller then announced several additions to the agenda - the MBA Proposal and the guest appearance of Dr. Mike Adams. Fred Rhynhart asked for a delay on the MBA Proposal discussion since he had not yet had time to review the Proposal and it was not on the agenda. Dr. McKenney raised a question about the propriety of discussing the MBA Proposal since it had not yet gone through the Curriculum Committee. Dr. Mike Adam was, however, introduced to speak about issues surrounding the MBA Proposal. Dr. Adams discussed procedures for the approval of graduate courses as well confusion over the MBA Proposal and the University Curriculum Committee. He stated that, traditionally, graduate courses did not go through the Curriculum Committee. They were approved by the Graduate Council, an

elected body of the University. Confusion came about when the Senate, acting under erroneous information about the abolishment of the Graduate Council, passed a resolution that the University Curriculum Committee would act to fill the gap in approval or disapproval of graduate courses. It was actually no gap, since the Graduate Council has continued to function. Certainly, Dr. Adams stated, he felt the University Curriculum Committee could look at proposals but it would clearly add to an already lengthy sign-off procedure for course approval. He discussed the large number of people who now must sign a form for the approval of any new courses, and stated that there seems to be enough quality control given the present procedures. He noted that on Friday the Graduate Council had voted unanimously to approve the MBA. They, in addition, voted on individual courses and rejected one course, Management 601, as being too tough. Responding to a question about a Math course, as well as courses from other disciplines, Dr. Adams said that all courses involved in the MBA Program would be discussed with various disciplines. The current document, however, represents an attempt at this time to develop a decent proposal to present to the Council on Higher Education. He noted that the Council will only approve courses two times a year and the MBA course could, they hoped, be presented at the January meeting. Fred Rhynhart asked about the election of the Graduate Council. Dr. Adams responded that Graduate Council was, as he understood it, elected by graduate faculty. Dr. Rhynhart questioned procedures for program development and noted the importance of faculty involvement along the line. The discussion continued on the Graduate Council, as well as sign-off procedures for program approval, the development of graduate programs at NKU, and other Math courses listed on the proposal for which Management 601 is listed as a prerequisite. Tom Cate asked for a clarification on the reasons for Dr. Adams' appearance at the Senate. President Miller replied that Dr. Adams had been asked to come to the Senate to give background on the proposal for a new graduate program. Jim McKenney stated that he thought questions about the proposal, in par-

ticular the math courses listed on the proposal for which Management 601 is listed as a prerequisite. Dr. Steely then reiterated the fact that proposals sent to the Council for approval are used just for that purpose and that specifics for the programs are usually worked out at Northern after they have been approved by the Council. He further noted the uniqueness of the MBA Program, as well as its importance for Northern. This Program, he said, would probably not cost as much as it would bring to Northern Kentucky University. Professor Oliver stated although he is in agreement with Dr. Steely he is concerned and irritated about the haste as well as the fact that it was not on the agenda. Professor McNally asked about the role of the Faculty Senate in even discussing the MBA. If, as Dr. Adams had stated, there is no question about whether Northern will have an MBA Program, it does not seem to matter what the Senate discussed. Dr. Adams reminded the Senators of the importance of the MBA to Northern Kentucky University, and that the Council had already recommended an MBA Program as a priority need for Northern Kentucky University. Dr. Adams felt that there should not be a debate on the need for such a program unless the Senate is willing to conduct a needs survey similar to the one conducted by the graduate office. The Senate role might best be to see, he said, that the program is a quality academic program. President Miller noted that there was sufficient time to deal appropriately with the matter and still get the proposal to the Council on Higher Education by January 17. Dr. Steely added that this was an importance enough issue that the Curriculum Committee should consider it immediately even if it meant a special meeting. Dr. Steely, in fact,

moved that the MBA Program be immediately referred to the Curriculum Committee and, if necessary, that there be a special meeting. Also, if necessary, the Senate should have a special meeting if a proposal must be brought back to the Senate. Ken Beirne seconded the motion. Dr. Hopgood noted that he planned to hold a special meeting of the Curriculum Committee on Thursday at 2:00 p.m. already. The motion passed by voice vote. Dr. Yerkes apologized at this point for any sense of rush. He stated that they were not pushing but that they welcomed full discussion of the proposal and were anxious to follow appropriate procedures. Bill Dickens raised a question about the possible dates of any special Senate meetings. The 8th of January would be more preferable, according to Dr. Adams, if the Faculty Senate needs to hold a special meeting on this issue. No date was agreed upon.

Ken Beirne suggested that the future if a regular agenda is not to be followed that the Senate follow regular parliamentary procedures and call for a suspension of the rules. Further, he stated, the President should call for approval of the minutes and not make the motion himself. President Miller accepted these suggestions. With further reference to the agenda, Dr. Beirne suggested that any changes of the agenda should be brought up at the beginning of the meeting and that the Senate could then accept a motion for the change in the agenda. Fred Rhynhart moved that the agenda be more specific and substantive. Tom Cate seconded the motion. The Discussion on the desirability as well as the difficulty of making the agenda more specific and substantive followed. Dr. Williams argued for some flexibility in the agenda which Ken Beirne replied could be achieved through his suggestion of calling for a suspension of the rules. Dr. Steely raised the possibility of sending a memo to the Senators in case items come up at the last minutes. Motion passed.

James Hopgood called attention to an item of old business from previous meeting. This related to the topic in independent study courses and their acceptance as general studies requirements. The Curriculum Committee report at the previous meeting included a proposal by Jim McKenney that "The Curriculum Committee recommend to the Faculty Senate that "Topic or independent study courses not be counted for general studies requirement." This motion had passed in the University Curriculum Committee at a vote of 5 to 4. The Senate voted at the last meeting to defer action on this part of a Curriculum Committee report until the December meeting in order to allow Dr. Aaron Miller to discuss the matter with the Senate.

At this time Dr. Miller was introduced to discuss topic in experimental courses. In his initial statement he said, "I appreciate this opportunity to address you. I think there are a few things that are wrong with this particular proposal and, if I may, I would like to explain what they are. First, the use of the ninety-nine, or topics number for cross-listed Experimental Program courses is largely a matter of convenient understanding rather than policy. The settlement on the use of that number was by agreement with the Curriculum Committee without any formal policy having been adopted. Were such cross-listed courses numbered differently, would this proposal have been offered by its sponsor, and if so, how would it have been worded? What is its intent?

I think the intent is to repeal the policy that was earlier approved by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate that would allow students to take as many as three cross-listed Experimental courses for general

studies credit. Since the prerogative for deciding which Experimental courses are to be approved for general studies credit resides with the individual departments and programs which are cross-listed those courses, one major effect of the proposal would be to compromise the authority of the individual departments and programs to make decisions regarding general studies courses in their subject areas. Why would this be so? A department or program that wishes to offer a strictly disciplinary course for general studies credit under the nine/nine number would not be free to do so, if this proposal were accepted. Nor would such an academic unit be free to determine whether a cross-listed course with Experimental Programs could be granted general studies credit. The question that arises then, I think, is whether the curriculum integrity of the individual academic disciplines is to reside with their respective faculty members or with the Curriculum Committee and the Senate. Example: The Geography course that will be offered during the Spring by the Experimental Program, and cross-listed by the Geography Department or Program, clearly is a general studies type of course. In fact, it was intended to be that, and the Geography faculty approved it for general studies credit. Now, if the Geography faculty wants to offer this course under the nine/nine number, for whatever reasons it may choose, and to give general studies credit for it, why should the Geography faculty not have the prerogative to do it? The McKenney proposal also, and this more a long range kind of problem, would preclude the Experimental Programs' developing with academic units courses that are specifically designed to meet the general studies requirements, to meet its standards and its purposes, and I am not sure that I would like to see the Experimental Program preclude from that kind of curriculum participation. I would like have the opportunity to engage in such curricular development.

Finally, I think the argument that the general studies courses and topics courses (and this argument was made in the Curriculum Committee and I don't think that you have a copy of that statement) are, by definition, diametrically opposed, either philosophically or in content, stems from what I think is rather a narrow interpretation of both topics courses and general studies courses. Such narrowness of interpretation and division and the restrictions that they would impose upon curricular development run counter to our University Mission Statement, and I would like to quote that Statement. "New demands upon standing fields of inquiry and study, new technologies and ethics, more perplexing problems in societies, and a host of emerging opportunities suggest that experimentation with promising ideas, with recombinations of existing programs, and with different ways of performing current functions is an essential mission for Northern to perform, if for no other reason than to prevent, or at least retard, institutional ossification in a university that is very very young." And then, under Section 3, Structure in that Mission Statement: "In period of change and transition, structure should be flexible, adaptive, and accomodating of increasing variables in missions and programs." For these reasons I think that this proposal is ill-advised and I would like to ask you to consider, in context, my objections to it, and I am sure that you will make an intelligent decision regarding it."

In summary, Dr. Miller argues against the Proposal.

Dr. McKenney stated that this proposal, which he made initially in the Curriculum Committee was put forward in order to correct what he thought

was a mistake made by the Curriculum Committee, when they approved a motion to grant credit for experimental or cross-listed courses. He believes such a course are too restrictive to count for general studies requirement. He also stated he did not believe that it was ever the intent of the Curriculum Committee or the Senate that the prerogative to determine general studies requirements should be left to the departments. He said the Curriculum Committee has been involved in general studies all along in order to provide a broad base. Further, he said that courses which any department means to count as general studies should go through the Curriculum Committee. He therefore urged the Senate to approve his proposal. Discussion continued about past procedures for the approval of courses for general studies, the assignment of course numbers, historical development of the assignment of numbers to experimental courses, and cross-listing. Professor Bushee argued for experimentation with courses for general studies. It was suggested that the Senate ought to trust the departments to decide what counts for general studies, as several Senators believe they have been doing, until there is a clearly established university policy. Professor Oliver expressed concern about counting courses for general studies which have by-passed the University Curriculum Committee. Also he noted his concern about the advisement process which he believes could become even more complicated. The Curriculum Catalogue at this point is not clear enough about those courses which have by-passed the University Curriculum Committee. Also he noted his concern about the advisement process which he believes could become even more complicated. The Curriculum Catalogue at this point is not clear enough about those courses which can be counted for general studies. Oliver also urged the Senators to maintain a policy of Curriculum Committee approval for graduate studies courses. Dr. Aaron Miller then responded to several items. First, he noted it would be good to clarify general studies requirements. He did not feel, however, that what is currently to be counted is to be engraved in stone. Second, he noted that there is a legitimate course-review procedure for Experimental Programs by the Advisory Committee for Experimental Programs. He restated that there seemed to be two major questions: 1) Will experimental courses be precluded from participation in the creation of general studies materials? 2) There is a need to clarify where the prerogative for approval of general studies courses lie, in department and programs, or in the Curriculum Committee? He believes that the departments should have the prerogative to decide if their courses have sufficient content to warrant acceptance as general studies. The Geography course, he noted, was a case in point. It had been produced as a general studies course. The Geography Department approved the course on an experimental basis, and they cross-listed it in order to use it as a general studies course. They felt they may want to alter it in some fashion in the future, but that the content was sufficient to qualify for general studies. Terry McNally noted that one could not make a general statement that an experimental or topic course is or is not acceptable to fill general studies requirements. There would be too much individual variation. Jim Hopgood then asked about the number of experimental courses which had been approved for general studies. Dr. Miller replied that of the twelve experimental courses for Spring, five had been approved for general studies requirements. He also noted that he believed that certain courses in general were too specialized. Courses which have been approved include one Geography course, two Literature

and two Anthropology courses. Bill Dickens asked about guidelines for the role of the Chairman in the approval of courses for Experimental studies. Dr. Bushee stated that there need to be some general guidelines about what ought to count for general studies. Until then, he suggested that courses which are proposed by a department to meet the general studies should be taken to the Curriculum Committee. Yet the department could continue to handle Experimental courses differently. He felt we

needed some mechanism for the development of new courses to meet general studies. Bob Schneider moved that the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee be defeated. He was asked, however, to withdraw that motion. Jim McKenney stated he did not believe the process for the approval of courses for general studies was as nebulous as some believed. He did not think the courses that had not been approved by the Curriculum Committee were ever thought to be acceptable for general studies. Dr. McKenney, in addition, stated he did not think any Experimental courses should ever be considered for general studies. Dr. Bushee raised questions about who would take courses which would not count for general studies. Dr. Miller stated he never assumed that most Experimental courses would qualify for general studies. The current policy recommendation or proposal originally come from the Advisory Committee. Fred Rhyhart felt the problem went back to the time when the Senate voted on the guidelines for Experimental Programs without seeing the guidelines. He believes that it is a procedural problem; further that the faculty had lost some of their power in that vote. He argued in support of McKenney's motion. Dr. Miller took issue with the motion that the Senate had given up power to some one. It Had, he said, merely moved from one faculty group to another. Point of order was then called to stop the cross conversation and to move on with the discussion. Jim Hopgood reread the motion. Bill Oliver called for the question. This was seconded by Bob Schneider. On the vote to call the question - 10 voted for and 8 against.

Call for the question was defeated.

Tom Cate asked for clarification on the previous motion to defer. The Parliamentarian said the motion to defer meant to postpone until the next meeting. Dr. McNally asked for further information about the type of courses which had been approved. Dr. Janet Johnson called attention to the fact that the Senate was at this point discussing only nine of the total general studies hours. According to recommendations approved by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate and proposed by the Advisory Council, students could only take up to nine hours of experimental or cross-listed courses. Frank Steely spoke in opposition to loosening general studies requirement. Dr. Hopgood said Senate had in the past questioned courses for general studies but had no policy about them and recommended the defeat of the motion. Tom Cate asked about some of the courses which now counted for general studies. He believed, further, that the Senators may have lost sight of the original debate. The topic is whether a specific course offering through the Experimental Dean could count for general studies. He did not think the Senate should at this time try to restructure general studies. Ken Beirne discussed general studies and asked for a clarification of Jim McKenney's motion especially with regard to cross-listing and numbering courses. Aaron Miller explained the procedures for cross-listing and numbering courses. Jim McKenney added to this by stating it was originally done last Spring to facilitate the movement of courses into the schedule. It was only a matter of convenience. Jim Hopgood said, however, it went back further than that to the time when the registrar used the ninety-nine course number as a way of allowing departments to offer courses on an experimental basis. Jeffrey Williams offered, at this point

an amendment to try to clarify and conclude the debate. His amendment was "That the Senate postpone judgement on whether experimental and topical studies should be counted toward general studies until the whole nature of general studies requirements is redefined." Ed Goggin seconded the motion. Discussion followed regarding the propriety of the motion. Ken Beirne stated that this was, in fact, a motion to postpone; others felt it was a motion to kill the original motion. Fred Rhynhardt called the amendment out of order. Parliamentarian said it was not out of order. Dr. Bushee noted that the faculty feels this-topical courses and general studies ==is a very serious issue and yet there was no consensus. He felt the Senate ought to develop a policy that will allow for experimentation. Again, since departments now make decisions they should continue to be trusted until there is a clear policy. Dr. Beirne discussed the amendment. He suggested voting against the amendment and then consider a motion for postponement. Dr. Dickens said the problem may be one more of the problems with general studies guidelines and not experimental studies. He supports the amendment which might get to the problem of general studies. Dr. Oliver stated the Senate should not vote to amend, but to postpone. Dr. Williams withdrew his amendment and called for the question. It was seconded by Bill Oliver. The roll call vote on Dr. McKenney's proposal was as follows: Yeas: K. Beirne, T. Cate, M. Clark, J. McKenney, S. Newman, W. Oliver, F. Rhynhart, F. Steely. Nays: W. Dickens, J. Hopgood, J. Johnson, T. Mazzero, T. McNally, J. Miller, R. Singh, J. Williams. It was tied - 8 to 8. President Miller voted with the nays. The motion was defeated.

Dr. Steely moved that the proposal (whether or not to consider experimental courses for general studies) be referred to Dr. Oliver's subcommittee on general studies. Drs. Dickens and Oliver said they did not believe it could be referred to a committee since it was voted down. Dr. Oliver, however, said that his committee would certainly discuss it, but that the motion was out of order. Dr. Steely withdrew the motion. Fred Rhynhart moved to adjourn. Meeting adjourned.