



Faculty Senate

MEMORANDUM

To: All Full Time Faculty
From: Gary Johnston, Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Date: 24 April 1981
Re: Faculty Senate Meeting 4 May 1981
The Faculty Senate will convene May 4th in the University Center Ballroom at 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
 - II. Approval of Minutes
 - III. Additions or Deletions from the Agenda
 - IV. Dr. Albright's address to the Senate
 - V. President's Report - Jim Fouche
General Announcements
 - VI. Committee Reports
 - A. Professional Concerns, C. Widmer, Chair
 1. Continuation of discussion on the Faculty Handbook, Revision II.
 2. Report on Faculty workload and overload.
(revised version)
 - B. Benefits, L. Giesmann, Chair
 1. Project Grant awards
 - C. Budget, Dick Snyder, Chair
No report
 - D. Curriculum, Tom Cate, Chair
No report
- N.S. The June meeting date has been moved up a week to June 15th, in the University Center Ballroom at 3:00 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

May 4, 1981

Senators Present:	Mildred Clark	Art Miller
	Gary Johnston	Debra Pearce
	MacKenzie Osborne	Frank Stallings
	Jim Kinne	Robert Vitz
	Rosetta Mauldin	Edwin Weiss
	George Goedel	Rachelle Bruno
	Peter Moore	Tom Cate
	Lois Schultz	James Fouche
	Byron Renz	Janet Miller
	Jean Wainscott	Richard Snyder
	Doris Brett	Connie Widmer
	Jonathan Bushee	Donna Bennett
	Larry Giesmann	Kay Cooper

Senators Absent without Alternates:

Richard Ward	Louis Noyd
Joseph Ohren	Frank Steely
Paul Joseph	Don Kelm
Ralph Peterson	David Elder
Mike Gray	

Guests Present:

- Jim Niewahner (alternate for Vernon Hicks)
- Pam Juengling, Library
- Geraldine Rouse, Library
- Macel Wheeler, History/Geography
- Becky Sturm, Library
- Mike Klembara, Chair, Honors Task Force
- Jeffrey Williams, Faculty Regent
- Kathy Brinker, Nursing
- A. D. Albright, President
- Lyle Gray, Provost

I. Call to Order

Jim Fouche called the meeting to order, May 4, 1981, at 3:00 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

Robert Vitz moved that under Item IX of the April 20th minutes the wording be changed to read "list of suggestions and observations from the handbook subcommittee of the Professional Concerns Committee." Seconded by Frank Stallings. Carried.

III. Agenda

Connie Widmer moved to change the wording of VI-A-2 to read "Recommendation" on the Faculty workload and overload, instead of "Report." Seconded by Gary Johnston. Carried.

IV. President's Report

1. Announcement of 1981-82 Senate Executive Committee elections:
Debra Pearce, President; Gary Johnston, Vice President; Byron Renz, Parliamentarian; Billie Brandon, Secretary; Tom Cate, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee; Larry Giesmann, Chair of the Faculty Benefits Committee; Ted Weiss, Chair of the Professional Concerns Committee; Dick Snyder, Chair of the Budget Committee.
2. The June meeting has been moved up to June 15, 3:00 p.m. in the U.C. Ballroom.
3. Peter Moore and Vernon Hicks have submitted recommendations regarding the length of semesters for the academic year. The recommendations have been sent to the Registrar. These recommendations will be forwarded to the Executive Committee for possible inclusion on the agenda of the June meeting.
4. Welcome to President Albright

V. President Albright's Address to the Senate

1. A memorandum was sent to the Executive Committee in 1979 (Dr. Arthur Miller, President) from Dr. Albright with 6 points outlined for the Senate to address. The Senate was requested to address the following areas:
 - a. To begin development on policy and procedures/evaluations and rewards for faculty,
 - b. attraction of able students,
 - c. credential procedures for students,
 - d. program review,
 - e. development of professional ethics, and
 - f. further general policy development.

Some of these have "moved along" and are almost complete. Some are complete.

2. Honors Program
Dr. Albright stated of the Honors Program as passed by the Senate: "It's a beginning, but not a whole lot more than that." We need to develop programs for dealing with gifted accelerated students in order to keep them. "It's [the Honors proposal] a good beginning."
3. Governance Policy
The Board passed this proposal at the Wednesday meeting. It's worth a try, but it is likely to be an interim step toward a University-wide articulated body representing more groups (the 4 segments). Connie Widmer asked whether this was the same proposal that was presented by the Faculty Senate. Dr. Albright replied that the Board was not presented with all the details addressed in the Senate's document. The Board authorized the administration to proceed along the lines of the Faculty Senate report.

4. Academic Program review

There will be a heavier emphasis placed by the academic officers of this institution on academic planning, academic program review, appropriate levels for decision making, and program priorities. The primary function of officers will be planning of academic affairs. This will probably mean that there will be more responsibility on the chairpersons of the departments.

Jonathan Bushee asked for an example. Dr. Albright said, for example, that travel requests approved at the departmental levels might not need to go through several levels, only through the Chairperson, so there would not be as much paperwork.

There is a need to begin in earnest the promotion of academic affairs. Peter Moore asked whether there would be compensation for extra responsibilities. Compensation for extra responsibilities will depend on how the person takes on the responsibility, the President replied.

5. Budget Outlook

The overall allocation of faculty/staff salary increases will be right at 9.8%. Up to 7.5% will be across-the-board, provided performance has been satisfactory. Equal division with fixed dollar amounts was seriously considered, but was ruled out due to compression of the overall salary picture. The President noted that 2.3% will be available for performance (merit) increases. A minimum of \$1,000 will be assigned to each merit raise. The meritorious faculty members were identified in each department before the quotas were assigned to the departments. The 9.8% does not include the lifting of the floors for ranks or allocations for promotion, nor is a probable dental health program included in the 9.8%. We should do well when compared with other states with respect to increases, President Albright said.

6. Senate Salary Report

The report was well done, but not so well conceived. If the salaries are not what they should be, then what is the best strategy for getting them up? The strategy of comparing the salary structure of the Highland Heights faculty with that of the Chase College has not helped. All institutions of higher education are in a struggle for an improved salary structure. There are those in the state reviewing the matter of Kentucky's having three law schools and needing only one. This might come up before the next legislature. If Chase is dropped, the money allocated for the law school would not be returned to Northern Kentucky University.

Jim Fouche thanked the administration for its cooperation with the Senate with respect to the Salary Report.

7. Budget cuts in the future

In President Albright's judgment, there will be another budget cut. Of the 114 million dollars from all budgets the State cut, 75 million dollars was in non-recurring money (from balances, reserves, etc.). The State is losing 8 million dollars per month from coal reserves. President Albright is implementing a contingency plan which would help cushion the effect of the anticipated cut somewhat.

8. Faculty Handbook

Jonathan Bushee asked for a status report on the Faculty Handbook vis-a-vis going to the Board. President Albright stated that the handbook was in the hands of two attorneys. A report from the attorneys is expected by May 15th. There will be 2 or 3 additions made: rights and responsibilities of the faculty, etc. The Board of Regents meeting will be delayed until about the middle of June. The administration will sit down with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to discuss alterations that may be made before the June meeting. Everything will be done for the welfare of the institution and the protection of individual faculty members.

VI. Professional Concerns Committee, Connie Widmer, Chair

a. Faculty Handbook

On the matter of contracts being issued before this handbook has been approved, Jim Fouche stated that letters will be sent out, and the issuance is not contingent upon whether this body approves the document or not. On the other hand, since the document is in the hands of attorneys, it would be wise to go ahead and go as far as we can with this matter of the handbook.

Frank Stallings addressed the concern for a grievance clause in the document. These are to be looked into next year, as well as other areas which can be examined and perhaps, added to the handbook. This document could be reviewed each year, with additions being made as needed.

Peter Moore moved to delete the last five words in section G (Lecturer) on page 14. Lois Schultz seconded. Carried.

Jonathan Bushee moved that in Article X - Faculty Summer Fellowships - the words "and whether reassigned time is necessary" be added on page 67, 2-a-3. Tom Cate seconded. Carried.

Larry Giesmann moved that there be an insertion "reassigned time or" between the words "upon" and "the receipt" on page 66 of Article X, F-2. Tom Cate seconded. Carried.

Donna Bennett moved that an insertion on page 37 of the word "Steely" be made in Article VI-II, 3rd sentence, before the word "Library," and also in the 4th sentence, that the word "Chase" be inserted before "librarians." Peter Moore seconded. Carried.

The question was called on the document as a whole as amended. The Faculty Handbook revision as amended carried unanimously.

Connie Widmer distributed a statement for the general information of the Faculty Senate concerning the Retrenchment Policy's being removed from the document.

Gary Johnston presented a resolution that the Faculty Senate request that the handbook be expanded to include a section on faculty rights; and that the handbook be expanded to address the handling of grievances other than those related to a faculty member's professional

appointment; and that a statemnt be added on raises relative to tenure and promotion; and that these sections be added during the 1981-82 academic year. Seconded. Carried.

Debbie Pearce moved that Dick Ward and the Faculty Handbook Committee be thanked. Seconded. Carried.

b. Overload Policy

George Goedel moved to delete Item 2 from the Overload Policy. Seconded by Janet Miller. Motion failed.

The Overload Policy document as presented carried.

VII. Benefits - Larry Giesmann

There have been 17 Project Grants in a total of \$17,000.

Widmer	\$2,030
Mulligan	1,639
Juengling	903
Carter/Cobb	300
Storm/Payne	1,954
McPherson/Wagner	1,950
Zaniello (S.F.)	410*
Adams	1,000
Jacobsen	1,000*
Oliver (S.F.)	745
Ward	540*
Mullen	400
Goedel	600*
Stoll	350*
Kempton	2,000

*-partial funding

S.F.-Summer Fellowship recipients, 1981

Sab.-Sabbatical recipient 1981-82

VIII. Other

June Executive Committee meeting - June 1 - 2:00 p.m.

Senate Meeting June 15 - 3:00 p.m. U.C. Ballroom

Calendar

Meeting adjourned 5:15 p.m.

MEMORANDUM

April 29, 1981

TO: Faculty Senators
FROM: Professional Concerns Committee
RE: RETRENCHMENT POLICY

The Professional Concerns Committee feels that the draft of the retrenchment policy lacks clarity and specificity. There appears to be much editorializing and very few clear concise statements. We feel that the policy should be a part of Article V., Termination of Appointment by the Institution.

Since retrenchment involves survival of the University with quality programs, we feel that budget priorities must be severely examined. Highest priority must be placed on retaining tenured faculty and maintaining quality instruction. These budgetary priorities must evolve from thorough discussions between the Faculty Senate and the Central Administration. Recommendations should be submitted to the full faculty for review prior to final decisions being made.

Because of the professional consequences to faculty facing termination, the rights of appeal should not be abridged. The expansion of the Peer Review Committee may be necessary and should be addressed in the policy.

Specific termination decisions concerning tenured faculty should be based on the following:

1. Value to the instructional program.
2. Meritorious contributions to the University and Community.
3. Rank and Seniority of the Faculty Member.
4. Feasibility of Retraining the Faculty Member.
5. Economic and Professional consequences to the Faculty Member.

The statement on severance pay must be made more definitive. For example: If I have been employed by the University for 5 years, how much severance pay will I receive and how much notification will I be given.

We feel that the proposed Retrenchment Policy is by no means ready to be considered by the Faculty Senate. It should be returned to the Handbook Committee for extensive revision.

TO: Professional Concerns Committee Members

FROM: Subcommittee on Faculty Overload
Doris Brett
George Harper
Pam Juengling, Chairperson *lg*

DATE: April 21, 1981

The Faculty Senate has asked that the Professional Concerns Committee reexamine the Statement on Faculty Overload, approved by the Senate on February 25, 1980, in light of current budgetary constraints. Following is our recommendation:

Under normal circumstances, we strongly recommend that Faculty overload be discouraged, as per the attached statement, and bearing in mind the following points:

1. It has been expressed that by having full time faculty teach an overload rather than hiring part time faculty, the University will realize a financial savings. Assuming that the full time faculty member is compensated at at least the same rate as a part time instructor, there is indeed no financial savings. If funds are available for such remuneration, there is no financial advantage in overloading full time faculty.

2. It is possible that the short term incentive of additional salary for overload services will obviate the more important long term benefits of a salary increment.

3. If it appears that faculty are able to operate on an overload, the progression may be to increase the current load.

4. An individual on an overload very likely has less time, and may indeed neglect the scholarly, University, and community activities deemed important by the University; yet this individual is financially compensated above his/her normal salary.

5. Because of varying load formulae among academic departments, it is extremely difficult to equitably administer an across the board overload policy.

The Faculty recognize, however, that at some time in the future, financial exigency may be declared. In such a case, we will consider developing a temporary, revised overload policy.

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Professional Concerns Committee

DATE: April 28, 1981

The Faculty Senate has asked that the Professional Concerns Committee reexamine the Statement on Faculty Overload, approved by the Senate on February 25, 1980, in light of current budgetary constraints. Following is our recommendation:

Under normal circumstances, we strongly recommend that Faculty overload be discouraged, as per the attached statement, and bearing in mind the following points:

1. It has been expressed that by having full time faculty teach an overload rather than hiring part time faculty, the University will realize a financial savings. Assuming that the full time faculty member is compensated at at least the same rate as a part time instructor, there is indeed no financial savings. If funds are available for such remuneration, there is no financial advantage in overloading full time faculty.

2. It is possible that the short term incentive of additional salary for overload services will obviate the more important long term benefits of a salary increment.

3. If it appears that faculty are able to operate on an overload, the progression may be to increase the current load.

4. An individual on an overload very likely has less time, and may indeed neglect the scholarly, University, and community activities deemed important by the University; yet this individual is financially compensated above his/her normal salary.

5. Because of varying load formulae among academic departments, it is extremely difficult to equitably administer an across the board overload policy.

The Faculty recognize, however, that at some time in the future, financial exigency may be declared. In such a case, we will consider developing a temporary, revised overload policy.

Statement on Faculty Overload

The Professional Concerns Committee of the Faculty Senate has carefully considered the question of faculty overload. In weighing points on both sides of the issue, it is our feeling that overload be discouraged wherever possible. Acceptance of teaching overload suggests to the University that faculty are capable of teaching more than the currently defined load, without neglecting other required professional activities possibly leading to readjustment of the load formula.

The following points were raised in our discussions:

A. Points favoring overload:

1. A full time faculty member is already under contract with the University and, therefore, tends to be more available to students.

B. Points against full time faculty teaching overload:

1. Faculty with a teaching overload may actually be less available to students.
2. Teaching overload could result in a decrease in the quality of teaching.
3. Teaching overload may allow less time for student advising.
4. Teaching overload can lessen scholarship and reduce time available for research and professional activities, reflecting poorly on the institution as a whole.
5. Teaching overload may discourage involvement in University committees, the Faculty Senate, and University service in general.
6. Teaching overload may discourage community involvement, community service, and contributions to the community in general.

Therefore, the Professional Concerns Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. That a teaching overload is unacceptable except in extreme, unavoidable circumstances (e.g. where a department is unable to hire an adequate part time instructor, the illness or resignation of a faculty member within the department, etc.).
2. That a correspondingly lightened load be assigned during the semester following an overload, rather than awarding financial compensation.
3. That a routine overload shall not be tolerated.