

# **Faculty Senate**

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

## **FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**December 19, 1988  
12:00 NOON**

**Snacks and Refreshments will be served  
from 11:30 until Noon**

**UC Ballroom**

### **AGENDA**

- I. Approval of Minutes of November 21, 1988
- II. Agenda Deletions and/or Additions
- III. President's Report
- IV. Status of Senate Recommendations
- V. Committee Reports
  - A. Benefits
  - B. Budget & Commonwealth Affairs
    - 1) Recommendations for library automation and 7% salary **(voting item)**
    - 2) Faculty Salary Policy Guidelines **(voting item)**
  - C. Curriculum **(voting items)**
    - 1) Department of Literature and Language:  
New Courses: ITA 101, 102
    - 2) Department of Political Science:  
Masters in Public Administration
  - D. Professional Concerns
    - 1) Policy on HIV Infections **(voting item)**
      - a) Employees
      - b) Students
    - 2) Recommended changes to Strategic Plan  
(for information only)
- VI. Old Business
  - Proposed Increase of Parking Fees
- VII. New Business
- IX. Adjournment

# **Faculty Senate**

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES Meeting of December 19, 1988**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Barry Anderson, Roger Blanchard, Carol Bredemeyer, Tom Brossart, Andrea Cornuelle, R. Kent Curtis, Sudesh Duggal, David Dunevant, Sandy Easton, Lynn Ebersole, J. Lynn Jones, William R. Jones, Mike Klembara, Nancy D. Martin, Art Miller, Marjorie Muntz, Phil Obermiller, Dennis O'Keefe, Fred Rhynhart, Denise Robinson, Fred Schneider, Dennis Sies, Frank Stallings, Chris Stiegler, James Thomas, David Thomson, Bill Wagner, Robert Wallace, Richard Ward, Ted Weiss, Nancy Campbell for Emily Werrell, Macel Wheeler, Geraldine Williams.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Margaret Myers, Lou Noyd

**GUESTS:** Al Pinelo, Addison Reed, Rose Stauss, Carol Futhey, Mike McPherson, Perry Bratcher, Lois Schultz, Chris Christensen, Bob Bussom, David Jorns, John Connor, Bill Oliver.

Nancy urged all senators to remain until the conclusion of the meeting. A crew needs to get into the ballroom at 2 p.m. to set up for another meeting. Our meeting time is therefore limited. She asks to limit debate to 35 minutes on Budget voting items, 15 minutes on Curriculum voting items, 15 minutes on Professional Concerns and 20 minutes on the proposed increase of parking fees. Bill Wagner moved to limit discussion to the times suggested. Dave Thomson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**II.** There were no additions or deletions to the agenda.

### **III. President's Report**

Peg Goodrich has been provided with a work study. This will help her especially with mailings.

Correspondence from the president of COSFL received on December 1 included a financial report from Morehead which was done by Pete/Marwick. A copy has been forwarded to all Senates in the state. It is available for NKU faculty in the Senate Office.

The search for the admissions director has been reopened. Dr. James McKenney and Dr. Fred Rhynhart will represent the faculty on the Search Committee.

NKU's SACS accreditation was reaffirmed at SACS December 13 meeting.

Phone calls and questions have been received from faculty on the assessment plan as outlines in the document sent to SACS by the administration. Faculty are concerned about the Executive Committee's role. The Executive Committee does not act and will not act without full Senate deliberation and action. The plan was discussed in an Executive Committee meeting, with Dr. Jorns and Dr. Futhey. The Executive Committee did not endorse the plan. The committee discussed and endorsed the concept of assessment. Already there are a number of assessment measures in place and these need to be labeled as assessment activities. Dr. Jorns indicated that the administration will move slowly but with the understanding that this is a necessity and the university has outside forces pushing for assessment. All members of the university will be involved in the development of the plan.



The Provost has announced that the deadline for those wishing to retire under the Early Retirement Policy will be January 1, 1989 for the 1989/90 year. Every other year the deadline will be July 1 of the year prior to the year retirement is requested. The deadline was extended due to the tax questions affecting the plan.

The University Strategic Planning Committee is meeting this afternoon to review suggestions to the plan. The Senate will review the strategic plan after recommendations have been addressed by the University Planning Committee. The strategic plan is still in draft form. Questions have been raised about faculty involvement in the planning committee itself.

Mike Klembara has been named Executive Director of the Cooperative Center for Study in Britain beginning next semester for four years. He has agreed to remain chair of the Curriculum Committee for spring semester.

Dr. Schneider has indicated some portions of changes to the Faculty Handbook will be brought to the Senate early in the new year.

Dennis Sies is taking a leave from NKU to become the manager of Symmes Township. He will be replaced on the Senate as an at-large senator by Terry Pence who received the next highest number of votes in the last Senate election.

The initial committee recommended salary policy consultant has changed. It will not be Clemons, Nelson and Associates but will be Ray Fortunato and Associates.

## **VI. Status of Senate Recommendations**

No action to the Senate recommendation on the extra monies which was sent to the administration in October has been taken. After the last meeting, another recommendation on the rest of the money has been made by the Budget Committee. It places the Senate in an awkward position with no action taken on previous recommendation. In October, the Senate did not have various options. Due to the fluid budget, the total amount was not known. The Senate was told initially that the money was soft and could not be rolled over. Some monies can now be rolled over. The seven percent increase was not an option as understood by the Senate in October.

Response from administration indicate that the Department Salary Inequity Appeal Policy recommended by Senate is being reviewed by a subcommittee of the Deans' Council.

The recommendation on the peer review policy was initially rejected by President Boothe and is now under review by Professional Concerns. Dr. Boothe has expressed a willingness to review his initial decision.

We have received no further word on the status of the Sexual Harassment Policy recommendation. It may still be under review by Legal Council and Student Affairs.

## **V. Committee Reports**

### **A. Benefits Committee - Marjorie Muntz**

A record number of requests for faculty development monies have been received this year. The committee is proud of the number of projects received but is frustrated by the lack of money to fund requests. This concern has been forwarded to the Provost who in turn forwarded the request to President Boothe and the Budget Office to see if additional funding is available. Although there are no high hopes for success, the effort is appreciated.

The Benefits Committee wishes to express appreciation for the work by the Budget Committee. Notifications of the awards will go out today.

### **B. Budget Committee - Sandy Easton**

The Salary Consultant will be undertaking its work in January or February.

The Budget Committee has been requested to review how much funding should be available for faculty development and from where this money should come in the budget.

Budget Priorities Subcommittee met and will present document for discussion by the Senate in January. Faculty are urged to discuss concerns with your department representative to the Budget Committee.

The Budget Review Subcommittee met with Dr. Scholes.

The Budget Committee submits a motion on the floor to phase in the "funding for library automation project in a two-stage approval - \$150,000 in 1988/89 and \$200,000 in 1989/90, with the recommendation that the \$200,000 come from excess fund, if possible, rather than from the recurring reserves. This allows \$100,000 to be used by Academic Departments for equipment in 1988/89 and \$100,000 to be used by Administrative Affairs for maintenance/repairs."

The money will need to be made up next year. A question was raised regarding from where the funds would come. Dr. Jorns indicated that it would not be from the base but from recurring reserve money in the 1989/90 budget. A question was raised whether faculty should recommend money for maintenance and repairs for this year for Administrative Affairs. The Senate does not know needs in this area and it does not seem to be an item for faculty decision. The committee discussed this to some extent. It was suggested that there is no need to make a response if the Senate is willing to accept this as it is an administrative decision.

Jim Thomas moved to table this item. Bill Wagner seconded. Their motion passed with 16 for, 14 against, and 1 abstention. Since a simple majority is needed, the motion was tabled.

Item 2 of the Budget Committee recommendation - "The 7 percent salary increases for existing employees in the 1989/90 operating budget totaling \$1,680,000 for the proposed increase. This means the employees bonuses are not a viable option." was then discussed. Discussion began with proposal which was against tabling this recommendation. It has gone through the Budget



Committee. Unless we are opposed to this, Senate should not terminate the process abruptly. This has been a transition year. An increased effort has been made to share information. Further discussion noted that if more effort is to be encouraged, we need to show appreciation to administration. It would be better to defeat than to do nothing. Dialogue with the administration is appreciated. More information has been shared this year. The administration is proposing addressing salary. It has good merits. Previous position has been made by Senate. Senate could simply accept administration proposal. As Senate appreciates dialogue and in consideration of future, would not mind passing resolution. Is Senate not willing to rescind prior recommendation to support process? Item is on floor as a voting item. Vote is called on item #2. Motion passed unanimously.

Copies of the 1988/89 faculty salary policy and the Budget Committee's 1989/90 recommendations were included in Senate meeting packet. (See attachments). The main changes were in items #1 and #2. The footnote on 1988/89 recommendation was made #4 in 1989/90 proposal. Perception of the committee was that this gives the chairs an opportunity to talk with faculty. In the best case scenario, it gave the opportunity to departments to change which can be validated and substantiated.

Fred Rhynhart moved to accept the 1989/90 policy proposal. Andrea Cornuelle seconded.

Discussion on the floor ensued. Some departments may not approve of the direction the Provost decides how the university should proceed by the distribution of the money. There is no limit to what he could decide to do. Faculty also have no commitment from the deans level. There are two administrative levels - the Provost and Dean - where money could be distributed in a manner such that the money available would not be funded at a 7% level for satisfactory performance and merit.

Concern was expressed about money being spread across the board as a flat percentage as this merely leads to increasing the discrepancy between departments at the lower end and higher end of pay scale. Gap widens as a larger amount of money is involved. It is implied that it will be 7% in salary base. Question was raised concerning waiting for the strategic plan as none is in place currently.

Fred Schneider moved to change item #1 in the new policy to item #1 in the 1987/88 policy for 1988/89. It was seconded by Bill Jones. Opposition was expressed because if adopted a large percentage would go to areas with a large salary base. It was pointed out that department can decide how to spread in 6 and dean can also decide. It was mentioned that the problem exists at the Provost level. It would be more equitable for distribution to be based on the salary of different defined units than 7% across the disciplines. The amendment was defeated - 7 for, 21 against.

Clarification was requested on #4 not coming from the salary base. Is this a suggestion for a tax increase? It simply meant that no monies should be taken to address equity issues from 7% increase. They should be addressed but not from the salary base increase. The legislature has appropriated some money once or twice for this purpose. Suggestion was made to recommend division of money half on per head basis and half on % basis. Barry Andersen moved to amend #1 to include a flat dollar amount for 50% of the increase on a per head basis and the other 50% distributed on a percentage basis. It was stated that the Provost has heard the concerns and Senate should let policy go as written. Motion was withdrawn by Professor Andersen.

The issue was raised that the salary consultant has been hired and he should address this issue. Macel Wheeler moved that money should not come from the increase in the salary base to address issues in #4. Additional funds are available to the Provost. Chris Stiegler seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

It was pointed out that there was a gentlemen's agreement that last year's recommendation would be in place for two years until the salary consultant was in place. The Budget Committee chose to look at salary policy recommendations again this year.

Question was raised on #3 as this is not currently the way monies are distributed in the Colleges of Business and Chase Law. These colleges had opportunities for faculty input to policies.

Question was raised on market adjustment and equity. If there is no discretion, how would these be addressed. Money could come from open positions. He will not take a cut of the 7%.

Time allotted for discussion was over.

Clarification was requested on the intent of the administration to address market and equity issues. The 10% recapture by the Provost's Office amounts to approximately \$100,000 per year. The Provost indicated he did not intend to take monies off the top of the 7% salary base increase money to address market or equity issues.

It was again pointed out that time was up. The question was called. The motion as amended passed - 30 for, 1 opposed.

### **C. Curriculum Committee - Mike Klembara**

1) Questions was raised concerning the courses in Italian about whether this was a language we should be expanding in a time of limited resources. Should university be expanding into a language in nonwestern category. Courses are being proposed at this time because the university currently has a faculty member who can teach Italian but not other languages and music students can use Italian. They are therefore useful courses which compliment the romance courses currently taught. The university has a resource here that we should use it. The motion passed with 1 negative vote.

2) A quick update was provided on the Masters in Public Administration proposal. It is not a new initiative. It dates back to 1983 when Public Administration was a separate one person program. At that time CHE only wanted joint proposals. Eastern and NKU proposed a joint degree program. The CHE did not reject the proposal but beginning in 1985/86, Kentucky State University was to offer the program at NKU. Problems existed. KSU didn't put personnel and money into the program to offer a viable program. It was basically manned by one person and no publicity was given to program. Twelve to fifteen students enrolled. Conditions deteriorated and the program was discontinued. CHE now is willing to let NKU take over. The proposal needed to be to CHE in October and was re-entered in the NKU process at the same time. It is a 3 year program primarily geared to people currently in the government work force. CHE questions were satisfactorily answered. It is felt they will respond favorably. Documentation was persuasive.



A question was raised as to how this will affect undergraduate teaching. Will it mean more part time faculty or larger classes? Courses will be slightly different for graduate courses. It will not weaken but allow department to develop and strengthen enrollment. There will be double enrollment (undergraduate and graduate) in some courses.

Time was called.

One comment was made that there would be standards for entrance. Request will be made for accreditation from discipline related source. The motion passed unanimously.

The Provost has requested an assessment plan for the four year general studies component from the Curriculum Committee.

#### **D. Professional Concerns - Ted Weiss**

1) The voting item on the Policy on HIV Infections passed unanimously. Student Government previously approved the student policy.

2) The committee has recommended changes to the draft of the strategic plan. These have been shared with the University Planning Committee. There were no comments or suggestions from the floor.

A resolution has been passed by the committee on complimentary textbooks. It is now in Sheila Bell's office.

Recommendations on university governance are now in the Provost's Office. These will be discussed at the January meeting.

The committee hopes to have recommendations on the Student Grade Appeal Policy ready for the next Senate meeting.

- VI. A motion is on the floor concerning parking fees increase which was tabled at the last Senate meeting to secure more information. Information on the fee increase itself and from benchmark and Kentucky schools was sent to Senators. A clarification was requested concerning whether these increased monies would be specifically for parking needs or go into the general funds. Information shared by Dr. Scholes indicated this is not a dedicated fee but revenue would be kept for parking and other related improvements. At this time the administration would be irresponsible not to request more money in parking fees. Questions were raised on parking improvements. It takes \$30,000 to resurface one lot. \$400,000 has been spent on lots in the past five years. We are currently up some 600-700 spaces. There have been a number of improvements. It is not a one to one match. If increase goes into effect it will provide additional revenues of \$86,027. Current revenue is \$165,000 of which \$30,000 is raised by fines.

Question was raised that isn't a 37% increase in one year exorbitant. If the portion of increase which would go into capital fund were utilized, would then parking fees be decreased? Some faculty and staff spaces will be returned in lot J when construction is completed. Why are the increases different %'s for different classes? An increase of between \$85,000 and \$100,000 was needed and the fee increase proposals were backed into. The administration is trying to

meet the January Board meeting. There was no change recommended for part time faculty because currently it is a bargain to the institution to get part time faculty to teach for them and it doesn't sit well to turn around and require a parking fee. It is also difficult to administer these fees. It only generates about \$3,000 in revenue for the institution. Where are we currently on multi-level parking? The university is running out of land for parking lots. To build a parking structure would cost between \$8,000 - \$10,000 for one space. Necessary revenue would therefore be high to retire bonds. If a private agency is brought in, it would be expensive. There needs to be a rational relationship between costs and fees.

Senate discussion noted that the 37% increase is too much at one time. Scholes indicated it was tied to salary increases and that there has been no increase for several years. It is now intended to be reviewed on a more regular basis. Questions was raised whether it was advisable to give someone a parking sticker. If some uses a space, shouldn't everyone be charged? In the listing of campus parking improvements, some signage was seen as parking related but not all signage. Lighting was seen as a security measure and should not all be recovered from parking fees. The listing of improvement was seen as partially misleading as they are only partly related to parking. The additional cost for not charging part time faculty was seen as valuable because of the benefits gained from good part time faculty. A parity issued might be present in charging part time staff but not part time faculty.

Cost needs to be taking into consideration in comparison to downtown parking. Increase will be used to provide some funds for the Department of Public Safety as well as for improvement of lots. The size of the increase was again questioned. It was not seen as appropriate in the years of 2-3% raises but we are now looking at a more reasonable salary increase. Therefore it is more appropriately to discuss increase at this time. Does this not confirm "fat" within the university if we can finance within the university? The 37% increase was still seen as too much.

By discussion we have removed from tabling the motion to oppose any increase in parking fees. There appears to be justification for some increase. Fred Schneider moved to substitute recommendation not to increase parking fees more than 10%. David Thomson seconded. The amendment was defeated - 16 opposed to 12 in favor.

Mike Klembara moved to recommend a \$7 increase (to \$42 instead of \$48) for faculty. Andrea Cornuelle seconded. The motion was amended to change reserved spaces to \$144 instead of \$180 for faculty. The amended motion passed -21 in favor, 7 opposed.

The motion to recommend a \$7 increase for regular parking, \$144 for reserved parking, and no fee increase for part time faculty passed - 19 for, 9 opposed.

As there was no new business the meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.



# **Faculty Senate**

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

## VOTING ITEM

SUBMITTED BY THE BUDGET COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION  
BY THE FACULTY SENATE ON DECEMBER 19, 1988

During the November 14 meeting of the Budget Committee, Dr. Jorns and Dennis Taulbee presented new budget information/proposals which indicated that funds could be used for more than a "one-time" allocation. The Budget Committee solicited input from members of their departments and met on December 5 to discuss the new information.

At our meeting on the 5th, the Committee voted to support the following recommendations:

1. Funding for the library automation project in a two-stage approach - \$150,000 in 1988-89 and \$200,000 in 1989-90, with the recommendation that the \$200,000 next year come from excess funds, if possible, rather than from the recurring reserves. This allows \$100,000 to be used by Academic Departments for equipment in 1988-89 and \$100,000 to be used by Administrative Affairs for maintenance/repairs.
2. The 7 percent salary increases for existing employees in the 1989-90 operating budget totaling \$1,680,000 for the proposed increased. This means the employees' bonuses are not a viable option.

The Budget Committee requests Senate Action on the above recommendations.

12/5/88

*Amendment*  
Faculty Salary Policy  
1989-90

The following statements will guide the distribution of salary dollars awarded to faculty in the Spring of 1989.

1. Monies allocated for salary increases in the 1989-90 academic year will be distributed to College and the Steely Library by the Provost following discussions with the deans. It is the duty of the deans to convey to the provost, the features of their College departments which justify salary allocation as requested.

2. A written policy directing the distribution of monies from dean to departments must be developed at the college level. Each dean will collaborate with his/her chairpersons on the development of this policy to be put into effect.

3. Within departments, monies will be distributed to individual faculty based on policies developed by the faculty and department chairs, and approved by the college dean.

4. Market and equity adjustments should not come from the <sup>increase in the</sup> salary base. It is the responsibility of the administration and legislature to see that these considerations be funded from other sources.

5. Active scholar and graduate compensations must not alter the proportion of monies distributed by the provost to the colleges and to Steely library for faculty increases.

6. Written policies directing the distribution of monies from provost to dean, from dean to departments within the colleges, and from chairpersons to individual faculty members must be on file with the faculty senate. At each level, monies should be allocated on the basis of (a) across the board increase, based on satisfactory performance and (b) merit, based on performance judged to be above satisfactory.

Approved as amended (#4) by Faculty Senate on 12/19/88  
30 for ; 1 opposed



FACULTY SALARY POLICY\*  
1988-89

The following statements will guide the distribution of salary dollars awarded to faculty in the Spring of 1988 for 1988-89:

1. Monies allocated for salary increases in the 1988-89 academic year will be distributed to Colleges and the Steely Library as a proportion of the salary base of faculty and chairs of each unit.

2. A written policy directing the distribution of monies to departments will be developed at the College level. Each Dean and his/her chairpersons will collaborate on the development of this policy which will require a majority vote to be put into effect. Equity issues based on gender and/or salary compression, if they exist, should be addressed by this policy.

3. These monies will be distributed to individual faculty based on written policies specifying performance criteria and salary distribution developed jointly by the faculty and departmental chairs and approved by the college dean.

4. Each department faculty, the College of Business faculty, the Chase College of Law faculty, and the Steely Library faculty will develop a policy on salary distribution which will include some across the board increase distributed to all faculty members judged to have performed satisfactorily. Each policy will also have a meaningful component of the salary increment reserved for performance that is above satisfactory.

\* It is appropriate that market adjustments and equity considerations be addressed by the state legislature with adjustments to affect all university faculties in Kentucky.

passed by the Budget and Commonwealth Affairs Committee,  
October 14, 1987

submitted to Faculty Senate, October 19, 1987

approved F/S: For 20, opposed 5, abstentions 2