

MEMO

To: Faculty Senators
From: Janet Miller, Senate Secretary
Re: Faculty Senate Meeting
Date: Sept. 8, 1978

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held Monday, Sept. 18, 1978, in Landrum 110 at 3:00 p.m.

At this meeting, materials will be given to you to distribute among your program's faculty. Be sure you know the number of faculty members in your program, including the number of new faculty.

AGENDA

- I. President's Report
- II. Old Business
 - Honors Program Proposal
 - Constitution
- III. Committee Reports
 - A. Curriculum
 - B. Faculty Benefits
 - C. Professional Concerns
 - D. Budget
- IV. New Business
 - Congress of Kentucky Faculty Senators

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

September 18, 1978

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

Others present:	Aaron Miller	V. Schulte
	A. Pinelo	R. Abrahamson
	F. Stallings	

President's Report

President Miller announced that Dr. Ralph Pearson, a candidate for the position of Director of Community Research and Services, would be on campus on Wednesday, September 20. There will be a meeting with faculty at the time of his visit.

Dr. Miller called upon Jeffery Williams, Vice President, who is trying to arrange for a new meeting room in the University Center. In the future the Faculty Senate will meet in Room 108, University Center. The dates of future meetings were discussed. It was decided that a room would be reserved for the December meeting although the December meeting is tentative at this time. Following a brief discussion, Jonathan Bushee made a motion to hold the February meeting on the fourth Monday. Tom Cate seconded the motion. Motion passed.

In March, because of spring vacation, the agenda will be mailed two weeks ahead of time.

President Miller announced a forthcoming meeting with representatives from Student Center and the Academic Council regarding the idea of a University Senate, in early October. He then reminded Senators of the need to develop, through their committees, a set of priorities for the year's activities. The committee chairpersons have been asked to submit their priorities in writing by the first of October. He announced that a full report of all appointments to various University Committees by the Faculty Senate will be made at the next meeting. He noted also that Connie Mulligan-Nichols will report on the allocation of funds for the library at the next meeting. In addition, Mr. Holloway may be asked to the meeting.

President Miller then announced that he had received a packet from President Albright with materials from the Danforth Foundation. Dr. Miller explained the program to which faculty members can be nominated including some of the benefits which accrue from appointment as an Associate. Information regarding the Danforth Associate Program will be made available to the deans and chairpersons and will also be on

reserve in the library. President Miller will also provide any information personally on the program.

Finally he reported that he met with Dr. Travis, along with Jim Fouche and Jonathan Bushee, regarding the faculty handbook. They found no substantive problems with the handbook, and it will be sent on to the printer in a few days.

Old Business

Honors Program Proposal

Al Pinelo briefly explained the Honors Program Proposal which had been introduced in the last Senate meeting. Several questions were raised about the role of the Senate in considering the proposal. It was not clear whether the Senate was to approve or disapprove the program or merely discuss it. President Miller and Professor Pinelo agreed that the Senate would vote to recommend or not recommend the proposal. Question was raised as to whether the proposal had gone through any curriculum committee. Dr. Pinelo responded that it had not gone through the University Curriculum Committee. Professor Cate noted, according to his reading of the proposal, that the program would be set up to exist as an experimental program for five years. At this point, Dean Aaron Miller came forward to respond to a question regarding the role of the Experimental Dean's Office and the Honors Program once it is under way. He noted that the Honors Program proposal, which was drafted by members of the faculty itself, was given to him by the Provost for administrative purposes only. He envisions the Director of the program and the council working with the director would be or should be reporting directly to the Provost. He does not think an honors program is, by definition, not an experimental program. It was, he thinks, intended to be housed in the Experimental Programs on a temporary basis until such time as the program could be established according to the wishes of the faculty. Dr. Pinelo explained that the statements in the proposal were intended to set a time limit for trying the program. If it did not work out it would be terminated. Further, the intent of the committee was that it would not be tried if the faculty did not wish to try it.

Jim McKenney questioned the rationale of the program. He expressed the thought that it might be better to have honor sections in each program and then perhaps build that into a full Honors Program. Al Pinelo responded to this by noting the difficulty of an individual faculty member doing much alone, given 12 hour teaching loads. He then pointed out the role of each department as described in the proposal.

Professor McKenney then asked how the program would get started. Dr. Pinelo said entering freshmen would be guided into honors sections when they register. McKenney questioned whether any departments had honors sections in which to place students. Frank Steely responded to this particular point noting that while he thought the idea itself was honorable at Northern Kentucky University, it would be difficult to get students who commute and work to sign up in honor sections. *The enrollments were not enough and so they had to give them up. Professor Pinelo thought an institutional effort with a director appointed might be able to overcome these problems.

*See insert on page 6

Ron Gardella then suggested that the University might identify honor students and develop a Honors Program through an individual contract system. If only a few honors sections were offered in a few areas, it might become discriminatory. Al Pinelo responded to this by noting that the program did not exclude Dr. Gardella's suggestion; in fact, the proposal at this point was not that detailed. Much of the work on the Honors Program is left for the Director to work out. Debra Pearce pointed out that the program could develop gradually starting first with freshman English classes and then adding in courses at the upper levels, which might involve special research or could be carried out as a seminar.

Jonathan Bushee raised the question of the lack of faculty resources at Northern Kentucky University to deal with present program requirements. Others expressed concern about budget needs and particularly the addition of another administrator before the need is clearly identified. Dr. Pinelo noted that the proposal only calls for half-time release to get the program going. Dean Miller responded that the question at this point is to determine the faculty inclination about a Honors Program. He said if the Administration wanted to support the program, they would have to support it in terms of Faculty Budget needs. The Honors Program as it is presently proposed involves only a fourth-time reassigned faculty.

Tom Cate raised several points. First, he pointed out that the high entry grade average is then lowered as a requirement for continuation in the program. Another point he made was that we already have a program for graduation with honors. He asked whether any studies had been done on the ACT scores of entering freshmen who are in the upper ten percent regarding their college achievement. Finally, he wondered if we would be creating a program which would result in ignoring the other students. **See insert on page 6.

Dean Miller then addressed the philosophical question raised by this sort of program in a university with a democratic mission. He said, indeed, one must consider whether this is an elitist program. Professor Cate called attention to recent developments at CUNY.

Frank Steely suggested that Dean Miller develop a list of students with high grades at this time and try to determine if they would take courses at certain times, if they were honors courses. Dean Miller responded that he did not know whether it would be more costly for him to do this than to go ahead with the proposal and have the fourth-time reassigned faculty director of the Honors Program do this sort of survey. The question right now is whether the faculty wants to go ahead with the Honors Program in principal, rather than deal with the logistics, of implementing the program.

Ken Beirne moved that the Honors Program Proposal be referred to the Curriculum Committee for study, after which they would return a recommendation to the Faculty Senate for a vote. Bill Oliver seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Constitution

Copies of the constitution were distributed to all Senators to be distributed, in turn, to all members of their respective program faculties.

Report on the poll as to whether faculty members were in favor of the public disclosure of faculty salaries

The results of the poll indicated that while a majority of the faculty voted for public disclosure a very substantial minority were clearly opposed to public disclosure. A number of faculty members responded to the question with reservation or with qualifications.

Jonathan Bushee moved that faculty salaries be listed individually in a file in the library. Debra Pearce seconded the motion. After some discussion Dr. Bushee withdrew his motion and then moved that all faculty, administrator, and staff salaries be made available through a file in the library.

At this point, Bill Oliver questioned the legality of any disclosure of salaries, especially since staff members were not involved in any vote on the issue. Ed Goggin responded that the legality issue was not clear. Salaries are on public record in Frankfort. Professor Bushee noted that salaries were published at Western and that they were not in jail. They were then able to make a comparison of their salaries in relation to benchmark institutions, as well as an intra-university comparison. Professor Bushee stated that it is better to have facts rather than to deal with rumors.

Jim McKenney asked about the value in having information about specific faculty salaries. Lois Sutherland noted that salary information is available. The Northerner, she said, had information on salaries in the past but had not printed it. Dr. Steely noted that while the press has access to the payroll they do not have individual salaries unless they take the time to go to Frankfort. Further discussion centered on the availability of information on salaries, the strong vote in favor of disclosure in some programs and the strong vote against in others. Ed Goggin reminded the Senators that the initial concern of this issue was a comparison of Northern Kentucky University's salaries and average salaries given in the AAUP. The format of the polling and the lack of specific predetermined categories was discussed. A motion to table issue of public disclosure of faculty salaries passed.

Committee Reports

Curriculum Committee: Professor Hopgood reported that the Curriculum Committee had met and recommended approval of a new Three-Plus-Two Program in Engineering as proposed by Physical Sciences. The report was approved by the Senate.

Faculty Benefits: Jonathan Bushee reported on various items from the Faculty Benefits Committee. The committee voted an increase for the Summer Fellowship Fund from \$2,000 to \$2,200. The deadline for applications for summer fellowships was extended to the 25th of September since only one copy of the Policy and Procedures Manual has been available in each program. In addition, Professor Bushee had received a number of phone calls about application procedures.

The review of the fringe benefits package for Northern Kentucky University employees will soon be made. The Administration will learn on the 22nd of September if the state will allow them to fund the study. The cost of the study by an independent company will be

approximately \$5,000. One important point of the study is to compare the benefits at Northern Kentucky University with other institutions in the Cincinnati area. If completed, results of the study will be referred to the Senate for consideration.

Project grant proposals, which have been submitted and approved, are on file in the Reserve Room of the Library.

The tax for TANK, which is being taken out of salaries, is being checked on. There is a possibility the tax may be repealed and monies may have to be refunded. The counties are well aware of this possibility.

Mr. Bushee discussed liability coverage for Northern Kentucky University faculty. The Provost has been asked to inform the faculty about their liability coverage. The faculty appears to be covered when they drive state vehicles, but they are not covered when they are driving their own vehicles on university business. He is not sure about liability for statements made in class.

The budget for Faculty Development Programs is not yet finalized. It appears it will at least not be less than last year's allocations.

Finally, the Faculty Benefits Committee worked all summer on the Policy and Procedures Handbook. A copy of this is in the hands of the chairpersons.

Professional Concerns

Janet Johnson reported for Jim Fouche' on Professional Concerns. The various subcommittees which have been established reflect the priorities of that committee. These subcommittees include faculty handbook student affairs, teacher evaluation, and academic standards.

Budget

Professor Singh had no report from the Budget Committee at this time.

New Business

Jonathan Bushee reported on the first meeting of the Congress of Kentucky Faculty Senators. He discussed the idea of the Congress which is to develop a formalized procedure to exchange documents and perhaps put some pressure on the Council of Higher Education regarding enrollments and funding, etc. Northern Kentucky University, he noted, may certainly want to consider carefully their involvement since their situation is somewhat different from some of the other institutions.

President Miller asked for an expression of opinion from the Senators regarding the Congress. It was pointed out that there are great differences from one university to another in matters such as curriculum review, leaves, influence on policy procedures, etc. Jim Hopgood noted that since we are under no obligation to go through with the final form of the Council, there would be no harm in continuing at this point.

Ken Beirne moved to adjourn. Meeting adjourned.

Insertions

Honors Program Proposal:

*Page 2, last paragraph -- *It was tried three or four years ago and students would not register at the specified times the honors sections could be available. Bill Oliver pointed out that Physical Science had tried honor sections.

**Page 3, paragraph 3 -- **Professor Pinelo responded to these questions and noted that the grade point averages and such details were only suggestions at this point. Some of the ideas in the proposal resulted from consultation with Dean Claypool.

N.K.U. HONORS COMMITTEE REPORT:

A Proposal for the Creation of an Honors Program

I.. Rationale

During the academic year 1977-1978, Dr. Janet Travis, Provost, assigned faculty members to a committee for the purpose of studying the feasibility of an Honors Program at N.K.U. It is the opinion of this committee that an Honors Program would engender the following results:

- 1) Render N.K.U. a more attractive educational option to above average or gifted students who might otherwise attend other institutions.
- 2) Challenge gifted students currently enrolled at the University with a more rigorous course of instruction.
- 3) Challenge faculty members to teach their subjects in an innovative and more demanding fashion to well-motivated students.
- 4) Enhance the reputation of N.K.U. by sending more students into graduate or professional programs.

Therefore, the Committee recommends that an Honors Program be implemented at Northern Kentucky University.

II. Description of the Honors Program and Criteria for Entrance

- 1) The purpose of the program is to provide special educational opportunities for students who have indicated unusually high academic promise. These opportunities should include honors sections of regular courses, independent study, special seminars, interdisciplinary or integrative courses, and in addition, an opportunity to share scholarship with the whole academic community at N.K.U. through some type of in-house publication.
- 2) The objective of this program for the individual student participating is to foster initiative and self-reliance in learning under the guidance of mature faculty members.
- 3) The Honors Program is composed of two levels - one for freshmen and sophomores, and the other for juniors and seniors.
 - a. Admissions to the first level: 1) A prospective N.K.U. student whose ACT score is in the upper 10% of the incoming freshman class, or a student having completed one semester or more with a grade point average of 3.5 or better would be invited to join an Honors Program for the freshman and sophomore years.
2) Thereafter, a 3.0 grade point average each semester would be necessary for the student to remain in the program.
 - b. Upon completion of a minimum number of hours (possibly 24 semester hours) the student would be certified as an Honors Associate, and would be automatically eligible to enter the next phase of the Honors Program - generally covering the junior and senior years.

- c. The second level Honors Program is centered on the student's individual major, and the various program faculties should design a plan for honors work in that discipline.
- d. At graduation, the student who has participated in the second level of honors work is eligible to graduate "with Honors" upon the recommendation of the University Honors Council.

III. Implementation of the Honors Program at N.K.U.

- 1) Identification of students for Honors Program through Registrar.
 - a. Incoming freshmen whose ACT scores are in the upper 10% of the incoming freshman class.
 - b. N.K.U. students with grade point averages of 3.5 or above.
- 2) The computer system must be set up to automatically check that all students entering honors courses have been accepted into the Honors Program.
- 3) Formation of the Honors Council at N.K.U. -- a committee composed of faculty and students to work with the Dean of Experimental Programs. (The formula for membership on the Honors Council will be worked out by the Director of Honors programs). This committee will be responsible for recommending students to graduate with Honors, evaluating the Honors program, and overseeing the admission of students to the Honors program. Committee chaired by the Director of Honors program.
- 4) A half-time Director of Honors Programs should be hired on a fiscal year basis. This person should be recruited from the current full-time faculty at N.K.U.; should be tenured, and have a terminal degree in his or her discipline. In addition, this person should have a record of excellence in teaching and a genuine concern for students.
 - a. Search Process - The search should be conducted by a committee composed of four representatives elected by the Faculty Senate, the Provost, the Director of Advising, the Dean of Students, and chaired by the Dean of Experimental Programs.
 - b. The Director of Honors Program should be assisted at minimum by a half-time secretary.

IV. Job Description: The Director of Honors Program is responsible for:

- 1) Recruiting faculty and students to form an Honors Council to oversee the Honors Program. Decide on formula for membership and method of selection in consultation with the Dean of Experimental Programs.
- 2) Reviewing, refining and modifying this initial proposal for an Honors program in conjunction with the Honors Council. A full policy should be developed and publicized to the University community at large.

- 3) Implementing Honors Program policies, with the assistance of a part-time secretary.
- 4) Reporting periodically to the Dean of Experimental Programs and to the Honors Council on the state of the Honors program.
- 5) Acting as liaison between the Honors program and appropriate academic entities such as Admissions, Advising, Deans, and Program Chairpersons and Coordinators, and also between the N.K.U. Honors Program and the National Collegiate Honors Council.
- 6) Securing a list of eligible students from the Registrar and notifying them in writing of their eligibility.
- 7) Recruiting suitable students from the incoming freshman class and from those currently enrolled at N.K.U. into the Program.
- 8) Developing and supervising, in conjunction with the Honors Council and the various program faculties, the honors curriculum for the junior and senior levels in the Honors Program.

V. Timetable for Development of Proposed Honors Program at N.K.U.

- October, 1978 - Faculty Senate elects nominees and the President or the Provost appoints Search Committee to seek a Director of Honors Program.
- December, 1978 - Search completed. President appoints Director.
- January, 1979 - Director takes office and sets up Honors Council and begins development of and recruitment for the new program with initial budget.
- May, 1979 - In cooperation with the Honors Council, the Director works out expanded budget to include funding for purchasing faculty time from academic program and for a biannual publication to be used as a vehicle for the best work of Honors students.
- Fall, 1979 - The Associate level program is in place for incoming freshmen and sophomores. The program includes honors sections of introductory courses as well as possible interdisciplinary colloquia.
- January, 1980 - Director and Honors Council begins planning junior-senior honors program by meeting with program faculty. This second stage Honors essentially centers on the student's major or pre-professional course of study.
- August, 1981 - Honors Program is functioning at full capacity and the Committee develops an instrument for the evaluation of the program.
- May, 1982 - Honors Program evaluated
May, 1983

VI. Initial Budget: Second half Fiscal Year 1978-79

Office Supplies	\$ 50.00
Duplicating Expenses	250.00
Computer Time	100.00
Postage	125.00
National Collegiate Honors Council Dues	60.00
Travel	200.00

TOTAL (exclusive of salaries for Director and part-time secretary)	\$ 785.00
---	-----------

While it would be difficult to predict the budget request of a future Honors Program, the Committee estimates that for the academic year 1979-1980, the program would require some \$3,500 to \$4,000, including an Honors publication, and exclusive of any salaries or fringe benefits.

VII. Conclusion

The Committee recommends this undertaking, on a five year experimental basis, provided that after adequate consultation with the Faculty, the Administration determines that sufficient institutional support exists for the new program.

The Honors Program Committee wishes to thank Dr. Kyle C. Sessions, Director of Honors, Illinois State University, for his expert and most generous assistance in developing this proposal.

Honors Program Committee:

James Claypool
William McKim
Dennis O'Keefe
Debra Pearce
Adalberto J. Pinelo, Chairman

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty

FROM: Raman J. Singh, Chairman
Budget Committee, Faculty Senate

The Budget Committee is in the process of establishing priorities and goals for submission first to the Faculty Senate and then to President Albright. We strongly feel that the entire faculty ought to be involved in the budgetary process at N.K.U. This may seem (and it is!) an additional burden on us, but if we don't take an active part we will certainly miss out on the opportunity to voice our opinions on matters that affect us. Whether we are successful in this regard or not is going to be determined by the nature of our actions - collective or fragmented.

The trend that appears to be developing is that the administration is more than willing to react to a list of priorities submitted by the Faculty Senate. While this is commendable, we feel that faculty input should be more substantive. The faculty is certainly capable of playing a more direct and constructive role during the budget making process that should include: reaction to goals and priorities (short and long range) as defined by the administration; consultation on a regular basis before final decisions on broad issues are made, etc., etc. For instance, the increase in the non-faculty personnel category in the last two years ought to interest us. Whether this rapid expansion in the non-faculty category is justified or somewhat questionable can be determined only if we are informed and consulted on a regular basis. Some say that the increase in faculty and non-faculty personnel should have been more balanced. Since Fall 1976, while over a hundred non-faculty new positions have been filled, only about 17 (233 vs 250) new faculty positions have been approved. We would like to know if only to maintain the faculty morale.

Our more traditional concerns are in the area of faculty salaries (cost of living, merit increase, etc., based on some system with predictable results from year to year); promotion increases (\$300, \$500, \$750 for 1978-79; even Boone County School System gave \$1,500 increase for promotion from Rank III to II and Rank II to I - data from their published Salary Schedule); a reasonable minimum travel fund per faculty; maintenance and strengthening of existing programs, etc., etc. These concerns need to be discussed and resolved on both a short term and long term basis.

What all this leads to is that the Budget Committee needs your help in developing a faculty position paper in regards to budgetary concerns. All members of the Committee have been asked to have this item put on the agenda of their next program meeting or even hold a special meeting if feasible. Your representative can thus bring your concerns to the Committee. Additionally, you are welcome to send your suggestions to me.