

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

**January 23, 1989
3 p.m.
UC Ballroom**

AGENDA

- I. Approval of Minutes of December 19, 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) Funding for Faculty Development (**Voting Item**)
 - 2) University Budget Priorities (**Voting Item**)
 - C. Curriculum
 - D. Professional Concerns
 - 1) Governance -Faculty Workload and Titles (**Voting Item**)
 - 2) Complimentary Copies of Textbooks (**Voting Item**)
- VI. Old Business
- VII. *Report on SACB*
New Business
- VIII. Adjournment

NDM/pg

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University **Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076**

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES **Meeting of January 23, 1989**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Barry Andersen, W. Vernon Hicks replacing Roger Blanchard, Carol Bredemeyer, Tom Brossart, Andrea Cornuelle, David Dunevant, Lynn Ebersole, J. Lynn Jones, William R. Jones, Mike Klembara, Nancy D. Martin, Art Miller, Marjorie Muntz, Margaret Myers, Phil Obermiller, Dennis O'Keefe, Terry Pence, Fred Rhynhart, Denise Robinson, Fred Schneider, Frank Stallings, Chris Stiegler, James Thomas, David Thomson, Ramon J. Singh for Bill Wagner, Robert Wallace, Richard Ward, Ted Weiss, Emily Werrell, Macel Wheeler, Geraldine Williams.

MEMBERS ABSENT: R. Kent Curtis, Sudesh Duggal, Sandy Easton, Lou Noyd.

GUESTS: Rebecca Sturm Kelm, Linda Olasov, Bob Bussom, Jerry Legere, John Johnson, Rose Stauss, Roger Adams, Darryl Poole, Steve Stephens, Iris Tiedt, Joe Conger, Lynn Langmeyer, Jerry Carpenter, Carol Futhey, Tom Harden, Lew Wallace.

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

- I. The minutes of the December 19, 1988 meeting were corrected by changing the typing error on page 2, paragraph 4 from indicted to indicated and the period on page 7 in the \$3,000 to a comma. Frank Stallings moved to accept the minutes as corrected. The motion passed.
- II. A report on SACS by the Provost was added under old business. Professional Concerns Committee action was switched with Benefits on the agenda. Under status of Senate recommendations, a reconsideration of the Senate recommendation on the salary guidelines was added as a voting and discussion item. Under new business a discussion on assessment was added.

Nancy suggested limiting debate on agenda items - 15 minutes for reconsideration of salary guidelines, 10 minutes on funding for faculty development, 10 minutes on university budget priorities, 20 minutes for governance - faculty workload and titles, and 10 minutes for complimentary copies of textbooks. David Thomson moved acceptance. Art Miller seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Senate President's Report

The Chemistry Department has a new senator because Roger Blanchard has a schedule problem. He will be replaced by Vernon Hicks.

The automation of the library will not be with the GCLC project.

Data will be available in the Senate office on the report on pass-fail.

Dr. Boothe's response to the Faculty Study Report will be available in the Senate office. Three copies of the report are in the libraries.

Rose Stauss will continue as Associate Provost for another year.

Tom Brossart will serve as senate representative to the committee to develop an emergency evacuation plan for the university.

A Teaching Conference Workshop will be held on our campus on February 1, 1989 in cooperation with the Greater Cincinnati Colleges and Universities. The title is the "Dynamic Classroom". This will be a presentation of different learning styles with Steve Kenesha as presenter. The Provost's office will pick up the registration fee. It will be held in the University Ballroom from 1:30 to 4 with a buffet lunch offered from 12:30-1:30. Contact Peggy Bertlesman if interested in attending.

The Office of Institutional Research now reports to the Provost's office effective January 1, 1989.

A committee is being proposed to address and coordinate assessment. A draft will soon be available on committee structure and duties. Carol Futhey is willing to meet to discuss question of assessment with university groups. There is a copy of History and Geography department's response available in the Senate office.

Some faculty concerns which have been conveyed to Nancy include questions on assessments; the nature of our long term disability coverage; and the advertisement of NKU on radio and TV when it appears the classes were not open for students to register at that time due to the closing of classes. A concern was expressed about the lack of evening classes in general studies.

IV. Status of Senate Recommendations

Dr. Boothe has responded to the commitment of the 7% salary increase on January 11, 1989.

General guidelines have been re-drafted on a supplemental compensation policy. This will be reviewed by Professional Concerns Committee.

No response has been received to our resubmission of a 1985 Senate recommendation on the peer review process.

No response has been received on the HIV policies.

A response has been received on the sexual harrassment policy from Sheila Bell. Her revision was given to Professional Concerns.

The increase in the parking fee will be the Senate recommendation for next year and will increase to the administration's proposal the following year. It will be presented to the Board of Regents this Wednesday.

The salary consultant will begin work the week of February 20th or 27th. He will meet with staff, administration and faculty in open forums.

A request has been received for the Senate to reconsider point 4 in the salary policy guidelines passed by the Senate which stated that market and equity adjustments should not come from the increase to the salary base. When the University President disagrees with a Senate recommendation the Senate may be requested to reconsider. The Senate may ask the University President to present the Senate views to the Board of Regents.

Darryl Poole explained the administration's request. The policy last year allowed some money to be available for equity. One college has already made plans within the college to use some of the 7% for this. Another is considering it. Other sources of money are not available for this. The feeling of the Deans' Council was that money should be used where serious equity problems exist. With no change the institution may lose good faculty and therefore a reconsideration is requested.

Linda Olasov requested time to speak to the Senate. She requests consideration of the impact of disbanding the Faculty Senate. Other than Curriculum, no one would be any worse or better. She requests we think seriously about this. This Senate is evolving to a low point on the collegial totem pole. The Senate appears to have the least amount of input and appear to be the last people to be consulted. The Senate represents the most people. This item could be discussed under new business.

The reconsideration of the salary guideline was discussed. There are several aspects to the recommendation. Nothing was said about whether there should be market or equity adjustment but just that it shouldn't be taken from the 7% increase to the base. The budget was revised upward as of January 4, 1989. The projection for spring enrollment increase was conservative. An increase of 7% in enrollment is possible. An increase has also been received from the bookstore and from investments. Other monies are therefore available.

The salary policy guidelines were seen as a rebuilding of trust. Latitude has been given to the provost. It is believed that the 7% increase is seen as a regular increase. Senate should stay with the recommendation and not recommend the money be used for equity or market adjustments. The faculty will be very upset if only 4-5% will be available for regular issues. It is realized that Dr. Boothe does have the legal right to use money any way he wishes.

Last fall the Senate recommendation was changed about pay raises. The 7% was seen as available for pay purposes. It is hard to view equity and adjustment as part of a normal pay raise. They are entirely two different things. The understanding was that the 7% would be available in a pool for regular pay increases barring unforeseen emergencies and not to address equity or market adjustments.

The feeling was present that last year's guideline were for two years. This needs to be seen as a negotiable item. Colleges could agree to do it internally to retain faculty which would otherwise leave.

The Senate represents the faculty as a whole. If the policy is agreed to in principle, we should not change what we believe. Fred Schneider moved to reaffirm the salary guidelines policy of December 19, 1988 and to ask the University President to convey the Senate views to the Board of Regents. Carol Bredemeyer seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

V. Committee Reports:

D. Professional Concerns - Ted Weiss

- 1) A response on the governance issue was presented for the full Senate to consider.

A request was made to separate principle from specifics. Margaret Myers moved to separate the five points. Art Miller seconded. The motion passed with 1 negative vote.

Margaret Myers moved to delete from point 1 the term "active scholar". The amendment died due to the lack of a second.

It was felt that the term "active scholar" brought the statement into sharper focus. Concern was expressed about the implications in the statement. It was for illustration only. The vote on point 1 passed with 2 negative votes.

Point 2 was written to unify the university due to the implications of the workload policy and its effect on other colleges. The vote on point 2 was unanimous.

Point 3 was discussed. The College of Business policy was built on the faculty release time as a collective effort from the faculty. This was to have policy which articulated how release time would be granted. It was not to develop a new academic title. Concern was expressed that ultimately all the College of Business would have a 9 hour teaching load. This was to provide an objective standard whereby faculty if they requested release time and met certain criteria, they could expect to receive it. Prior to this time, release time had been addressed on an ad hoc basis. The intent was to be fair.

This creates a problem university wide. Faculty are doing same type of work without any break in their own department. A university wide equity factor is created with 9 hour, 12 hour and 15 hour faculty being separated into 3 different categories. This is a reinterpretation of the twelve hour load

Point 3 passed with 23 in favor and 6 opposed.

Point 4 was discussed. The College of Business policy was originated within a department to see that release time was generated above board and fairly.

A generic policy related to the Department of Education. They were denied accreditation by NCATE at the graduate level. A workload formula is not optional. It is necessary to keep program in existence.

We are not challenging the College of Business's right to change release time, but needs to be addressed by faculty handbook if the impact goes beyond the College of Business. This is a campus wide issue if additional faculty are needed to meet policy guidelines.

Time was called. The vote on 4 was 23 in favor and 6 opposed.

On point 5, there is a larger issue. As the institution grows, the colleges are going to develop their own autonomy. Caution is needed on two fronts - how new policy will affect the mission of the University and fairness between colleges. This is not directed against the College of Business but is key to the administration response to the May resolution

that no one has anything to say about it. This is asserting the Senate's right to address these type issues in principle. The Senate should have a right to address any policy which might have a deleterious effect upon the university.

The vote on point 5 was 28 in favor and 2 opposed.

2) The complimentary textbook policy was returned from Sheila Bell's office with minor changes. Some felt that the Senate should not endorse this policy because it is an ethical problem and should not be prohibited by a corporate mandate. Each department or individual should resolve issue internally. Some reasons given by the AAP included professors/authors deprived of royalties, students don't save money, raises price of new books to students, and publishers will become more reluctant to distribute complimentary copies. The question was called. 16 voted in favor of policy and 12 were opposed.

B. Budget Committee - Macel Wheeler

1) The Budget Committee presented a proposal for funding for faculty development.

Denise Robinson moved acceptance. Chris Stiegler seconded.

Discussion included need, request for expansion monies, request growing out of maturing of faculty, and faculty wanting to do more therefore more support is needed.

Time was called. The motion passed with 23 in favor and 4 opposed.

2) The only change from last year's budget priorities recommendation is to have a long range budget plan accompanying the Strategic Plan. The Provost supports this. The question was called. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Curriculum Committee - Mike Klembara

The committee continuing to work on assessment for general studies.

A. Benefits Committee - Marjorie Muntz

No report.

VI. Dr. Jorns reported that we have been reaffirmed by SACS with no reservations.

The Provost was asked whether he intended to distribute the 7% salary increase money evenly between colleges as this would merely increase the problem currently present. No decision has been made.

VII. The Senate was asked to discuss the report generated by the History and Geography Department on assessment. It was suggested that perhaps this could be discussed at a general faculty meeting. Concern was expressed that it could become a multiple choice exam. The assessment plan is not optional but mandated by SACS. There were 3 recommendation and 8 suggestions addressing

institutional effectiveness. Therefore the institution must do assessment. Many departments are already doing assessment and this needs to be formalized. The university as a whole is not doing it.

Macel Wheeler moved that the Executive Committee readdress their decision on assessment separately from the strategic plan and that this be put on the agenda of the next meeting. Jim Thomas seconded. The motion passed with one negative vote.

The strategic plan will be out in two weeks. Carol Futhey has documentation on criteria for SACS.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

GW/pg

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Leon E. Boothe

FR: Nancy D. Martin *NDM*

DA: January 20, 1989

RE: Your January 17 Response to Senate
Faculty Salary Policy Guidelines, 1989-90

It was disheartening to receive your memorandum regarding the Faculty Senate recommendation 4 of the guidelines for the 1989-90 faculty salary policy which states:

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

Your suggestion that the colleges should have the right to reserve a percentage of the dollar amount for equity and compression because they did it under last year's policy and had planned to do it again this year, misses the point of the annual guidelines as proposed by the budget committee and approved by the Senate.

There was lengthy discussion on the floor of the Senate's December 19 meeting regarding this very point. I stressed that discussion in my December 22 memorandum to you reporting the Senate action which was 30 in favor of the guidelines to 1 opposed. Provost Jorns assured the Faculty Senate that no funds for equity adjustments or compression problems would be taken from the 7% increase at the Provost level.

Today in my meeting with Dr. Jorns I was surprised to learn that he had discussed with you your January 17 response to the Senate and that he agreed that the procedure of allocating equity and compression from the college dollar amounts should be continued.

Dr. Jorns has indicated that you wish the Senate to reconsider it's position on point 4 at our meeting on Monday January 23. Although your memorandum did not mention this request, I will bring this before the Senate in my report on the status of Senate recommendations. Since you were unable to attend the December Senate meeting where the policy guidelines were discussed, I am disappointed that you will be out of town on January 23 and will not be present to address the equity and compression issue in point 4 and participate in the reconsideration.

Point 4.b. of your memorandum speaks to your "legal responsibility to access all university funds if the institution is found to be treating any group or

individual inequitably or unfairly." Certainly no one questions this. In fact, I would encourage the administration to consider the use of some of the additional monies just announced to the Board of Regents in the January 4, revised budget to address equity and compression. If faculty and staff salaries are truly the number one priority of the university and if we are sincerely attempting to build trust between the faculty and administration, then we need to protect the expected 7% increase to the faculty base.

When you return to campus, I would appreciate an opportunity to meet with you at your earliest convenience and discuss this issue and other Faculty Senate concerns.

copies to: David Jorns
Senate Executive Committee



Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076
(606) 572-5100

MEMORANDUM

January 17, 1989

TO: Nancy Martin

FR: Leon E. Boothe

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'L. Boothe'.

RE: Faculty Salary Guidelines for 1989-90

This is to acknowledge receipt of your memorandum of December 22, 1989, on the above-stated subject. As you know, I have approved the recommendation that the 7 percent raise pool be allocated for faculty raises. However, I have two reservations:

- 4a. Last year, the colleges had the right to reserve a percentage of the dollar amount allocated for equity and compression after consultation with the departments within the college. Since at least one college has already planned to do this, and since colleges should have some control over allocated resources, my thought is that this procedure be continued.
- 4b. Please be aware that I have a legal responsibility to access all university funds if the institution is found to be treating any groups or individuals inequitably or unfairly.
6. Regarding point six, I have no objection to posting salary allocation policies; however, I would prefer to have these policies posted at the library. Also, with the exception of my thoughts on number four, I believe decisions on the proportion of distribution of salary increase money should be reserved for the departments under the current policy

mjh

cc: David Jorns
Dennis Taulbee

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Leon E. Boothe

FR: Nancy D. Martin *NDM*

DA: December 22, 1988

RE: Faculty Salary Policy Guidelines, 1989-90

The Faculty Senate approved (30 for, 1 opposed) the following statements to guide the distribution of the 7 percent increase to the salary base for 1989-90.

1. Monies allocated for salary increases in the 1989-90 academic year will be distributed to Colleges and the Stealy 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 increase in the 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 Stealy 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 chair persons 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.

There was a great deal of discussion on the floor of the Senate about these guidelines. Concern was raised primarily that market and equity adjustments should not come from the 7 percent increase in the salary base. This was articulated through an amendment to the first statement in point 4: "Market and equity adjustments should not come from the (increase in the) salary base."

NDM/pg

cc: Dr. Jorns
Senate Executive Committee

SUB-COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE
Faculty Workloads and Titles

Background

On May 9, 1988, the Faculty Senate unanimously passed the following motion:

Matters of redefinition of faculty workloads and titles are matters of professional concern that apply universally and need to be addressed through normal governance channels of the Faculty Senate.

In response to this motion the administration over the summer responded with the draft of a "Resolution Concerning Governance Issues and College Directions." Pertinent sections of that draft read as follows:

Although teaching is of primary importance (University Mission Statement), the relative emphasis given to scholarship-research-creative activity, community service and university service may well vary among the colleges. Faculty assignments and the establishment for faculty workload policies are within the purview of each college, subject to review and approval by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

In order to provide for equitable and balanced faculty workloads, the college deans have, in the past, approved reductions in teaching loads for selected faculty engaged in extensive research or service activities. . . The recent establishment of teaching load policies by the College of Business and by the College of Professional Studies have not redefined the traditional 12-semester hour workload policy. They have, in essence, established (formalized) criteria for equitable faculty workloads in terms of teaching, research and service assignments. These policies were established only after discussion and agreement among the faculty in the respective colleges.

The Faculty Senate should certainly be concerned with issues that universally affect maximum workloads. However, the establishment of policies relating to the balance of assignments in teaching, research and service should be within the purview of each college, subject to its individual directions, emphasis and goals.

Response

1. We note that the administration draft does not respond to the issue of new titles (ie., Active Scholar within the Business College). We continue to feel that this issue is a matter of university-wide concern that needs to be addressed through the governance channels of the Faculty Senate.
2. We disagree that "faculty assignments and workload policies" ought to be solely "within the purview of each college." Such assignments and policies may have campus-wide impact that needs to be addressed by other campus bodies (including the Faculty Senate). If, for example, the internal policies of a college were to alter, in effect, the mission of the university (or to change the nature of undergraduate education here), such policies would necessarily have to be addressed by governance bodies beyond the college itself.

3. We think that the teaching-load policies recently established by the College of Business have redefined the traditional 12-hour workload policy at NKU. They have done this by creating a new title ("Active Scholar"). They have done it by giving preference to graduate classes (and teachers) in what had been a predominantly undergraduate department (item 3 in the College of Business "Guidelines"). They have done it by formalizing a division of labor between those who teach 9 hours or less (Active Scholar) and those who teach 12 hours or even more (a fifteen-hour load is indicated in item 9d of the guidelines). These policies change the traditional undergraduate teaching load at NKU both quantitatively (in the 15-hour load) and qualitatively (in the new title and in the new preference to graduate rather than undergraduate classes). Such changes are matters of professional concern to the Faculty Senate and to the university community-at-large. We believe that no single college should unilaterally be allowed to redefine faculty titles or faculty workloads or to change in a significant way the mission of this university (which presently emphasizes the teaching of undergraduate students.)

4. We believe that the new policies have "redefined" the traditional twelve-hour teaching load in two other ways. 1) They have raised issues of fairness and equity in that they would appear to reward teachers in some colleges more than those in other colleges who are doing comparable work (in terms of research and creative productivity). We speak here not of salary, which as the administrative draft points out is subject to market forces, but of workload and title (which are appropriately matters of university governance). 2) They have also raised pragmatic questions of financing, as they formalize a policy that requires the hiring of relatively expensive professors (even within the context of present business school salaries, already very high in relation to the rest of the institution). The implementation of this policy will inevitably reduce the ability to hire new faculty in other colleges; in this way, too, it could have a strong impact on the mission of the university itself.

5. We reiterate the Faculty Senate's motion that "redefinition of faculty workload and titles are matters of professional concern that apply universally and need to be addressed through normal governance channels of the Faculty Senate."

TW/pg

APPROVED BY FACULTY SENATE January 23, 1989: Point 1 passed with 2 negative votes
Point 2 was unanimous in favor
Point 3 passed with 23 in favor, 6 opposed
Point 4 passed with 23 in favor, 6 opposed
Point 5 passed with 28 in favor, 2 opposed

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS VOTING ITEM

Complimentary Copies of Textbooks

The Professional Concerns Committee recommends the following:

1. The buying and selling of complimentary copies of textbooks shall be prohibited on the NKU campus.
2. A "complimentary copy" of a textbook is defined as a textbook which has been given, not sold or exchanged for compensation of some kind, to a faculty member or an other individual by a book publishing and/or selling business or a representative of such a business.
3. The campus bookstore shall not sell textbooks which reasonably appear to be complimentary copies of textbooks.
4. NKU policy prohibits book companies and their agents or other persons involved in the book sales industry from soliciting unused complimentary textbooks on the NKU campuses.

Voting Item January 23, 1989

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

BUDGET COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

VOTING ITEM

The Budget Committee reaffirmed the Budget Priority Recommendation which was adopted by the Senate last year and commends the administration for its willingness to work with the faculty and Senate on these recommendations. The Budget Committee would like to add #5 on the attached to the Budget Priorities recommendation.

Faculty Senate meeting of January 23, 1989

SE/pg

The subcommittee decided to respond to last year's recommendations (1989-90) and offer further recommendations as necessary.

1. Since faculty salaries are significantly below those at the benchmark institutions, it is recommended that salaries be increased by at least 5% in each of the next two years. The total number of faculty, administrative or staff positions should not be increased unless the aforementioned recommendation is accomplished.

We recommend that faculty salaries be increased by at least 7% for 1989-90 as the administration proposes.

2. Because of the anticipated budget constraints, available monies should be used to support existing programs. Any new initiatives requiring a material financial commitment (e.g. Student Information System, A.A.C.S.B. accreditation) should be discussed by all constituencies of the University (i.e. Faculty Senate, Staff Congress, Council of Deans, Council of Chairs). A cost analysis, which includes the full disclosure of the source and uses of funds and the relationship of those initiatives to the missions of the University, should be addressed.

The administration has made progress in involving faculty and other groups in discussions regarding the budget.

3. The importance of maintaining the academic quality of the university requires that the academic programs be given the highest priority in the distribution of available monies.

We support this recommendation, but would like to see efforts made to improve the quality of our academic programs through an increase in operating budgets, upgrading of equipment and/or purchasing of new equipment, and an increase in monies to support those services which directly affect academic programs such as the Library and Academic Computing.

4. If the budget requires a significant reallocation of monies, all constituencies of the University (i.e. Faculty Senate, Staff Congress, Council of Deans, Council of Chairs) should have input into the reallocation process.

Once again, we recognize the administration's progress in involving the faculty and other groups in the budget process. We encourage these positive efforts to continue.

In addition to our response to the previous recommendations, we also recommend the following:

VOTING ITEM January 23, 1989

5. Although our response to the Strategic Plan is positive, we would like to see a long range budget plan (accompanying the Strategic Plan) with specific funds/dollar amounts attached to the priorities. This would help show how the goals would be accomplished monetarily and also give faculty enough advance notice to have significant input in the budget process.