

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
December 17, 1990
U. C. Ballroom NOON

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes of November 19, 1990 meeting
- III. Additions to and/or deletions from agenda
- IV.. Senate President's Report - Jim Thomas
- V. Committee Reports
 - A. Budget & Commonwealth Affairs - Ljubomir Nacev
 - 1. Market/Equity Salary Policy - voting item (10 minutes)
 - B. Professional Concerns - Ray McNeil
 - 1. Resolution concerning "University Tenure" - voting item 20 minutes
 - C. Curriculum Committee - Phil McCartney
 - 1. Course Change (PSC 103) - voting item (5 minutes)
 - 2. Program change (Teacher Ed in HPE) - voting item (5 minutes)
 - D. Faculty Benefits - Gary Scott (5 minutes)
- VI. Old Business
- VII. New Business - possible consideration of the university's proposed Affirmative Action Plan (copies on reserve in Steely Library)
- VIII. Adjournment

*Should have been 30 minutes.
Pg 12/19/90*

JT/pg

FACULTY SENATE PLEASE NOTE:

You are invited to come to the Ballroom prior to the December meeting. Snacks and refreshment will be served in appreciation of your serving on Faculty Senate. The buffet table will available at 11:30 a.m. Your Christmas treat!!!

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

Minutes of the December 17th 1990 Meeting of the
Faculty Senate

Members Present: Michael Avey, Diane Belland, Lawrence Borne, Carol Bredemeyer, Y. Datta, Frank Dietrich, Sudesh Duggal, Nancy Firak, Ron Hickey, Randy Holt, Mike King, Vinay Kumar, Dennis Lye, Phil McCartney, Ray McNeil, Frances Mosser, Bob Mullen, Ljubomir Nacev, James Niewahner, L. MacKenzie Osborne, Dennis O'Keefe, Terry Pence, Michael Prioleau, Vince Schulte, Jim Thomas, J. Michael Thomson, Bill Wagner, Stephen Walker, Bob Wallace, Allen Ellis for Emily Werrell

Members Absent: Gary Clayton, Don Kelm, Nan Littleton, Margaret Myers, Bill Recker, Gary Scott

Guests: Mary Kirk, Dennis Taulbee, Carla Chance, David Jorns

I. Call to Order--12:07pm

II. Approval of Minutes of Nov. 19th 1990 meeting

Amendments:

Typographical Errors--in D.2.1. the words "were," "eligibility," and "ceiling" were misspelled.

Ray McNeil asked that in section V.B. the more accurate term "University Tenure" be substituted for "tenure for administrators."

On the record of the vote on the Justice Studies Department the phrase "with one opposed" should be deleted.

In the Curriculum Committee report, section 5-C, the paragraph outlining the development of a non-traditional course should be deleted.

The phrase "The motion to approve carried" should be added referring to the Budget voting item.

The minutes were approved as amended.

III. Additions/Deletions to the Agenda

Typographical Error--Item V-A should list 30 minutes for discussion, not 10 minutes.

IV. Senate President's Report--Jim Thomas

A. Senate/Administration Retreat

Jim reported that informative discussion had occurred on several issues. One of these was the revision of the Articulated Strategic Plan. It is not quite clear exactly what the Senate's role is in the revision process. In the future, faculty will have input into the formative stages of the next Articulated Strategic Plan. A copy of the revision will be put on reserve in the library. Chairs also have been given copies. The faculty may read it and offer input to the Faculty Senate president, the deans, or Dr. Jorns. If there are concerns that need to be brought before the Faculty Senate they may be brought at the next meeting. It should be noted that the Senate is not being asked to approve the revision, therefore it does not need to go through a subcommittee.

B. Education Support Program

Will be referred to Professional Concerns Committee.

V. Committee Reports

A. Budget and Commonwealth Affairs--Ljubomir Nacev

Ljubomir briefly highlighted the features of the proposed voting item:

It contains no bright-line test.

It is merit based.

It features a vertical evaluative process.

It is reactive in nature, reflecting the responses given in the last Senate meeting.

It is a value-based approach.

He then asked for responses.

Nancy Firak noted that pg. 1, 2-a evaluates degrees only by level, and doesn't consider the source. A friendly amendment was offered changing the wording of 2-a. to "The presence of terminal and/or joint degrees held by the faculty member." The amendment was accepted. She further noted that the faculty must make a case for themselves, forcing an adversarial nature to the process, and putting women and certain other faculty at a disadvantage in a self-promotion contest. Ljubomir reiterated that the process was not intended to be adversarial, but acknowledged that the concerns were valid and worthwhile.

A proposal was offered to lessen this adversarial quality. It was proposed to move the 2 sentences of step A to after the first sentence of step B. Step A would be eliminated and steps B-C-D-E would be relettered as A-B-C-D. In the second sentence of the original step A, the words "his/her case" would be deleted and replaced with "reasons for such adjustment, using all..." Discussion followed, questioning whether the amendment would really eliminate the adversarial nature of the process. The amendment was approved.

The next issue discussed was that of feedback. Ray McNeil noted that last year feedback on the requested adjustments were given to some faculty and not to others. He proposed that feedback be given to faculty members after step A. The following amendment was proposed:

"The chair will notify each faculty member of the recommended adjustments and the reasons for the adjustments." This sentence was added after the 1st sentence of revised step A. The amendment was approved.

The time limit was extended an additional 15 minutes.

The placement of the sentence on faculty notification was questioned. Ray McNeil moved placing it at the end of Revised Step A. This motion failed.

Frank Dietrich moved deleting Revised Step D on the principle that the policy should not include formulae. After discussion, this motion failed.

The time limit was extended an additional 10 minutes.

A minority report was brought before the Senate, which was intended to offer less room for interpretation within the process. After discussion on this report, a third proposal from Frank Dietrich and Phil McCartney, that relied on case by case evaluations by the chair, was introduced. There was also discussion on the relative merits of CUPA data as a standard.

The question on the original proposal was then called, and the voting item passed as amended.

Ljubomir expressed his thanks to Peg Goodrich for her help with the distribution of materials at the last minute, and to the committee members for their work.

B. Professional Concerns Committee--Ray McNeil

1. Resolution on University Tenure--distributed to members

Discussion focused on whether any reference should be made to the case of Dean Johnson. A motion to delete all references to Dean Johnson was defeated. A motion to table the resolution until the January meeting was defeated. The resolution was passed.

C. Curriculum Committee--Phil McCartney

1. Change in Course Description--PSC 103
Deletion of a mention of a course that no longer exists.
Approved
2. Program Change--Teacher Education in Health and Physical Education
Action in response to a state mandate
Approved

D. Faculty Benefits

No report

VI. Old Business

None

VII. New Business

The Affirmative Action Policy was moved to the agenda of the January meeting. It is hoped that the Professional Concerns Committee will approve the document so that, after Senate approval, it could be sent to the Regents for their consideration in the Jan. 30 meeting. Copies of the document are in Stealy Library.

VIII. Meeting adjourned--2:04pm

Submitted by Michael King, Secretary

MEMORANDUM

December 7, 1990

TO: Faculty Senate

FR: Professional Concerns Committee

RE: Draft Resolution on "University Tenure"

The Northern Kentucky University Faculty Senate hereby resolves that:

1. No form of tenure shall be given to anyone within the University other than faculty members who go through an appropriate departmental review. Therefore, the faculty does not recognize the title "University Tenure" granted to Dean Johnson.
2. The purpose of tenure is to ensure that faculty members may teach and conduct research in an appropriately free atmosphere.
3. If the Administration wishes to grant some form of job security to ensure similar freedoms to any administrator not tenured in a department, the Administration should develop a detailed proposal for such an award. The proposal should outline the responsibilities and benefits, delineate the process for appointment and revocation, and specify a title that does not include the term "tenure". (Of course, appointments subject to the traditional faculty tenure process would still be granted tenure.) We request that any such proposal developed by the Administration would be presented to the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate further recommends that:

1. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate send a letter to President Boothe (with copies to Provost Jorns and Dean Johnson) expressing the faculty's displeasure with the manner in which Provost Jorns recommended University Tenure for Dean Johnson.
2. The Faculty Regent be requested to make sure the Board of Regents is made aware of the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate.

Note: The above resolution and accompanying recommendations are not meant to reflect negatively on Dean Johnson or on the quality of his contributions to Northern Kentucky University. They are directed at the title which has been awarded and the procedure by which it was granted.

Faculty Senate

Northern Kentucky University Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

TO: Department Representatives on Faculty Senate

FR: Peg Goodrich, Office Secretary

DA: December 7, 1990

RE: Curriculum Voting Items for Senate Meeting December 13

Your departmental representative on the Curriculum Committee were instructed at their meeting on November 29th to give you the necessary papers for the voting item #2 under Curriculum on the enclosed agenda. If you have not received them please secure these from your representative shown below.

We recently set up this procedure in order to reduce the paper work. If your department was not represented at the last meeting, or they have not turned it over to you as yet, please contact them.

Your department representative:
