

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

December 18, 2009

Members present: Seyed Allemeh, Michael Baranowski, Scottie Barty, Kevin Besnoy, Richard Boyce, Perry Bratcher, Carol Bredemeyer, Heather Bullen, Tom Cate, Steve Crites, Patty Connelly, Adele Dean, Emily Detmer-Goebel, Kristi Haik, Nancy Hancock, Mary Carol Hopkins, Irene Encarnacion (for Barbara Klaw), Alar Lipping, Lisa MacQueen, Phil McCartney, Kim McErlane, Jacqueline McNally, John Metz, Carl Miller, Phil Moberg, Scott Nutter, Cathy Pence, K.C. Russell, Toru Sakaguchi, Ron Shaw, Karen Tapp, Jim Thomas, Jeff Ward, Steve Weiss

Members absent: Paul Cooper, Ken Engebretson, Rich Gilson, Brant Karrick, Marc Leone, Aron Levin, Ausbra McFarland, Ban Mittal

Guests: Jim Votruba, Gail Wells, Chuck Hawkins, Grace Hiles, Ray McNeil, Suzanne Soled, Pat Moynahan, Debra Meyers, Joe Wind, Julie Kunselman, Diana McGill

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Alar Lipping at 1:00 pm. The minutes of the November 16, 2009 were approved after the following revisions: 1) under the Provost report, change wording under third bullet point from “Concern was expressed regarding...” to “Faculty Senate expressed concern regarding...” and 2) under the fifth bullet point of the Director of Wellness report changed “Karen MacQueen agreed to replace...” to “Lisa MacQueen agreed to replace...”

GUEST REPORTS:

- **University President** (Jim Votruba):
 - Thanks were expressed to the Senate regarding the hard work put forth this past year on SACS and general education reform.
 - Funding totaling \$17.5M have been received from various sources outside of state funding (\$35.5M) for the new College of Informatics building. Quite an achievement during tough economic times.
 - The Board of Regents, Faculty Senate, Staff Congress and Student Government are each custodians for various interests of the university. During tough economic times it is extremely important that all of these custodians work together for the best interests of the university as a whole. The outlook for the state economy is indicating that we are in for difficult times for the near future. Communication amongst the areas is vital. State revenues are falling below expectations. This indicates:
 - The worst fiscal environment in Kentucky history.
 - State use of stimulus funding is being used to recover and balance the budget.
 - The higher education budget will be considered more than in the past for possible cuts.

- However, there is a strong demand/base for NKU, and NKU is well positioned in the market place.
 - Conservative budgeting has served us well in the past, and we will continue this practice.
 - NKU is currently underfunded and therefore “used” to operating “lean”.
 - NKU needs to continue to cognizant of affordability to students.
- Options for operation during these “lean” times include:
 - “Hunker down” and hope to do better – an exhausting option which suppresses visioning and is not a preferred option
 - Maximizing student credit hours and moving to a per credit hour pricing option
 - Enforcing more stringently the current tuition payment policy
 - Setting enrollment targets by college and department
 - Closer management of classroom space
 - Seeding academic programs that make sense academically
 - Reassigned time as necessary
 - Keeping 80% of the classes in the 24 student enrollment range, with 20% of the classes in larger formats
 - Renovation of large classrooms to accommodate a larger student enrollment
 - Review of public engagement activities
 - Reduction of administrative overhead
 - Review of investments. However, we don’t want to see several years of no salary increases
 - Reviewing departmental decisions and how they affect others outside the unit
- **Provost** (Gail Wells):
 - Thanks were expressed to the Senate, Pat Moynahan, and Debra Meyers for work on the QEP this past year.
 - The “academic core” was spared a lot of the budget cuts this past year. Need to make sure that we are running efficiently.
 - Letters for sabbaticals, project grants, and summer fellowships have been sent.
 - The Professional Development group is working on the emphasis for online/blended class review. More technical support is needed in this area, particularly in instructional design.
- **Faculty Regent** (Chuck Hawkins):
 - Board of Regents will be meeting Jan. 13
 - At the last BOR meeting, the Student Regent expressed concerns regarding the Intellectual Property policy and notification of student works being used by the university. The BOR passed the policy but did state that the issue could be revisited regarding these concerns.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- **Professional Concerns** (Scottie Barty): The following issues were submitted for consideration:
 - **Prior Service change to the Faculty Handbook:** The following two paragraphs were approved for addition to the handbook: Add to Section III. Faculty Appointments. B. Faculty Recruitment and Appointment (p. 11):

The decision to award credit for prior service will be negotiated at the time of the initial appointment between the candidate and the department chair in consultation with the department's Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. However, if circumstances warrant, the candidate may alter this agreement within the first two years of the candidate's initial appointment. All recommendations for prior service must receive approval of both the appropriate dean and the Provost, and must be transmitted in writing to all of the affected parties: candidate, department chair, RP&T Committee, appropriate dean, and the Provost. Credit for prior service in a full-time, tenure-track appointment in the rank of instructor, assistant professor, or associate professor at an accredited, four-year institution of higher learning may be counted toward the normal six-year probationary period. The awarding of prior service does not alter the schedule of non-renewal: regardless of the amount of prior service awarded toward tenure, faculty members with two or fewer years of service at NKU are subject to the non-reappointment schedule stated in IV. C. 11.

NOTE: The original proposal contained the word “non-renewal” in place of “non-reappointment” in the last sentence. Approval was made to amend the wording to “non-reappointment”.

Add cross reference: Section VII Tenure G, p. 29 of this Handbook, 2006 edition:

Normally a faculty member will be considered for grant of tenure during the faculty member's sixth year of probationary appointment, including University-recognized credit for prior service, upon the faculty member's application. [See Section III. B. p. 11 for information about University-recognized credit for prior service.] A faculty member may request grant of tenure in an earlier year, but only faculty of extraordinary merit may be approved for early grant of tenure. Denial of early tenure is not a basis for non-reappointment.

- **Performance Review Timeline Proposal:** The following revisions (in **bold**) were made to Section IX Performance Review C. Procedures of the Faculty Handbook by a vote of 16 (yes) to 10 (no):

*Performance review occurs during the **fall** semester. The period evaluated is the prior **academic** year.*

The chair or director, in consultation with the department or program faculty, will set the date for the faculty member's performance review. The performance review

*should be completed no later than **November 1**. Prior to that date the faculty member will prepare a written statement of his/her performance **according to department guidelines and calendar due no earlier than the fourth Monday of the fall academic semester**, including a statement of goals and objectives for the coming year. The chair or director will meet with the faculty member to discuss the performance, assess attainment of goals and objectives, and set goals and objectives for the coming year. The chair or director will be responsible for preparing a document summarizing the performance evaluation, goals and objectives assessment, and goals and objectives set for the coming year. Both parties will sign the document to verify that the review has occurred. If differences of opinion exist, they shall make every effort to resolve them. If the content of the summary is unsatisfactory to the faculty member, the faculty member is responsible for providing a written addendum stating the difference(s) of opinion. All performance review documents, including the faculty member's original written performance statement, shall become a part of the faculty member's personnel file maintained in the department or program; a copy must be given to the faculty member, to the dean, and to the Provost.*

The performance review process includes performance review for all first-year full-time tenure-track faculty and to full-time, non-tenure-track renewable faculty during the spring semester of their first academic year. This review covers the previous fall academic semester and should be completed no later than March 31. These full-time faculty in their second year of appointment undergo performance review during fall semester, but the review period will be limited to the previous spring and summer to avoid reviewing his/her first semester twice.

The faculty member may use his/her copy of the performance evaluation to support applications for reappointment, promotion, tenure, or any combination of them, or in grievance procedures. Otherwise, the chair or director, dean, and Provost must keep the contents confidential. In the event that a post-tenure review is triggered, the faculty member's annual performance review materials from the two most recent reviews, including the chairperson's own evaluation letters, will be made accessible to the P-TR committee and can be used in evaluating that individual's performance and must remain confidential.

If circumstances change during the year, the faculty member and chair or director may agree to amend the goals and objectives for that year.

NOTE: The third paragraph, first sentence of the original proposal stated “*The performance review process includes performance review for all first-year full-time faculty during the spring semester of their first academic year.*” The wording to specify full-time tenure-track and full-time, non-tenure-track was added to clarify this section. This revision was approved by Senate.

- **Implementation of Performance Review Process.** A document suggesting the implementation of the new performance review process (above) was approved. The Faculty Senate approved the original document proposed by the Professional Concerns Committee with the following changes: Changed dates for which the contract will be impacted by any raise resulting from performance review section from First Year Implementation date of August 15, 2011 to August 15, 2010-11 and Future Years August 15, 2012-13 to August 15, 2011-12.

We propose that the performance review (PR) process be moved to the fall concurrent with the reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) process. If adopted, this proposal does not require any changes to the current university, college, or department RPT process. The proposal changes only the timing of the Performance Review.

Following the transition period described below, the process will unfold as follows. Early in the fall semester, tenured faculty and all full-time non-tenure track faculty members will submit materials for annual Performance Review. Probationary faculty will submit materials for both annual Performance Review and for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

We see the following benefits of this approach:

- 1. We would evaluate performance across an academic year (instead of a calendar year) to align performance review with contract year. This timing is more consistent with the way faculty think about their work and plan their activities.*
- 2. Faculty annual goal-setting process would also be moved to an academic year time period.*
- 3. The proposal would reduce the workload for probationary faculty who would prepare materials only one time a year.*
- 4. Faculty would have the option to complete the performance review materials over the summer, but this would not be a requirement.*

This proposal would require a year of transition as shown below. RPT materials would be submitted on the regular RPT schedule. Individual department chairs will still have the ability to set the due date for performance review materials, no earlier than the earliest date specified in the procedures for performance review.

New Performance Review	What time period is covered?	When are performance review materials due?	When will performance evaluation occur?	Which contract will be impacted by any raise resulting from performance review?
First Year Implementation	Spring 2009 Summer 2009 Fall 2009 Spring 2010 Summer 2010	Determined by Chair	September 13, 2010 - November 1, 2010	August 15, 2010-11*
Future Years	Fall 2010 Spring 2011 Summer 2011	Determined by Chair	September 12, 2011 - November 1, 2011	August 15, 2011-12

**Note: Twelve-month faculty salary changes (Librarians, Department Chairs, Associate/Assistant Deans, etc.) would begin on 7/1/2011 in the first year and on July 1 in subsequent years.*

*Under the proposed first year implementation, there would be no performance review process in the spring of 2010 to cover calendar year 2009 **except for the first-year full-time faculty**. Any raise that might occur during the transition period would be determined by the most recent performance evaluation.*

This change would have implications for the post-tenure review process which should be reviewed upon adoption of any revised performance review process.

- **Curriculum** (Ron Shaw): The following curriculum map and SLO changes were approved by the Senate:
 - The curriculum Map for the Foundations of Knowledge General Education Program has been defined and is as follows.

Certification Area (SLOs)	A 1	A 2	A 3	A 4	B1	B 2	B 3	B 4	C1	C 2	C 3	C 4	C 5	D 1	D 2	D 3	E1	E2	D3	Total
Communication S Oral	X								X		X									3
Communication S Written										X	X	X					X			4
Natural Science			X											X	X	X				4
Mathematics			X										X	X						3
Culture & Creativity	X			X		X		X												4
Cultural Pluralism					X	X	X											X		4
Individual & Society		X														X			X	3
Elective Global Viewpoints					X	X	X	X									X	X	X	3 or 4
TOTAL	3	2	3	2	1/2	3/4	1/2	2/3	1	2	3	2	1	3	2	4	2/3	1/2	2/3	

Each category would address 3 or 4 SLOs. These SLOs would be the required SLOs for recertification as well as for reporting assessment.

Courses in Global Viewpoints would meet B1, B2, B3, B4 or E1, E2, E3

In addition the following language changes were made to several of the SLOs

- A.2. Students identify, interpret, and evaluate assumptions, evidence, conclusions, and theories.
- A.4. Students explore the implications and consequences of their initial conclusions and use them to generate new ideas, questions and directions for further inquiry.
- C.5. Students use information technologies appropriately and effectively in their written, spoken, or visual communication of information.
- D.1. Students apply scientific and quantitative reasoning through problem solving or experimentation, and effectively communicate results through scientific, analytic and/or quantitative methods
- E.1. Students comprehend the ethical perspectives and responsibilities of individuals.
- E.3. Students demonstrate an understanding of the variety of influences on human behavior.

NOTE: The original wording in section C.5. above was “...in their written, spoken, and visual communication...” Senate approved the amendment to change “and” to “or”.

- **Benefits** (K.C. Russell): The following applications were approved by the Provost: 18 Sabbaticals (27 submissions); 16 Summer Fellowships (31 submissions); 11 Project Grants (28 applications). Guidelines will be discussed during the spring semester.

OFFICER REPORTS:

- **Vice-President** (Kristi Haik): Pending Officers for next year:
 - **President:** Alar Lipping
 - **Vice-President:** Heather Bullen
 - **Secretary:** Perry Bratcher
 - **Parliamentarian:** Steve Weiss
 - **Faculty Regent:** Chuck Hawkins
 - **Benefits Chair:** K.C. Russell
 - **Budget Chair:** Ken Engebretson
 - **Curriculum Chair:** Richard Fox
 - **Professional Concerns Chair:** Scottie Barty
- **Parliamentarian** (Steve Weiss): Will be working with Alar on reviewing the Senate structure and possible revisions for the future.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- **COSFL Representative** (Carol Bredemeyer): Met in November with Carl Rollins, a Ky. legislator. A bill is being considered mandating the transfer of credits between the community colleges and regional universities.
- **Wellness Committee Representative** (Lisa MacQueen): Healthcare screening will take place next spring
- A faculty representative for the World Cultural Festival Planning Committee is needed.
- Concern was expressed regarding the recent Senator election process, Alar will look into this.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Perry Bratcher, Secretary