

Professional Concerns Committee

Minutes for Oct 15, 2020

Virtual Meeting (On Zoom Conferencing Software), 3:30 pm

Members in Attendance: S. Alexander, K. Code, W. Darnell, L. Dynan, J. Elliott, K. Fuegen, N. Grant, B. Green, J. Herman, J. Human, K. Katkin, M. King, A. Miller, K. Munte, M. Nakamura, M. Providenti, M. Scola, G. Sun, J. Washburn

Guests in Attendance: Provost Sue Ott Rowlands, J. Bloch, G. Hiles

Members Not in Attendance: B. Karrick, G. Newell, K. Noyes, H. Riffe, J. Rubleske, I. Saad

1. Call to Order, Adoption of Agenda
 - a. The Meeting was called to order at 3:30pm. The agenda was adopted unanimously as distributed.
2. Adoption of Minutes of PCC Meeting of October 1, 2020
 - a. Draft Minutes from PCC Meeting of October 1, 2020 were approved without dissent.

3. Chair's Report & Announcements:

The Spring 2021 schedule has been finalized. Five dates including Mon-Tues Feb 15-16, Fri March 12, and Thurs-Fri April 1-2 have been added to the list of dates that classes will not meet in Spring 2021. These five dates constitute the same number of days of missed classes that would have occurred if Spring break had taken place, though for classes that meet only on Mondays and Wednesdays, this schedule will include one additional unpaid day of teaching.

Agenda Items

1. Collegial Governance

The NKU Statement of Collegial Governance is part of the NKU Faculty Handbook. The NKU Statement of Collegial Governance is based upon a Statement that was jointly approved by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), and the American Council of Education (ACE). It has been adopted by Faculty Senate, the NKU Administration, and the NKU Board of Regents (as part of the Faculty Handbook).

In recent years, collegial governance has not always been honored at NKU. In part, this is because the general faculty lacks awareness about the requirements of faculty governance. Discussion ensued about how collegial governance could be restored. Discussion focused on the immediate desirability about raising faculty awareness of the Collegial Governance statement among the General Faculty. This might be accomplished through discussion of the document at Senate and PCC, followed by Members of those bodies raising the issue with their colleagues, either at departmental or college faculty meetings or more informally.

2. Performance Review in Schools (including SOTA)

In past years, annual performance reviews (APRs) in SOTA (and other “schools” within NKU) were conducted by the person coordinating the day-to-day operations of the academic unit. Until several years ago, this person was a department chair. Later, when departments within SOTA were eliminated, this person was denoted a “program head.” More recently, however, the Director of SOTA has taken over conducting all annual performance reviews within SOTA. The current Director of SOTA is a Professor of Visual Arts. However SOTA includes many units (e.g. music, theatre) whose work cannot be professionally evaluated by an administrator of a different academic discipline. Different disciplines engage in different activities, different methodologies, and different assessment rubrics.

The PCC Chair noted that the Faculty Handbook now requires annual performance reviews to be conducted by a Chair or a School Director. In order to effectuate the proposed change, PCC would therefore need to recommend an amendment to the Handbook. The Chair asked PCC Members to consider what the purpose of APR is. The APR process should be aligned with its purposes. Is the only purpose about giving raises? Or is the purpose to help faculty members with path progression, career development, mentoring, etc.?

A PCC Member asked about multi-disciplinary departments within NKU’s Colleges (e.g. Anthropology / Sociology within the College of Arts & Sciences). If Chairs come from one discipline, how well does it work when the Chairs conduct annual performance reviews of faculty members in their departments who work in other disciplines? Several PCC members responded that there have not been problems in such situations in their departments (or schools).

A PCC Member asked whether faculty members within SOTA consider their Program Head to be a peer? Or an administrator? If the Program Head is a peer, then should the Program Head be forced to have the responsibilities of a Chair? Would requiring the Program Head to perform Annual Performance Reviews change the relationship?

Another PCC Member responded that in the NKU Theatre Department, the Program Head understands that theatre is a collaborative enterprise. The Annual Performance Review plays a role in assignment of resources, etc. The faculty in Theatre (like the faculty in Visual Arts) strongly prefers the Program Heads to conduct the Annual Performance Reviews.

A PCC Member queried whether it would be possible for the Program Head and the Director in SOTA to conduct the APR together with the faculty member under review?

Would the Program Heads be paid for this work? K. Muerte will canvass the SOTA Program Heads on this question. Conversation will continue.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:30pm.

Submitted,

K. Katkin

May 5, 2020

Professional concerns from the Visual Arts Program in the School of the Arts in regard to the proposed APR policy dated August 19, 2019.

Until this proposed handbook policy came up in PCC at the beginning of the year, Visual Arts (one of three programs in SOTA) has had a decades-long history that the person coordinating the day-to-day operations of our academic unit, first as a department chair, then as a program head, performed our APRs. Clearly, at the formation of SOTA, program heads were deemed to perform the reviews and this was always the intent in how it would operate. It should also be noted that at that time it was not communicated to our faculty, that the introduction of these 'program head' positions were not administrative ones—it was largely assumed these were essentially chairs with a different name since these were not defined anywhere. While there may be some varying opinions, the sudden shift with the director performing the reviews has created layers of concern shared by a significant number of faculty in Visual Arts. These include:

- It's doesn't appear to be typical to skip a level (ie: over the program head to director) when performing APRs for most faculty at NKU. Faculty should be reviewed in a consistent way and with the move to a 2-4-6 system for RPT, APRs have even more significance.
- Given that the director oversees three programs (formerly departments), this person's background and disciplinary awareness will be outside of that for two of the three programs. This is uneven relative to reviews performed by most chairs on campus who are within the same general academic area.
- Interactions with the school director are typically infrequent and he is not as familiar with the faculty's day-to-day operations. The program head is the one running faculty meetings, performing oversight of curricula, assigning committees, scheduling courses and engaging with student concerns and complaints as they relate to faculty. Having the program head provide input on the director's review is not the same as performing it. The director must rely primarily on reports and faculty self-reporting, rather than first-hand knowledge.
- With the sheer number of reviews, it is not fair to the director to perform so many, or to faculty whose review may be compromised because of the high volume of meetings and written reviews.
- A process by which the program head merely informs the director's review of each individual creates ambiguity as to where input comes from, is difficult to address directly in APR meetings and uses the resources of three individuals.
- The evolution of the SOTA director's role into managing the day-to-day academic unit operations and performing APRs, is moving away from the intended role of this position to focus on donor relationships, large-scale initiatives, developing cultural/community outreach, recruitment, etc.. Instead we are seeing the evolution of one large 'mega-chair' position taking on more traditional chair responsibilities. Consolidating into a mega-department was not the intent of SOTA and undermines the role of chairs at NKU.
- A number of faculty have expressed that the program head's duties fall in line with that of an administrative role of a chair and prefer this position. A chair position would solve the peer-to-peer issue with program heads not being classified as administrators. Some faculty are

uncomfortable with a peer-to-peer relationship with the program head as reviewer and think it should be performed by an administrator.

Due to the issues presented, the Visual Arts faculty respectfully ask that the committee recognize the systematic, structural and procedural anomalies that happen within SOTA compared to norms elsewhere on campus, as established by structures that are well-defined within the Faculty Handbook."

COLLEGIAL GOVERNANCE AT NKU

The Faculty and Administrators, of Northern Kentucky University, has endorse the "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities", jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and the American Council of Education. (As adopted by the AAUP on October 29, 1966 and revised in April 1990) as the most appropriate general statement on University Governance. The remainder of the position paper, specifically addresses the role of faculty and faculty bodies in university governance, consistent with the aforementioned "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities."

The Faculty and Administrators of Northern Kentucky University believe in a collegial system of university governance, based on a concept of authority and responsibility shared among colleagues, some who have primary duties as faculty and some who have primary duties as administrators. A collegial system has, as its fundamental principle, the concept of good faith, consultation among these colleagues prior to decision-making as stipulated below. Under the collegial system, decision-making authority is delegated or assigned to the collegial group most expert in or responsible for the particular area in which the decision is made. However, the Board of Regents and Council on Post-secondary Education is statutorily responsible for the governance of the University, and this document does not abridge this responsibility or authority. All colleagues in the system, regardless of their respective roles as faculty or administrators, have an obligation to honor and support the decisions reached through the collegial process. If good faith consultation among colleagues exists, if decision-making authority is delegated appropriately, and if all participants are committed to the decisions made through the collegial system, non-productive adversarial relationships among groups are minimized, and university goals and objectives are more easily achieved.

A. CHARACTERISTICS OF A COLLEGIAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE:

1. "Colleague" is defined as a university employee of faculty rank or of professional or administrative classification.
2. Leadership, reason, persuasion, and cooperation are the hallmarks of the collegial system.
3. All colleagues have the opportunity to participate, directly or through elected representatives, in the collegial process.
4. Good faith consultation and mutual respect among colleagues are fundamental principles of the collegial system. All university decisions are preceded by dialogue among relevant constituencies, followed by appropriate rationale.
5. Academic freedom is an essential element of collegial governance.
6. When the person responsible for making the decision reaches a decision, and that person has considered all recommendations made pursuant to this document, then that decision is reached through the collegial process.
7. Colleagues are bound by the decisions relating to or affecting matters, which are reached through collegial processes. Colleagues, therefore, ought to avoid using external political processes (e.g., legislature, CPE, governing board) to frustrate the decisions reached through the collegial process.
8. All colleagues are bound equally by the results of the system and seek to implement those decisions. Of course, a colleague is free to seek to change policy within the collegial system. Leaders of the faculty (e.g., president, provost, senate president, deans, and chairs.) have a particular responsibility to implement the decisions of the system. To facilitate consensus on [the policy] policies and procedures, the procedures outlined in section B1 through B4 below shall be followed.

B. THE ROLE OF FACULTY BODIES IN THE COLLEGIAL SYSTEM:

"Faculty bodies" are defined as the collective members with faculty rank of an academic unit (such as) Department and College faculties, the Senate and its committees, and department and college faculty committees. As participants in the collegial system of university governance, all faculty bodies are obligated to make decisions and/or recommendations for the good of the university. Generally speaking, faculty bodies have primary responsibility for recommendations in matters directly related to academics, including curricula subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which directly relate to the educational process.

1. Academic matters:

Faculty bodies have primary responsibility for recommendations in the following matters, and their recommendations should be implemented except for compelling reasons. Reasons for non-implementation of faculty recommendations should be clearly stated in writing, except where giving reasons in writing would contradict the faculty handbook, other pertinent university governance documents, or state or federal regulations. In cases where written notification is prohibited, reasons for non-implementation of recommendations should still be communicated in another manner to the appropriate faculty bodies. Implementation or notification should occur in a timely fashion.

Examples:

- Admissions requirements
- Graduation requirements
- Graduation of students
- Program Curricula
- Approval of academic degree programs
- Policies regarding grading and student grievances associated with academic work
- Academic personnel policies
- Academic personnel decisions
- Dismissal of tenured faculty
- Policies (personnel policies) which result in dismissal of tenured faculty
- Faculty and academic grievances
- Approval of agreements with external organizations which directly affect academic matters
- Structure of faculty and collegial academic governance bodies
- Appointment and reappointment of academic officers
- Academic planning
- Issues related to academic freedom
- University policy statements related to the matters listed above

2. Activities fundamentally affecting academic programs:

Good faith consultation with faculty bodies is routine in the following matters. Faculty opinion in these matters should be strongly considered.

Examples:

- Selection of the President and Executive Officers
- Structure and organization of academic units (departments, divisions, colleges, and schools)
- Institutional Budget Priorities
- Building priorities and design of academic facilities
- Policies regarding academic administrators (e.g. job descriptions, performance reviews)
- Selection of academic administrative staff at the Director level and above
- Decisions regarding organization of academic administration

- Goals and objectives of major fund raising efforts as they may affect academic matters
- Foundation money for academic affairs
- General policies regarding intercollegiate athletics, to the extent that they involve academic concerns
- Policies concerning agreements with businesses and other entities which may affect academic matters
- University policy documents related to these matters

3. Activities which may affect academic programs:

Good faith consultation generally occurs in the following matters, which are the primary responsibility of the administration, to the extent that they affect academic matters.

Examples:

- Structure of support services
- Scholarship policies
- Student non-academic discipline (policy and implementation)
- Long range planning not affecting academic matters
- Selection of major non-academic administrators
- Structure and authority of campus security/police services
- Policies concerning disposal of major assets of the university
- Foundation priorities
- Planning for support services related to academic functions
- University support services related to academic functions

4. Activities not normally affecting academic matters:

Consultation does not take place routinely in the following matters. When consultation does occur, the faculty act more as advisors or expert assistants than the colleagues. Decision-making or recommending authority generally is shared substantially with other groups (e.g. students, staff, and the community), and in some cases other (non-faculty) groups may retain primary authority. Faculty bodies may feel free to give advice in these matters regardless of whether formal consultation occurs.

Examples:

- Management and investment of funds of the university and the foundation
- Implementation of budget priorities and policies
- Selection of contractors and vendors
- Routine operation of and planning for auxiliary enterprises
- Non-academic personnel policies (development and implementation)
- Staff personnel policies
- Selection of staff and lower level non-academic administrators
- Development and implementation of staff grievance policies
- Alumni and development structures and plans (not including academic matters)
- Selection of auditors and outside counsel
- Development and implementation of recreational policies
- Routine operation of intercollegiate athletics
- Development of lobbying and legislature efforts

Approved by NKU Faculty Senate February 23, 1998

[Dr. Vijay V. Raghavan,](#)

document.writeln ("This Document was Last Revised on: "+document.lastModified);

8. PERFORMANCE REVIEW

8.1 PURPOSE AND APPLICABILITY

The purpose of the annual performance review is to assess the quality of faculty performance during that year and to measure attainment of the goals and objectives set for the year. This process applies to full-time, tenure-track faculty and to full-time, non-tenure-track renewable faculty (see Section 1.3 regarding applicability to renewable faculty).

8.2. CRITERIA

The criteria for evaluation set forth in Section 3.1, Criteria, and in the departmental/school, college, and Steely RPT guidelines shall be the criteria upon which a performance review is based. Any judgment, by a chair or director, that the overall performance of a tenured faculty member is unsatisfactory for the review period will be based upon and consistent with the statement of expectations for adequate performance approved by the faculty member's department/school or program.

8.3. PROCEDURES

Performance reviews occur during the spring semester. The period evaluated is the prior January 1 through December 31 calendar year.

The chair or director, in consultation with the department/school or program faculty, will set the date for the faculty member's performance review. The performance review should be completed no later than April 1 and no earlier than one week after receipt by all faculty in a department/school or program of fall semester student evaluations. Prior to that date the faculty member will prepare a written statement of his/her performance, 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/school or program; a copy must be given to the faculty member, to the dean, and to the provost.

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/director'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. In colleges where there is no department or school, the dean will function as department chair in these processes.

8.4. APPEAL PROCEDURES

A faculty member convinced that misevaluation is damaging his/her professional status or advancement may pursue one of the complaint processes as set forth in Section 14, Grievances.