

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

May 1, 2000

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, May 1, 2000 in the South Room of the Keen Johnson Building. Senate Chair Phyllis Murray called the ninth meeting of the academic year to order at 3:30 p.m.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------|----------|----------|-------------|
| Adkins | Knight | McKinnon | Schuster | R. Thompson |
| Chambers* | Lewis | | Rink | Smith |
| Hodge | McGuire | | Robinson | Thomas |

*Indicates prior notification to the Senate Secretary

Visitors to the Senate were:

Jacinta Feldman, The Eastern Progress; Susan Willis, Family & Consumer Science; Betsy Kurzinger, Art; Dory Markin, O.T.; Dorothy Mercer, Psychology; Steve Falkenberg, Psychology; Charlie Everett, Leisure Studies; Dominick Hart, A&S; Libby Wachtel, Academic Affairs; Rita Davis, Academic Affairs; David Gale, CHS

Announcement

Senator McAdam made the motion to postpone the second organizational meeting of the new 2000-2001 Faculty Senate until time definite to Monday May 8, 2000 at the same time as usual. Senator Murray said in lieu of the agenda and the fact that we have a faculty retirement reception at 5:00 p.m. and that effects several of our senators, I think that motion appropriate. Senator Kilgore seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Approval of the Minutes

Approval of minutes of April 3, 2000, any additions/deletions/corrections. Minutes stand as written. April 17, 2000 minutes not complete as yet.

Report from the President: Senator Kustra

Senator Kustra not present.

Report from the Provost: Senator Marsden

Senator Marsden has agreed to postpone his report until the new business of Council of Academic Affairs.

Report of the Executive Committee and Senator Chair: Senator Murray

The Executive Committee met on April 10 and 24. On April 10, a lot of the time was spent on structuring the agenda for April 17 and May 1st meeting to make sure we did not overlook unfinished business, since a lot of items have been postponed because of the time intensive issues that we have been dealing with in the previous meetings. In addition, and also along those lines, a considerable amount of time was taken in the Executive Committee to discuss faculty senators' concerns about our use of our time. These concerns preceded and followed Dr. Marsden's suggestions that future Senate meetings be held more frequently. However, based on a lot of concerns voiced not only to me, but also to other members of the Executive Committee, we wanted to make a few suggestions as to how we could better utilize our existing time before we suggested that we have more meetings. One of the suggestions, and by the way, this will be forwarded to the new members of the Executive Committee, was that all of the standing reports to be submitted to the Executive Committee in writing and that would include the report from the President as well as the report from the Provost and they be disseminated on the WEB and the time taken in the Senate meetings would be highlights or updates, questions that would come from the floor. That would also include all standing committee reports and in fact we do have a process already in place that has been remissed for several years and that is having the committee chair submit a report to the Executive Committee prior to the Senate meeting. We suggest that we take a look at that process that we already have in place, it might need to be tweaked a little bit, but again, just in effort to try to reduce the amount of time on the initial reports so that we can then have adequate time without feeling rushed to get to the actual business at hand.

I did speak with Dr. Kustra about concerns prior to the Executive Committee meeting and he indicated that he did not need to give a monthly report and kind of play it by ear when something came up. Senator Murray added that Senator Kustra's report be placed on the first and last meeting of the semester with the understanding that in the interim should there be any issues that he felt necessary and felt extremely important to discuss and bring to the faculty as well as any issues that faculty had that required his attention in a public forum then we could amend the agenda to accommodate the situations. He was quite receptive to that. I took that information back to the Executive Committee on the 24th and discussed. There were some concerns that if he wasn't on the agenda that we all know how things can infringe upon our time and things get bumped around and again we just left it that we would make these suggestions and forward it to the oncoming executive committee which will be determined next week. Dr. Marsden is on this committee and has heard these concerns.

Senator Murray commented on the ending of her year as Senate Chair. "It has been a challenge. It has been interesting. It has been fun; although, some people have questioned my interpretation of fun. I feel that we have discussed a lot of issues, and I see quite a few more relevant and very critical issues coming to this floor in the future. The tenor of the Senate, I believe has changed since I've been senator. We really have become a deliberative body and becoming more and more involved on a daily function and routines and practices that affects us as academic. My role is actually easy. I have always been a faculty advocate and will continue to be. What I think has made a difference is the role that you play, getting input, writing e-mails, making phone calls and for being a voice for those that elected you and put you in your seat, and for that I thank each and everyone of you.

Report of the Faculty Regent: Senator M. Thompson

The Board met on Friday and committees started meeting about 1:30. The meetings went on until something after 5:00 p.m. Most of the meeting was routine and much of involved items that had been recommended through the Faculty Senate so, you would have been familiar with almost everything on there, but rather than repeat what you already know about, I distributed the agenda and will be happy to answer any questions that you might have about it. I do want to comment on two items. One is the admission criteria that was passed and was approved as you recommended. The Board had a lengthy discussion during the Academic Affairs committee meeting, and members raised a lot of questions. There was some awareness on my part about how much the Board does depend on the expertise of the faculty and particularly, several members of the Board asked me, how much did the faculty senate discuss this, how long did they discuss it, did they have a lot of questions, how satisfied were they with the proposal. One member did raise the concern that more than half our students will be admitted in probationary status and about another nine percent in special admissions category. We talked about just a little bit about the need for careful communication with those students particularly some of those good students that have a 22 composite score, but have a 17 in Math. I'm sure that attention will be given to that. Dr. Kustra reiterated that was an important thing to be sure to be addressed in the first communication.

The second item is the outsourcing of the bookstore to Wallace Bookstore. There were three or four things that were particularly highlighted as the reason for the Board approving that. The first is that our staff would be hired by Wallace. In fact, there was a particular motion that Benny Roop will be included as the Manager. More services to students especially on-line. There is a particular service that I was attracted to and that is when professors change books and sometimes you do get a book that just does not work out that first semester. They will buy them back and use them elsewhere. There has to be a stopping point of course, but that was a plus and of course, the University will pick up more money. They have made a proposal to the University to totally redesign the bookstore, and the committee was taken on a visual tour of that.

An important point the budget was not addressed at the meeting. President Kustra is working with Buck Consultants this week to get a more clearer report from them. There are some problems with the report, but he is working with the president of company to ask them to send in some experienced people to give us some clearer interpretation of what they have sent. Some of you have asked to have access to that report and as I understand it right now it is preliminary, but when the report is actually given, of course, it becomes open to everyone.

I want to ask you a favor. What are possible options about spending money? I would appreciate it if you would send me an email, and I will send you an email by Thursday outlining the options that I have heard discussed or I have heard come up in the forum, and then you can respond to that if you want to. If you already have an idea send it to me. I will not report your name to anyone, if that is a concern to you. I will have a better sense of faculty opinions. I have looked at other groups that I might give a quick email to and actually the Faculty Senate has a better representation of new faculty and senior faculty and departments and other areas. If you have any ideas, I'm ready for all the ideas that might come.

Report from the COSFL Representative: Senator Falkenberg

COSFL met on April 15, 2000. Our CPE representative gave a comprehensive report on the budget which was passed by the state legislature. There was a question raised concerning whether it is a vision that the Kentucky Virtual University (KCVU) become a separate institution within the higher education and was acknowledged it was an open-ended question and that in-state institutions could develop programs or if there were no in-state institution to providing these programs, Kentucky Virtual University could look for an out-of-state institution to provide the programs. Programs will be continued to be accredited through provider institutions. It was observed that CPE views the KCVU as a brokerage agency rather than a separate institution. Second, CPE Program Review process was discussed at length. It was decided that given the magnitude of concern COSFL should schedule a half day meeting with CPE staff thus providing COSFL an opportunity to provide input regarding a more constructive process. Future issues on the CPE horizons were outlined as issues concerning benchmark institutions. There will be a second look at Benchmark Institutions relative to funding. A concern was raised relative to how Benchmark comparisons are being used and whether they ??? benchmarks are maybe problematic. Enrollment - Kentucky does not do well in enrollment/retention compared to our ??? Which raises the questions that do other states do a better job with literacy. A concern was raised that the definition of retention maybe to narrow, for it does not take in to account the consideration of the non-traditional student. Another issue was the brain-drain. A feeling by CPE is that it does need to be more aggressive in recruiting national merit students. It was suggested that CPE needs to get involved in the issue of general education transfer agreements, since it is a chronic issue. COSFL continued discussion the evaluation of administrators. The method of evaluations of administrators vary from our institutions. It was suggested that COSFL recommend that processes and procedures be established for periodic evaluation of senior administrators including presidents.

Dr. Marsden - could you clarify that they discussed revisiting the benchmark data. Who are they?

Senator Falkenberg said the “they” is CPE.

Dr. Marsden asked for further clarification - the Council themselves or the Council Staff?

Senator Falkenberg stated that the faculty representative for CPE suggested that they were considering revisiting the benchmarks.

Dr. Marsden stated that it wasn't Dr. Davies.

Senator Falkenberg replied no, not the staff.

Senator MacLaren questioned Senator Falkenberg regarding the Kentucky Virtual University as a brokerage firm. It sounded as if it were a separate entity-university and that they could go outside the state to offer courses. To me that seems not in the best interest in the faculty of the commonwealth. Is there anything we can do to adjust this?

Senator Falkenberg replied that the best thing that you can do is work through the administrative organization of the University and send it forward to the CPE. You can work through COSFL as providing input. COSFL has a very good relationship over the last two years with CPE. But that is exactly what the Virtual University can do. And apparently, they are looking more seriously at out-of-state institutions.

Senator Janssen suggests that you look at the state money, and look at how much money has been put into the Virtual University. “My original belief when they were talking about the Virtual University was that this was going to involving all the institutions and that the money would be shared by the institutions. To me, it does seem that a whole lot of money is going to a separate entity and a separate funding university. So I think that you have asked a very good question and we should try to track this and try to understand what is happening because it still is in the process of development and very soon down the road I think this is truly going to be a separate entity and will essentially have another university in the state that will be competing with us.

Report from the Student Senate: Mr. Pace

No report - Mr. Pace absent.

Reports from Standing Committees

Committee on Elections reported that we are still trying to find a part-time faculty representative, and we had a mid April meeting at which only 2 of 3 candidates were present. So it was hard to hold an election. We might need to wait until the fall and send out a mail ballot to everyone.

Committee on Elections:

No report

Committee on Committees:

Senator Taylor reported that the Committee on Committees met April 20. Our nominees from the self nomination sheets were processed and the committee filled all those openings with two nominees for every opening we have on the committee. This is now included on our final report that is now in the hands of our Faculty Chair and the chair will follow forward the report to the President’s office. A motion that was made on Sept. 13, 1999 would like to resubmitted. The Committee on Committees requested the Faculty Senate adopt the following motions at it’s first meeting in September. The motions that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee should review the attached recommended changes to the ECU Faculty Senate Internal Procedures Manual concerning the procedures of the Committee on Committees and forward the proposal to the Rules Committee who will bring the motion to the Senate floor for approval. The reason why we have justification for this motion is that these changes are necessary to reflect the changes of the reorganizations of colleges within Eastern Kentucky University and to assure effective committee action. There is only one thing that has been changed since the last time we submitted this action and that is that we add another committee to the standing committees that is promoted by the Faculty Senate, and that committee be a Compensation and Benefits Committee. The committee will be composed of member from each college, and member from the staff, a member from part-time faculty, a member from the University Insurance committee, and a member from the Human Resource Office. Once again, this will go forward to the Executive Committee that will then go to the Rules Committee and will then be brought to the Faculty Senate floor at that time. We will not vote on it or make a motion at this time.

Committee on the Rules:

Senator Chambers - proud father of baby boy.

Senator Huebner is standing in for Senator Chambers - You have previously received a motion from the Committee on Rules that was distributed at the April 3 meeting. I would like to summarize it and propose it again. We were charged in October to draft a proposed policy that specifies procedures for future reorganization of academic unit and include a statement about the faculty role in this process. In our charge to the committee we were asked to look at other institutions and see how they were handling reorganization of academic units. The feelings behind the charge is that the faculty staff handbook did not have clear guidelines about how these matters should be handled. The Rules Committee investigated about 35 universities, all of our benchmark universities and others ones to see how they addressed issues of reorganization. We found in our survey that there was a wide variety of statements that particularly excluded the faculty senate from such shared governance ideas, to things that were very strong statements about how faculty senates should interact with the administration in terms of the academic in the reorganization. We felt that our faculty/staff handbook did not specify procedures for reorganization, and we felt that there were some room to add statements to the faculty/staff handbook to specify these. The motion that you should have is to add to the part 7 of the faculty/staff handbook under organization of the faculty of Eastern Kentucky University is the statement that reads : “The faculty senate should coordinate in conjunction with the president of the University the addition or the elimination of a college or other academic unit. The president of the University shall use the Executive Committee as the vehicle in introducing the structuring of reorganization proposed to the faculty.” Your attention here is to make sure that things are going to the executive committee for their input in coming to the Faculty Senate for discussion. The second part of our motion is to add a statement regarding the interaction with the Faculty Senate and the administration and the Executive Committee. That addition would be to part 7.e.1 and that would be to add the text to that statement that states “once a motion is acted upon by the Faculty Senate, the administration shall inform the Executive Committee of the disposition of the motion and the intent of this is to have some feedback about what was forthcoming to the Senate and have this feedback built into the system.

Senator Janssen seconded the motion.

Senator Marsden expressed his concern of the lack of specificity. For example, we actually have at this time before us, even though Phase II is completed, we have a proposal which may in fact develop a slightly different department in Health Sciences and the movement of one of the units that was formerly with those other two units into yet another department. Is that truly something the Faculty Senate wants to be involved with? My questions is, what level of the reorganization are we talking about? Secondly, on the additional amendment to E.1.d. Define who you mean by administration. Who is supposed to respond? The provost, dean, president? I think it would be helpful to be specific as to who is supposed to respond and in what time frame.

Senator Huebner explained that the thought of the committee was not to specify too much of the administrative staff because in some issues the provost would respond and other times the president or some other member of the administrative staff. Regarding what level of reorganization should be brought to the Faculty Senate, we thought that any reorganization, and I guess there is a continuum and I really don't know what that continuum is, but that any reorganization should be at least brought to the Senate for some kind of discussion, even if it was more or less a brief discussion. These are issues that effect faculty a great deal and they are issues that we really feel that we should have some input on.

Senator O'Connor asked is the idea that these proposals would come to the Senate before they are discussed at the level of the department or college?

Senate Huebner explained that the intent was to have these proposals actually finalized before they come before the Faculty Senate.

Senator Maclaren added a friendly amendment that once a motion is acted upon by the Faculty Senate, the president, acting on behalf of the administration, shall inform the Executive Committee of his disposition of the motion within three months.

Senator Huebner accepted the friendly amendment and restated the motion. "Once a motion is acted upon by the Faculty Senate, the president, acting on behalf of the administration, shall inform the Executive Committee of his disposition of the motion within three months."

Senator Jones asked to clarify the question of the time limit, that is, where would this be put in the process that to the first part that Faculty Senate shall coordinate in conjunction with the president of the University that any proposal to add or eliminate a college, I would assume that the proposal would have to be either discussed at the departmental level or the administrative level.

Senator Anderson asked to move the motion be postponed until the first fall meeting.

Senator Huebner - Part of the charge was to look at both policies and procedures. As we looked at universities throughout the nation, no one had procedures. There were policies similar to what we are proposing here, similar to things that are written in the handbook, that the actual procedures of how that would work out were not specified anywhere to be found.

Senator Murray stated there was a motion on the floor to postpone this motion until September 2000 meeting of the Senate. Motion seconded.

Senator Banks recommended Senator Huebner get together with the Executive Committee and to involve Dr. Marsden to work out the details before the proposal is brought before the Senate.

Motion passed.

Committee on the Budget:

Senator Anderson has no final report, because the budget committee has not concluded its business for the year, but is continuing to meet with Dr. Marsden. Next meeting is this Friday.

Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities:

Senator Steinbach - no report.

Reports from Ad Hoc Committees

Dr. Dorie Combs reported on Governing Report. The 1999/2000 Faculty Club Board members include Ann Chapman, myself, David Hufford, Betsy Kurtsinger, Joel Roitman and Margaret Willingham. Our board began meeting in October and met at least once a month. The first issue was the establishment of the Faculty Collegiality Award in memory of Klaus Heberle. We have ordered a permanent plaque to be located in the Faculty lounge as well as an individual plaque that will be presented to Dr. Heberle's wife and family.

In December, we held a reception for new faculty. We have 45 faculty/staff. Many of our new faculty were unaware that this beautiful space was available to them. We spent some time researching the history of the Faculty Club and Lounge area. The Lounge Area in the Keen Johnson Building including the restrooms, the parlors, and the kitchen were paid for by faculty fees. Historically, this area has been under the jurisdiction of the faculty through the Faculty Club Board. A copy of the most recent constitution was approved in 1998. After rediscovering the history, locating files and funds, the board began to focus on the future of the Faculty Club and Lounge. We met with Dr. Marsden and with his support developed a budget proposal for the 2000/2001 year, and I have attached that proposal. This is based on a request of \$2.00 per faculty contract staff member. If this is approved this will mean that the members will no longer have to pay dues and therefore, we don't go through trying to collect dues, which, by the way, we didn't do this year. The board is contracting with Aramark for a hot beverage maker. It will make coffee, tea, or hot chocolate at .50 a cup located in the kitchen area. We are proposing that next year, the five colleges sponsor a first Friday for faculty, which will be a Friday afternoon or evening reception. Each college will pick a weekend and have a reception for faculty to encourage socializing among faculty. We have representatives from colleges to begin this and develop a social reception and would like for them to get this started. Because the faculty lounge is a private club, the Board has received notice from Dr. Marsden that beer and wine could be served legally in the lounge. We have spend a good bit of time discussing this possibility including drafting possible policies and procedures to accommodate it, but we realize that this change in policy should be carefully reviewed and discussed, that there are quite a few logistical problems that would have to be solved, and therefore we are going to recommend that this continue to be studied and discussed in more detail next year.

Another area of concern is the allocation of faculty lounge space for the use of the Teaching and Learning Center. The Teaching & Learning Center planning committee submitted its report and recommendations to Dr. Rita Davis, then acting Vice President for Academic Affairs in May of last year. This report recommends the allocations of men's and ladies's parlor for computer and media consultation. Specifically, the men's parlor is requested as and I quote from the original report "space for four computer stations." The women's parlor is requested again and I quote "flexible space for individual consultation with the center staff or other consultants." According to our records, there was no active Faculty Club Board at this time report was approved. The current board was appointed in the May 1999 Faculty Senate meeting, but we were not notified of our appointment until early September. So our first meeting was not until October 4th and it wasn't until late in the fall that we located all of the old files and documents and came to understand the original nature of the Faculty Lounge state and its ownership. The Faculty Club Board supports the Teaching & Learning Center and believes that these two programs can and should co-exist and even support each other. The Faculty Club Board also supports the placement of network computer stations in the men's parlor and use this as an opportunity for faculty and staff to work individually or in collaboration with others in a quiet, comfortable space. We are, however, concerned about the placement of desks and other office furniture in the ladies' parlor as well as the removal of some of

the Faculty Club's furniture. Members of the board have heard from individual faculty members and have been discussing this issue with the Teaching & Learning Center Committee and it is our understanding that the decision to put office furniture in the ladies' parlor is going to be reconsidered. The real issue and the source of conflict is the confusion over management and jurisdiction of the Faculty Lounge and its adjoining rooms. The rooms are scheduled through the Student Development Office and therefore use and operating hours are determined by that office's policies, procedures and budget. This fact makes it difficult or at least costly to keep the lounge open after the normal hours of the Keen Johnson housekeeping staff. The Teaching and Learning Center has followed procedures that they were aware of in requesting the use of the space from Vice President of Academic Affairs. Contributing to this confusion is the fact that the lounge, once a vibrant place for faculty daily conversation, has gone into disuse. On a campus as crowded as Eastern's, no one wants to see wasted space. In fact, the Keen Johnson Building and the Faculty Lounge present a natural and central location for faculty development and collegial planning. Therefore, we are requesting that Faculty Senate direct appropriate parties clearly delineate the office or group that is to be responsible for scheduling, allocation and developing procedures for the use of the Faculty Lounge and its adjoining rooms. This is not in the form of a motion. I am not exactly sure how the Senate goes about this and who ought to be involved in making this decision. We are asking that we try to resolve this issue as soon in the Fall 2000 semester as we can."

Senator Murray stated that her understanding of the Faculty Club Governing Board is an independent entity and reports to the Senate primarily as points of information, as well as seeking input, and I think that is how we should take your request. Are there any comments, suggestions, advice that you could share with the members please contact the governing board members.

Senator Thompson asked about the status of decision about whether computer and tables stay in this room?

Dr. Combs reported that the committee is going to look at the ladies' parlor issue again.

Senator Murray entertained a motion that an Ad hoc Committee be established to assist the Faculty Governing Board with these issues. Senator Janssen moved. Motion seconded and passed.

Senator Murray reported that the initial item of business was to postpone the organizational meeting of the new Senate until next Monday at 3:30 p.m. due to time constraints. Senator Murray addressed the new committee members and asked that they review the committees and the handbook pages 121-123 which gives you the ideas of the function of the committees. There are 3 to 4 seats with continuing senators and encourages them to pick one or two committees that they would like to participate in.

Senator Kilgore reported on the Committee on Tuition Waiver for Faculty Dependents. The committee met basically electronically during the spring semester. The committee has surveyed all the institutes in Kentucky colleges and universities and the benchmark universities. What was found concerning the tuition waiver is that some schools did not have a tuition waiver policy. Some schools grant full tuition waivers, all members of the families that are dependents, with little restrictions as to how long it takes in terms of getting a degree, etc., and others have a great deal of restrictions. What the committee has at the moment is a proposal that is being bounced around through the electronic process at this moment with feedback on any changes. We hope to have a finished proposal for you as soon as the September meeting.

Senator Murray mentioned that Ad hoc committees do not have to have Senate membership, so it would be nice if those of you who are going off the Senate could remain on these committees.

Senator Collins reported the Committee on College Credit for Work Sub Experience. The Faculty Senate has raised some good questions and the proposal will be brought back to the Faculty Senate.

Senator O'Connor commented on the Committee on Faculty Workload that it is hoped to have a finalized report in due course.

Senator Goodwin reported on the Committee on Domestic Partner Benefits. The two motions that are included in the packet are the result of an extensive virtual committee meeting. The history of the committee is that we agreed on the delineation of responsibilities and a general focus for what we wanted to accomplish, which resulted in the following motions. A copy of the preliminary report is at the Reserve Desk in the Library. Some questions by Senator Strong while MedBen were here, who are our new insurance broker, and they would have no particular problem covering the benefits that we are talking about from an insurance standpoint. So from an insurance standpoint this isn't an issue, because what we tell MedBen to get, we will get. What we have to decide upon is what our institution priorities are and that is where this comes in.

First motion - which is written with the understanding that we will have a faculty and staff member on the committee. The Faculty Senate recommend that Eastern Kentucky University adopt the following definition of domestic partnership and add it to the Faculty/Staff handbook. "A domestic partner is defined as a person over 18, unrelated by blood to an extent that would preclude marriage under the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, who has demonstrable financial interdependence with an employee at Eastern Kentucky University and shares an exclusive relationship with both partners intend to maintain indefinitely." The purpose for that definition standing alone is to have something that subsequent items in the handbook can refer to. Rather than have to restate it constantly, we will have something there that we can always refer back to.

Second motion - deals with the rights of the domestic partner. "The Faculty Senate extends the following recommendations to the President and to the Board of Regents to consider. Eastern Kentucky University considers domestic partners as employees as defined by the Faculty/Staff handbook to be eligible for all benefits extended by the University. (There are certain things that we don't have control over, such as our Retirement System or the tuition waiver which is arranged with our sister university) extended by the University of spouses of married employees. Eligible employees must complete the Declaration of Domestic Partner Relationship Form to enroll the non-employee partner for benefits and a Termination of Domestic Partner Relationship Form must be completed within 60 days of the dissolution of a domestic partner relationship." These forms do not currently exist. Although, I have created the forms within the body of the report which you can review and these are all open to discussion and open to negotiations. This is a proposal that you will have a chance to review both in the documentation of the report and by looking at the substance of the motions and by doing your own research. We hope to come back in the fall and have a chance to do something that is a very good idea to adopt. This is a chance for us to be competitive and offering a tone benefit package to professors who may be people we really want and may feel particularly good about the fact that we are doing these things where other people aren't. It could mean the difference where salaries are equivalent or where we can't necessarily offer them the same total financial package. Also, to be considered, right now employees pay the full cost of the spouse. So those costs are not things, in the current state, you would even be dealing with at this institution.

Senator Marsden asked about the cost implications of these policies.

Senator Goodwin reported that we do have indications from other institutions that the usage is typically under 1% of the workforce. As the institutional cost, it seems to be nonexistent given our current system, because the employee is already covered and the employee is covering the spouse. That's number one.

Senator Marsden asked, "are you assuming that the employee covers the entire amount of the family cover? Is that your assumption?"

Senator Goodwin responded, yes, that is the way it is. Should that change, that could be an issue, but that is our current state of affairs. As far as actual total cost, one of the single biggest cost is labor, pregnancy, etc. We are not dealing with an incredible large number of people first of all, and second, we are not dealing with a tremendously costly segment of the workforce.

Senator Marsden mentioned that the other issue would be originally told under the package, for example tuition scholarships.

Senator Goodwin stated that what the committee tried to do was put everything that was within our administrative institutional purview on the table. We are aware that there are legislative and political constraints that would make it unwise to try to tackle something as a whole; however, within the University, we felt that we were truly being fair with respect to our nondiscrimination statement as amended this year that we should extend across the board.

Senator Wasicsko asked about Kentucky Laws such as the common law issues.

Senator Goodwin replied that the Committee has not done that specifically with relationship to the Kentucky Law. Although this is really an institutional standard as far as getting a specific ruling from university counsel that would require action from the Board of Regents before we would even consider doing anything official. As to the substance of what is in here and what is in the report, you will find that everything in the wording that is included here is taken from a sort of national standard. You will find declaration forms for domestic partnership, you will find domestic partnership policies and various packages that various universities across the country offer, and you will see that this wording is very much in line with what is going on nationally.

Senator Murray reported that this motion will be forwarded to the agenda in September, and the new senators will be reminded on Monday that this is something that is on their agenda.

Senator Murray announced that the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Faculty Positions was an action was taken on March 6 and those members will be Joy Anderson, Steven Black, Keith Johnson, Karen Spears, Marta Stripling. Karen Spears will call the first meeting for the purpose of selecting a chair and scheduling future meetings.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Senator Murray reported that with regrets Senator Carey had to decline the nomination and the floor is open for nominations for Faculty Senate secretary. The secretary will be elected at an organizational meeting of the new Senate. Senator Murray stepped aside as chair and nominated Joanna Dickey. Senator Miller asked for other nominations. Hearing none, nominations ceased and this name will be presented at the organizational meeting of the new Faculty Senate for a vote.

Motions for the Faculty Senate to recommend as new policy that the University support but not require the option to hire an outside candidate for the position as department chair as tenured faculty.

Senator Thompson reported that Eastern had a rigid policy in the past that did not allow for tenure for new chairs being brought in to departments, and now a new policy has been initiated to change that in the opposite direction. This is more than administrative decision because it effects faculty so much. Checking with other universities in Kentucky, other universities did allow some flexibility for departments to negotiate a shortened tenure review for some chairs. Faculty that I spoke with seemed to support this flexibility more than any other possible position. An important reason for bringing this up is because I believe this is something that the faculty should discuss and Faculty Senate in particular. The argument has been given that departments' faculty will have their role to play in that they can choose whether or not to tenure a given person and if they can't find someone, they could use an acting chair. I believe this postpones the issue. It has been commented that we have to tighten up our procedures and improve those for selecting candidates and a lot of other strategies. I support that, but again even with the best procedures in place, one can't always know. If faculty in a department believe that they want to negotiate a shorten tenure review for this candidate and bring them in, it is a flexibility that I believe should be allowed.

Senator Janssen seconded the motion and spoke in support of having the option to delay tenure for an incoming chair.

Dr. Marsden spoke against the motion. "It is only half a motion. It only addresses the issue of people from outside the campus. The real issue is whether or not we should put an individual in the role of chair of the department without providing them the minimal credential of tenure. The issue is not who grants tenure, because tenure begins with the faculty. If a department is uncomfortable with an external chair choice, they can certainly choose to select from the ranks of their tenured colleagues. The issue is not tenure but whether or not people should be put in a role as department chair without granting them the basic power to operate efficiently as a department chair. I would suggest we have had some very successful department chair searches this year. I would ask the Department of History if they were uncomfortable with their process, and also ask the departments of, Economics, Geography, and English if they were happy with this process. If we did not create an environment wherein tenure was indeed an option, we would lose some very fine candidates. It also is true that here at ECU and other institutions that individuals who are brought in without tenure have found very difficult to operate, because the decision process is compromised by the lack of the person's credentials. Again, the issue is whether or not the departments will find someone suitable for tenure. The administration does not grant tenure. This is a position that is supported by the deans and the president. It is a position, if given careful thought, you would support, because, again, it simply indicates to you the decision process allows the granting or not granting tenure is outside the realm of this policy. You may ask are there circumstances under which you would might put someone in the role of the department chair, the answer might be there could always might be circumstances that would occur. A suggestion for that case would be to put

someone in as acting chair. We have put some of our colleagues in very difficult situations by bringing them in without tenure and asking them to earn tenure when their teaching load is significantly reduced and their responsibilities are other than their normal responsibilities. The issue is the minimum credential for academic leadership at this institution. Where do we want this institution to go?

Senator Miller commented that he is strongly against the motion. The Chairs Association has wrestle with this issue quite a bit over the last few years. The consensus from that body is that we need the policy proposed by Senator Marsden. We have seen some very tragic circumstances here rising to do some serious harmful work against the chair's position. However, on the positive side, it seems that in bringing a senior faculty with senior rank, which would be the requirement, that person would have a track record at the other university that can be found out if a better kind of search is put in place. But the overriding need to reject this motion and go with what is being proposed is that we would be able to attract the people we want at this University, and to give them integrity in office. I strongly urge that you reject this motion.

Senator Anderson spoke in favor of the motion, but wanted to be sure faculties knew that they had the option to bring in a chair as tenured.

Senator Falkenberg said she thought that both policies essentially do the same thing. The motion raises the bar and allows most departments to bring in tenured chairs but it does not force them to if there are exceptions. She was also concerned about "other academic administrators" being brought in tenured.

Senator Marsden: The issue to me is truth in advertising. I do not want to be in the position of misleading a department about a search process. The motion says you have the option, but what that might lead a department to say is that we can go through this process and have it either way. The bottom line of the policy is to state the expected policy behavior of the institution. As with any policy, there are exceptions but you don't build the exceptions into the policy. If would ask Western Kentucky University do they have a policy that tenures chairs, they would say yes. Do they have an exception to the policy in living flesh, the answer is yes. In supporting Senator Thompson's motion, it lets it seem in fact as if it's an option rather than a policy.

Senator MacAdam: "If we wanted someone in and we wanted a trial period before tenure and they had already had tenure at their present position, would we take them through the whole tedious process that we do again?"

Senator Miller clarified that the motion reads that the department has the option to bring in a tenured chairperson. There are some departments which would never bring in a tenured chair on historical precedence. Other departments have no problem. Please understand that what is being proposed would not solve any problem we have existing, recruiting quality chairs, the chair's ability to function because of the tenure question being held over his/her head. You have from the administration a policy that a chair is being brought in as a tenure faculty member, of course, the five year review as chair is for all of us. The reasonable administration you have to presume will allow the department to go to the administration to request an exception to the policy, but again, the policy should be clean. The motion does not allow us to go far enough in solving existing problems.

Senator Taylor: “I do agree that we want to bring in highly qualified candidates. I don’t see how the policy being proposed by Senator Thompson would prevent that. Another concern is if a chair is brought in tenured but is later judged unfit to continue as chair, would the chair automatically become a member of the faculty?”

Senator Marsden: The policy that the administration is now operating under is that every department chair—inside, outside, it doesn’t matter—will be tenured. What matters is that they have tenure, they’ve earned tenure in the eyes of their peers. If the chair returns to the faculty, since they are already tenured, of course they return as a tenured faculty. The policy is not whether or not we tenure somebody, whether we short-circuit the tenure review process, it is, rather, that we say to the faculty that you should be putting forth names you would be comfortable with, individuals to whom you are now willing to grant tenure. The same would be true in bringing in the director of the Teaching and Learning Center. Judging tenure is an art and a science. A lot of hard work must go into it. Remember we are tenuring these people as faculty member and we should be asking the kinds of questions about their background and performance that indeed we would ask of any person coming up for tenure review. We should be doing a lot of checking. The problem with the motion before us is that it could mislead the department into believing that they have the option of presenting a slate of candidates some of whom would be tenured and some not. If we create a dual system on this campus, which is what we have now, because internal candidates already have tenure, would that be fair to the candidates? It creates an enormous inequity among department chairs.”

Senator Janssen stressed that most of the faculty are in support of hiring a tenure person for the chair position. However, we as faculty want the option in the search of entertaining the possibility of an hiring individual whom we think would be an excellent chair, but we don’t yet have all the evidence we need to have to provide them with tenure in the initial stage. Most of the universities that Senator Thompson and I talked with had an option with one year of the person teaching classes and finding how they functioned and finding out if we wish to give them tenure. This exception may be unusual and it may be rare and it may be an exception, nevertheless, if we don’t have that as a statement then we will possibly pass up some excellent candidates, and we do have fields or disciplines where finding people to hire is extremely competitive and extremely difficult to find. The same situation could happen with the chair position and if we have this statement as an option, the faculty should be trusted to believe it is to their benefit to have a person as a tenured chair.

Senator Flanagan spoke in favor of the motion, wanting departments to have the option to hire someone not tenured as part of University policy.

Senator Marsden said that he did not see the value of bringing someone into a five-year position, and that senators should be reminded that the present and continuing policy of the administration is that it does not intend to appoint to positions of chair anyone who is not immediately tenurable. If I were faced with the request from a department to bring in a chair untenured, I would ask them to select an acting chair from within.”

Senator Janssen asked Senator Thompson if she would accept as a friendly amendment adding the option of hiring a chair as acting.

Senator Thompson said that her original intention was that she wanted the motion to go to an ad hoc committee for study, and she would not like to change her motion at this point in the discussion.

Senator Miller explained the motion at hand. The motion is that we would allow the department to initiate a search for a chair who would be brought in not tenured. The present administrative policy says you go look for a chair whom you are willing to tenure. If you cannot find that person, come to the administration and we will deal with that as an exception.

Senator Goodwin stated that often policies are acted out that are not in print. It is necessary that the policy be clearly stated, including the exception.

Senator Murray asked for the motion to extend the time and to suspend the rules. Motion made, seconded and passed.

Senator Maclaren made the motion to postpone indefinitely the issue regarding tenuring chairs. No second. Discussion continued.

Senator Flanagan moved the question previous question. Seconded. Passed.

Senator Murray called for the vote on the motion: "To recommend as new policy that the University support as an option but not a requirement to hire as tenured faculty an outside candidate for the position of department chair." The motion passed.

Senator Schlomann made the motion to postpone to time specific Monday, May 8th at 3:30 p.m., the remainder of the agenda, . Motion seconded.

Senator Jones spoke against the motion, wanting to finish Senate business in a timely manner.

Senator Banks recommended that we postpone the post-tenure review policy definitely until the Fall 2000 meeting.

Senator Schlomann accepted Senator Banks motion as a friendly amendment the issue of post-tenure review faculty process to the September meeting.

The motion to continue the post-tenure review policy was seconded and passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Murray stated that the motion on Council on Academic Affairs will have to be carried over because Dr. Marsden has departed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senator Murray announced that the video tape of the third candidate for the Director of the Teaching and Learning Center will be aired tonight at 7:30 p.m. in the Kennamer Room.

Senator Murray wanted to thank Dr. Miller for serving as Parliamentarian and for Faculty Senate Secretary. " He has been invaluable in both roles and it truly is a benefit to have a philosopher as parliamentarian, because he has given me undeniably wonderful words of wisdom such as 'I don't know, just wing it.'"

ADJOURNMENT

Senator Banks made the motion to adjourn at 5:45 p.m.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES September 11, 2000

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, September 11, 2000 in the South Room of the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Taylor called the first meeting of the academic year to order at 3:30 p.m.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

| | | | | | |
|--------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|-------|
| Banks* | Baxter | Brown | Collins | Dantic | Hodge |
| Rich | Rini | Spears | Wascisko* | | |

* denotes prior notification of absence to the Faculty Senate Secretary

Visitors to the Senate were: Onda Bennett, Walter Boles, Danny Britt, Rita Davis, JoAnna Dickey, Steven Fulkerson, Jim Keith, Nancy B. Kenner, Jean Marlow, Doris Pierce, Ritchie Rednour, Jennifer Rogers (*The Eastern Progress*), Elizabeth Schmidt, Aaron Thompson, Linda Turner, Elizabeth Wachtel, Doug Whitlock.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Kustra

The President informed the Faculty Senate that he fully intends to keep the faculty and staff better informed on EKU's finances and budget. Once the new Vice President for Finances is on board, Dr. Kustra plans to meet with him and with each department on an individual basis to discuss the budget and current budget issues. In addition, Dr. Kustra plans to have the Faculty Senate Budget Committee work actively with the new Vice President for Finances. He stressed the importance of the university community working together as a whole to face the upcoming budget issues for this next year.

The President indicated that there are several financial opportunities available to Eastern Kentucky University in the near future. One such opportunity is the Action Agenda fund set up by the Commonwealth of Kentucky in the amount of \$1.5 million dollars which would be available to EKU during the next physical year if an acceptable proposal is presented to the Council on Postsecondary Education. Dr. Kustra suggested that a possible proposal could be developed to help with salary inequities. This would be a tremendous help in making needed salary adjustments without having to take those funds from the regular salary pool.

Dr. Kustra stated that he had spoken to the Governor recently and learned that the benchmarking-budgeting process may no longer be in effect for Kentucky's institutions. This would be favorable for Eastern as well as the other universities in the state.

The President reminded the Faculty Senate that there is a \$5 million dollar endowment trust fund challenge currently open to Eastern Kentucky University. If enough funds are generated to total \$5 million dollars before the end of the biennium, the state of Kentucky will match that total with another \$5 million dollars. If those funds are generated, those dollars can be used for endowed chairs, endowed professorships and scholarships for our students. If you have names of individuals who you feel would make a considerable contribution to Eastern Kentucky University, please submit those names to Vern Snyder, Vice President of University Advancement.

The President invited faculty to attend a presentation on September 28 at 7:00 p.m. in the Pearl Buchanan Theater where the Meridian company will present its latest effort to sum up what the essence of Eastern is. The findings of the Meridian Company will provide the basis for the public relations and marketing campaign that this University will utilize to recruit our students in the future.

The President indicated that new student enrollment for the fall semester is up by 755 students, compared to last fall's enrollment.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIR: Senator Taylor

Senator Taylor announced that Eastern's insurance has been changed from MedBen back to Anthem Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

Senator Taylor commented that on April 5, 1999 the Faculty Senate passed legislation that would place a moratorium on the IDEA numeric data and department numerical equivalent for a period of three years for the purposes of merit pay, promotion and tenure decisions starting with the academic year 2000-2001. Senator Taylor has been informed by Senator Marsden and President Kustra that the IDEA evaluations and departmental-equivalent evaluations WILL continue for this academic year and may be used for merit pay, promotion, and tenure. The Executive Committee will discuss the teaching evaluation process at their next meeting and a report will be made at the October Faculty Senate meeting.

Senator Taylor stated that the Executive Committee met on August 28 and discussed the following three topics:

1. Evaluation of Administrators. It was the consensus of the Executive Committee that Senator Taylor meet with Senator Thompson, Mr. Gilbert and Dr. Kustra to discuss the idea that all faculty in a specific area be given the right to evaluate an administrator during the evaluation process. As of this date, a meeting date has not been set.
2. Faculty Minimum Salary. It was the consensus of the Executive Committee that Senator Taylor meet with the President and discuss the possibility of establishing a faculty minimum salary. This is just a discussion at present, and faculty input is welcomed and encouraged. Send Senator Taylor any feedback you may have.

The Minimum Salary by Rank recommended for 2001-2002 is as follows:

| | | |
|---------------------|----------|---|
| Professor | \$54,000 | Terminal degree required, tenured & fifteen years |
| Associate Professor | \$45,000 | Terminal degree required & tenured |
| Assistant Professor | \$36,800 | Terminal degree required |
| Instructor | \$27,100 | |

3. University Compensation Committee and Benefits Committee. The Executive Committee were in agreement that two committees need to be formed on a university-wide basis by the President: A committee on faculty/staff compensation and a separate committee to review university benefits as compared to other Kentucky institutions.

OLD BUSINESS:

Election of Faculty Senate Secretary: Senator Harley nominated Pauletta King Rogers as Faculty Senate Secretary, seconded by Senator Miller and the motion was passed by the Faculty Senate.

Tenured Faculty Member Review: The post tenure review document, in its amended state, was approved by the Faculty Senate. The corrected document can be viewed at:
<http://www.eku.edu/academics/facultysenate/posttenure.htm>.

Domestic Partner Benefits. Senator Goodwin moved that the Faculty Senate recommend that Eastern Kentucky University adopt the following definition of domestic partnership and add it to the Faculty/Staff Handbook.

A domestic partner is defined as a person over 18, unrelated by blood to an extent that would preclude marriage under the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, who has demonstrable financial interdependence with an employee of Eastern Kentucky University and shares an exclusive relationship which both partners intend to maintain indefinitely.

In addition, Senator Goodwin further proposed that the Faculty Senate extend the following recommendation to the President and the Board of Regents to consider:

Eastern Kentucky University considers domestic partners of employees, as defined by the Faculty/Staff Handbook, to be eligible for all benefits extended by the University to spouses of married employees. Eligible employees must complete the Declaration of Domestic Partner Relationship form to enroll the non-employee partner for benefits, and a Termination of Domestic Partner Relationship form must be completed within sixty days of the dissolution of a domestic partner relationship.

The Faculty Senate approved the motions with a majority ruling.

Phase II Reorganization. As an informational item, Dr. Marsden shared with the Faculty Senate that the Medical Services Technology program changed the program name to Medical Assisting Practices and requested to join the Department of Health Promotion and Administration. In addition, Clinical Laboratory Sciences and Environmental Health Science have combined to form a

new department with Professor Worley Johnson appointed as acting chair. The two units were combined this summer on a one-year approval, with a final solution to be reached sometime during this academic year.

Senator Konkel, as a representative for the Department of Environmental Health and Clinical Laboratory Science, stated that the two departments work very well together and would prefer to continue as a department functioning under the name of the Department of Environmental Health Science and Clinical Laboratory Sciences. Senator Konkel stated that if the subject is revisited in the next year, then he would appreciate the Senate's involvement, focusing on the needs of students and faculty in the newly constituted department, and recognizing tradeoffs in any further reorganization.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

New Child Care Center: Senator Taylor stated that a new child care facility is being established on campus, and Dr. Jansook Gilbert would like to give a report at the next Faculty Senate meeting on the center's progress.

Shared Faculty Positions/Appointments: Ms. Joy Anderson gave a brief report on the committee's progress on the faculty positions and appointments task force findings. Ms. Anderson stated that the committee hopes to bring a proposal to the Senate for a vote by early December. Senator Spears will present additional information at the October meeting.

New EKU E-Mail System: Access 2000 is the new e-mail system now available on campus. It can still be set to access your mail through Netscape Mail or Internet Explorer Microsoft Outlook 2000, if preferred. However, all the new features will not be available to those who choose this option. All e-mail addresses will need to be changed to first name.last name@eku.edu. Some of the advantages of the new system will be virtually no e-mail down time, a more up-to-date address book for campus e-mails, calendar functions which can be shared university-wide, read-receipt and delivery receipt of e-mails, and an office assistance option that upon receipt of mail to your in-box responds with an e-mail to the sender notifying them of your absence from the office. There will be training provided on the new e-mail system in the near future. Questions may be directed to Steve Fulkerson at 622-5900.

Faculty Senate Representation: Senator Taylor mentioned that the Committee on Elections will be reviewing the Senate representation to make sure the departmental representations meet the Senate By-Laws.

Materials Submitted to Faculty Senate: Senator Taylor informed the Faculty Senate members that all items submitted to the Faculty Senate must now be on disk or through e-mail. The Faculty Senate Agenda and attachments will be available from this point on through the Faculty Senate Web Site at:<http://www.eku.edu/academics/facultysenate/>.

Faculty Senate Picnic: Senator Taylor reminded the Faculty Senate members that the second annual picnic will be held on Wednesday, September 27 at 6:00 p.m. at Arlington s Mulebarn. Senator Taylor thanked Kathy Kustra and Renee Taylor for their help in organizing the event.

NEW BUSINESS:

Evaluation of Administrators (Deans and Vice President of Academic Affairs): Senator Schlomann proposed two motions to clarify the faculty/staff handbook:

1. Under the Vice President of Academic Affairs evaluation section in the faculty/staff handbook it should read, Chairs, deans, and other academic support administrators working directly with the Vice President and all faculty would be given the opportunity to complete a questionnaire and shall be transmitted to the President.
2. Under the deans evaluation section in the faculty/staff handbook it should read, Academic support administrators who work directly with the dean as well as all college faculty and college chairs will be given the opportunity to complete the questionnaire.

The Faculty Senate approved the motion to suggest the addition of the two proposed statements to the Faculty/Staff Handbook.

Evaluation of Administrators (President): The Faculty Senate moved and approved a motion that Senator Taylor meet with Mr. Gilbert and the consultant, once selected by the Board of Regents, to discuss having an evaluation sent to all faculty and staff dealing with the President.

Task Report on Salary Inequities: The Faculty Senate were in agreement that a university wide policy should be adopted on the procedures to deal with salary inequities such as the proposal developed by a Departmental Salary Inequities Committee in the College of Business and Technology recently. Senator Marsden indicated that such a proposal could easily be expanded to work effectively for the Academic Affairs area.

EKU Degree Completion for Accomplished Professionals: This item was moved to the October agenda for lack of time for discussion.

Council on Academic Affairs Report: Senator Marsden reported that during the summer he began working on faculty development ideas with the Committee on the Improvement of Instruction. The report from that committee will be presented at a future Faculty Senate meeting.

Senator Marsden introduced a report from the Faculty Development Task Force which deals with very specific recommendations with regards to enhancing faculty development at the university. The report is on the web at the following address:
<http://www.biology.eku.edu/frederick/tdtaskforce.htm/>.

Senator Marsden made a motion to approve the proposed Public Child Welfare Certification program from the Department of Anthropology, Sociology, and Social Work. This motion was seconded and approved by the Faculty Senate.

Report from the Faculty Regent: Senator Thompson reported that since the Senate's last meeting in May, the Board of Regents has met four times. One of the four meetings was with the Financial Affairs Committee on May 16 for a discussion of the budget. The second meeting was a full board meeting where the budget was officially approved. The third meeting was the two-day July retreat at which time the Board utilized a consultant to facilitate discussion of board functions. The beginning discussion on the presidential evaluation also began at this meeting. The fourth meeting was on August 3. The Academic and Executive Affairs Committee of the Board is Regents, according to the by-laws of the Board, is charged with conducting for the Board the Presidential assessment process. That committee reached a general agreement that proposals would be solicited and considered for consultants who would assist with the Presidential assessment.

Report from the COSTL Representative: Senator Strong (Reporting for Senator Falkenberg) stated that the meeting mainly focused on the Council on Higher Education presentation and program review.

Report from the Student Government: Ritchie Rednour indicated that the Student Senate is working on several initiatives ranging from parking to campus safety to community service. He further stated that he hopes there will be joint proposals from the Student Senate and the Faculty Senate during this academic year.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Committee on Elections: Senator McAdams was elected chair.

Committee on Committees: Senator Willingham was elected chair.

Committee on Rules: Senator Yoder was elected chair.

Committee on the Budget: Senator Rink was elected chair.

Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities: Senator Goodwin was elected the chair.

ADDITIONAL ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Senator Lifland: At approximately 9:00 a.m. on Friday morning, the ECU flag left on board the space shuttle. Within the next week or two it will be transferred to the international space station that is orbiting and will be brought back when the shuttle returns. Dr. Boles, Dr. Lifland, and the other members of the Robotics team expressed their thanks to Dr. Kustra for providing the funds to attend the launch.

Senator McAdams: There will be a part-time faculty representative on the Faculty Senate by the next meeting. A ballot will be sent out soon to all part-time faculty members to cast their votes. Please encourage part-time faculty to return the ballots.

ADJOURNMENT:

Dr. Marsden made a motion to adjourn at 5:30 p.m.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

October 2, 2000

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, October 2, 2000 in the South Room of the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Taylor called the second meeting of the academic year to order at 3:30 p.m.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Brown, Collins, Eisenberg, Hodge, Schlomann*, Stephens*, Thompson*, Vance*, and Wernegreen.

* denotes prior notification of absence to the Faculty Senate Secretary

Visitors to the Senate were:

Steve Byrn, Rita Davis, Elizabeth Wachtel, and Jennifer Rogers (*The Eastern Progress*).

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Kustra

Dr. Kustra announced that Ken Johnston has just been appointed as the new Vice President of Finance and Treasurer of the University. One of the first things on the agenda for Mr. Johnston and the President will be to meet on an individual basis with each of the colleges and the library staff to review EKU's funding situation and what things look like for the coming year.

EKU now has a sick leave bank policy. Employees will be given an opportunity to contribute a minimum of one day and a maximum of three days to the sick leave bank. Employees must have a sick leave balance of 10 days or more at the time of their contribution. A full set of guidelines for the Sick Leave Bank was mailed to faculty and staff during the summer. It may be helpful to send that information out again to make sure everyone is aware of the new policy.

Dr. Kustra mentioned that the administration would like to re-institute a policy similar to the former ERO policy. A discussion like this must have the full and complete input of the Faculty Senate.

Regarding the domestic partner benefits proposal which the Faculty Senate approved at the September meeting, we (the administration) think that it is important that we make some effort to cost this out, to determine the number of people that might be available to participate in that program, and to what extent it will affect our numbers as far as health insurance is concerned. The best thing to do is to bring the proposal back to you with that analysis at a future date before it is forwarded to the Board of Regents.

Dr. Kustra informed the Faculty Senate that Senator Lieberman had rented Arlington for the week to prepare for his debate in Danville on Thursday evening. At some point during his stay, he will make an unofficial visit to EKU s campus.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIR: Senator Taylor

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on September 18. The committee discussed the possibility of establishing lecture and part-time lecture positions at EKU. We also are recommending ways to properly contextualize quantitative evaluation data and ways to enhance the qualitative evaluation data for teaching.

Senator Taylor thanked the Senate body for disseminating the draft about establishing minimum faculty wages. All the information and e-mails Senator Taylor received were supportive of the draft mentioned in the September report.

The Minimum Salary by Rank recommended for 2001-2002 is as follows:

| | | |
|---------------------|----------|---|
| Professor | \$54,000 | Terminal degree required, tenured & fifteen years |
| Associate Professor | \$45,000 | Terminal degree required & tenured |
| Assistant Professor | \$36,800 | Terminal degree required |
| Instructor | \$27,100 | |

On September 27, the annual faculty senate welcome back dinner was held at Arlington. Senator Taylor thanked Kathy Kustra for organizing the event, the EKU Foundation for sponsoring the event and Tracy Whitaker and EKU Catering for handling the event.

On September 28 the Meridian group presented their research results and recommendations in Keen Johnson Pearl Buchanan Theatre. It was an informative and impressive presentation on the perceptions of EKU. The consultant is now proposing an ad campaign for the university with the slogan EKU - Get the Know How . For those of you who could not attend, the consultant said copies of the powerpoint presentation will be made available soon.

During the month of September, Senator Taylor met with Dr. Kustra and Dr. Marsden to discuss the possibility of re-establishing EKU s early retirement option. Under the previous administration this was used as an indiscriminate retrenchment tool that caused some departments to offer less courses and/or hire more part-time faculty. If ERO is re-established, Senator Taylor expressed that it should not be used as an indiscriminate retrenchment tool, and he further stated that he believes Dr. Kustra and Dr. Marsden are in agreement to this as well.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members have been invited to attend a consultants presentation on strategic planning from 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. in the Perkins building on October 3, and they have also been invited to attend a meeting with CPE representative Jim Appleton on October 25.

OLD BUSINESS:

EKU Degree Completion for Accomplished Professionals

Senator Marsden made a motion to approve the ECU Degree Completion for Accomplished Professionals proposal. Eastern, like many other institutions in the country, have had a number of individuals who leave the institution before they complete their undergraduate degree, but who go forward to receive an advanced degree. Yet some of these individuals would like to receive their undergraduate degree and be an alumnus of ECU. This would be a university-wide policy which would be completely controlled at the departmental level. If the department does not recommend the individual for that degree then it does not occur. This was passed for consideration by the majority of the Faculty Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Shared Faculty Positions/Appointments

Senator Spears announced that the committee members on the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Faculty Positions/Appointments are: Joy Anderson, Karen Spears, Steve Black, Keith Johnson, and Marda Stribling. The committee met last on September 19. The Ad Hoc Committee met with Drs. Marsden and Whitlock to get their impressions on how the shared faculty arrangement might work for ECU. The committee posed several questions covering both temporary and permanent arrangements. The committee has been researching such policies at Kentucky schools including existing policies at Midway College, Morehead State University, and the University of Kentucky. On September 29 the committee met again with Patty Costello of the Math Department, with Dr. Marsden and Dr. Whitlock both present again to give feedback particularly concerning KTRS regulations. The memo received by Senator Johnson from Steve Judy, Director of Member Benefits at KTRS was also discussed at length. The committee hopes to begin writing the document soon. We would like, if possible, to have this completed by the end of the semester. Another committee meeting is scheduled for October 13.

NEW BUSINESS:

Creation of a Lecturer/Part-Time Lecturer Position. The Faculty Senate body approved a motion to create an ad hoc committee to review previous studies on the creation of a lecturer/part-time lecturer position at ECU. The Faculty Senate were in agreement that the committee should report back to the Faculty Senate by February 2001.

Faculty Evaluations. Senator Falkenberg moved to have the committee on Improvement of Instruction review the current practices for evaluation of teaching at ECU and to recommend ways to properly contextualize quantitative evaluation and ways in which we may enhance the qualitative evaluation of teaching. This motion was approved by the majority of the Faculty Senate.

Council on Academic Affairs Report

Senator Marsden gave a handout to the Senators which explained the rationale for the administrative decision not to support the Faculty Senate recommendation to place a moratorium on the use of IDEA forms for the purposes of merit pay, and tenure and promotion decisions starting for a period of three years beginning with the academic year 2000-2001 which was discussed at the September meeting.

Senator Marsden mentioned that the Student Government Association may present a fraternization policy to the Faculty Senate at some point in the near future. He stated that while the university does not currently have a written policy regarding consensual romantic relationships between faculty, staff and students, it is the University's position that the professional ethics governing such relationships are widely understood within the academy. More specifically, professional ethics would preclude a faculty or staff member from having a consensual romantic relationship with any student over whom they are in a position of authority by virtue of their specific teaching, research, or administrative assignments.

Senator Marsden introduced the proposed format for the Academic Affairs Program review. Discussion was postponed until the Executive Committee had a chance to review the document. Based on the decision of the Executive Committee, the Academic Affairs Program review may be listed for approval on the November agenda.

Senator Marsden introduced the ERO draft proposal. Senator Siegel moved to postpone discussion on the ERO draft proposal until the Executive Committee could review it at the October 23 meeting. The ERO draft proposal could then be listed on the November Faculty Senate agenda.

STANDING COMMITTEES:

Committee on Elections: Senator McAdams stated that the part time faculty representative will be selected by the end of the week. Please remind part-time faculty to cast their vote.

ADDITIONAL ANNOUNCEMENTS/INFORMATION:

Meridian presentation: Senator Taylor invited comments on the Meridian presentation. Senator McGuire indicated that she would like to know what stage the new logo is in and, as part of their money we paid for the research, is it their obligation to actually do any of the marketing now that they ve started on this logo.

Senator Taylor indicated that he had very little information on this. From what he has heard from the consultants, they are waiting for a budget from us to decide where to go with this. We could give them \$0 and it stops right there or the administration can make their own proposal.

Senator Marsden stressed that any monies paid to the Meridian group was paid by the Foundation, not by ECU funds.

Senator Yoder indicated that in her department, the faculty discussed some of the material and felt that some of the things Meridian did were good and that the research had been done well and the presentation was good, but had only heard negative comments about the get-the-know-how logo. She further indicated that even some students she had talked with did not like the new logo.

Senator Taylor stated that he checked with some students, and the students thought it was great.

Senator McGuire said that when Meridian made the presentation, they said that the logo chosen was one of several suggestions that the administration showed support for. Is there any chance that we might can find out what the other slogans were? Furthermore, could we have the students vote on them?

Senator Taylor indicated that he would mention that possibility to Dr. Kustra when they talked next.

Evaluation Procedure for the President: Senator Siegel asked if there was any progress made on consulting with the chair of the Board of Regents about the evaluation of the President.

Senator Taylor indicated that he had some correspondence with the chair of the Board of Regents, and it seemed positive. However, the Board will not act with the consultant until March.

ADJOURNMENT:

Senator Marsden moved to adjourn the meeting at approximately 5:10 p.m.

September 26, 2000

Dr. John W. Taylor
Chair, Faculty Senate
Coliseum 108
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, KY 40475

Dear Dr. Taylor:

On Saturday, July 22, 2000, Barry Wayne Ledbetter, a 23 year-old student at Eastern Kentucky University died from injuries sustained in a motorcycle accident in Somerset, KY. Barry, a Monticello native and a Health Care Administration major, had worked very hard to earn a Bachelors in Business Administration and was excited that he would be graduating in December 2000. At all times during his tenure here at Eastern Kentucky University, Barry was in good standing academically. Barry was an active member of the student organization for Health Care Administration Students where he had an opportunity to demonstrate his leadership abilities. Members of the faculty will remember Barry for his participation in class.

Barry was a role model for other nontraditional students. He demonstrated that one can maintain a meaningful relationship with a spouse, an offspring and parents while earning a degree. Barry's greatest service to the University, however, was the manner in which he interacted with others while representing EKV. At the time of his death, Barry was serving an internship at Wayne County hospital in Monticello. Administrators at the hospital where he worked thought so much of Barry they are planning to plant a tree in his memory on September 28.

On behalf of the faculty in the Department of Accounting, Finance and Information Systems, I would like to nominate Barry Wayne Ledbetter for a posthumous degree to be granted at the December 2000 Eastern Kentucky University graduation. Thank you for considering this matter. If you have questions please call me at 1087.

Sincerely,

Jessica Johnson Frazier, Chair
Department of Accounting,
Finance and Information Systems

cc: Dr. Michael T. Marsden
Provost and Vice President for
Academic Affairs and Research

The faculty who served on the Ad Hoc Committee on Program Review were:

Dr. Anisa Al-Khatab, Associate Professor
Administration/Counseling/Educational Studies
College of Education

Dr. John Gump, Professor
Management, Marketing & Administration Communications
College of Business

Dr. John Harley, Professor
Biological Sciences
College of Arts & Sciences
(Member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee)

Dr. Karin Sehmman, Professor
Music
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Irina Soderstrom, Associate Professor
Correctional and Juvenile Justice Studies
College of Justice & Safety

Dr. Deborah Whitehouse, Chair/Professor
Baccalaureate and Graduate Nursing
College of Health Sciences

Mary McGregor, student

Eastern Kentucky University
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Approved by
Council on Academic Affairs
September 21, 2000

Eastern Kentucky University

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Principles of Academic Program Review

1. The primary purpose of academic program review is to ensure that quality and continuous improvement is an integral component of all EKU programs.
2. Academic program review is an ongoing process that contributes to refining Eastern 's programmatic directions and priorities, which then shape resource allocations and other academic and administrative decisions.
3. The review process involves the faculty and administrators of the program being reviewed as well as the Academic Program Review Committee.
4. Every effort has been made to ensure that the institutional criteria used in program review are clearly stated, are uniform, and disseminated with sufficient lead-time so that program faculty and administrators are aware of them before the review process starts. Program faculty may develop additional criteria that are unique to an individual program.
5. Program review is intended to provide helpful information through a process that is designed to be thorough yet not excessively burdensome to faculty and administrators.
6. A university-wide organizational framework for program review has been developed and will be consistently implemented. Program review is an integral part of each program 's and the University 's ongoing assessment and strategic planning processes.

Eastern Kentucky University**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW****Process and Structure**

1. The normal review cycle is five years. With approximately 150 degree programs we will review approximately 30 degree programs per year. The Office of Planning and Assessment will distribute a five year schedule listing programs to be reviewed.
2. The definition of an academic program is any degree program.
3. Academic program review is normally scheduled for all degree programs within a department during a given academic year.
4. To the extent possible, for programs which have specialized accreditation, the academic program review is scheduled to occur in relationship to the specialized accreditation process as determined by the department.
5. Indicators which will trigger early program review include but are not limited to:
 - a) decreases in enrollment
 - b) lack of a critical mass of faculty required for a quality program
 - c) loss of program accreditation
 - d) lack of evidence that the program is achieving its stated goal(s) and objective(s)The Provost Council initiates any early program review. The same guiding principles, criteria and data used for a regular program review govern any early program review. As resources permit, external review may also be utilized as deemed appropriate by the Provost Council and/or the relevant program.
6. An Academic Program Review Committee is established to coordinate academic program review. The Academic Program Review Committee is a standing university committee. Membership of the committee consists of three faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences, two faculty each from the Colleges of Business and Technology, Education, Health Sciences, and Justice and Safety. Committee members are to be appointed by the President from nominations from the deans. (Initial appointments are for a one, two and three year period.) Two students are members. The Director of Institutional Research is a permanent non-voting member. The Associate Vice President for Planning and Assessment, a voting member, chairs the committee.
7. The Academic Program Review Committee makes recommendations concerning academic degree programs to the Provost Council. Any formal actions based upon these recommendations go through normal university approval processes as appropriate.

Eastern Kentucky University

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW CRITERIA

1. With respect particularly to numerical data, no single piece of data or narrow data set is used as the sole assessment criterion for any program.
2. The Office of Institutional Research provides the same data set about each program for a five year period of time. These data are identified and consistently defined across programs. Programs may provide additional data in order to clarify some aspect of the program.
3. Some data at the university are collected and reported by department and not by program. The program review process uses available data. The Associate Vice President for Planning and Assessment approves requests for "extraordinary" data.
4. Information provided by the program should be presented in a clear and concise manner. The review must provide specific indicators or evidence of program accomplishments and quality and must clearly demonstrate the use of assessment of student learning in the program review process.
5. Every effort is made to minimize redundant, and repetitive information.

Approved by Council on Academic Affairs
September 21, 2000

Eastern Kentucky University

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW CRITERIA

I. INFORMATION AND DATA PROVIDED BY INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

(These data are typically examined when considering the viability and distinguishing profile of a program.)

A. Program Enrollment and Faculty Data (most recent five-year period)

1. Number of Majors

2. Number of Graduates

3. Ratio of Graduates to Majors

(This ratio provides a rough gauge of the rate of the persistence of majors through a program to graduation.)

4. Student Credit Hours

Lower

Upper

Graduate

5. Average Class Size

Lower

Upper

Graduate

6. Number of Full-time Faculty (budgeted lines)

7. FTE Part-time Faculty and SCH Generated by PT

On-campus

Off-campus

8. Student/Faculty Ratio

9. Comparisons with external data

(Where available and appropriate, data about the program will be compared with data about similar programs elsewhere, especially in Kentucky through CPE-supplied data, or from benchmark institutions.)

Approved by Council on Academic Affairs
September 21, 2000

Please explain any special circumstances affecting Program Enrollment and Faculty Data.

Approved by Council on Academic Affairs
September 21, 2000

B. Student Profile Data

(These data, supplied by Institutional Research, provide indicators of the program 's student quality, as reflected in standardized "input" measures.)

1. Higher Education GPA of Program Graduates
2. ACT scores and high school GPA
3. Graduate Program Data
(GPA, GRE, GAP)

Please explain any special circumstances affecting student profile data.

C. Resources

(Supplied by Budget Office and/or Institutional Research)

1. Total Institutional Budget and Expenditures, including research & support materials
2. Ratio of total expenditures/Student Credit Hour
(This ratio reflects a rough cost per credit hour measure.)

Please explain any special circumstances affecting resources.

II. INFORMATION AND DATA PROVIDED BY PROGRAM

(The program will provide specific indicators of its quality and viability as reflected in the following categories. Note that many of these indicators are based on outcomes, not inputs, of the program.)

A. Mission Statement/Relation to University Mission

(Provide a copy of the program's mission statement, and explain how it is congruent with and supportive of the university 's mission.)

B. Teaching and Learning

1. Indicators of Teaching and Advising Quality
(Provide evidence of the program's quality of teaching and advising.)

2. Indicators of Student Learning

a. Currently-enrolled Students

(Describe the program's methods of assessing the learning outcomes of its students. These methods should be delineated in the department's assessment

Approved by Council on Academic Affairs
September 21, 2000

plan. Provide evidence of student achievement and success.)

b. Program Graduates

(Provide evidence that graduates of the program achieve professional success.)

The indicators used in this section should reflect as much as possible outcomes not inputs and should be clearly delineated in each program's assessment plan.

C. Research/Creative Activity; Grants

(Provide evidence that the program is productive in research/creative activity and that the quality of the activity is high. Provide evidence that the program is active and successful in attracting funds from extramural sources.)

D. Service

(Provide evidence of the quantity and quality of the program's university service and public service.)

E. Other Indicators of Program Achievement and Contribution

(Supply information reflecting specific ways in which the program contributes significantly to the mission and success of the university in any of the following categories, as appropriate.)

1. Program Viability

(Provide evidence that the program attracts, recruits, and retains quality students. Explain any anomalies that are reflected in Institutional Research or program-supplied data. Provide any relevant data, citing recognized sources, about enrollment trends, cycles, etc., in the specific field.)

2. Contributions to university programs

(Describe the program's contribution to other university programs through its significant involvement in the general education program, its support to other university programs through service course offerings, or in other ways.)

3. Use of Technology

(Describe the program's significant use of technology to enhance learning. Describe the program's use of technology to provide alternative delivery to time/place-bound learners.)

4. Uniqueness of Program

(Describe the program 's uniqueness to the state or region of the country and indicate specific advantages the uniqueness affords the university.)

Approved by Council on Academic Affairs
September 21, 2000

5. Contributions to Diversity Goals

(Describe the program's efforts and progress toward promoting diversity of students and faculty. Explain how issues of diversity, including contributions of women and minorities, are integrated into the curriculum.)

6. Accreditation Status (if applicable): Attach copy of most recent report.

(What is the program's accreditation status? Is accreditation available for the program? If the program is not accredited, explain why. Does the most recent accreditation report identify program strengths and/or areas needing improvement?)

7. Planning, Development, and Other Areas

(Address the achievement of any strategic planning goals or action plans not covered elsewhere in this document. Address any other area of significant contribution or achievement of the program, including successes in attracting development funds and other forms of private support.)

8. Additional Indicators for Career Preparation Programs

(Programs that have preparing students for specific careers as an identified and central part of their missions should supply any additional, relevant information not already covered concerning the following topics: current and future demand, or job outlook, for graduates in this specific career area; the "need" [social, economic, technological, etc.] for program graduates in the region, state, and nation; job placement data for graduates; achievement and success of graduates in the specific career area.)

9. Additional Indicators for Pre-Professional Programs

(Programs that prepare students in pre-professional programs for transfer to baccalaureate degree programs at other institutions should supply any additional, relevant information not already covered such as the number of students transferring to other institutions.)

F. Response to Previous Program Reviews or Other Assessments

(Address any perceived problems in the program as identified in previous program reviews or other relevant assessments, internal or external.)

ERO POLICY AND PROCEDURES

The granting of an ERO in a department must in no way reduce the quality of its teaching, advising, or service. Further, an ERO may be granted only when it is in the best interest of the University and has the approval of the Department, the Dean, and the Provost/VP for Academic Affairs and Research. Granting an ERO may not increase the total FTE faculty of the University.

Guidelines

1. Preparation. Potential ERO faculty should review the Faculty Handbook and talk with the ECU Office of Human Resources regarding benefits before submitting a request. Some benefits are restricted to full-time faculty members and some will be shifted from ECU to KTRS.
2. Eligibility. Faculty members who are eligible and elect to retire under KTRS may apply for the special tenured category of ERO status.
3. Expectations. ERO faculty are contract faculty teaching up to a 12 hour load for the contract year.
4. Duration. ERO status may be granted for one, two, or three years, depending upon need and ongoing performance.
5. Assignments. Specific teaching assignments for ERO faculty are to be determined by the department chair, based on the schedule and curriculum needs of the department.
6. Salary. The faculty member's salary will be up to 37.5% (or 3 1/4% per credit hour) of their salary upon retirement. ERO faculty are eligible only for across-the-board component of salary increases.

Procedures

1. Faculty members considering an ERO request should consult with their department chair and representatives from KTRS and ECU Human Resources prior to submitting an ERO request.
2. ERO requests should be submitted between November 1 and December 31, in order to facilitate planning for the following year. Chair and Dean consideration of all requests will begin after January 1.
3. The format of the ERO request is a memo addressed to the President, through normal administrative channels.
4. Review of ERO requests by the Chair will include an assessment of faculty replacement needs. This assessment must ensure that the quality of department teaching, advising and services will not suffer as a result of this ERO. The assessment should describe the impact of the ERO on the department. Specifically it should address the impact of the ERO on:
 - a. Advising loads.
 - b. The quality of teaching in the department, including class size.
 - c. Percentage of courses taught by part-time faculty.
 - d. Committee assignments.
 - e. The percentage of faculty on ERO.
 - f. Any special conditions, such as space, computers, or faculty travel.

The assessment will be appended to the ERO request and forwarded by the Chair to the Dean, who shall review the request in view of the needs of the college and the impact on the department. The Dean will then forward the request and his/her recommendation to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research. The Provost/Vice President will forward the request, along with his/her recommendation, to the President.

Memorandum

To: EKV Faculty Senate President and Secretary

From: Faculty Senate Committee on Elections
Marianne McAdam (Chair), Charlie Everett, Peggy McQuire, Sara Sutton, Joyce Wolf

Date: October 10, 2000

Subject: Election Committee November Report

The election of a part-time faculty senate representative is complete. Kathy Breeden of the Political Science Department won with 47 votes. Mark Mefford had 10 votes and there were 9 unusable votes since the voters did not put their names and addresses on the outside of the envelope.

When we voted to include a part-time faculty senate representative we had determined it be a one year position. We may want to reconsider and make this at least, a two year position for the following reasons:

- an accurate list of part-time faculty cannot be obtained until well into Sept. which means that by the time the election is completed the new senator's first meeting is in November.
- the time that goes into polling part-time faculty to first find a nominee and then complete a vote is lengthy. The same process that was used for electing a Faculty regent was used for this election.
- the faculty that would choose to hold this position are usually faculty who have been teaching at the University on a part-time basis for a number of years.

A brief discussion as to whether to lengthen the term of the part-time faculty senator may be in order at this time.

The committee also asks that each department double check their representation on the senate. The Rules of the Faculty Senate state that:

“Each election unit shall be entitled to one delegate for each ten full-time Teaching/Research Faculty members employed by that election unit during the fall semester. In other words, an election unit with 10-19 faculty is entitled to one delegate, an election unit with 20-29 faculty is entitled to two, 30- 39 is entitled to 3 etc.” (p. 7, Rules of the Faculty Senate). Check to see how many full time faculty members are in your department and then how many senators have been attending senate meetings. A few discrepancies have come to our attention lately and more may exist. Thank you for your attention to this matter.