

Faculty Senate Agenda

October 6, 2003
3:30 p.m.

Call to order

Approval of Minutes

September 8, 2003

Report from the President: Senator Glasser

Report from the Executive Committee Chair: Senator Johnson

Report from the Faculty Regent: Senator Schlomann

Report from the COSFL Representative: Senator Siegel

Report from the Provost: Senator Cook

Report from the Student Senate: Kristina O'Brien

Report from the Standing Committees:

Budget Committee: Senator Siegel

Rules Committee: Senator M. Yoder

Rights and Responsibilities Committee: Senator Dunston

Elections Committee: Senator DeBolt

Committee on Committees: Senator Wolf

Welfare Committee: Senator G. Yoder

Unfinished Business:

Foundation Professor motion

Salary Equity Adjustment motion

New Business:

Report from the Council on Academic Affairs: Senator Cook

Suspend Program (Specialist in Education Ed Ad & Supervision)

Sabbatical Leave Policy

Plus/Minus Grading Final Report: Daniel Thorne

Adjournment

Faculty Senate Minutes September 8, 2003

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, September 8, 2003, in the South Room of the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Johnson called the first meeting of the academic year to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.

The following members were absent:

L. Collins, J. Glasser*, S. Fister*, A. Gossage, J. Harley, C. Jackson, D. Jackson, D. Jones, L. Kay, L. Kelley, S. Konkel*, M. Marchant, B. Matthews, N. McKenney*, M. McNew, R. Messerich, L. Patterson, J. Payne, K. Rahimzadeh*, and M. Winslow.

***Indicates prior notification to the Senate Secretary.**

Visitors to the Senate: Ken Johnston, Finance; Cassandra Kirby, *The Eastern Progress*; Gary Kuhnhenh, Arts & Sciences; Sandra Moore, University Diversity; Kristina O'Brien, Student Government Association; John Shafer, Athletics; Aaron Thompson, Enrollment Management; Virginia Underwood, Equal Opportunity Office; John Wade, Arts & Sciences; and Doug Whitlock, Administrative Affairs.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The May 5, 2003 regular and organizational minutes were approved as written.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT: Virginia Underwood reported for Senator Glasser.

Enrollment is up by 9.6%, the residence halls are full, and 1800 freshmen joined the President at her house for a barbecue the night before classes started. This was the largest turnout ever.

Search committees have been appointed for the Dean of Arts and Sciences, chaired by Gary Corder, and for the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, chaired by Malcolm Frisbee.

If state budget revenues projections do not improve significantly there could be another mid-year cut in higher education. Senator Glasser has asked the vice presidents to begin preparing for this potential cut.

Senator Glasser also wished to express her concern that neither gubernatorial candidate is currently speaking about support for higher education. This situation is not particularly well received in the higher education community. Senator Glasser will continue to speak with business leaders as well as legislators about the importance of keeping support for higher education reform alive and funded.

Next week Senator Glasser will be traveling to Washington, DC to meet with the Chronicle of Higher Education, US News and World Report to share ECU's story and successes.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR'S REPORT: Senator Johnson.

Senator Johnson reported that the Executive Committee met on August 25, 2003. The following University committee appointments were made: Senator Hubbard, General Education Committee, Senator D. Jackson, Residency Appeals Committee; Senator Konkel, Withdrawals Committee and Senator Flanagan, Arlington Representative.

The following Executive Committee members will be responsible for reporting standing committee progress at each Executive Committee meeting.

Budget Committee: Senator Johnson
Rules Committee: Senator Hubbard
Rights and Responsibilities Committee: (new member, when elected)
Elections Committee: Senator Flanagan
Committee on Committees: Senator Jackson
Faculty Welfare Committee: Senator Collins
Ad Hoc Committees: Senator Konkel

A motion for a university Ombudsman was discussed and referred back to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee for further review.

The final report on Plus/Minus Grading was distributed to the committee members and will be discussed at the next Executive Committee meeting. The final report will be presented at the Senate meeting in October.

Senator G. Yoder was present to discuss a motion on salary inequity adjustments submitted by the Faculty Welfare Committee. The Faculty Welfare Committee made suggested changes and submitted an updated motion which will be presented later in this meeting.

Senator Johnson reminded the senators about the upcoming Faculty Senate dinner on September 30 at Arlington.

Senator Johnson reminded the senators that there will be an election in the spring semester for a new faculty regent. This is a three-year appointment.

FACULTY REGENT'S REPORT: Senator Schlomann

Senator Schlomann reported that the Board of Regents has met twice since the last Senate meeting. They met in June to finalize the budget and again on Saturday, September 6. Additionally, in May the Regents attended an "Institute for Effective Governance" seminar.

The theme for the "Institute for Effective Governance" was "Working Together to Sustain Our Momentum: Public and Political Support for Postsecondary Reform." Governor Patton talked about how he had become known as the "higher education governor". Originally, higher education was not on his platform. It became part of his platform because people educated and lobbied him during the campaign. Most of his speech centered on encouraging the university regents and presidents to educate the candidates on higher education.

The next Institute for Effective Governance will be on September 21-22; both gubernatorial candidates will be present. Senator Schlomann stressed the importance for faculty to contact the candidates to make sure they see the importance of education for the betterment of the entire Commonwealth.

COSFL REPORT: Senator Siegel

Senator Siegel explained the meaning of COSFL to the new senators and announced that COSFL information is available on the web at <http://www.cosfl.eku.edu>.

COSFL met on July 14 at the Council on Postsecondary Education in Frankfort. The joint AAUP/COSFL mini-conference is scheduled for Saturday October 18 in Frankfort from 10:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m. Scheduled speakers include Dr. Jane Buck, National AAUP President and Dr. Tom Layzell, CPE President.

Tom Layzell and his staff will begin working on the 2004-2006 budget process shortly and will make a budget recommendation to CPE in November.

CPE is currently studying how to match funding to the reform agenda given the limitations of the present fiscal environment.

COSFL's next meeting will be later this month. If there are any issues or concerns that should be addressed at that meeting, please let Senator Siegel know.

PROVOST REPORT: Senator Cook

Senator Cook announced that a committee has been appointed to steer the process of changing Banner to be social security number transparent.

Senator Cook reported that there will be \$50,000 available for faculty development this year. Anyone with suggestions on how to distribute the funds should contact him.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION REPORT: Kristina O'Brien

SGA's fall festival is scheduled for Wednesday, September 24 from 9:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. in the Powell Plaza and courtyard.

SGA will be sponsoring a reception for family weekend on October 4 in the Powell Lobby from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Budget Committee. Senator Siegel reported that the Committee met on September 4.

The committee will sponsor a campus-wide open forum on budget issues with Provost Cook and Finance Vice President Johnston sometime in late February 2004. Last year, over 70 people attended the budget forum.

The committee will continue to meet monthly and will resume the study on major budget areas on an alternate monthly basis. Other issues will be discussed in the interim month. Any suggestions for additional agenda items may be forwarded to the committee members.

Rules Committee. Senator M. Yoder reported that the Rules Committee met via e-mail and via phone and Senator M. Yoder was selected as chair. The committee is working on several items which includes reviewing the procedures for the Faculty Regent election, finishing up the internal procedures, and researching the idea of a vice chair for the Senate.

Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Senator Johnson indicated that the committee will meet briefly after the Senate meeting to elect a chair.

Elections Committee. Senator Everett announced that Senator DeBolt was elected to serve as chair.

Committee on Committees. Senator G. Yoder announced that Senator Wolf was elected to serve as chair.

Faculty Welfare Committee. Senator G. Yoder reported that the committee has met three times this semester and formulated a motion on faculty salary adjustments which will be presented later in the meeting today.

OTHER REPORTS:

Enrollment Report. Senator Johnson requested Dr. Aaron Thompson to report on the current enrollment.

Dr. Thompson reported that presently there are 15,681 students enrolled.. While the total is still changing, compared to the same time last year enrollment was 14,783 which indicates about a 6% increase overall.

At present, there are 2,582 new freshman (9.78% increase), 1,047 new transfers (10.2% increase), and 2,324 graduates students (5.93% increase).

In 2000 EKU had a matriculation rate of 46.53%. This rate has increased to 61.33% this year. Three years ago students who needed developmental remediation were at 65%. That figure has now decreased to 45%.

Last year students were contacted and asked why they chose to attend EKU: 41% chose EKU because of campus location, and 39% chose EKU because of the programs offered. Forty-one percent of those questioned indicated they had family members who attended EKU; 85% were residents of Kentucky; and 74% indicated that EKU was their primary university choice.

Last year non-returning students were contacted and asked why they did not return: 25% stated financial reasons, 17% stated a lack of goals, 14% stated family reasons and 11% were on active military duty. These students were also asked what ECU could have done to improve their college-going experience: 59% stated that ECU could have done nothing else, 9% stated better living conditions, 9% stated better communications with the faculty and staff, 5% stated better parking facilities, 4% stated party atmosphere. Overall, most of the students who were contacted had a positive experience here at ECU-- even those that didn't return. The number one positive experience was the attitude of the professors.

NEW BUSINESS:

Committee Elections.

Budget Committee. One position available to replace John Wade. Two individuals were nominated: Senator Fenton and Senator Ware. Senator Fenton was elected with a vote of 27-12.

Committee on Committees. One position available. Two individuals were nominated: Senator Dean and Senator Newsome. Senator Newsome was elected with a vote of 20-19.

Executive Committee. One opening available. Two individuals were nominated: Senator Carmean and Senator Hyndman. Senator Carmean respectfully declined nomination and Senator Hyndman was selected.

Rights & Responsibilities Committee. Two openings available. Two individuals were nominated and elected by acclamation: Senator Coyer and Senator Kristofik.

Council on Academic Affairs Report. Senator Cook presented the proposed Foundation Professor procedures. Senator Reed moved approval of the procedures, seconded by Senator Coyer.

Senator Schломann moved to postpone discussion to the October meeting so that a member of the committee could be present to answer questions. The motion was seconded by Senator Flanagan. The Senate were in favor of postponing discussions to the October meeting.

Salary Adjustments Motion. Senator G. Yoder moved approval of the proposed motion, seconded by Senator Reed. Senator Johnson ruled the motion substantive and deferred discussion to the October meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

Senator Cook moved to adjourn at approximately 5:00 p.m.

Foundation Professorships

Nomination, Evaluation, and Selection Procedures for 2003-2004

Foundation Professorships recognize those faculty members who have demonstrated outstanding performance as teachers and who have been recognized by their colleagues as exemplifying outstanding qualities relating to the University's stated missions in teaching, service, and scholarship. Selection of these professorships shall be based on the criteria listed under Section I.B below.

I. Nomination

A. All full-time tenured faculty members whose major responsibility is teaching and who have held the rank of Professor for at least five years at ECU are eligible for nomination.

B. Full-time tenured faculty members may nominate any qualified faculty member. Self nominations are not accepted. Nominations will consist of the following items:

1. **Nomination Form:** Include the completed nomination form as the first page of the nomination.
2. **Narrative:** Describe the nominee's extraordinary successes in teaching, service, and scholarship by providing a three- to five-page (double-spaced) narrative that addresses the following criteria:
 - Outstanding teaching skills: using a variety of effective instructional techniques; motivating students to a high level of interest; and guiding students to a high level of learning and achievement;
 - Creativity and resourcefulness in fulfilling teaching responsibilities;
 - Self-motivation and enthusiasm for university teaching;
 - Expertise or distinguished accomplishment in the discipline;
 - Exemplary linking of service and scholarship to excellence in teaching;
 - Recognition by colleagues as making and having made significant contributions for the advancement of the department, college, and university; and
 - Acknowledgment as a leader and mentor for colleagues, students, and individuals in the professional community.
3. **Nominee's Vita:** Provide a current curriculum vita.

C. Nomination materials shall be submitted to the Chair of the Foundation Professor Selection Committee no later than the **last Friday in October**.

II. Preliminary Selection

The Foundation Professor Selection Committee shall give full consideration to all eligible faculty who are nominated and, based on these nominations, will select up to six candidates for Foundation Professor. Candidates will be notified of the Committee's selection(s) by the **last Friday in November**.

III. Submission of Additional Information

The Foundation Professor Selection Committee will request additional information, including but not limited to supporting recommendations from the department chair, promotion and tenure committee, and/or dean, for each of the candidates selected in Part II. This material shall be submitted to the Committee no later than the **second Friday in January**.

IV. Final Selection

The Foundation Professor Selection Committee will review all materials submitted, conduct personal interviews with the candidates, and recommend a finalist or finalists to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research no later than the **third Friday in February**. The Provost will transmit the recommendation, along with his/her own recommendation, to the President, who will notify the successful candidate(s). The Provost will notify the unsuccessful candidates. Announcement of the award(s) to the university community will be made in a timely manner through appropriate university publications and the local news media.

V. Expectation

The Foundation Professor will serve as an exemplar for the academic community. The unique talents of the recipient(s) will be shared with colleagues, especially junior members of the University faculty. The salary supplement of \$5,000 for a Foundation Professor assumes employment at full salary; the supplement shall be proportionately reduced for Foundation Professors who are not in full-time status at full salary (e.g., leave without pay for a semester or academic year sabbatical at one-half salary). Each successful candidate's department shall receive \$2,000 per annum for two years to be used for enhancing the teaching effectiveness of the department. The Foundation Professor, the chair, and the senior faculty will develop the enhancement plan.

The ECU Faculty Senate Welfare Committee's Recommendations for Salary Equity Adjustments

The Faculty Welfare Committee envisions equity adjustments as an essentially administrative process as opposed to a peer-driven academic process. We think it is also important that the University distinguish between equity adjustment resources and regular annual salary increases. Without a separate basis for funding, the equity adjustment process may very well result in decisions that end up creating a wider sense of inequity among the faculty than the original inequities the process was designed to address.

The Welfare Committee recommends the following principles to address faculty salary inequities:

1. In accordance with the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate at its December 2002 meeting, the Welfare Committee's principal recommendation is that the University consistently provide a pool of money each year to address salary equity issues as part of a campus-wide adjustment program. Further, the Committee recommends that the University commit itself to a program that addresses equity issues within five years.
2. In determining faculty salary adjustments, the Committee recommends that the University consider these principal factors: market indicators for specific discipline, rank, and time-in-rank.
3. To insure that a significant number of faculty receive a reasonable adjustment, the Committee recommends that no single adjustment exceed a maximum value. This value would change annually and would be contingent upon the amount of funds available, the number of faculty needing corrections, and the size of adjustments needed to reach target values. For example, to insure that at least fifty salaries are adjusted, the maximum salary adjustment would be set at 2% of the funds available.
4. Because departmental involvement is crucial to the success of a long-term adjustment program, the Committee recommends that the individual chairs and deans be central to the process of making salary adjustments. Chairs are in a unique position that allows them to make the university aware of other mitigating factors that are otherwise not readily available; such as performance of candidates, candidates with non-terminal degrees or a candidate's previous experience.
5. Finally, an equity appeals process should be available to individual faculty members.

The Welfare Committee moves that the Faculty Senate adopt these principles as a recommendation to the Provost to address faculty salary inequities.

Curriculum Change Form
(Present only one proposed curriculum change per form)
(Complete only the section(s) applicable.)

Part I

<input type="checkbox"/> (Check one) New Course (Parts II, IV)	Department Name Counseling and Educational Leadership	Education
<input type="checkbox"/> Course Revision (Parts II, IV)	College Education	
<input type="checkbox"/> Course Dropped (Part II)	*Course Prefix & Number NA	
<input type="checkbox"/> New Program (Part III)	*Course Title (30 characters) NA	
<input type="checkbox"/> Program Revision (Part III)	*Program Title Specialist in Education Ed Ad and Supervision	
<input type="checkbox"/> Program Suspended (Part III)	*Provide only the information relevant to the proposal. (Major __, Option __; Minor __; or Certificate __)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Proposal Approved by:	Date		Date
Departmental Committee	<u>10/18/01</u>	Graduate Council*	<u>09-10-03</u>
College Curriculum Committee	<u>12/11/01</u>	Council on Academic Affairs	
General Education Committee*		Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>09-18-03</u>
Teacher Education Committee*	<u>12/18/01</u>	Faculty Senate**	
		Board of Regents**	
		Council on Postsecondary Edu.***	<u>NA</u>

*If Applicable (Type NA if not applicable.)
**Approval needed for new, revised, or suspended programs
***Approval/Posting needed for new degree program or certificate program

Completion of A, B, and C is required: (Please be specific, but concise.)

<p>A. 1. Specific action requested: (Example: To increase the number of credit hours for ABC 100 from 1 to 2.) Program Suspended</p> <p>A. 2. Effective date: (Example: Fall 2001) Spring 2002</p> <p>A. 3. Effective date of suspended programs for currently enrolled students: (if applicable) Students currently in program would be allowed to finish</p>
<p>B. The justification for this action: Low enrollment</p>
<p>C. The projected cost (or savings) of this proposal is as follows:</p> <p>Personnel Impact: Minimal. Professors have completed the necessary work in addition to the normal assignments.</p> <p>Operating Expenses Impact: None</p> <p>Equipment/Physical Facility Needs: None</p> <p>Library Resources: None</p>

Part III. Recording Data for New, Revised, or Suspended Program

1. For a new program, provide the catalog description as being proposed.
2. For a revised program, provide (a) the current program requirements and (b) the revised program, reflecting the exact changes being proposed.
3. For a suspended program, provide the current program requirements as shown in catalog. List any options and/or minors affected by the program's suspension.

CURRICULUM FOR THE SPECIALIST IN EDUCATION DEGREE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

The applicant for the Specialist in Education degree must work closely with the student's advisor on such things as:

1. Evaluation of previous graduate work.
2. Fulfilling requirements set forth in the guidelines for the degree.
3. Completing required application forms.
4. Establishing a program, which lists courses to be taken for the area of specialization.

Admission --- Admission to the Specialist in Education program is based on the following entrance requirements:

1. Completion of requirements for the master's degree from an accredited college or university.
2. A score on the combined general tests (verbal, quantitative and analytic sections) of the Graduate Record Examination of at least 1400.
3. Successful professional experience appropriate to and as required in specific programs.
4. Completion of application forms for admission to the program.
5. Approval of screening and selection committee composed of three persons appointed by the departmental chair.

Admission to candidacy --- Application for admission to candidacy for the Specialist in Education degree should be filed by the student with the student's advisor and department chair:

1. When a minimum of nine semester hours of graduate credit beyond the master's of nine semester hours of graduate credit beyond the master's degree has been earned at Eastern Kentucky University. (A minimum of 12 semester hours must be taken after admission to candidacy.)
2. When work taken toward the Ed.S. degree shows an overall graduate grade point average of 3.0 or above.
3. When the advisor has approved the planned program of study and a copy of this program has been filed with the department chair and the Dean of the Graduate School.

Program Requirements --- Curricula will be individually planned within the following guidelines.

Research Core.....9 Hours

EAD 898, 899, and EDF 895.

Administrative Core.....27 Hours

EAD 801, 802, 804, 805, 806, 809, 810, 811, 821, 824, 827, 828, 831, 834, 846, 888, EDF 869, ELE 810, EMG 810, EMS 850, ESE 863, EPY 816, 842, SED 800, SED 810.

Minimum Program Total.....36 Hours

With permission of the Educational Administration Admissions Committee, the administrative certificate may be earned concurrently with the specialist degree. Any of the required courses taken as part of the master's degree may be counted, however, 36 hours must be earned after the master's degree.

Comprehensives --- Candidates will be expected to provide evidence of professional maturity through written and/or oral comprehensive examinations.

3b. List any options and/or minors affected by the program's suspension. None

JG

FINAL DRAFT
May 1, 2000

Sabbatical Leave Policy

Eastern Kentucky University maintains and promotes a program of sabbatical leaves for faculty as a part of its overall efforts to maintain high quality academic programs and energized faculty. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to apply for a sabbatical leave when eligible.

Sabbatical leaves are designed for professional improvement by providing release time for a specified period from assigned contractual obligations current faculty members to pursue scholarly activities which will strengthen the teaching, research, service and/or any combination therein at the department, college, or institution levels. Sabbatical leave requests are to be closely related to the faculty member's teaching area, and are not to be utilized for the completion of a faculty member's advanced degree and other related activities without the expressed consent of the Dean of the faculty member's college prior to submitting the request.

University sabbatical leave pool funds are derived from the University budget and other funds which may be allocated by the University. Additionally, individual colleges may fund sabbatical leaves for faculty members through college development funds, indirect cost allocations, private sources designated for the college, or other approved sources. Faculty members are encouraged to seek outside sources of funding to supplement the sabbatical leave.

To be eligible to apply for a sabbatical leave, faculty members must:

- A. Complete fourteen (14) semesters of full time service to the University;
- B. Submit a timely and appropriate request document in accordance with the faculty member's college criteria;
- C. Request a sabbatical leave within three (3) years of the date of the submission of the sabbatical leave request document
- D. Acquire all required approvals and receive written approval from the Provost. Faculty members should be aware that a sabbatical leave is a privilege and not a right. Sabbatical leaves are not automatic with the accumulation of fourteen semesters of service.
- E. Prepare and submit a report to the Dean of the College within ninety (90) days from the completion of the sabbatical leave. Submit for publication a

- C. A departmental review committee for screening and making recommendations to the Chair.
 - D. A College review committee and making recommendations to the Dean.
 - E. In evaluating a request for sabbatical leave, the departmental and college committees are encouraged to develop evaluation criteria taking into account the benefits of the leave for the faculty member, the department, the college, and ultimately the students.
4. The Dean of the College shall transmit the selected sabbatical leave requests to the Provost and Research by November 1 of the preceding academic year in which the leave will begin or for up to 3 years from the date of the sabbatical leave applications.
 5. The Vice President of Academic Affairs and Research will evaluate and transmit the selected sabbatical leave requests to the President by December 15. The President will notify selected faculty members following the action by the Board of Requests.
 6. A faculty member who is approved for a sabbatical leave is expected to carry out the plan set forth in the leave application and file a comprehensive open-file report to the Dean of the College identifying the accomplishments within ninety (90) days for return to contractual assignment and publish, if appropriate, the findings of the sabbatical leave within six (6) months.

A sabbatical leave can be a rejuvenating and re-energizing experience for a faculty member permitting time to pursue avenues to improve academic quality in the pursuit of excellence. All eligible faculty members are encouraged to apply for sabbatical leave.

AGREE

DISAGREE

_____	_____	Dr. Karl Kuhn	_____
_____	_____	Dr. Ella Hunter	_____
_____	_____	Dr. David Dailey	_____
_____	_____	Dr. Robert Reynolds	_____
_____	_____	Dr. Thomas Schncid	_____

document based upon the topic of the sabbatical leave within six (6) months from the date of the completion of the sabbatical leave. The Dean may extend this time period at his/her prerogative for publications and related projects.

Tenured faculty members on full-time appointments may apply for a sabbatical leave of two semesters at half salary, one semester at full salary, or one-half time leave for two semesters at full salary. The faculty member must designate the type of sabbatical leave requested as well as the semester or year requested in the application. The University and College will assist, when possible, for faculty members requesting a full year sabbatical leave at half pay with appropriate contributions to the faculty member's retirement program and related benefit programs.

It is fully expected that the recipients of a sabbatical leave will return to ECU for a minimum of one year following the sabbatical leave. In the event that the faculty member does not return to ECU for the specified period, the recipient shall reimburse ECU in full for the salary and fringe benefits received during the leave.

Procedures

1. Each College shall develop specific guidelines as to the criteria, quality and weight provided to specific categories of research, service and scholarly activities which serve as the basis for a sabbatical leave. These guidelines shall be clear and concise and address the process, procedures and expected results. These guidelines shall be published for all faculty members and each college shall establish an education and assistance program to assist faculty members in the development of high quality sabbatical leave requests within one (1) year from the publication of this policy.
2. Faculty members seeking sabbatical leaves must submit in a timely manner a full and complete request for sabbatical leave with supporting information to their Chair at least one semester prior to the requested leave. Faculty members may apply for a sabbatical leave up to three (3) years prior to the requested leave initiation date.
3. Each college shall develop policies, procedures, and guidelines approved by a majority of the faculty of the college, for the submission and review of sabbatical leave applications. These policies and procedures shall include the following elements:
 - A. Timetable for receiving the sabbatical leave request
 - B. Perimeters for the development of the reasonable request document and supporting materials.

Sabbatical Policy

September 8, 2003

Purpose and Principles

Eastern Kentucky University maintains and promotes a program of sabbaticals for faculty as a part of its overall efforts to maintain high quality academic programs and an energized faculty. A sabbatical can be a rejuvenating experience for a faculty member, permitting time to investigate avenues for improving academic quality in the pursuit of excellence. All eligible faculty members are strongly encouraged to apply for sabbaticals.

Sabbaticals are designed for professional improvement of current faculty members by providing, for a specified period, time away from the usual contractual obligations. This time enables faculty members to pursue scholarly activities that will strengthen teaching, scholarship, service and/or any combination therein at the department, college, library, or university levels. Sabbatical requests are to be closely related to each faculty member's teaching area but are not granted for the completion of an advanced degree or for any other activities related to that goal.

Since a sabbatical is a privilege and not a right, sabbaticals are not granted automatically after the required semesters of service. A sabbatical may be granted to a faculty member who has demonstrated an above-average ability in teaching, scholarship, and service and who has completed an application which meets the sabbatical requirements.

Funding and Salary Payment

University sabbatical pool funds are derived from the University budget and other funds which may be allocated by the University. The distribution of available funds is given to the colleges based on the proportion of full-time, tenure-track faculty. Additionally, individual colleges may fund sabbaticals for faculty members through college development funds, indirect cost allocations, private sources designated for the college, or other approved sources. Faculty members are encouraged to seek outside sources of funding to help supplement their sabbatical request.

The three types of sabbaticals for which eligible faculty members on full-time appointments may apply are as follows: (1) one year at half salary, (2) one semester at full salary, or (3) one-half time for two semesters at full salary. The salary will be based upon the amount that would have been received for the academic year had the sabbatical not been taken. In the application, the faculty member must designate the type of sabbatical requested as well as the effective semester or year.

Since preference is given to one-year sabbatical requests at half salary, these candidates are encouraged to seek scholarships, fellowships, or other honorary stipends to supplement their sabbatical salaries.

Eligibility and Application Process

To be eligible to apply for a sabbatical, faculty members must meet the following requirements:

1. Complete twelve (12) semesters of full-time service to the University before the first sabbatical or between subsequent sabbaticals.
2. Submit an appropriate request document with supporting information in accordance with the faculty member's college criteria.
3. Submit requests to the department chair no later than September 15 of the year preceding the academic year of the sabbatical. (Requests may be submitted two years in advance for approval. If the request is denied, a new application may be filed the following year.)
4. Obtain all required approvals at the department and college levels and receive written approval from the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs.

College Procedures

Each college will assure that the University-approved procedures have been followed and that the sabbatical recommendations concur with the goals and needs of the college. The following procedures apply to the colleges:

- A. Each college will develop specific guidelines regarding the criteria, quality, and weight assigned to specific categories of scholarly activities and service which are the basis for a sabbatical. These guidelines will be clear and concise and will address the process, procedures, and expected results. These guidelines will be published for all faculty members; and each college will establish an education and assistance program to help faculty members in the development of high quality sabbatical requests within one (1) year from the publication of this policy.

Preferred purposes for sabbaticals include, but are not rank-ordered or limited to, the following:

1. A carefully designed scholarly/creative project related to the discipline.
2. Scholarly writing or other comparable form of creative activity with a goal of publication or presentation.

3. A clearly defined program of independent study related to instructional responsibilities.
 4. A clearly defined program of a major course revision and/or new course development.
- B. Each college will develop policies, procedures, and guidelines approved by a majority of the faculty of the college for the review of sabbatical applications. These policies and procedures will include the following elements:
1. Timetables for receiving the sabbatical request.
 2. Parameters for the development of the reasonable request document and supporting materials.
 3. Evaluation criteria that will take into account the benefits of the sabbatical for the faculty member, the department, the college, and, ultimately, the students.
 4. A departmental review committee for screening and making recommendations to the chair. (A faculty member who will be considered for a sabbatical will not be eligible to serve on this committee. The same rule applies to anyone with a significant conflict of interest, e.g., the candidate is a member of one's immediate family.)
 5. A college review committee for making recommendations to the dean.
- C. The dean of the college will forward the selected sabbatical requests to the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs by November 1.
- D. The Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs will evaluate and forward the selected sabbatical requests to the President by December 15. The President will notify selected faculty members following action by the Board of Regents.

Faculty Rights During a Sabbatical

Successful candidates will retain the following rights during their time spent on a sabbatical:

1. The faculty member may share in the salary increases awarded by the University.
2. Retirement contributions depend on the faculty member's retirement plan. KTRS is a Defined Benefit Plan, and the Non-KTRS programs are Defined Contribution Plans.

- a. If the candidate is a KTRS participant, retirement contributions are not withheld and the University does not make retirement contributions during the sabbatical period. However, as stated in the KTRS guidelines, participants may purchase service credit within the “interest-free period” and the University will pay the difference between the service credit purchase price and the amount that would have otherwise been deducted from the candidate’s pay. By purchasing the service credit, the sabbatical year or semester counts toward retirement service.
 - b. Retirement withholdings for non-KTRS candidates and contributions by the University on their behalf will continue at the rates in effect before the sabbatical began.
3. The candidate who is a member of a University insurance coverage plan or a family plan will continue to receive coverage at the same rates while on a sabbatical.
 4. The sabbatical period counts toward requirements for promotion.

Faculty Obligations After a Sabbatical

The successful applicants will accept the following obligations regarding the sabbatical:

1. A faculty member who is approved for a sabbatical is expected to carry out the plan set forth in the application and forward a comprehensive open-file report to the dean of the college identifying the accomplishments within ninety (90) days from the completion of the sabbatical and to publish, if appropriate, the findings of the sabbatical within six (6) months.
2. A recipient of a sabbatical will return to ECU for a minimum of one (1) academic year following the sabbatical. (Unless otherwise agreed in advance by the faculty member and chair or dean, the sabbatical recipient will return to his or her former position within the University.) In the event that the faculty member does not return to ECU for the specified period, the recipient will reimburse ECU in full for the salary and fringe benefits received during the sabbatical.

Exceptions to the University Policy

The President, in concurrence with the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs, has the option of making exceptions to the above-stated policy when deemed in the best interest of the University.

Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading, 2002-2003

Final Report
August 2003

Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading:
Thom Fisher, Ph.D. (Chair), Meredith Wells, Ph.D., James Wells, Ph.D.,
Daniel Thorne, Ph.D., Martin Diebold, Ed.D., Matt Schumacher, Lance Melching
Academic Year 2002-2003

Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading, 2002-2003

“Teachers in making their final reports should not use the plus and minus signs in their grades. The official grading scheme of the institution does not provide for plus and minus grades.”

EKU President Donovan, July 11, 1932

Introduction

In February 1999, the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation submitted a report to the Faculty Senate in which they argued that grade inflation was a problem on the Eastern Kentucky University campus. In an effort to curb grade inflation, the Committee made three recommendations and proposed five motions. One recommendation was to establish a plus/minus grading system. During the 2001-02 academic year, plus/minus grading was instituted. However, there was resistance from both faculty and students from around the campus. Issues that were raised included the lack of an A+, ambiguity about a C-, as well as the impact on GPAs, scholarships, retention, and recruitment. In April 2002, after a year of plus/minus grading, the Faculty Senate placed a temporary moratorium on plus/minus grading.

After the April 2002 Faculty Senate meeting, the Faculty Senate Chair established the Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading. The Committee’s charge was to study the impact of plus/minus grading using data from ECU benchmark institutions, other Kentucky public universities, and ECU’s experience with plus/minus grading and give a final report and recommendations about continued use of plus/minus grading to the Faculty Senate.

The Committee consisted of one faculty member from each college (Thom Fisher, Health Sciences; Meredith Wells, Arts and Sciences; James Wells, Justice and Safety; Daniel Thorne, Business and Technology; and Martin Diebold, Education), one undergraduate student (Lance Melching) and one graduate student representative from Student Government (Matt Schumacher).

Methods

The Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading met monthly and sometimes weekly from September 2002 to April 2003. From the charge, the Committee determined that six research questions needed to be answered. These were accepted by the Faculty Senate on November 4, 2002:

1. Do ECU benchmarks and other Kentucky public universities use plus/minus grading? If yes, how? If no, why not?
2. What are the benefits of plus/minus grading?

3. What are the drawbacks of plus/minus grading?
4. Does plus/minus grading significantly minimize grade inflation?
5. What is the ECU experience of plus/minus grading (e.g., usage rates, like vs. dislike)?
6. Do ECU faculty and students prefer to use plus/minus grading or not?

The Committee developed a plan to answer each of these questions using data from ECU faculty and ECU students; grade data from the ECU Registrar's Office; data from ECU benchmark institutions and other Kentucky public universities; peer-reviewed, published literature on the effects of plus/minus grading; the Executive Summary from the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation 1999; as well as reports from other universities who have had experience with plus/minus grading.

Procedure

The Committee began its work by examining the scientific literature and the ECU Executive Summary from the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation 1999 on the usage, benefits, drawbacks, and effectiveness of plus/minus grading. (See results section for review of these articles.) The Committee then designed structured phone interviews for the ECU benchmarks and other Kentucky public universities and written surveys of ECU full-time faculty and students. These surveys, the Phone Interview of ECU's Benchmark Institutions and Kentucky Public Universities, the ECU Faculty Survey on the Plus/Minus Grading System, and the ECU Student Survey on the Plus/Minus Grading System, are located in the Appendix.

Upon completion and review of these documents in February 2003, Committee members used their Phone Interview of ECU's Benchmark Institutions and Kentucky Public Universities to conduct structured phone interviews with Provosts or Registrars from all 18 ECU benchmark institutions and the seven other Kentucky public universities. The Committee was able to complete these interviews with 16 of the 18 benchmark institutions and all seven other Kentucky public universities. Thus, the response rate for this sample was 92%.

Simultaneously, the ECU Faculty Survey on the Plus/Minus Grading System was distributed by campus mail to all university faculty, and the ECU Student Survey on the Plus/Minus Grading System was distributed by campus mail to a random sample of 1500 students. Surveys were sent to all 611 university faculty, and 331 (55%) were completed and returned. This response rate allows us to be 95% confident that our data is accurate within plus or minus 3.61 percentage points. Of the 1500 student surveys distributed, 326 (22%) were completed and returned. This response rate allows us to be 95% confident that our data is accurate within 5.3 percentage points.

All the surveys (the phone interview, the faculty survey, and the student survey) were scanned, and the results were tabulated. Additional comments from respondents were typed and evaluated. Due to the ordinal nature of most of the data, analyses performed were primarily descriptive statistics such as frequencies and modes. However, some comparisons of means also were performed. In all three surveys, participants were asked whether plus/minus grading had a

positive effect, no effect, or a negative effect on a variety of academic issues such as student recruitment, student retention, student motivation, scholarships, grade inflation, etc. The mode (most common response) for each issue is reported. In order to examine the Committee's research questions pertaining to the benefits and drawbacks of plus/minus grading, modes falling in the "positive effect" response category are interpreted as benefits of plus/minus grading, and modes falling in the "negative effect" response category are interpreted as drawbacks of plus/minus grading.¹

Sample

The faculty sample was 72% tenured and 28% non-tenured faculty; 30% Professors, 35% Associate Professors, 29% Assistant Professors, 3% Instructors, 3% Visiting Instructors, and 0.3% Lecturers. The sample was 51% male and 49% female. The average number of years in academe was 17.5. College affiliations were as follows:

44%	Arts and Sciences
15%	Business and Technology
12%	Education
24%	Health Sciences

¹ As a result of one concerned faculty member questioning the validity of the grade inflation item (#7), the Committee decided to conduct some follow-up validation analyses. When constructing the item, the Committee intended that if the respondent selected "positive effect," that implied that the respondent thought that the plus/minus grading system would have a beneficial or desirable effect and reduce grade inflation. Conversely, if the respondent selected "negative effect," the Committee felt that this implied that the plus/minus grading system would have a negative or undesirable effect and increase grade inflation. In retrospect, the item most likely could have been better worded to avoid any chance of confusion. Nonetheless, the Committee chose to examine this issue further.

To adequately address this issue in a scientific manner, two members of the Committee, working independently, examined the results of open-ended items #16 (benefits of plus/minus grading) and #17 (drawbacks of plus/minus grading) and compared these responses to the "positive effect" and "negative effect" responses in item #7 regarding grade inflation. The two researchers used a very conservative approach in locating open-ended responses that agreed with the Committee's intended response (positive effect implies grade inflation will be reduced, negative effect implies grade inflation will be increased or worsened), and a very liberal approach in locating open-ended responses that disagreed with the Committee's intended response (positive implies grade inflation will be increased, negative implies grade inflation will be decreased). With perhaps one or two exceptions, virtually all of the open-ended responses were consistent with the Committee's intended interpretation of the question. Although it is impossible for the Committee to ascertain whether every faculty member answered the item in the manner intended (because not every faculty member provided responses to these two open-ended items), the Committee felt that the results of this cross-validation check suggest that it was interpreted in the intended manner and thus the item is valid.

6% Justice and Safety

The student sample was 67% female and 33% male; 11% freshmen, 12% sophomores, 17% juniors, 38% seniors, and 22% graduate students. In addition, 48% were full-time students; 14% were Honors students; 15% were on a scholarship; and 74% were EKU students in 2001-2002 when plus/minus grading was used.

Results

1. Do EKU benchmarks and other Kentucky public universities use plus/minus grading? If yes, how so? If no, why not?

Phone interviews with EKU benchmarks and other Kentucky public universities indicated that 8 of our 16 Benchmarks (50%) and one of the 7 other Kentucky public universities (14%) use plus/minus grading. Of those that do use plus/minus grading, 73% use a scale similar to the one that EKU used in 2001-2002 with no credit for A+.

Of those universities that did not use plus/minus grading, one reported having used it in the past. The reasons given for not using plus/minus grading included faculty/student resistance, administrative and software changes necessary to make the switch to plus/minus grading, difficulty distinguishing grades, complexity, financial cost, and anticipated increase in grade change requests from students.

2. What are the benefits of plus/minus grading?

Participants from the benchmark and other Kentucky public universities, EKU faculty, and EKU students were asked whether they thought plus/minus grading had a positive effect, no effect, or a negative effect on a number of academic issues (e.g., recruitment, retention, scholarships, grading accuracy, student motivation, etc.). As noted above, modes falling in the “positive effect” response category were interpreted as benefits, and modes falling in the “negative effect” response category were interpreted as drawbacks.

Participants from the benchmark and Kentucky public universities reported that they thought plus/minus grading had a positive effect on student motivation and grading accuracy. Participants were split on grade inflation: five said that plus/minus grading helped guard against grade inflation, but an equal number said that plus/minus grading had no effect on grade inflation. Furthermore, the nine benchmark and Kentucky public universities using plus/minus grading were asked what benefits their university perceived their plus/minus grading system to have. Reported benefits included more accurately reflects students’ work, more precision in grading, and increased student initiative.

EKU faculty reported that the positive effect of plus/minus grading was grading accuracy.

EKU students reported no positive effects of plus/minus grading.

3. What are the drawbacks to plus/minus grading?

Participants from all the benchmark and Kentucky public universities reported that they thought plus/minus grading had a negative effect on scholarships. They reported that plus/minus grading had no effect on student recruitment, retention, admittance into graduate programs, student employment opportunities, faculty morale, faculty attitudes toward grading, and grade inflation (as explained above). Furthermore, the nine benchmark and Kentucky public universities using plus/minus grading were asked what drawbacks their universities perceived plus/minus grading to have. Drawbacks reported included more grade appeals, faculty questioning the distinctions between grades, and an increase in grade inflation.

EKU faculty perceived plus/minus grading to have a negative effect on scholarships, student motivation, student retention, faculty morale, and faculty attitudes toward grading. Faculty perceived plus/minus grading to have no effect on grade inflation, student recruitment, student retention, student admittance into graduate programs, and student employment opportunities.

EKU students perceived plus/minus grading to have a negative effect on grading accuracy, scholarships, student motivation, student recruitment, student retention, and admittance into graduate programs. Students perceived plus/minus grading to have no effect on grade inflation or employment opportunities.

4. Does plus/minus grading significantly minimize grade inflation?

Studies on the effect of plus/minus grading on GPA distributions consistently show little effect on grade inflation. Studies conducted by Matthews (1997) used a computer simulation to predict the changes in average individual GPA by looking at actual GPAs under the plus/minus system and then comparing them to GPAs when the plus/minus suffixes were stripped. His conclusions were that 1) the average of all individual GPAs will not change because the pluses will cancel the minuses, and 2) a small deflationary effect would be felt in the A grade bracket, but it would not exceed a decrease in individual GPA of more than 0.08.

Similar studies were conducted at North Carolina State University with similar results (Gosselin, 1997). A Grade Task Force created by the Academic Council at Loyola University to study the effect of plus/minus grading refused even to study the issue of grade inflation, stating that it “is a separate issue from the grading system,” and should be addressed separately (Loyola, 1998). Matthews (1998) came to the same conclusion, stating that no grading scale, regardless of its complexity, could override professor subjectivity in grading. Another recent study at Ball State University on the actual GPAs of graduate students under the plus/minus grading system

found no evidence that the plus/minus grading system has any effect on overall GPA (Malone, Nelson, Van Nelson, 2000). Furthermore, a report by Bressette (2002) reexamined studies by Matthews (1997, 1998) and Gosselin (1997) and reaffirmed that there was little chance of an absolute reduction in GPA with plus/minus.

An ex-officio member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading and Mathematics Honors student, David Campbell, examined the effect of plus/minus grading on grades here at EKU using the same methodology used by Matthews (1997, 1998) and Gosselin (1997). He collaborated with the Registrar's Office to obtain grade data from the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 academic years.

First, comparisons were made between the average undergraduate GPA in 2000-2001 when plus/minus grading was not in use and the average undergraduate GPA in 2001-2002 when plus/minus grading was in use (N=232,000 grades).

<u>Academic Year</u>	<u>Average Undergraduate GPA</u>
2000-2001 (no plus/minus)	2.74
2001-2002 (plus/minus)	2.75

Results suggest that actual undergraduate GPA increased by 0.01 grade points when plus/minus was used. Using a significance level of 0.05, this difference was not statistically significant. GPAs did not decrease, as would have been expected if plus/minus reduced grade inflation.

Secondly, actual GPAs were calculated for individuals enrolled in undergraduate courses during the 2001-2002 academic year. The pluses and minuses were then removed and GPA was recalculated under the standard 5-point scale (A, B, C, D, F). Differences in the actual GPA and stripped estimates were calculated. Although some students (35%) had a minimal negative change of up to 0.25 grade points when plus/minus was used, most students (59%) had either no change or a higher GPA when plus/minus was used.

In sum, Campbell's (2003) research suggests that the plus/minus grading system had little effect on GPAs and grade inflation on the EKU campus in 2001-2002.

5. What is the EKU experience of plus/minus grading (e.g., usage rates, satisfaction)?

EKU faculty were asked if they used the plus/minus grading system during the 2001-2002 academic year. Results indicate that 79% used plus/minus every semester, 9% used it some semesters, and 12% did not use it at all. Likewise, according to Campbell (2003), data from the Registrar's Office verifies a 13% non-compliance rate. These findings suggest that the majority of faculty did use the plus/minus grading system. However, of those who did use it, 19% did not use it as presented by the administration but rather modified the scale.

EKU faculty and students who were at EKU during the 2001-2002 academic year were asked on their surveys to indicate their level of satisfaction with plus/minus grading that year.

The faculty response was:

29%	very satisfied
11%	slightly satisfied
12%	neutral
11%	slightly dissatisfied
37%	very dissatisfied

Collapsing categories, the data suggest that 40% of the faculty were satisfied, 12% were neutral, and 48% were dissatisfied with plus/minus grading.

The student response was:

7%	very satisfied
10%	slightly satisfied
23%	neutral
21%	slightly dissatisfied
40%	very dissatisfied

Collapsing categories, the data suggest that 17% of the students were satisfied, 23% were neutral, and 61% were dissatisfied with plus/minus grading.

6.Do EKU faculty and students prefer to use plus/minus grading or not?

EKU faculty and students were asked their overall opinion of EKU re-establishing a plus/minus grading system. The faculty response was:

27%	strongly in favor
14%	slightly in favor
8%	neutral
10%	slightly opposed
41%	strongly opposed

Collapsing categories, the data suggest that 41% of the faculty are in favor of re-establishing plus/minus grading, 8% are neutral, and 51% oppose re-establishing plus/minus grading at EKU.

The student response was:

9%	strongly in favor
12%	slightly in favor
11%	neutral
23%	slightly opposed
45%	strongly opposed

Collapsing categories, the data suggest that 21% of the students are in favor of re-establishing plus/minus grading, 11% are neutral, and 68% oppose re-establishing plus/minus grading.

Demographic comparisons of the students suggest that students at ECU during the 2001-2002 academic year were most opposed to re-establishing plus/minus grading. There were no significant differences between males and females, full- and part-time students, Honors and non-Honors students, or scholarship and non-scholarship students.

Discussion

The results of the Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading suggest that less than half of ECU benchmarks and other Kentucky public universities use plus/minus grading. Those not using it cited reasons such as faculty/student resistance and financial and administrative costs. Most believed that plus/minus grading may enhance grading accuracy and student motivation, and a few believed it helped reduce grade inflation. However, those using it reported many drawbacks to plus/minus grading including more grade appeals, faculty questioning the distinctions between grades, and an increase in grade inflation.

ECU faculty dissatisfied with plus/minus grading had a slight majority (48%) over those satisfied with it (40%). Most faculty used it every semester that they were instructed to, but many did not use the scale mandated by the administration. Most faculty felt that the only benefit of plus/minus grading was enhanced grading accuracy, and most faculty perceived plus/minus grading to have a negative effect on scholarships, student motivation, student retention, faculty morale, and faculty attitudes toward grading. Furthermore, most faculty (51% vs. 41%) were against re-establishing plus/minus grading on the ECU campus.

ECU students were strongly opposed to the plus/minus grading system. Of students on campus in 2001-2002, 61% were dissatisfied with plus/minus grading vs. 17% who were satisfied. The students perceived plus/minus grading to have no benefits but a negative effect on grading accuracy, scholarships, student motivation, student recruitment, student retention, and admittance into graduate programs. An important note is that the faculty do not perceive plus/minus grading to have a negative effect on recruitment and retention, but the students do. Finally, most of the students (68% vs. 21%) were opposed to re-establishing plus/minus grading on the ECU campus.

Plus/minus grading was instituted on this campus in 2001-2002 in an effort to reduce grade inflation. However review of the Executive Summary of the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation finds "As faculty begin to +/- grades in border line cases, a (mild) drop in campus wide GPA will result. Once faculty use of +/- grades stabilizes, no additional reduction in GPA will

occur as presumably +/- grades will be a zero sum game (minus grades equaling the number of plus grades).” (p. 10)

Furthermore, the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation indicated in their report that 42% of the faculty would like the option of plus/minus grading, and that 50% were content with the standard grading system. Thus, the Committee recommended that faculty be given the option of using plus/minus grading. However, in 2001-2002, the final action as passed by the Faculty Senate was that all faculty were required to use plus/minus grading.

Committee Recommendations

In light of the findings of this research, the Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading cannot recommend continued use of plus/minus grading. One reason that plus/minus grading was instituted on the EKU campus was to reduce grade inflation. Research from this campus, other campuses, and the scientific literature suggests that it does not accomplish that goal. In addition, members of the campus community perceive far more drawbacks than benefits of plus/minus grading. Furthermore, the majority of the faculty and students are opposed to re-establishing plus/minus grading on this campus. Therefore, the Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading recommends that plus/minus grading not be reinstated at EKU at this time.

It should be noted that several members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading began their committee work in favor of plus/minus grading. However, the data that emerged from this study and from the literature convinced the entire Committee that plus/minus grading is not better than standard grading.

Acknowledgments

The Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading thanks committee members James Wells and Meredith Wells, Kim Cobb, and the staff of the Center for Criminal Justice Education and Research for production of the survey, scanning, typing comments from respondents, and computer analyses.

The Committee also thanks David Campbell who conducted his Honors thesis on the EKU experience of the plus/minus grading system on grade inflation. As part of his thesis, David obtained grade data from the Registrar’s Office, analyzed it, and presented it to the Committee.

Finally, the Committee would like to thank the 7 Kentucky public universities, the 16 benchmark universities, the 331 EKU faculty, and the 326 EKU students who participated in our research.

References

Bressette, A. (2001). Arguments for plus/minus grading: A case study. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 25.

Campbell, D. (2003). *Honors Thesis: Plus and Minus Grading at Eastern Kentucky University: A Statistical Study*. Richmond, KY: Eastern Kentucky University.

Chapman, A., Chen, R., Jones, K., Kopacz, P., McSpirit, S. (1999). *Executive Summary: Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation*. Richmond, KY: Eastern Kentucky University.

Gosselin, L. (1997). *Plus Minus Grading Study, Fall 1994 Through Spring 1997*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University.

Loyola University (1997). *Report of the CAS Task Force on Grades*. Loyola University.

Malone, B.G., Nelson, J.S., & Van Nelson, C. (2000, October). *A study of the effect of the implementation of the plus/minus grading system on graduate student grades*. Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Matthews, R. (1997). Evaluation of the plus/minus grading system: A computer model. [Online]. Available: http://www.wfu.edu/~matthews/plus_minus/plus_minus.html.

Matthews, R. (1998). *Simulation of Plus/Minus Grades*. Wake Forest, NC: Wake Forest University.

McSpirit, S., Jones, K., Chapman, A., & Kopacz, P. (2000). Identifying grade inflation at an open admissions institution. *College Student Journal*, 34, 228-235.

McSpirit, S., Kopacz, P., Jones, K., Chapman, A. (2000). Faculty opinions on grade inflation: Contradictions about its cause. *College and University Journal*, 75, 19-25.

EKU Ad-Hoc Plus/Minus Committee 2002-2003

Faculty Survey on the Plus/Minus Grading System

In April 2002, the Faculty Senate passed a motion to establish the Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading. The Committee's charge is to study the impact of plus/minus grading using data from our benchmarks, other Commonwealth Universities, and Eastern's previous experience. As part of that effort, the Committee would like to get faculty input about their experiences and opinions about plus/minus grading.

Instructions:

Please answer each item by darkening with a pen or pencil the bubble that MOST agrees with your response. Fill in the entire bubble and make sure erasures are complete because multiple responses are not allowed. When finished with this survey, PLEASE DO NOT FOLD OR STAPLE.

Please return this survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

1. Did you use the plus/minus grading system during the 2001-2002 academic year?

- Yes, all semesters
 Yes, some but not all
 No, not at all

2. If yes, did you..

- use scale as presented
 modify the scale

3. If you modified the scale, in what way did you modify (e.g. use only pluses without minuses, adjust points, etc.)?

4. If you did not use plus/minus, why not?

5. What is your level of satisfaction with plus/minus grading as it was implemented in 2001-2002?
- Very Satisfied
 - Slightly Satisfied
 - Neutral
 - Slightly Dissatisfied
 - Very Dissatisfied

In your opinion, what effect do you think the plus/minus grading system has on the following:

	Negative Effect	No effect	Positive Effect
6. Grading accuracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Grade inflation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Scholarships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Student motivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Student recruitment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Student retention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Student admittance into graduate programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Student employment opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Faculty morale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Faculty attitudes towards grading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. What (other) benefits do you perceive the plus/minus grading system to have?			

17. What (other) drawbacks do you perceive the plus/minus grading system to have?

For the next question, please review "Attachment A" on page five of this survey.

18. If EKU re-established the plus/minus grading system, which one would you prefer?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Option A | <input type="checkbox"/> Option D |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Option B | <input type="checkbox"/> Option E |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Option C | <input type="checkbox"/> Option F |

19. If there is another scale you would recommend, please describe it.

20. What is your overall opinion of EKU re-establishing a plus/minus grading system?

- Strongly in favor
- Slightly in favor
- Neutral
- Slightly opposed
- Strongly opposed

The following questions address your demographic characteristics. These questions will allow the Committee to ensure that they are obtaining a representative sample of faculty. This data is used for statistical purposes only.

21. What is your College Affiliation?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arts & Sciences | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Sciences |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business & Technology | <input type="checkbox"/> Justice & Safety |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education | |

22. What is your tenure status?

- Tenured
- Non-tenured

23. What is your current rank?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Professor | <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor | <input type="checkbox"/> Visiting Instructor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor | |

24. What is your gender?

Female

Male

25. Number of years in academe?

**Thank you very much for your participation. Your input
is appreciated!**

EKU Ad-Hoc Plus/Minus Committee 2002-2003

Phone Interview of ECU's Benchmark Institutions and Kentucky Commonwealth Universities

My name is (your name), a member of Eastern Kentucky University's Ad-Hoc Plus/Minus Committee. Did you receive a letter about a week ago indicating that someone from our Committee would be contacting you?

Do you have a few moments to speak with me about the issue of Plus/Minus grading at your Institution? Great!

I have just a few questions regarding your Institutions experience with Plus/Minus grading. It should only take about 5 to 10 minutes to complete.

1. What is your official title at (mention name of University here)?

Provost (preferred)

Registrar

Other:

2. If other, list title here.

3. Does your University currently use the +/- grading system?

Yes

No

If no, ask questions 4-6

If yes, ask questions 7-10

If No, go to #4

4. Have you ever used +/-? If so, why did you discontinue using +/-?

5. Were there some drawbacks to +/- that kept you from using it? If yes, what were they?

6. Did you perceive any benefit of implementing +/-?

If Yes to #2:

7. What scale did you use?

8. What benefits does your University perceive +/- to have?

9. What drawbacks does your University perceive +/- to have?

10. What is your University's overall level of satisfaction with +/-?

- Very Satisfied
- Slightly Satisfied
- Neutral
- Slightly Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

ASK EVERYONE

How do you think the +/- grading system affects the following:

	Negatively	Not at all	Positively
11. Recruitment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Retention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Scholarships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Student Motivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Admittance to graduate programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Student employment opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Grading accuracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Grade inflation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Faculty Morale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Faculty attitudes toward grading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**If you have materials or resources you could share with us regarding the plus/minus grading system, please send them to Dr. Thomas Fisher by e-mail at Thom.Fisher@eku.edu or by mail to:
Occupational Therapy
Eastern Kentucky University
Dizney 103
Richmond, KY 40475.**

This concludes our telephone survey. Thank you for your participation and we appreciate your input.

EKU Ad-Hoc Plus/Minus Committee 2002-2003

Student Survey on the Plus/Minus Grading System

In April 2002, the Faculty Senate passed a motion to establish the Ad Hoc Committee on Plus/Minus Grading. The Committee's charge is to study the impact of plus/minus grading using data from our benchmarks, other Commonwealth universities, and Eastern's experience. As part of that effort, the Committee would like to get student input about their experiences and opinions about plus/minus grading.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please answer each item below by darkening with a pen or pencil the bubble that MOST agrees with your response. Fill in the entire bubble and, make sure erasures are complete because multiple responses are not allowed. When finished with this survey, PLEASE DO NOT FOLD OR STAPLE.

Please return this survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

1. If you were a student at EKU during the 2001-2002 academic year, what was your level of satisfaction with the plus/minus grading system?
 - Very Satisfied
 - Slightly Satisfied
 - Neutral
 - Slightly Dissatisfied
 - Very Dissatisfied

**Please proceed to question #2
whether or not you were an EKU student during 2001-2002.**

In your opinion, what effect do you think the plus/minus grading system has on:

	Negative Effect	No effect	Positive Effect
2. Grading accuracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Grade inflation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Scholarships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Student motivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Student recruitment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Student retention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Student admittance into graduate programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Student employment opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. What (other) benefits do you perceive the plus/minus grading system to have?			

11. What (other) drawbacks to you perceive the plus/minus grading system to have?

For the next question, please review Attachment "A", page five of this survey.

12. If ECU re-established the plus/minus grading system, which one would you prefer?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Option A | <input type="checkbox"/> Option D |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Option B | <input type="checkbox"/> Option E |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Option C | <input type="checkbox"/> Option F |

13. What is your overall opinion of ECU re-establishing a plus/minus grading system?

- Strongly in favor
- Slightly in favor
- Neutral
- Slightly opposed
- Strongly opposed

The following questions address your demographic characteristics. These questions will allow the Committee to ensure that they are obtaining a representative sample of students. This data is used for statistical purposes only.

14. What is your year in school?

- Freshman
- Junior
- Graduate student
- Sophomore
- Senior

15. In which College is your major?

- Arts & Sciences
- Education
- Justice & Safety
- Business & Technology
- Health Sciences

16. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

17. Were you an ECU student in 2001-2002?

- Yes
- No

18. Are you a full-time student or a part-time student?

- Full-time
- Part-time

19. Are you a student in the Honors Program?

- Yes
- No

20. Are you here at ECU on a scholarship that requires a minimum GPA?

Yes

No

21. Are you working toward an ECU degree or a degree from another University?

ECU Degree

Other University Degree

Thank you for your participation!

**Please put the survey in the enclosed envelope and send
to:**

**Dr. Thom Fisher
Chair, Ad Hoc Plus/Minus Committee
Stratton 105**