Faculty Senate Agenda
February 1, 2010
3:30 p.m.

Call to order

Approval of Minutes
January 11, 2010

President's Report: Senator Whitlock

Unfinished Business:
• Status of University 5-Year Calendar
• Policy on Policies
• Policy on Authorization for Regulations

New Business:
• Posthumous Degree for Daniel Evans Rigney
• Report from Council on Academic Affairs
  (CAA agenda is included in the Senate packet.)
  (See separate PDF file for the curriculum forms.)

Report Overview & Questions:
  Executive Committee Chair: Senator Ware
  Faculty Regent: Senator Frisbie
  COSFL Representative: Senator McKenney
  Provost: Senator Vice
  Student Government Association: Afsi Siahkoohi
  Financial Planning Council: Senator Ware
  Strategic Planning Council: Senator Taylor

Standing Committees:
  Academic Quality Committee: Senators Shordike or Schmelzer, Co-Chairs
  Budget Committee: Senator Johnson, Chair
  Committee on Committees: Senator Staddon, Chair
  Elections Committee: Senator Randles, Chair
  Rights and Responsibilities Committee: Senator J. Palmer, Chair
  Rules Committee: Senator McKenney, Chair
  Welfare Committee: Senator Ciocca, Chair

Ad Hoc Committees *(if any)*

Adjournment
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
January 11, 2010

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, January 11, 2010, in the South Ballroom in the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Ware called the fifth meeting of the academic year to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.

The following members were absent:

*indicates prior notification of absence
^ ALT Socorro Zaragoza attended for A. Poffenberger
^ ALT Mary Whitaker attended for L. Wray

Visitors to the Senate: Jim Conneely, Student Affairs; Tina Davis, Registrar; Sherry Robinson, Provost Office; Afsi Siahkoohi, SGA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
The November 30, 2009 minutes were approved as written.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Motion on Faculty Development Funds. Senator Johnson presented an updated motion (listed below) based on comments from the November 30th meeting. Motion carried.

The annual Faculty Development Funds, which have been distributed to departments from Academic Affairs, should be distributed to individual full time teaching and/or research faculty* and lecturers**. Faculty Development Funds shall roll over from year to year for individual faculty members for a total of not more than three years. If none of the money has been spent by the individual faculty member by the end of the third year; or if the faculty member spends only a portion of the faculty development funds, the maximum amount left in the individual faculty member’s account should not exceed a total of three consecutive years of rollover. The money which would have been distributed to the individual faculty member for faculty development would remain in the department’s Faculty Development account.

*As defined by the Faculty Handbook in Part VII section II Membership, B.
**As defined by the Faculty Handbook in Part III, Faculty Appointments section, #5 Lecture and Senior Lectureship Appointments.

NEW BUSINESS:

Policies. Dr. Sherry Robinson was in attendance to introduce the revised drafts for the Policy on Policies and the Policy on Authorization for Regulations. She indicated that the policies are "sister" policies and should be considered together. Please share the documents and solicit feedback from colleagues. The policies will be placed on the February agenda for action.

Resolution on Pending Legislation. Senator Schmelzer moved approval of the resolution, seconded by Senator Shordike.
Senator Vice moved to amend the motion (listed below), seconded by Senator Taylor. Motion carried.

Move the 6th “whereas” statement to just after the 3rd “whereas” statement, which results in renumbering the rest of the statements.

Senator Frazer moved to amend the motion (listed below), seconded by Senator Matthews.

To change the new number 5 & 6 from:

Whereas
Mandating that all degrees be 120 hours or less, as specified in the proposed transfer policy, will come as a sacrifice of liberal arts courses, as most departments will not sacrifice their major courses in the move to 120 hours. Mandating that general education requirements be reduced and be the same and consistent throughout the community colleges and regional Universities affects academic freedom and is problematic due to inconsistencies within the institutions themselves.

Whereas
The move from 128 hours to mandated 120 hours will have minimal impact on either graduation rates or retention rates, as other factors such as changing majors, poor advisement, and financial problems are more important correlates of both.

Senator Frisbie moved to amend the amendment to strike the last sentence entirely from the new number 5 (listed below), seconded by Senator Taylor. The majority were in agreement and the motion carried.

Senator Lowry moved to amend the amendment a second time (listed below), seconded by Senator Walz, to replace the wording “come as a sacrifice” in the new number five, with “come at the expense of”. Motion carried.

Whereas
Mandating the number of hours required for degrees, as specified in the proposed transfer policy, will come at the expense of liberal arts courses, as most departments will not sacrifice their major courses.
Senator Wilson, seconded by Senator C. Palmer, moved to amend the amendment a third time to remove the words “poor advisement” and to add a notation at the end of the statement to reference a work of research. Motion carried.

Reducing the number of hours will have minimal impact on either graduation rates or retention rates, as other factors such as changing majors, poor advisement, and financial problems are more important correlates of both*.

* Notation to be provided by Senator Wilson

The main amendment, as amended, to change the verbiage to the new items 5 & 6 was approved.

Senator Farrar, seconded by Senator Hunter, moved to change the “Be it resolved” statement (listed below). Motion carried.

FROM
Be it resolved that the EKU Faculty Senate strongly opposed any mandate that all degrees and general education curricula be the same number of hours.

TO:
Be it resolved that the EKU Faculty Senate strongly opposes any mandate that degrees and curricula of all institutions require the same number of hours.

Senator Day moved, seconded by Senator Godbey, to add an additional “Be it resolved” statement after the first “Be it resolved” statement (listed below). Motion carried.

Be it further resolved that EKU Faculty Senate strongly opposes any legislative action that would waive program-specific course prerequisites and automatically grant admission to related upper division degree programs.

Senator Shoredike moved to delete item 2, seconded by Senator Petronio. Motion carried.

Senator Day moved to create a new item 2 (listed below), seconded by Senator Foote. Motion carried.

Whereas
EKU has a strong record of supporting transfer students from KCTCS and other Kentucky institutions.

Senator Biggins moved to change number 3 (listed below), seconded by Senator Noblitt. Motion carried.

Whereas
Accrediting bodies and faculty have the greatest degree of expertise in their respective fields of study related to determining the core knowledge needed by students in their majors.

The motion, as amended, carried.

Senator Biggins moved, seconded by Senator Taylor, to allow the Academic Quality Committee the right to change the language grammatically, if needed. Motion carried.
Academic Quality Committee Election. Senator Ware announced that as Senator May is no longer on Senate, a replacement is needed on the Academic Quality Committee. Senator Butler nominated Senator Bosley. Senator Taylor moved to accept by acclamation, seconded by Senator Randles. Motion carried.

Report from Council on Academic Affairs. - Senator Vice

Program Revisions – Reducing Hours Required to Graduate
1. Public Relations B.A. – change the number of hours required to graduate from 128 to 120 by reducing the number of free electives.
2. Office Systems and Technologies A.A.S. – add the following: a grade of "C" or better is required for the Office Systems and Technologies A.A.S. supporting courses and major requirements. Delete the following: ACC 250(1) from the supporting course requirements and 3 hours from the free electives lowering the total degree hours to 60 hours.
3. Business and Marketing Education/Teaching B.S. – delete ACC 250(1) from the major requirements lowering the total degree hours to 127.
4. Graphic Communications Management B.S. – decrease total required hours from 128 to 120 by reducing hours from free electives and 3 hours from GCM 349. Drop CSC 160 and the option of ACC 202 or ECO 300 or MGT 301 or MKT 301, and require both MGT 301 and MKT 301. Add MGT 330.
5. Interpreter Training Program – revise program title, revise course requirements within program, lower total curriculum requirements from 128 to 127 hours.
6. French B.A. - Add requirement of GPA 2.75 in courses for French major, reduce required hours from 128 to 120, and delete recommendation for supporting courses. Delete reference to FRE 400 and replace with FRE 312.
7. Minor in French – change total required hours for French minor from 24 to 21 and reword recommended sequence of FRE courses.
8. Spanish B.A. – add requirement of GPA 2.75 in courses for Spanish major, reduce required Hours from 128 to 120, and delete recommendation for specific supporting courses.
9. History B.A. – reduce the total degree hours from 128 to 120 by reducing the required number of electives from 46 to 38.

Program Revisions
10. Minor in Computer Electronics Technology – change prefixes for networking and security related courses from EET to NET. Drop EET 254 as a requirement. Add EET 251 as a requirement. Offer a selection between EET 351 and NET 354 (formerly EET 354).
11. American Sign Language (ASL) Studies – revise the program description based on course revisions.
12. Physical Education B.S. – correct Catalog, PHE 415 is a requirement for the teaching option only and PHE 562 is in the core requirement for all options so it needs to be removed from the option area for fitness and wellness. Correct free electives for fitness and wellness.
13. Art/Studio Options B.F.A. – add a description of program objectives and degree requirements. Remove dropped courses and add approved courses. Add courses that are required but not listed.
14. Art B.A. – correct typo errors, revise list of approved degree requirements and include a description of objectives for degree programs.
15. English B.A. – change ENG 499 from a required course to an elective.

Senator Vice moved approval of items 1-9, seconded by Senator Wade. Motion carried.

Senator Vice moved approval of items 10-15, seconded by Senator Day. Motion carried.

Senator Vice gave a brief update on some curricula issues.
• The Animal Studies major approved last month by Faculty Senate has also been approved by the Provost Council and will go to the Board of Regents at their January meeting.
• If the Doctorate of Nursing Practice isn’t approved, the Masters of Nurse Practitioner at Eastern will not be adequate for students to be certified as nurse practitioners. Dr. King at CPE is planning to put forward a bill that would give the comprehensives the authority to offer the Doctorate of Nursing Practice. In addition, he’s checking with the Attorney General to see if, providing the universities are in agreement, the standing statute would be adequate for the DNP.
• As of December, EKU was approved for Level V status by SACS and can now offer up to three doctorates.
REPORT FROM FACULTY REGENT: Senator Frisbie
The Board will next convene for a regular quarterly meeting on January 29, 2010.

REPORT FROM COSFL: Senator McKenney
COSFL will meet jointly with CPE later this month.

REPORT FROM PROVOST: Senator Vice
A list of announcements will be distributed electronically within the next few days.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION: Afsi Siahkoohi
Ms. Siahkoohi shared the following announcements.
- January 21st - Chautauqua Lecture Series - Frank Warren, PostSecret, will be the guest speaker
- January 23rd to February 17th - EKU and Morehead plan to engage in a Philanthropic Challenge to see which school can get the most donations. Kids First Dental is the chosen philanthropy. The winner will be announced at the EKU-Morehead game in Morehead on February 17th
- February 8th - Listen Up Legislators - Question and answer forum at 3pm in the Powell Building lobby
- February 9th - Rally for Higher Education - from 10am - 3pm in Frankfort. SGA is providing transportation to and from and lunch
- February 11th - President Ball - Keen Johnson Building

REPORT FROM FINANCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL: Senator Ware
The next meeting is scheduled for February 8th.

REPORT FROM STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL: Senator Taylor
The Council has met once since the last Senate meeting. The data gathering stage is complete and the Council is now ready to begin the strategy phase.

Budget Committee. Senator Johnson reported that the committee met on December 4th. At the next meeting, Interim Provost Vice is expected to share a report listing the number of administrators, support personnel, and faculty that have been hired over the last five years.

Elections Committee. Senator Randles announced that he will serve as chair for the committee. The committee is scheduled to meet next week to begin the preliminary work on the Faculty Regent election.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:
Senator Wilson announced that the University Technology Committee will hold two focus groups on February 2nd and 3rd at 3pm in the South Ballroom in Keen Johnson specifically for the Faculty Senate. The purpose of the focus groups is to identify the general technology issues that affect faculty at EKU. Karen Russell has been hired to facilitate the forums.

Senator Taylor announced that the Provost Search Committee has met twice. On February 8th, the committee will begin reviewing the applicants. Additional information can be found at provostsearch.eku.edu.

ADJOURNMENT
Senator Vice moved to adjourn at approximately 5:20 p.m.
Interim Policy on Policies

Policy Statement

Eastern Kentucky University, through the practice of shared governance, formally develops, approves, disseminates, implements, and maintains policies, as defined in this document, through a uniform process. All members of the University community may be involved in developing, updating, recommending, and disseminating University policies and thus must adhere to the precepts set forth in this policy. This document defines a University policy, and also provides a format for the development, approval, and dissemination of such policies. Additionally, it describes the responsibilities of the parties involved in the formulation and adoption of University policies.

This policy enables the University to make policy development and retrieval efficient and consistent. Further, a comprehensive document that outlines the development, approval, dissemination, implementation, and maintenance of University policies allows for more consistent enforcement, greater accessibility, and timelier review. This process will enhance communication, organizational operations, compliance, and accountability.

Eastern Kentucky University will be guided by the following principles:

- Policies will
  - be designed to encourage students' success in achieving their goals while at the same time be intended to maintain the mission of a high quality educational experience;
  - support the University's mission, values, initiatives, and strategic goals;
  - align ownership with authority, responsibility, and accountability;
  - comply with federal and state laws and regulations as well as accrediting standards; and
  - be consistent with other university policies; and

- The policy process will
  - be transparent;
  - honor shared governance by seeking participation from stakeholders;
  - have a mechanism for evaluation and improvement in a timely manner; and
  - avoid bureaucratic gridlock.

Entities Affected by the Policy

Entire university community, including all campuses and extended sites

Policy Background

The implementation of a policy on policies enables the University to more effectively and efficiently manage its body of policies. No previous policy concerning the formulation and adoption of policies existed.
POLICY ORIGINATING/GETTING/AND APPROVAL PROCESS

Any individual sponsored by a recognized University unit or organization, or any individual sponsored by a recognized University unit or organization may identify the need for a new policy or the revision of an existing policy. Once the need for a new policy or the need to revise a current policy is identified, the following steps should be followed:

Pursuant to Part VII Section VII A1a, Faculty Handbook, when the Faculty Senate is the Policy Originator policy impact Statements and policy drafts may be submitted directly to the President or may be submitted as described below. The President may recommend that policies proposed by the Faculty Senate be vetted through this process.

All other Policy Originators should:

1) If the proposed issue is academic in nature, complete an Impact Statement and forward to the Office of Policy, Compliance and Governance or to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs.

2) For issues that are non-academic in nature, forward the completed Impact Statement to the Office of Policy, Compliance and Governance.

If there is uncertainty as to whether the issue is academic or non-academic, forward the Impact Statement to the Office of Policy, Compliance and Governance. When the Policy Originator is an individual, a recognized University unit or organization must be listed as a sponsor. A draft of the policy or policy revision may be submitted with the Impact Statement.

2) The Office of Policy, Compliance and Governance or the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs will review the Impact Statement and will work with the Policy Originator to make revisions as necessary to the Impact Statement.

3) The Office of Policy, Compliance and Governance or the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs will form a Drafting Team consisting of those representative stakeholders who may be affected by the policy.

4) When necessary, the Drafting Team will create the draft policy in the template format. As part of the policy draft, drafting teams should identify the Responsible Office, Responsible Executive and Interpreting Authority.

5) The Drafting Team will submit the draft policy, as instructed, for appropriate review. The sequence of review, as outlined below, may vary:

- The Office of Policy, Compliance and Governance or the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs will post the draft policy on the University Policy and Regulation website for a 30-day University policy public comment period. For Non-Academic University Policies, just prior to posting for the 30-day University comment period, the Office of Policy, Compliance and Governance and the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs will notify the Chair of the Faculty Senate, Staff Council and the Student Senate. The draft policy will also be notified prior to the 30-day comment period to begin legal review of the proposed policy. an announcement that a policy is posted for 30-day comment period on the Policy and Regulation Website will be made to the University community through EKU Today and EKU Student Today. The Drafting Team will review and consider all comments made during this time period of ACADEMIC POLICY NOTIFICATION?

- Policies will generally be reviewed using the two tracks below. If appropriate, a policy may be reviewed using both tracks. The Office of Policy, Compliance and Governance and the Office of the Provost are responsible for ensuring policies are reviewed through the appropriate track(s).
University Non-Academic Policies

- The Administrative Council reviews the University Non-Academic policy drafts and may:
  - i. determines if further drafting or stakeholder feedback is necessary,
  - ii. makes a recommendation to the President.

The Administrative Council may
  - iii. recommend that the Office of Process, Compliance and Governance reconvene the Drafting Team to incorporate feedback from stakeholders or from the 30-day University comment period, and then resubmit the draft for additional review.

- Once all recommendations are made and a final draft is ready, the Office of Policy, Compliance and Governance will submit the policy draft to the President.

University Academic Policies

- The Council on Academic Affairs (CAA) reviews policy drafts that affect curriculum, academic programs, or academic requirements for students and makes recommendations. Prior to making a recommendation, the CAA may determine that further drafting or stakeholder feedback is necessary. The Special Assistant to the Provost (for Academics) will reconvene the drafting team to consider feedback from the CAA.

and/or

- The Faculty Senate reviews policy drafts that affect academics, including admissions, curriculum, instruction, and criteria for granting degrees; faculty welfare; student affairs in the areas where the proposed policy concerns the students’ academic achievement; and other policies as referred to the Senate. The Faculty Senate makes recommendations. Prior to making a recommendation, the Senate may determine that further drafting or stakeholder feedback is necessary.

and/or

- The Provost Council reviews policy drafts that affect Academic Affairs or that are referred to the Council. The Provost Council makes recommendations. Prior to making a recommendation the Provost Council may determine that further drafting or stakeholder feedback is necessary. The Special Assistant to the Provost (for Academics) will reconvene the drafting team as necessary to consider feedback from the 30-day University comment period of from any stakeholder groups.

and

- The Special Assistant to the Provost (for Academics) will reconvene the drafting as necessary to consider feedback from the 30-day University comment period or from any stakeholder groups.

- Once all recommendations are made and a final draft is ready, the Special Assistant to the Provost (for Academics) will submit the policy draft to the President.
6) For all policy proposals both Academic and Non-Academic policy drafts including those originated by Faculty Senate, the President may:

   i. submit to President’s Cabinet for advisement and/or to others identified in the policy process for further review, drafting, or stakeholder feedback;
   ii. approve as a University Regulation where BOR-Board of Regents approval is not required (see 1.1.2P Authorization for Regulations);
   iii. recommend approval and submit to the BOR-Board of Regents for adoption;
   iv. not approve and/or not recommend approval for submission to the BOR;
   v. take other action as President deems appropriate.

*Pursuant to Part VII Section VII A4a, Faculty Handbook, when the Faculty Senate is the Policy Originator policy impact statements and policy drafts may be submitted directly to the President or may be submitted as described below. The President may recommend that policies proposed by the Faculty Senate be vetted through the as-process outlined in this policy.*

Upon adoption, the policy is promulgated to the University Community and posted on the University policy website. The Board of Regents has authority to approve University Policies (both Academic and Non-Academic). Pursuant to 1.1.2P Authorization for Regulations, the President has authority to approve University Regulations.

University Regulations will be vetted through this process (except no Board of Regent approval is required) in accordance to 1.1.2P Authorization of Regulations. Depending on the nature of the issue, guidelines that are part of policies or regulations may require vetting through this process.

Only the President and Board of Regents have authority to approve University policies.

7) Once a policy or regulation is approved/adopted, it will be posted on the University Policy and Regulation website. Policies and regulations will be codified in a manner that includes Volume, Chapter, and Section.

DEPARTMENTAL/UNIT POLICIES, GUIDELINES, AND REGULATIONS

Policies that apply only to specific departments or units are not subject to this process.

ESTABLISHING AN INTERIM POLICY

On occasions when an Interim Policy is necessary, a Drafting Team will draft and recommend the Interim Policy for approval by the President. The chairs of the Faculty Senate, the Staff Council, and the Student Senate Government Association along with the Office of University Counsel will be notified upon formation of the drafting team for and adoption of Interim Policies.

An interim policy must carry an expiration date and will either be allowed to expire without additional action, be extended once for a specific period upon special permission from the President, or will be replaced by a standard University Policy or Regulation, which must be vetted through the process as stated within this policy.

UPDATING OR REVISIONING A POLICY

On an as-needed basis, the Office of Policy, Compliance & Governance Office of the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs will make routine changes (such as position or unit titles, links, etc.) to University Policies or Regulations. These changes will not substantively affect the policy. The Office of Policy, Compliance & Governance Office of the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs will notify the date of such changes (as Updated) to the first page of the policy.
Editorial changes that do not substantively affect the policy may be suggested to either the Office of Policy, Governance and Compliance or to the Special Assist to the Provost for Academics. Such changes will be made to the policy and updated on the university policy website.

Procedures for substantive revisions to an existing policy are the same as for reviewing and approving a policy (see above). Policy Originating/Vetting/Approval Process as stated within this policy.

IMPLEMENTING, DISSEMINATING, AND TRAINING

Unless otherwise stated in the policy, a policy or regulation is in effect immediately after it is adopted by the Board of Regents or President. Once adopted, the Office of Policy, Compliance & Governance Office of the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs will ensure that the policy is disseminated to the university community by either communicating this information directly or will charge the Responsible Executive with the dissemination. The Responsible Office(s) will assist the Responsible Executive in establishing any support systems to train the community to ensure ongoing compliance.

INTERPRETING A POLICY

When questions or conflicts arise concerning the application, compliance, or scope of a policy, the affected parties will provide the details of the question or conflict in writing to the Interpreting Authority designated in that policy.

The Interpreting Authority will review the case, as well as any precedents to ensure consistent interpretation. Once an interpretation has been determined, the Interpreting Authority will communicate the decision in writing to the appropriate parties. The Interpreting Authority will ensure that proper records are kept of interpretation decisions.

PERIODIC REVIEW OF POLICIES

University policies should be reviewed on a periodic basis (a five-year cycle is recommended) to ensure the currency and accuracy of the policies. The Responsible Executive will devise a mechanism that includes representatives from key stakeholders and that ensures policies under his/her jurisdiction are so reviewed.

Policies will be reviewed for the following:
- Continued relevance to the University mission and values
- Consistency with other University policies
- Reflection of changes in laws, regulations, accreditation standards, educational goals/practices, university practices, etc.
- Errors in fact or in language
- Other potential problems

If changes in the policy are deemed necessary, the appropriate process (revising, updating, or repealing) should be initiated.

REPEALING A POLICY

If a policy is deemed identified as no longer relevant or necessary after undergoing the appropriate review process (see Reviewing and Approving, above), then a policy will be repealed, the same process as stated in the Policy Originating/Vetting/Approval Process within this policy will be followed to repeal the policy.

ARCHIVING A POLICY

If a policy is updated, revised, superseded, or repealed, the Office of Policy, Compliance & Governance Office of the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs will archive the older version of the policy. These archived policies will be made available upon request.
**Definitions**

**Academic-University-Policy**  
University policies that pertain to the academic-mission and issues of the University.

**Administrative Council**  
The Administrative Council is made up of direct reports to the President and others as appointed by the President. As it pertains to this policy, the Administrative Council will review Non-Academic University Policy drafts and make recommendations to the President.

**Board of Regents (BOR)**  
The legal and active policy making body of the University.

**Chapter**  
The designation for a sub-unit of a University policy volume. This designation indicates the broad category under which individual related policies will be found.

**Council on Academic Affairs (CAA)**  
The Council on Academic Affairs is a University body that is charged with oversight of the curriculum and academic programs of the University. As it regards this policy, the Council reviews and recommends policies that affect curriculum, academic programs, or academic requirements for students.

**Drafting Team**  
A drafting team is a small workgroup formed for the purpose of writing and editing a policy draft and in placing that draft in a University policy template. For NonAcademic Policies, drafting teams will consist of representative from Staff Council, Faculty Senate and Student Senate and other stakeholders.

**Departmental Policy**  
A policy that pertains only to the internal procedures of a given department. Departmental policies are not subject to this policy. However, departmental policies must be consistent with University policies.

**Effective Date**  
The date the University policy is approved by the Board of Regents or University President unless otherwise specified.

**Faculty Senate**  
The Faculty Senate is the delegate assembly of the University faculty through which the faculty normally exercises its responsibilities as a group. As it pertains to policy, the Faculty Senate reviews and recommends policies that affect academics, including admissions, curriculum, instruction, and criteria for granting degrees; faculty welfare; student affairs in the areas where the proposed policy concerns the students’ academic achievement; and other policies as referred to the Senate.

**Guidelines**  
A statement of desired best practice that recommends procedures, processes, outcomes, and the like that have been endorsed or approved by the University to achieve a particular outcome or goal. Guidelines may or may not be affiliated with policies and regulations. Guidelines may or may not apply institution-wide.

**Impact Statement**  
Document to be completed by the Policy Originator describing the justification for developing a new policy or revising a current policy and the impact of such on the University.

**Interim Policy**  
This is a provisional policy issued when a University policy is needed before the standard process can be completed. An interim policy must carry an expiration date and will either be allowed to expire without additional action, be extended for a specified period upon special permission from the President or will be replaced by a standard University Policy.

**Interpreting Authority**  
The authority to interpret the intent of the policy when questions or conflicts arise concerning its application, compliance, or scope.

**Policy Originator**  
An individual or group identifying a need for a policy or policy revision and assisting in the development of that policy. An originator may be a representative from an administrative or academic unit; a committee, senate, association, or council; or an individual member of the campus community.

**Policy Vetting and Approval Process**  
The formal process by which the University develops, recommends, and approves University policies. (See link.)
Policy 1.1.1
Volume 1, Governance
Chapter 1, Policies, Regulations and Guidelines
Section 1, Policy on Policies

Policy Website
A University website dedicated to housing University policies and all related information.

President’s Cabinet
The President’s Cabinet consists of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Associate Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs, the Executive Vice President for Administration, the Vice President for Financial Affairs, the Vice President for Institutional Advancement, and the Chief of Staff.

As it pertains to this policy, the Cabinet functions as a senior level policy advisory body to the President.

Provost Council
The Provost’s Council is the major advisory body to the Provost for the review of policies and procedures in the area of academic affairs.

Recognized University Unit or Organization
Examples include: University Departments, RSO’s, Student Government Association, etc

Regulation
A standard or statement that either 1) articulates procedures or reporting requirements related to implementation or compliance with University policies or 2) addresses matters not specifically addressed in such policies. Does not require Board of Regents approval, but may require presidential approval. Regulations may or may not apply institution wide.

Responsible Executive
The University executive under whose jurisdiction a University policy falls. Depending on the scope, a policy may have more than one responsible executive.

Responsible Office(s)
University office(s) designated with the responsibility of administering a policy, communicating with and training the university community regarding the policy requirements, and executing its timely review and updating.

Section
The designation for University policy or regulation that provides the name of the individual policy or regulation.

Shared Governance
As it relates to this policy, a joint effort of the university community for the development of University policies.

Stakeholder
Any individual or group who might be impacted by or might have knowledge related to a particular policy.

Template
The official format for all University policies. See Related Links for a copy of the template.

University
Eastern Kentucky University

University Academic Policy
University policies that pertain to the academic mission and issues of the University.

University Non-Academic Policy
University policies that pertain to matters not considered academic.

University Policy (both Academic and Non-Academic)
A University policy includes the following characteristics:
- Assists the University in achieving its mission through the promotion of operational efficiency
- Applies broadly across the University
- Complies with federal, state, and local laws as well as accrediting bodies
- Mandates actions or limitations
- Ensures responsibility and accountability
- Requires approval by the President and/or the Board of Regents for substantive changes or implementation
- Reflects University values

University Policy Document
All official policy documents have the following characteristics:
- Are reviewed and approved by the policy vetting and approval process
- Are under the authority of a university executive to execute and interpret
- Are in a standard format (template)
Responsibilities

**Administrative Council**
- Review and provide feedback to the Non-Academic University Policy Drafting Team and provide recommendations to President’s Cabinet.
- Identify additional stakeholders as needed and seek input.

**Associate Provost**
- Review Impact Statements and provide feedback to the policy originator(s).
- Determine the appropriate process path (academic or non-academic). Refer to Policy, Compliance, and Governance Executive Director if a non-academic policy.
- Identify stakeholders and provide a list to the appropriate review group(s).
- Identifies need for policy development or revision as needed

**Board of Regents**
- Review and approve University policies.

**Council on Academic Affairs**
- Review policies that affect curriculum, academic programs, or academic requirements for students.
- Identify additional stakeholders as needed and seek input.
- Make recommendations to Faculty Senate and/or Provost Council regarding such policies.
- Recommend appropriate Catalog language as necessary

**Drafting Team**
- Work with the policy originator to draft a new policy or make revisions to an existing policy.
- Use the template to create a draft based on the PAC’s feedback.
- Submit policy draft, as instructed, to the appropriate group(s).
- Edit policy draft based on input from review groups, stakeholders, and the 7-day public comment period.

**Faculty Senate**
- Review policies that affect curriculum, academic programs, or academic requirements for students, or faculty welfare.
- Review other policies referred to or originated by the Senate.
- Provide input as requested.
- Identify additional stakeholders as needed and seek input.
- Make resolutions of support or recommendations to the Provost Council, to the Council on Academic Affairs, or to the President regarding such policies.

**Interpreting Authority**
- Make sound judgments on the intent of the policy when questions or conflicts arise concerning its application, compliance, or scope.
- Review precedents, if any, to ensure consistent interpretation.
- Render an interpretation when called upon to do so and communicate the decision to the appropriate parties.
- Document all interpretation decisions.

**Office of Policy, Compliance, and Governance—Policy Compliance Analyst**
- Facilitate the development and processing of non-academic policies.
- Facilitate non-academic university Policy Drafting Teams as needed.
- Ensure that policy is disseminated to the University Community.
- Ensure that the University community is trained concerning policy development and compliance matters.
- Maintain website with a listing of all University policies and the tools for the
development of policies.
- Archive policies that have been revised, suspended, or superseded.
- Identifies need for policy development or revision as needed

**Policy, Compliance, and Governance Executive Director**
- Review Impact Statements and provide feedback to the policy originator(s).
- Determine the appropriate process path (academic or non-academic). Refer to Associate Provost if an academic university policy.
- Identify stakeholders and provide a list to the appropriate review group(s).

**Policy Originators(s)**
- Complete the Impact Statement and submit to the Office of Policy Compliance and Governance or to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs to begin the policy process.
- Consult key stakeholders during the development process, and considers all suggestions.

**President**
- Review and approve policies not required to be submitted to the Board of Regents.
- Review and submit policies to the Board of Regents for approval.

**President’s Cabinet**
- As it pertains to this policy, makes recommendations to the President on policy matters.

**Provost**
- Recommends Academic Affairs policies to the President.
- Participate in policy recommendations as a member of the President’s cabinet.

**Provost Council**
- Review policies that affect Academic Affairs.
- Provide input on other policies as requested.
- Identify additional stakeholders as needed and seek input.
- Make resolutions of support or recommendations to the Provost.

**Responsible Executive**
- Be accountable for substance of policy [VP1]
- Review final draft of the policy document before submission to the Approval Authority.
- Conduct timely reviews of existing policies under his or her jurisdiction.
- Assist, as needed, in the development, updating, or revision of policy within his or her jurisdiction.

**Responsible Office(s)**
- Lead in the establishment of support systems needed to achieve compliance of policies.
- Inform and train the university community concerning new and substantially revised policies.
- Consult with the Responsible Executive(s) to update existing policies.

**Special Assistant to the Provost for Academics**
- Facilitate the development and processing of academic university policies.
- Serve on Drafting Team as needed.
- Ensure that the University community is trained concerning policy development and compliance matters.
- Assist with the maintenance of the University Policy website, particular as it regards academic policies.
- Assist with the archiving of policies that have been revised, suspended, or superseded, particularly as it regards academic policies.

**Stakeholder**
- Assist with drafting and formulation of policies. Will determine Will have input on whether a policy goes to BOR approval.
- Will have final review of all policies before approval. Will have input on whether a policy goes to the Board of Regents for approval or is approved as a Regulation by the President.

---

**Violations of the Policy**

---
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Interim Policy
Violations of this policy may result in the delay of the approval process or in the official University recognition of the policy’s effect.

**Interpreting Authority**

- President
- Chief of Staff and Unit Head for Policy, Compliance & Governance, if so delegated
- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, if so delegated
- Vice President or other Direct Report to the President, if so delegated

In the event there is a conflict between interpreting authorities, the President will make the final interpretation decision.

**Relevant Links**

- Policy template
- Impact Statement
- Process Diagram

**Policy Adoption Review and Approval**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2008</td>
<td>President Whitlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2009</td>
<td>President Whitlock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Authorization for Regulations

Policy Statement

Eastern Kentucky University acknowledges the statutory authority of its Board of Regents to adopted policies that govern the University. It is the responsibility of the President, the administration, and the faculty to administer and implement these policies. Further, it is the expectation of the Board of Regents that the President will develop a system of well-vetted Regulations that implement University policies or that manage routine operations of the University not addressed in these policies.

Entities Affected by the Policy

- Entire university community, including all campuses and extended sites.

Procedures

Procedures for developing, approving, and implementing University Regulations shall follow those established in the Policy on Policies 1.1.1P for University Policies except Regulation will not require Board of Regent approval.

Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>A standard or statement that either 1) articulates procedures or reporting requirements related to implementation or compliance with University policies; or 2) addresses matters not specifically addressed in such policies. Does not require Board of Regents approval, but requires presidential approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Eastern Kentucky University

Interpreting Authority

President of Eastern Kentucky University
Relevant Links

Policy on Policies 1.1.1P

Policy Adoption Review and Approval
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mixon Ware,
    Chair, Faculty Senate

CC: Janna Vice
    Interim Provost

VIA: Dr. Allen Ault, Dean
    College of Justice & Safety

FROM: Dr. Victor Kappeler, Chair
      CJPS Department

DATE: January 19, 2010

RE: Nomination of Mr. Daniel Evans Rigney (901329251) for
    Posthumous B.S. in Criminal Justice

I am writing to concur with Dr. Chuck Fields’ recommendation to award Mr. Daniel
Evans Rigney the degree of Bachelor of Science of Criminal Justice. I believe he has
met the university requirements for awarding a posthumous degree. Please see Dr. Fields’
letter that accompanies this request. If you have any additional questions or need more
information, please contact me.

If any additional information is needed, please contact Keely Garden, Administrative Assistant
I, Criminal Justice and Police Studies Department (keely.garden@eku.edu / ext. 2-1978).
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mixon Ware,
Chair, Faculty Senate

CC: Janna Vice
Interim Provost

VIA: Dr. Allen Ault, Dean
College of Justice & Safety

FROM: Dr. Victor Kappeler, Chair
CJPS Department

DATE: January 19, 2010

RE: Nomination of Mr. Daniel Evans Rigney (901329251) for Posthumous B.S. in Criminal Justice

I am writing to concur with Dr. Chuck Fields’ recommendation to award Mr. Daniel Evans Rigney the degree of Bachelor of Science of Criminal Justice. I believe he has met the university requirements for awarding a posthumous degree. Please see Dr. Fields’ letter that accompanies this request. If you have any additional questions or need more information, please contact me.

If any additional information is needed, please contact Keely Garden, Administrative Assistant I, Criminal Justice and Police Studies Department (keely.garden@eku.edu / ext. 2-1978).
January 13, 2010

Victor I. Kappeler, Chair  
Department of Criminal Justice & Police Studies  
College of Justice and Safety  
Eastern Kentucky University  
Richmond, KY 40475

Professor Kappeler:

On behalf of the faculty in the Department of Criminal Justice & Police Studies, and pursuant to University policy, I would like to take this opportunity to respectfully nominate Mr. Daniel Evans Rigney for the posthumous awarding of the Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice. He was a student of ours who died tragically in an automobile accident recently and was scheduled to graduate this year.

Daniel was a very personable young man and a pleasure to have in class. The faculty that knew him are very saddened by his passing. As required by the University, he had completed more than 75% (110 credit hours) and met all of the other requirements for receiving the degree posthumously.

Thank you for your consideration regarding this request. If there is anything else I can do, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Charles B. Fields, Ph.D.  
Professor of Criminal Justice
TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Janna P. Vice, Chair
The Council on Academic Affairs

DATE: January 27, 2010

SUBJCT: CAA Agenda for Faculty Senate

As a result of the Council on Academic Affairs’ meeting on January 21, 2010, the following items are presented for the Faculty Senate’s agenda on February 1, 2010.

**Curriculum Proposals**

**New Programs**

1. Doctorate in Occupational Therapy – *create a doctorate program in Occupational Therapy*
2. Certificate in Financial Literacy (Undergraduate) – *Create a 12-hour, in-house certificate.*  
   *This certificate will not require CPE approval.*

**Program Revisions – Reducing Hours Required to Graduate**

3. French/Teaching B.A. - *Add requirement of GPA 2.75 in courses for French teaching major,*  
   *reduce required hours from 128 to 120,* and delete recommendation for specific supporting courses. Delete reference to FRE 400 and replace with FRE 312.
4. Spanish/Teaching B.A. - *Add requirement of GPA 2.75 in courses for Spanish teaching major,*  
   *reduce required hours from 128 to 120,* and delete recommendation for specific supporting courses.
5. Earth Science/Teaching B.S. - *Revise Major and Supporting Course Requirements.*  
   *Editorial corrections of General Education Requirements, Teacher Education Requirements and hours totals from 130-143 to 126-143.*

**Program Revisions**

6. English/Teaching B.A. - *Change ENG 499 from a required course to an elective.*
To: Faculty Senate  
From: Malcolm P. Frisbie  
Date: 1 February 2010  
Re: Regent’s Report

25 January 2010, Regular Quarterly Meeting of the Board of Regents

The Board elected Gary Abney as its new chair and Craig Turner as its new vice chair. Hunter Bates, who served as chair for the past five years or so, will rotate off the Board when his term expires this spring. Mr. Abney has served on the Board for 11.5 years, including serving as vice chair for the last couple of years. He is an EKU alumnus with a long and active affiliation with the university. He is a lifelong Richmond resident, currently working in real estate after an earlier career in banking. Mr. Turner is also an EKU alumnus. He resides in Lexington. He is the founder of a medical instrument and supply firm and is involved in several other businesses. He has recently served as chair of the finance committee of the Board. The Board had strong leadership under Mr. Bates. I am confident that we will continue to have very strong leadership under Mr. Abney and Mr. Turner.

The Board heard updates on the Foundation from its chair, and on the University from VP Newsom. The Foundation has seen about 25% growth this year and continues to grow in number of donors, which is welcome news after the financial downturn over the prior year. The University is on target in terms of revenue and expenditure rates in comparison to our status at this same time last year. Therefore, the expectation is that we will finish the fiscal year on a solid financial footing. One problem we had last year was a large expenditure overrun in student financial aid. The university has taken steps to correct that problem, but because financial aid often entails a multiyear commitment to students, that problem will not disappear this year. We should expect an expenditure overrun in the $2-3M range on the financial aid line of the budget. This is a reduction from last year’s overrun and can be handled within University resources. Overall, VP Newsom predicts that we will maintain an unrestricted fund balance of around $6M – enough of a safety cushion, without being unnecessarily large.

Also on the financial front, the Board formally accepted the audit report for the year ending 30 June 2009. The Finance Committee received the report and spoke directly with the auditors (Deloitte and Touche) in November. I provided a more detailed report of the audit at that time. The take home message is that the auditors concluded that the University is doing a very good job of tracking and reporting its financial picture. That is good news for us financially, and it also speaks very highly to the careful work that our financial branch is doing on our behalf. The Board has begun the process of selecting another auditing firm to take over from Deloitte and Touche this spring. It is standard practice to change external auditors at least every five years.

In personnel actions, the Board approved RTP applications from four individuals. On the Academic Affairs front, the Board approved 53 (count ‘em!) program revisions, three new programs, and six program suspensions. All are items that had been recommended through the Faculty Senate. The Board also approved revisions to the University’s Hazing Policy and changes to the Student Government Association Constitution, particularly in the portion pertaining to the Judicial Branch.

You may have read in the newspaper that the Board approved two new capital projects – a hotel to be associated with the new Performing Arts Center and a communications tower. Yes and no. Those projects are possibilities, but have not yet been fully appraised. Nevertheless, in order to investigate the feasibility and advisability of these projects further, state regulations require that they be incorporated into the state budget – even if no state monies will be used. We approved these projects so that planning may go forward, but the university has not yet committed to either project.

The Board will next convene for a regular quarterly meeting in April 2010.

Please feel free to contact me for further information about any of these items or to discuss topics of concern to you.

Respectfully submitted,
Malcolm P. Frisbie
622-1507 / malcolm.frisbie@eku.edu
COSFL MEETING
January 29, 2010

Held at the Offices of the CPE
Frankfort, Ky.
1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

COSFL Members in attendance:
Tom McPartland, KSU (Former Senate President)
Ed Conner, KSU (Faculty Senate President)
Joel Jones, KSU (COSFL Rep.)
David Randall, UK (Senate Council Chair)
Tucker Landy, KSU (Faculty Regent)
Joe Steffen, U of L (Faculty Senate member)
Melissa Laning, U of L (Faculty Senate Chair)
Mixon Ware, EKU (Faculty Senate Chair & COSFL V.P.)
Peg Munke, Murray State (Faculty Senate V.P. & COSFL President)
Carol Bredemeyer, NKU (Former Senate President)
Nancy McKenney, EKU (COSFL Secretary and Faculty Rep. to the CPE)

Members meeting via ITV:
Molly Kerby, WKU (COSFL Rep. & COSFL Treasurer)
Kate Hudepohl, WKU (COSFL Rep.)
Patti Minter, WKU (Faculty Regent)

COSFL members met with CPE President Dr. Robert King and with a number of other CPE staff members, most notably Aaron Thompson and Adina O’Hara, for purposes of discussing the Transfer Bill (HB-160) which recently passed in the State House of Representatives. The bill is now on the desk of Senator Ken Winters who chairs the Senate Education Committee. COSFL members are deeply concerned that the provisions of this bill, as it was originally proposed, be modified so that they will not be unduly restrictive and in violation of the academic freedom of faculty.

President King gave background on the genesis of this Transfer bill. Apparently when he first arrived to become CPE President, Former Gov. Paul Patton took him around to visit numerous legislators. King asked each one what he or she thought of higher education and the CPE. The most frequently mentioned concern was transfer. We did not have any hard data last year to show that it is or isn’t a big problem, but it is perceived as such by legislators, and if we don’t fix it, they will fix it for us!
King has been having meetings with provosts of the state universities in order to develop a set of agreements that will alleviate problems. He noted that state legislators go to conferences in the summer, and this year some of them, namely Rep. Rollins and Sen. Shaughnessy, went to a conference in Louisiana and came back ready to put through legislation to “fix the transfer problem” this spring. Ironically the Louisiana legislation that so excited our legislators has not even been implemented yet! President King told Rollins and others that the CPE was actually further down the road in its own process. Rep. Rollins was willing to let the CPE amend the Louisiana bill that was to be used as a model for his bill.

King explained that there are two items in the bill that we should be aware did not originate with the CPE and do not follow their plan. One of these is the mandate that bachelor’s degrees require no more than 120 hours. King stated a number of times that he and the CPE do not feel strongly about this provision. He emphasized to faculty that they may apply to the CPE for an exception to be made to this 120 hours rule. The motivation behind this provision was Sen. Shaughnessy’s desire to have more people graduate in 4 years.

The other item stems from 1996 legislation from Sen. Shaughnessy that was supposed to mandate alignment (of courses, degree requirements, etc.) between the community colleges and the 4-year institutions. President King says this alignment worked initially but there was no mechanism in place to sustain it as changes were made in courses at various institutions. No other state had any such mechanism for maintaining such alignment, so the CPE has made one up! Basically this mechanism would require that when changes are made in courses or degree requirements at a 4-year institution, then both KCTCS and the CPE should be notified, preferably at least 6 months in advance. He emphasized that faculty have the prerogative to make changes in courses, and he doesn’t see the CPE trying to block that. At the same time, if a new course is created at a 4-year institution, the community colleges are not required to offer the same course. However, if the course is a degree requirement at the 4-year institution, then students need to be informed that they will have to take this course when they have transferred to the 4-year institution.
A very lengthy Q & A session followed Dr. King’s opening remarks. A number of interesting facts and statistics came out in the discussion. It was noted that there are currently about 12,000 students at 4-year institutions who came from KCTCS. For the 2008-2009 academic year there were 4304 traditional transfer students (i.e. with 2-year degrees) from KCTCS and 7446 others who had taken some KCTCS courses. It was pointed out by Tucker Landy of KSU that the CPE’s own website indicates that 90% of credits from KCTCS are accepted at the 4 year institutions—in other words, the supposed problem with transfer is much overstated! King acknowledged that transfer problems are actually rare, but he understands that legislators confronted with angry constituents who’ve had a transfer difficulty will naturally see transfer as a big problem. One way the CPE is addressing this problem of perception is through collection of data. Karen Carey and Adina O’Hara are in the middle of conducting a survey of transfer students.

With regard to this Transfer Bill, King says the CPE and the Chief Academic Officers (i.e. provosts) of the public institutions of higher education have agreed upon changes to the bill, and he thinks these will go through. He has spoken with Senator Winters and thinks that the 120 hour provision might be dropped. Further, King believes he has been able to convince Senator Shaughnessy that it is not necessary to have common course numbering and identical course content throughout the public colleges and universities. Instead, the CPE and the CAOs are emphasizing common learning outcomes which could be achieved by a variety of courses. He noted that the CPE plans to maintain a cross numbering system for courses, but that faculty would not have to worry about this.

At the request of some COSFL members, President King read the actual text of the Transfer Bill as it currently exists on the CPE website. However, as noted earlier, a number of changes have been proposed by the CAOs, and this newer proposed version (not yet approved by legislators) was shared with COSFL members via e-mail several days ago.

COSFL President Peggy Pittman Munke suggested that President King write a letter to all faculty stressing the uniqueness of the comprehensive universities and explaining that the CPE is already working on the things addressed in the
Transfer Bill. This would allay further misunderstanding and alarm on the part of faculty, some of whom are already jumping to conclusions about what is in the Transfer Bill. King indicated that he was willing to write such a letter.

In the course of a discussion of the possibility of doing a cost analysis of the bill, Aaron Thompson pointed out that the CPE is proposing that the requirement for a common transcript statewide be deleted from the bill. The cost of this requirement is being used as a reason for eliminating it.

After CPE staff members left at 4:30 p.m., COSFL members spent the final half hour drafting a letter to the CPE to thank them for their efforts on this bill, and to reiterate concerns that COSFL members continue to have regarding the language of the bill. The COSFL President plans to send a final draft of this letter to all COSFL members via the list-serv.

*Minutes submitted by,*  
*Nancy McKenney, COSFL Secretary and Faculty Rep. to the CPE*
1. We expect to be finished with our review of both the draft 2010 faculty handbook, the many policies it includes, and the policies website by the next Senate meeting. We ask everyone to look over these things and send us any concerns or questions.

2. We will be requesting that the policy Academic Work While Under Contract to Teach at Eastern be reviewed for clarification, relevance, or repeal.

3. Circulating in recent days was a “Social Web Policy” that a drafting team has been working on; it is under review. The sample draft included a date indicating Senate approval, which was confusing. That has been clarified; the date was there as an example only and has been removed. You will be hearing more about this policy as it moves through the process.

4. We ask everyone to look over the Interim Policy on Policies and send us any questions or concerns or post them yourself. Concerns have been raised about this policy. Specifically, concerns about the procedure (page 2, Procedures) for vetting and approving policies have been raised.

The 30-day comment period for this policy is set to expire on February 20th. The R&R committee will be commenting / making a statement before this time. To read this policy go to

http://www.policies.eku.edu/

...and click on “Interim Policy on Policies“ at the left.

To publicly post a comment on this policy go to the same page

http://www.policies.eku.edu/

...and click on “30 day comments“ at the top-left.