Call to order

Approval of Minutes
November 30, 2009

President's Report: Senator Whitlock

Unfinished Business:
• Budget Committee Motion on Faculty Development Funds

New Business:
• Policy on Policies
• Policy on Authorization for Regulations
• Resolution on Pending Legislation
• 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: TBA, 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
The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, November 30, 2009, in the South Ballroom in the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Ware called the fourth meeting of the academic year to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.

The following members were absent:
A. Back, R. Biggins*, M. Hesse*, J. Lowry*, M. Martin, M. McAdam, K. Minor, A. Poffenberger*, G. Purdue, T. Randles*

*indicates prior notification of absence
^ ALT John Bowes attended for J. Lowry
^ ALT Socorro Zaragoza attended for A. Poffenberger

Visitors to the Senate: Linda Frost, Honors Program; Shannon Means, EVP; Robert Mitchell, Psychology; Debbie Newsom, Financial Affairs; Jerry Pogatshnik, Graduate Education & Research; and Sherry Robinson, Provost Office

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
The November 2, 2009 minutes were approved as written.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT: Senator Whitlock
The Provost Search Committee has been selected. Senator Taylor has agreed to serve as chair of the committee. Millie Leach, a retired administrative assistant, has agreed to serve as administrative support, and a temporary office has been established in the Student Services Building. The committee will meet for the first time on December 4th.

The state has requested that all state agencies, with the exception of colleges, universities, and the public school systems, prepare a report to show the impact of a 6% current year budget cut which may be requested to address the $166 million shortfall for the current fiscal year. While the institutions have been spared, some of the areas included in the cut may still have an impact on education, such as transportation and the Council on Postsecondary Education’s operation budget.

The Doctor of Nursing Practice will professionally replace the Family Nurse Practitioner masters level across the country by sometime in 2015. In order for the comprehensive institutions in Kentucky to offer that, some modifications must be made to the current statute. In answer to this, CPE has prepared a draft which attempts to 1) write the amendment in a way to allow for future modifications without a major overall and 2) include language which clearly states that medicine, law, and dentistry are not included. However, CPE has also included the term “engineering” into the proposed language. So the proposed amendment has become extremely complex and may prove problematic. What may happen is that an amendment may be fashioned to address only the Doctor of Nursing Practice and then a broader amendment may be written for the 2011 session.

Provost Vice and President Whitlock are scheduled to meet next Monday with the Vice President of the SACS Commission on Colleges to learn of the Commission’s action on EKU’s substantive
change visit and evaluation. That’s the final step to receive SACS level V status which will make it possible for EKU to offer up to three doctoral programs.

Senator Vice will provide more in-depth details in the Provost report, but there is much legislative frustration over transfer issues. The legislature thought they fixed the issue ten years ago; and if every institution had taken the previous legislative mandate as seriously as this institution did, the problem remaining would be very small. This issue is of great concern to COSFL and so it’s incumbent on us to get this in the most reasonable form that it can be.

Another piece of legislation that definitely has the attention of the university presidents is the time to degree. The proposed legislation is pushing toward having 120-semester-credit-hour baccalaureate programs which will hopefully result in more people graduating in four years. However, there are a number of issues that can affect time to degree. Some of those include:

1. Number of students requiring remediation
2. Allowing students to drop classes through the mid-point of the semester
3. Public policy changes made to Pell Grants in recent years which has forced students to work more hours or borrow more money in order to pursue their education.

One additional note, this piece of legislation also states that by 2014 the Boards of Regents of the Trustees are supposed to include student success toward time to degree in the evaluation of the university president.

Senator Whitlock recently attended the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) meeting where he had the opportunity to see three excellent presentations.

1. Arne Duncan - conversation about administration priorities as they relate to public higher education including an idea for tracking teachers who are having the most impact on their students and then tracking those teachers back to their respective colleges of education to see which colleges are having the greatest impact.
2. Joshua Cooper Ramo, author of “The Age of the Unthinkable: Why the New World Disorder Constantly Surprises Us and What We Can Do About It”
3. Alan November of November Learning, Inc. (Novemberlearning.com)

NEW BUSINESS:

Report on Budget. Karen Neubauer, Executive Director of Budgeting, was in attendance to give a brief presentation on Eastern’s budgeting process. The full presentation can be found on their website at www.financialaffairs.eku.edu/budget.

This year to aid in the budgeting process a portal called “Go Forward” was created to outline the budgeting process. The portal can be accessed at www.financialaffairs.eku.edu/budget/goforward/.

Faculty Development Fund. Senator Johnson moved approval of the Faculty Development Fund motion listed below, seconded by Senator Taylor.

"The annual Faculty Development funds, which have been delegated to departments from Academic Affairs, should be delegated to individual full time teaching faculty members and should 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 delegated to the individual faculty member for faculty development would remain in the department's Faculty Development account."

Senator Johnson noted that the committee plans to develop guidelines for the use of the faculty development funds, and those should be ready to share with the Senate by the April meeting.

Senator Potter moved to amend the motion to “full time teaching and research faculty”, seconded by Senator Shordike. Motion failed for lack of support.

Senator Frisbie moved to postpone discussion to the January meeting to allow the committee time to review Faculty Handbook language and address the issue of teaching and research, seconded by Senator Day. Motion carried.

Report from Council on Academic Affairs. - Senator Vice

New Programs
1. B.S. Animal Studies

New Certificate
2. Certificate in Intelligence Studies (Undergraduate) - establish an Undergraduate, University-level certificate.
3. Post-Baccalaureate Health Information Management (HIM) Certificate

Program Revision - Reducing Hours Required to Graduate
4. Computer Electronic Networking B.S. - decrease number of hours from 128 to 120 hours, revise program title and CIP code, revise courses within the program, reduce free elective hours to 5-6, reduce Major Requirement hours from 42 to 40.

Program Revisions
5. Honors Program - establish required courses for the program to be included in the program description/Catalog text
6. Occupational Science - revise and clarify progression and retention in the program
7. Moderate to Severe Disabilities Graduate Certificate - remove NSC 700 from MSD program and provide an option for students because the content is similar in SED 718 and OTS 715. Delete SED 240.
8. Minor in Computer Science - update minor with current course offerings
9. Minor in Interactive Media - update minor with current course offerings
10. Computer Science: Computer Security B.S. - change option title to better reflect course offerings
11. Computer Science: Interactive Multimedia B.S. - change option title to better reflect course offerings
12. Economics B.A. - add "or its equivalent" next to ECO 220 under Economics Core in current Catalog.
14. Industrial Technology B.S. - revise program title, revise course prefixes INT to AEM within program, revise required courses within program core, drop credits from general electives, suspend the Industrial Distribution Option
15. Technology A.A.S. - revise course prefixes and course requirements in the program, reduce total number of hours in the Computer Electronics option from 44 to 39-40.

Program Suspension
16. Director of Special Education Alternate Certification
17. Special Education Learning and Behavior Disorders MAEd Alternative Certification

Senator Vice moved approval of item #1, seconded by Senator Wade. Motion carried.

Senator Vice moved approval of items #2 & #3, seconded by Senator Collins. Motion carried.
Senator Vice moved approval of items #4 through #15, seconded by Senator Taylor. Motion carried.

Senator Vice moved approval of items #16 and #17, seconded by Senator Borowski (?). Motion carried.

Senator Vice noted that there are at least two doctoral programs currently in the review process: 1) the Doctorate of Education in Educational Psychology and 2) the Occupational Therapy Doctorate.

REPORT FROM FACULTY REGENT: Senator Frisbie
The Finance and Planning Committee met on Monday, November 16.

One major order of business was to receive the yearly audit report from EKU’s external auditors, Deloitte and Touche. The Committee will recommend that the full Board accept the report at its next meeting. Deloitte gave the University a clear audit. Deloitte did make some recommendations for modifications to internal procedures, as they have in prior years. Changes have already been implemented to address those recommendations.

In 2008-09, the University increased its total assets by $32.5M (to $333.2M), but liabilities increased by $35.7M. Thus, net assets decreased by $3.2M to $217.3M. In light of a mid-year reduction of $1.5M in state funding and a loss of $6.4M in investment income, the financial health of the University was remarkably stable in 2008-09. The University Foundation had assets valued at $21.3M at the end of the year.

The second major order of business for the Committee was to hear a financial update from VP Debbie Newsom and the EKU financial staff. The University appears to be on track in terms of revenue and expenditures relative to revenue and expenditures at this time last year. Last year EKU overspent by a bit more than $2M. A big chunk of the over expenditure (about $4.5M) was generated by financial aid expenditures. These included institutional employment, employee scholarships, Beacon scholarships, and merit/entitlement scholarships. The over expenditures were made up by using some carry forward monies, realizing some savings in other parts of the budget, and drawing upon uncommitted funds. This year, expenditures for financial aid are being closely monitored. The budget includes an additional $800,000 for employee scholarships and new guidelines are being developed for recruiting and retention associated with Beacon scholarships. Because recruiting has already begun for students who will begin at EKU in FY2010, these new strategies will take effect in FY2011. In addition, due to prior commitments, the financial aid over expenditure situation will not disappear this year, but the University is moving to correct the problem. Overall, EKU is on track to maintain an uncommitted fund of about $6.4M.

The Committee also heard from Academic Affairs (Provost Janna Vice, Associate Provost/VP Jim Conneely, and Associate VP/Dean for Enrollment Linda Fossen) about efforts on the recruitment/retention front. The Committee had asked to see data pertaining to recruiting yield and data concerning effectiveness of scholarship expenditures relative to retention and graduation
of students. Data are available so far only for merit-based recipients. It is reassuring that merit-based scholarship recipients tend to stay in school (90-94% retention rates over the last 4 years) and graduate (79%, 5-year graduation rate; general student population graduation rate was 33%). The Committee also heard about ongoing and planned recruiting and retention efforts.

The Board will next convene for a regular quarterly meeting on January 29.

REPORT FROM SENATE CHAIR: Senator Ware

The December “Faculty First” will be at Arlington this Thursday at the new Colonel’s Paddock from 5pm to 7:30 p.m. Membership at Arlington is not required; all faculty are invited to participate.

The policy originator has withdrawn the request for a university policy on personal appearance and will pursue development of a departmental and college policy. Senator Ware thanked Senator Rainey for her willingness to serve on the drafting team.

Prior to the meeting, Senator Ware distributed information on pending legislation. She has discussed the issues with the Academic Quality Committee and suggested that the committee consider developing a resolution to address faculty concerns, if the Senate is in agreement.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST: Senator Vice

Senator Vice shared copies of two pieces of pending legislation which will have a significant impact on Kentucky’s public institutions: 1) transferability and 2) time to degree. CPE predicts that the two bills are almost guaranteed to pass. CPE President Bob King and Dr. Aaron Thompson plan to offer suggestions to the bills’ sponsors to make the bills more feasible for the universities, but the overall mandates are not likely to change. Dr. Aaron Thompson has asked the Chief Academic Officers for a list of their concerns by the end of today, and Senator Vice has already submitted her concerns. In particular on the transferability piece, she noted concerns (listed below) about items 2H, 2I, 2K, and item 4 (which was proposed by CPE).

(2) The Council on Postsecondary Education in collaboration with KCTCS and the public universities shall:

(h) Guarantee that upon admission to a public university, graduates of an associate of arts or an associate of science degree program approved by the council shall be deemed to have met all general education and program specific course prerequisites and be granted admission to related upper division degree programs of a public university on the same criteria as those students earning lower division credits at the university to which the student transferred.;

(i) Provide that graduates of approved associate of arts and associate of sciences degree programs who transfer to a bachelors degree program shall not be required to repeat or to take any additional lower-level courses to fulfill bachelors degree requirements in the same major;

(k) Establish a common college transcript to be used in KCTCS and all public universities;

(4) When a public university changes the learning outcomes within any course or program identified as a transfer equivalent, the state public university must communicate the change to KCTCS within a reasonable amount of time and either identify other KCTCS course equivalencies that will satisfy the new learning outcomes or collaborate with KCTCS to develop curriculum that ensures equivalent learning outcomes and thus Transferability must be resolved before the change is implemented. If disputes arise between public postsecondary institutions due to course and program revisions, the Council is empowered to appoint a committee, chaired by the Vice President of Academic Affairs at the Council, and comprised of distinguished faculty, with equal representation from KCTCS and the public universities, to resolve the dispute through evidence-based alignment of learning outcomes.

[Awaiting CAO feedback]
The second piece of legislation proposes that each public college and university formulate a plan listing strategies, incentives, programs, and timelines to increase the number of students who graduate with a bachelor of arts or a bachelor of science degree within four years of their initial enrollment.

Senator Vice requested that anyone with concerns about these two bills should email her and send a copy to their dean and chair as well.

The EKU Faculty Panel held a rich discussion regarding on-line education. Over 80 people attended on November 20. Thanks to the following faculty who, in addition to sharing their own experiences, gathered input from their colleagues in order to provide a very comprehensive view of the challenges and opportunities ahead in developing an EKU model for distance learning.

Richard Fern  Steve Sumithran  Mary Ann Kolloff
Mixon Ware  Brad Marcum  Tom Schneid
Rick Mott

Faculty Senators are invited to eat lunch with the Provost on Wednesday, December 2 from 11:30am-1pm in the Faculty Dining room. Please sign in at the register.

REPORT FROM COSFL: Nancy McKenney
COSFL met at the Frankfort offices of the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) on Saturday, November 21.

CPE Faculty Representative Nancy McKenney shared a copy of the Executive Summary from the recently completed “Final Report of the Governor’s Higher Education Work Group” and also COSFL’s recommendations which are in Appendix B of that report.

At the November 6th meeting of the CPE, the “2010-2012 Operating and Capital Budget Recommendation” was approved. This is a bare bones budget request. The news has reported that the request is for an increase of 4.6% for the first year of the biennium and 2.7% for the second year. However, this assumes that money will be provided for “strategic initiatives” of each campus. In the present economic climate it seems unlikely that the strategic initiatives will be funded. In that case, the budget increase would only be 2.2% for the first year and 0.4% for the second. The main concern is to replace $70 million worth of federal stimulus money which will run out after the current biennium.

Ed Conner, KSU Senate President, brought an urgent concern to the attention of COSFL members. It had been brought to his attention that legislation is being drafted by Senate Representative Carl Rollins, with input from State Senator Tim Shaughnessy, that would mandate transfer policy for students moving from KCTCS to any of Kentucky’s 4-year public institutions. The proposed bill states that all bachelor degree programs must require only 120 hours, with exception only for programs whose accrediting agencies require them to have more hours. Because of concerns on the part of Senator Shaughnessy that there be some common course numbers and common learning outcomes, no changes in the 30-hour general education core courses could be made by 4-year institutions without their consulting KCTCS first.
Aaron Thompson and Jerry Warmouth at the CPE have proposed modifications to the Transfer Bill in an attempt to make it consistent with the CPE’s Chief Academic Officers Transfer Action.

COSFL has been given a charge by CPE President Robert King to make recommendations for helping students to save money on textbook purchases.

COSFL plans to meet jointly with CPE in January. The date is yet to be determined.

**REPORT FROM FINANCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL: Senator Johnson reported for Senator Ware**

The Council met on Monday, November 23rd. The members were assured that information would be timely shared with both the FPC and the SPC during the budget approval process.

Tuition recommendations will be presented to the Board of Regents in January, and the general perimeters of the budget will be presented to the Board in April. The full budget will be presented to the Board in June.

The FPC is looking at the restructuring of tuition. Part of the meeting included a presentation for the Morehead model which basically deals with a per-credit-hour tuition charge which EKU has already implemented for the Graduate School for this year.

Senator Johnson thanked Provost Vice for stressing the need to turn around the loss of faculty revenues for the future.

Karen Neubauer gave a report on various scenarios that deal with the budgeting process.

**REPORT FROM STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL: Senator Taylor**

The Council is still in the process of gathering information. E.J. Keeley’s area has done an excellent job providing data.

*Academic Quality Committee.* Senator Shordike reported that the committee met today to begin drafting a resolution to address concerns about pending legislation. The resolution should be ready to present at the January Senate meeting.

*Budget Committee.* Senator Johnson reported that the committee met on November 9 to work on the Faculty Development motion. Later, the committee plans to work on developing guidelines for the use of the Faculty Development Funds.

The committee is also continuing work on the following:
1. Ways to provide input to the Financial Planning Council and the Strategic Planning Council about budget matters.
2. The loss of faculty lines either cut or unfunded over the last 5-10 years.
3. Gathering information about position over the last 5-10 years.
Rights & Responsibilities Committee. Senator J. Palmer reported that the committee is still in the process of reviewing the many policies and procedures that will constitute the new Faculty Handbook.

Rules Committee. Senator McKenney reported that the committee met on November 9th and 23rd to discuss the matter of term limits for faculty senators.

At the November 9th meeting, committee members shared the results of their informal survey of EKU’s benchmarks and also of other Kentucky public universities. Nineteen benchmark schools and seven Kentucky schools were surveyed. Of this group of 26 institutions, it was found that at least 10 do have some type of term limit for their faculty senators.

Among Kentucky schools, UK, KSU, and WKU have term limits, and U of L, Morehead, Murray, and NKU do not have limits. In other words, with the inclusion of EKU, in Kentucky 50% of the public university senates have term limits.

The committee decided to distribute an e-mail survey to all EKU Senators asking them to poll the faculty in their departments. Because the results of the survey did not suggest any clear course of action, the Rules Committee does not plan to propose any change at this time.

Welfare Committee. Senator Ciocca reported that the committee met on November 23.

Several items were discussed, including the joint November 4th meeting with the University Benefits committee. Below are some of the main points from that meeting.

1. 65% employees completed online enrollment (788 assisted and 738 self enrolled). Positive feedback was received about the new dental plan. Only 2% employees waived the dental benefit due to being covered by spouses elsewhere. Dental cards will be ordered for all participants.
2. The participation on the Flex Spending Account (FSA) for health expenditures is still low at 30%. There needs to be more consumer education on the FSA plans. Besides the tax savings by the individual, the University as a whole would save on the FICA amount as well.
3. Express Scripts provides EKU’s prescription benefits and they will be implementing a prescription home-delivering program, using emails and letters instead of phone calls. The Benefits Office will send out educational communications to employees prior to the start of the Select Home Delivery campaign. Implementation of Select Home Delivery will begin January 1, provided the Benefits office has educated employees up front about the program.
4. All 403b plans (supplemental retirement plans) must meet new compliance standards, similar to ERISA governed plans. All providers are compliant except two, American Funds and Prudential. Twenty-six employees currently participate in these plans and will be affected due to the new requirements. These employees will be notified that EKU can no longer do business with these funds, meaning they can no longer contribute new money into them, but can roll their funds over or choose a new supplemental retirement fund that is compliant.

In the Faculty Welfare meeting of November 23, the committee discussed the issue of faculty morale. Please send any ideas and suggestions on how to provide recognition and personal satisfaction to faculty with little or no cost to the Chair of the committee.

ADJOURNMENT
Senator Vice moved to adjourn at approximately 5:15 p.m.
To: Faculty Senate
From: The Committee on the Budget
Date: January 11, 2010

The Committee on the Budget requests that the Faculty Senate adopt the following motion at its meeting on November 30, 2009.

Faculty development funds are intended to enhance a faculty member’s academic credentials and professional capacity. The benefit of the funds should extend beyond the individual faculty member to the ultimate benefit of the discipline, the department, and/or the University.

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

NOTE:
The Senate Budget Committee plans to bring forward guidelines for the use of faculty development funds no later than the April Senate meeting.

JUSTIFICATION OF THE MOTION:

- Since the funding for faculty development has not increased over the years as it was originally intended to, this would give faculty the ability to “save” over a three year period and accumulate an adequate amount of funding for faculty development.
- Funding from departments is quite often not available or adequate for faculty to travel to conferences.
- Many departments have lost or gained faculty over the years and yet the funding to departments has not changed creating a situation with some departments being able to delegate more money to faculty development than others; and other departments have had their faculty development funds cut because of new hires.
- Since the money from Faculty Development funding has by practice been added to department M&O funds the Senate Budget Committee is recommending that the funding should be in a dedicated ORG. line item so it remains dedicated to individual faculty members’ development.

Respectfully submitted by the Faculty Senate Budget Committee: Marco Ciocca, Mike Hesse, Keith Johnson (Chair), Karen Petronio, Linda Wray, John Wade (Dean’s Representative), Debbie Newsom (VP for Financial Affairs – ex officio), Janna Vice (Interim Provost ex – ex officio), Mixon Ware (Faculty Senate Chair)
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.


**Procedures**

**POLICY ORIGINATING/VETTING/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.

3. **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 a develop 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/vetting. 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 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 Government Association that such policy is to be posted. Along with the Office of the University Counsel will also be notified prior to the 30-day comment period to begin legal review of the proposed policy that such policy will be posted for comment. 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. 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:
  - determine if further drafting or stakeholder feedback is necessary, or
  - make a recommendation to the President.

The Administrative Council may:
- recommend that the Office of Policy, Compliance and Governance re-convene 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.

- 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.

- 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 or from any stakeholder groups.

- 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.
Policy 1.1.1
Volume 1, Governance
Chapter 1, Policies, Regulations and Guidelines
Section 1, Policy on Policies

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 do not recommend approval for submission to the BOR;
   v. take other action as President deems appropriate.

*Pursuant to Part VII Section VII 4a, 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 is-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 REVISING 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 note the date of such changes (as Updated) on 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 Assistant 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.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policy Website</strong></th>
<th>A University website dedicated to housing University policies and all related information.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>President's Cabinet</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost Council</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognized University Unit or Organization</strong></td>
<td>Examples include: University Departments, RSO’s, Student Government Association, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulation</strong></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 may require presidential approval. Regulations may or may not apply institution wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Executive</strong></td>
<td>The University executive under whose jurisdiction a University policy falls. Depending on the scope, a policy may have more than one responsible executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Office(s)</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>The designation for University policy or regulation that provides the name of the individual policy or regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Governance</strong></td>
<td>As it relates to this policy, a joint effort of the university community for the development of University policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder</strong></td>
<td>Any individual or group who might be impacted by or might have knowledge related to a particular policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Template</strong></td>
<td>The official format for all University policies. See Related Links for a copy of the template.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University</strong></td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Academic Policy</strong></td>
<td>University policies that pertain to the academic mission and issues of the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Non-Academic Policy</strong></td>
<td>University policies that pertain to matters not considered academic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **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
Policy 1.1.1
Volume 1, Governance
Chapter 1, Policies, Regulations and Guidelines
Section 1, Policy on Policies

- 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 if 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 or is approved by the President.

---

## Violations of the 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

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 requires presidential approval.

University: Eastern Kentucky University

Interpreting Authority

President of Eastern Kentucky University
Relevant Links

Policy on Policies 1.1.1P

Policy Adoption Review and Approval
A resolution drafted by the Academic Quality Committee regarding recent legislative mandates affecting numbers of hours and course requirements for general education and degree programs

Whereas
The purpose of a university is to produce well-rounded citizens exposed to a liberal arts education.

Whereas
Students often come to EKU underprepared or unprepared to succeed as indicated in the current statistics from Institutional Research: for fall 2009, 1,124 new first-time students (42%) and 103 (8.3%) transfer students had at least one developmental education requirement, that receives no academic credit yet costs the same as a credit-bearing course.

Whereas
Professors trained in their field of study have a better knowledge of the core knowledge needed by students in their majors than an outside source.

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.

Whereas
Educational policy related to academic quality in higher education institutions is best determined by academicians from those higher education institutions affected rather than by the state legislature.

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

Submitted by:
Claire Schmelzer & Anne Shordike, Co-Chairs, Academic Quality Committee
January 11, 2010
TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

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

DATE: January 6, 2010

SUBJCT: CAA Agenda for Faculty Senate

As a result of the Council on Academic Affairs’ meeting on December 17, 2009, the following items are presented for the Faculty Senate’s agenda on January 11, 2010.

Curriculum Proposals

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.