

3-1-1999

Faculty Senate Minutes, Mar. 1, 1999

Eastern Kentucky University, Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://encompass.eku.edu/faculty_senate

Recommended Citation

Eastern Kentucky University, Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes, Mar. 1, 1999" (1999). *Faculty Senate*. Paper 63.
http://encompass.eku.edu/faculty_senate/63

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Minutes at Encompass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of Encompass. For more information, please contact Linda.Sizemore@eku.edu.

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, March 1, 1999 in the South Room of the Keen Johnson Building. Senate Chair Karen Janssen called the sixth meeting of the academic year to order at 3:30 p.m.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

M. Baxter*	P. Murray*	O. Feltus*
J. Levine*	K. Kilka*	R. Thompson
M. Chambers*	J. Thomas	

* denotes prior notification of absence to the Faculty Senate Secretary

Visitors to the Senate were:

Andrea Brown, Eastern Progress; Ann Chapman, Administration, Counseling and Educational Studies; Richard Chen, Accounting; Gary Corder, Law Enforcement; Leslie Covington, Vice President Student Government Association; Richard Crosby, Music; David Gale, Allied Health and Nursing; Bond Harris, Philosophy and Religion; Kirk Jones, Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science; Paula Kopacz, English; Stephanie McSpirit, Anthropology, Social Work and Sociology; Ronnie Mink, Staff Regent; Thomas Myers, Student Affairs; Robert Rogow, College of Business; Larry Sexton, Administration, Counseling and Educational Studies.

Approval of the Minutes

Senator Janssen called for additions or corrections to the February 1 minutes. Senator Chambers stated that a period should replace a ? on page two line two. There being no further corrections, the minutes were approved as amended.

Report from the President: Senator Kustra

President Kustra reported on several items of interest. The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) has recently issued a draft list of fifty benchmark institutions throughout the United States that are similar to Eastern or somewhere in the neighborhood of where EKU would like to be. Senator Kustra distributed the list of fifty, plus a list of current benchmarks that Eastern uses. (See [attachments 1 and 2](#)). CPE staff along with Eastern personnel will be reducing the list of fifty to twenty-four as soon as possible. Faculty are encouraged to contact the president with any suggestions they might have concerning the composition of the list.

The CPE has selected a company to develop a template for Web based courses for the Commonwealth Virtual University (CVU). President Kustra expressed some concern about the cost of implementing the CVU. He hopes that costs will not exceed what EKU currently spends on the three off-campus centers.

The president mentioned that the Board of Regents has expressed great concern over the issue of student retention. Collaterally related to this issue, Dr. Kustra enthusiastically endorsed the program of First Weekend which is intended to reinvigorate the campus culture on weekends. He

stated that retaining students on weekends is complex and will require time and resources to develop new or restore previously curtailed services on campus.

Report of the Executive Committee and Senate Chair: Senator Janssen

Senator Janssen reported that the Executive Committee met on February 8, 1999, and discussed the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on College for Workplace Training. The committee also addressed the need for nominations at the April meeting for the election of the Chair of the Faculty Senate. Finally, the policy that restricts the ECU teaching load of staff, which appears on page 104 of the **Faculty/Staff Handbook**, was discussed. In all likelihood a committee will be needed to clarify and study the implications of the policy.

Motion from Senator Harley

Senator Harley moved that the Chair of the Faculty Senate appoint an ad hoc committee to examine the four statements on "Teaching By Contract Staff and Classified Personnel" as listed on page 104 of the **Faculty/ Staff Handbook (1998-2000)**. The recommendations of this ad hoc committee are to be reported to the Faculty Senate at either the April or May meeting. Senator Banks seconded the motion, which was approved.

Report of the Faculty Regent: Senator M. Thompson

Senator M. Thompson reported on the February 19-20, 1999, ECU Board of Regents retreat. Although no decisions were made at the retreat, numerous issues were discussed in an open and cordial manner. Of particular interest was the question of retention of students. The group mentioned many factors that influence retention, from quality advising and teaching, especially to freshmen, to building the campus community through projects such as First Weekend, to the general attitude of faculty and staff that must be invitational and inclusive. Numerous strategies were discussed, such as establishing an office for retention to coordinate efforts and communication, training for staff, finding more resources and ways to help under- prepared students, working on the advising system, improving orientation, and many possibilities regarding student services and campus life.

Senator Thompson noted that there is a renewed vigor and commitment to retention, and that there will be some creative plans never tried before at this institution to address this vitally important issue. She stated that a clear message is growing that this is NOT "business as usual."

Report from the COSFL Representative: Senator Sowders

Senator Sowders reported on the February 20, 1999, COSFL meeting. Merl Hackbart, faculty representative to the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE), gave a brief report indicating that benchmarking is now being done institution by institution instead of lumping all comprehensive universities together. The CPE is working on budget requests for the next biennium, with requests to go to the executive branch in November for the January 2000 legislative session.

Dr. Gordon Davies, president of CPE, was a special guest. He talked about schools being evaluated by three methods:

1. Comparisons with benchmarks—Fifty schools that match ECU based on fifteen quantifiable criteria will be selected. Then the CPE staff will sit down with ECU officials to examine if these schools really match. Ultimately, they will try to get twenty- four that match (with ECU the 25th) and compare funding per student.
2. Performance—Instead of program sanctions, there will be rewards for meeting goals within a time frame, e. g., degree completion rates, equal opportunity goals.
3. Incentive funds—Some trust funds are not really trust funds--- the Commonwealth Virtual University, for example. He said that the programs of distinction were probably not a good idea, and the CPE is now wrestling with the problems of defining the real distinctiveness of comprehensive universities.

The CPE is also considering where Kentucky universities want to be in 2020. The Rand Corporation has been contacted to study what Kentucky will have to do to be average nationally by 2020, "average" referring to the number of people going to college and graduation rates. The results were that by 2014, Kentucky schools must enroll 60,000 more students and by 2020, 80,000 more. The enrollment in Kentucky now is about 150,000 in all public colleges and universities (including technical schools). Since about 67 % of students in Kentucky disappear, reaching those enrollment goals will be quite a challenge.

Dr. Davies responded to numerous questions. Among them were questions about whether or not colleges and universities can select the schools to which they will be compared (they cannot), about the effectiveness of programs of distinction and problems related to them, about what would happen in the next biennium to these programs (whether others would be developed or whether the current ones would simply continue?), and about financial problems in Kentucky that affect retention (e. g. too much money's being spent on remediation). Other concerns voiced had to do with space planning, the need to encourage the best high school students to remain in Kentucky, and the link between funding and benchmarking. Davies said that he would like for program decisions to be made by individual schools and further stated that he has proposed to the CPE that 33% of a school's budget come from tuition and fees and 67 % be contributed by the state (tuition policies to be determined by individual boards of regents).

Senator Barksdale asked Senator Sowders if the Kentucky Teachers and Employees Retirement Systems comparison which was mentioned in the February COSFL report to the Senate could be distributed. Chair Janssen agreed to distribute the comparison report with these minutes (See [attachment 3](#)). Report from the Student Senate: Mr. Adam Back

Mr. Back reported that a recently passed Student Government Association resolution that called for an extension of operating hours for the Begley Building exercise facility was, in fact, merely calling for a change in hours rather than an increase. Mr. Back mentioned that preparations are underway for April student elections.

Reports from Standing Committees

Committee on Elections: Senator McAdam Senator McAdam reported that at the May Senate organizational meeting, the following committee vacancies need to be filled:

Executive Committee - one Committee on the Budget - two Committee on Elections - two Committee on Rules - one Committee on Committees - two Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities - one

Nominations for the Chair of the Faculty Senate will be taken at the April Senate meeting. In addition, fifteen new senators need to be selected by the May meeting. Those senators whose terms end in May should encourage their Department Chairs to hold elections for new senators as soon as possible and to send the names to Marianne McAdam, phone # 1901, e-mail HEAMCADAM@acs.eku.edu. Committee on Committees: Senator Taylor Senator Taylor reported that the committee has designed the self-nomination form and established a time line for Department Chairs and Deans.

Committee on the Rules: Senator McCord Senator McCord reported that the committee has gathered information on changes that should be made to both the Senate's Rules and Internal Procedures booklets. Both booklets have been reviewed in detail along with recommendations for changes submitted by the Chair of the Senate, the Secretary, the Parliamentarian, and the chairs of each standing committee. The committee has identified a considerable number of substantive and editorial changes that should be made. Recommended changes will be sent to the Executive Committee for their information and review. The committee's goal is to have the two booklets corrected and reprinted by the May organizational meeting. Any changes to the Rules approved by the Faculty Senate will need to be approved by the Faculty-at-Large at the meeting in August. Committee on the Budget: Senator Rink Senator Rink reported that the committee is in the process of preparing its final report to the Faculty Senate.

Reports from Ad Hoc Committees

Ad Hoc Committee on Post -Tenure Review: Senator Murray In the absence of Senator Murray, committee members Drs. David Gale and Bond Harris responded to numerous questions, remarks, and issues on the post-tenure review motion, which had been postpone from the February 1, 1999, Senate meeting. Extended discussion centered around both positive and potential negative aspects of the motion. In the course of debate senators expressed concerns about who initiates the post-tenure review process, the need to add "failure to complete successfully a remediation plan" as a fifth reason for faculty termination in the Faculty/Staff Handbook, need for due process and proper grievance procedures to be established, source of funding for remediation, whether the merit evaluation is the only mechanism that triggers post-tenure review, the need to clarify how the five-year period will operate, and the potential corrosive affect post-tenure review might have on campus collegiality. In responding to the questions, Drs. Gale and Harris emphasized that the document under consideration was merely a statement of principles, not specific procedures, that merit evaluations are the sole criteria for the process, and that individual departments are responsible for establishing post-tenure review standards.

Senator Miller moved to delete item number six which reads "if a faculty member has been promoted to the rank of associate or full professor or recommended by a college for the Foundation Professorship during a five-year period, the faculty member will have fulfilled the requirements of the post-tenure review process for that five-year period." Senator MacLaren seconded the motion, which was approved. As a point of clarification, Senator Yoder suggested that "merit" be inserted before evaluations on the first line of item number three. The Senate agreed to this. Senator Huebner moved to amend the original motion to read "that a process for the implementation of post-tenure review be adopted using the following guidelines for the development of procedures." Senator Beck seconded the motion. Senator Mackinnon asked President Kustra if he intended to establish a committee to develop procedures for implementing post-tenure review. Senator Kustra responded that he will establish such a committee, composed of the University Council and other appointees, to insure that due process is followed every step of the way. The amendment was approved. The Senate then approved the following twice-amended main motion to read: That a process for the implementation of post-tenure review be adopted using the following guidelines for the development of procedures:

1. The procedure for post-tenure review commences after tenure has been granted and is required of all faculty and administrators who hold academic rank. All due process and other personnel policies must be followed.
2. The specific guidelines for the review process should be developed by the academic units with endorsement at the college level by deans and should be consistent with University policies and practices. These guidelines must take into account the unit's mission as well as unit and faculty responsibilities.
3. A faculty member receiving two annual merit evaluations within five years that are overall below the established standard of the academic unit must complete a comprehensive post-tenure review. Non-participation in the annual merit review system will be considered to be below the established standard. The comprehensive evaluation report must be reviewed by a committee consisting of faculty members selected by the academic unit. The review will be based on the available records of the faculty member's performance.
4. If the committee decides that the faculty members need to be engaged in a formal development plan, the individual will be required to participate in the formulation and implementation of the plan to remove identified deficiencies. The plan will include goals and objectives to be attained by the faculty member as well as identification of specific responsibilities of the faculty member during the review period. The committee must identify appropriate resources to support implementation of specific recommendations. This plan must be approved by the chair and the dean.
5. The faculty member will provide the committee with a summary of accomplishments and future plans 30 days prior to the end of the designated review period. Successful completion of the development plan, as determined by the original review committee, will initiate a new five-year review period.
6. A written record of all committee decisions and recommendations will be maintained.

7. Failure to complete the development plan requirements successfully or to achieve the departmental standards over a period of two years would initiate a recommendation for a terminal appointment contract as specified in the Faculty/Staff Handbook.

Senator Taylor moved that "the Faculty Senate requests that the President of the University appoint a committee to develop the post-tenure review procedures and that the procedures be sent back to the Faculty Senate for review and approval." The motion was seconded by Beck, which was approved.

Ad Hoc Committee on College Credit for Workplace Training: Senator Nelson Senator Nelson moved that the University change its policy on awarding of academic credit and begin awarding academic credit for training programs and experiential learning according to the following procedures:

Procedure I, Credit for Training Programs. Credit would be awarded for training programs, based on credit recommendations of the American Council on Education (ACE) as published in the ACE National Guide to Educational Credit for Training Programs. • Students would provide verification of successful completion of the training program to the Registrar; • Credits from official copies of the training program's records would be posted to the student's transcript using the appropriate guide; • Credits awarded would count toward the requirements for a specific degree program on the recommendation of the academic department and with the concurrence of the Dean of the College responsible for administering the degree program.

Procedure II, Credit for Occupational Experiences. In this procedure, credit would be awarded for experiential learning, based on the completion of requirements for either XXX 279, Occupational Subjects, or XXX 479, Advanced Occupational Subjects. • Students would present a packet of material (portfolio) for departmental evaluation; • A recommendation to award credits would be sent to the Registrar based on the departmental evaluation and after the student's successful completion of • 12 credit hours at Eastern Kentucky University and • a validation activity designed by the department • Credits awarded would be counted toward the requirements for a specific degree program on the recommendation of the academic department and with the concurrence of the Dean of the College responsible for administering the degree program.

Senator Steinbach seconded the motion. Considerable discussion ensued, which focused primarily on several questions surrounding implementation and concerns about procedure two. When asked, Senator Janssen mentioned that procedure two is being done by a few programs on campus. Senator Beck suggested that the Senate investigate how the Southern Association would look at accepting such credits. Senator Butler raised a question on how validation examinations would be administered by the various departments or colleges to test the student's level of knowledge. Senator Collins stated that it would be the responsibility of each department to develop criteria to measure the outcomes met by specific courses. In response to a question from Senator MacLaren concerning the maximum number of credit hours allowed under the procedures, Senator Collins stated that one to nine hours at both the lower and upper divisions without a letter grade being awarded and not to be calculated in the GPA. Senator Butler moved to separate procedure one from procedure two into two motions. Senator Miller seconded the motion, which was approved. The Senate then approved procedure one. Senator Goodwin moved

that a maximum of nine credit hours be allowed for procedures one and two. Senator Butler seconded the motion. Senator Culross mentioned that in procedure one, which the Senate just passed, the National Guide to Educational Credit for Training Programs standards sometime permits the granting of credit which exceeds nine hours. Senator Goodwin withdrew his original motion and moved to set a limit of nine credit hours for procedure two only. The motion passed by standing vote. Senator Banks moved to postpone further discussion of procedure two until the April meeting. Senator Butler seconded the motion, which was approved. New Business

Report from the Council on Academic Affairs: Senator Davis

Senator Davis moved approval of proposals from the Council on Academic Affairs. Senator Harley seconded the motion. The Senate approved the following proposals:

- Revision in department name from the College of Business: Department of Analysis and Information TO Department of Accounting, Finance, and Information Systems.
- Name change in the Master of Art in Student Personnel Services in Higher Education degree program from the College of Education TO Master of Arts in Human Services degree program.
- New options in the Master of Arts in Human Services degree program from the College of Education in Student Personnel Services in Higher Education and Community Agencies.
- New degree program in Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice from the College of Law Enforcement.

Adjournment

Senator Davis moved that the Senate adjourn. It adjourned at 5:24 p. m.