

10-1-2001

Faculty Senate Minutes, Oct. 1, 2001

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, Oct. 1, 2001" (2001). *Faculty Senate*. Paper 84.
http://encompass.eku.edu/faculty_senate/84

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.

Faculty Senate Meeting October 1, 2001

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, October 1, 2001 in the South Room of the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Schlomann called the second meeting of the academic year to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.

The following members were absent:

S. Black	K. Breeden	L. Collins*	R. Eisenberg	M. Hodge
D. Jones	S. Konkel*	M. Miranda	F. O'Connor*	

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

Visitors to the Senate were:

Gary Barksdale, Human Resources; Nick Bertram, Student Senate; Richard Freed, English; Karen Janssen, Special Education; Jessica Leake, *Eastern Progress*; and Elizabeth Wachtel, Academic Affairs.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The September 10, 2001 minutes were approved as written.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT: Eugene Hughes

Dr. Hughes indicated that he has appointed the members of the Alcohol Task Force and that committee will meet in the next couple of weeks.

Dr. Hughes stated that most of the members on the Centennial Committee have been appointed.

Dr. Hughes has asked Doug Whitlock to develop a formal organization of retirees for faculty and staff.

Dr. Hughes announced that the liquor license for Arlington was approved and alcohol sales began on the golf course today and will begin in the dining area tomorrow.

Dr. Hughes thanked the Faculty Senate and the campus community for their support during his service at Eastern.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR'S REPORT: Senator Schlomann

Senator Schlomann reported that the committee met on September 17 and reviewed the faculty workload recommendations; a motion will be presented later in this meeting.

Senator Schlomann indicated that Dr. Bankole Thompson presented a new application process to receive University monies for research. The committee commended the University Research Committee for their excellent work, made a few suggestions, and encouraged the University Research Committee to get further input from faculty before presenting the new process to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Schlomann sent an e-mail to all faculty, reminding them that the Senate's web page is the primary mechanism for informing faculty of the Senate's proceedings. Other memos will be sent to faculty as needed.

Senator Schlomann reminded the standing committees that they need to meet, elect a chair, and notify her of the selections as soon as possible.

COSFL REPORT: Dr. Richard Freed

Dr. Freed reported that COSFL met on September 22, 2001.

A motion was passed expressing concern about the search process, including minimal opportunity for meaningful involvement of faculty in the process, for the president at Murray State University.

STUDENT SENATE: Nick Bertram

Mr. Bertram reminded the Senators that the Blood Drive begins on campus on October 2 & 3.

Mr. Bertram announced that in an effort to get more faculty and staff involved in the Homecoming festivities, there would be a door decorating contest with the theme "there's no place like home."

Mr. Bertram mentioned that the plus/minus grading system is still being discussed by the Student Senate, and an opinion report will be coming to the Faculty Senate in the near future.

Mr. Bertram stated that there is a need to include diversity training as part of the new faculty/staff orientation. The Student Senate will be trying to move this forward and implement it soon.

Mr. Bertram announced that the Student Success Council met recently on the Ethnic Studies minor. Dr. Aaron Thompson is chairing this and will help identify the curriculum necessary to complete the minor.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Ad Hoc Committee on Compensation & Benefits: Keith Johnson

Senator Johnson made a motion that the Faculty Senate adopt the proposed plan from the Compensation & Benefits Committee in lieu of the salary equity motion that was passed at the April 2001 meeting. The proposal reads as follows: "The Faculty Senate recommends that individual faculty salaries for 2001 - 2002 be brought up to a minimum of 80% of the average salary (based on discipline and rank) as defined by the 2000-2001 CUPA (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources) National Faculty Salary Survey of our benchmark institutions." The motion was seconded by Senator Flanagan. The motion was approved by the Senate.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Foundation Professor Process. Senator Harley made a motion to table discussion indefinitely, seconded by Senator Flanagan. Motion to table indefinitely was passed by the Faculty Senate. After refinement of the policy, the Committee will bring it back to the Senate floor for action.

Faculty Workload Recommendations. Senator Schlomann reminded the Senate that last spring the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workload presented an excellent report with four recommendations. The recommendations were never acted upon. Senator Banks moved to adopt the faculty workload recommendations, seconded by Senator Siegel.

Senator Yoder made a motion to amend #4 to: "Recommend that the policy regarding advising be examined." The Senate approved the amendment.

The main motion, in its amended state, was adopted by the Faculty Senate.

Motion from University Research Committee. At the request of the University Research Committee, Senator Falkenberg moved to postpone discussion indefinitely, seconded by Senator Fisher. The Senate approved to postpone discussion indefinitely.

NEW BUSINESS:

Report from the Provost: Senator Marsden.

Senator Marsden passed out a tentative list of proposed academic priorities for 2001-2002. Senator Marsden is meeting with the colleges to discuss and refine the priorities. It will be posted on the Web after it is finalized and prioritized.

Senator Marsden also gave the Senators a copy of an executive summary of the Key Indicators of Progress toward Postsecondary Reform of Enrollment and Retention.

Intercollegiate Athletics Motion. Senator Fister made a motion for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to form an Ad Hoc Committee to examine the role of intercollegiate athletics at Eastern Kentucky University and to what extent funds used for intercollegiate athletics impacts the quality of academic programs at EKV. The committee should report its findings and recommendations to the Senate no later than February. Senator Rainey seconded the motion. Senator Schlomann postponed discussion on the motion until the November 5 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Senator Schlomann reminded the Senate that newly elected President Glasser will meet in Walnut Hall with Senators and guests from 2:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. on November 5 before the regularly scheduled meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

Senator Marsden moved to adjourn at 4:50 p.m.

Executive Committee Report

October 1, 2001

The Executive Committee met on September 17, 2001. We reviewed the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workload and will be bringing a motion later in this meeting to accept those recommendations. Dr. Bankole Thompson presented a new application process to receive University monies for research. The Committee commended the University Research Committee for their good work, made a couple of suggestions, and encouraged the University Research Committee to get further faculty input via departments prior to bringing it to Senate.

Since we no longer distribute hard copies of agendas and minutes to faculty, the Executive Committee decided to send a memo to all faculty, reminding them that the Senate's web page is the primary mechanism for informing faculty of the Senate's proceedings. We will at times send other memos to faculty to encourage their input in the decision making progress. We also encourage Senators to explore ways to communicate effectively with their departments.

I requested individuals to call the first meeting of committees to elect a chair and begin work. If you have not yet notified me of the chair selection, please do so.

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Compensation and Benefits Committee proposes that the Faculty Senate adopt the following motion in lieu of the Minimum Wage Motion which passed the Faculty Senate last April:

The Faculty Senate recommends that individual faculty salaries for 2001-2002 be brought up to a minimum of 80% of the average salary (based on discipline and rank) as defined by the 2000-2001 CUPA (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources) National Faculty Salary Survey of our benchmark institutions.

Rationale:

- >With CUPA being used for new hires on this campus, this allows for a more consistent approach to all faculty salaries.
- >Using the CUPA data is more legally defensible due to being data driven and it presents a consistency in figuring salaries.
- >This proposal is the most practical use of the available funds for this fiscal year, \$50,000.00.
- >This proposal moves Eastern Kentucky University closer to a desired market driven compensation plan.
- >This proposal is more reflective of market-based salaries according to discipline and rank.
- >This proposal does not increase inequities by creating more salary compression problems.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

Minimum Wage Motion passed last April:

1. The Faculty Senate recommends that the following minimum wage requirements be enacted:
 - >Professor (\$54,000)-Requirements: terminal degree, tenure, and 15 years of ECU experience
 - >Associate Professor (\$45,400)-Requirements: terminal degree and tenure
 - >Assistant Professor (\$36, 800)-Requirements: terminal degree
 - >Instructor (\$27,100)
2. This minimum would be implemented after determining the current faculty member's contract at 3% (50 COLA raise/50 merit).
3. Funds to implement this policy should be provided through the "Faculty Salary Equity Pool" proposed in the current budget at an allocation of \$50,000.
4. Additional funding (approximately \$30,000) should be added to this pool by requesting \$30,000 from the "Action Agenda" fund, which is subject to CPE approval.
5. After this minimum wage policy has been implemented, any remaining funds should be held for either resolving other salary inequities as specified by a university wide salary equity policy when approved by the ECU Faculty Senate or for continued implementation of this policy in the budget period of 2002-2003.

DRAFT
Foundation Professorships
Nomination, Evaluation, and Selection Procedures for 2001-2002

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

I. Nomination

- A. All full-time, tenured faculty members, whose major responsibility is teaching, and who hold the rank of Professor for a minimum of five years, are eligible to be nominated.
- B. Any full-time, tenured faculty member may submit a nomination for another qualified member. Self nominations are not permitted. Nominations will consist of the following criteria:
- i. Nomination Form: The completed nomination form should be the first page of the nomination.
 - ii. Narrative: Please describe the nominee ' s extraordinary success in teaching by providing a narrative that addresses the following criteria:
 - Outstanding teaching skills: using a variety of effective instructional techniques; motivating students to a high level of interest, and guiding students to a high level of learning and achievement;
 - Distinguished expertise or accomplishment in the discipline;
 - Self-motivated and enthusiastic about university teaching;
 - Creative and resourceful in fulfilling teaching responsibilities;
 - Exemplary in linking service and research to excellence in teaching;
 - Recognized by colleagues as making significant contributions for the good and advancement of the department, college, and university, rather than simply promoting one ' s own career;
 - Perceived as a team player, a collaborator, or a mentor for colleagues, students and in the community.
- Please limit this narrative to no more than five double-spaced pages.
- iii. Nominee ' s Vita: Provide a current vita.
- C. Nomination materials shall be submitted to the Chair of the Foundation Professor Selection Committee no later than the last Friday in October (October 26, 2001).

II. Preliminary Selection

The Foundation Professor Selection Committee will give full consideration to all eligible faculty nominated and, based on these nominations, select up to six Foundation Professor Candidates. Everyone who submitted a nomination will be notified of the committee ' s selections by the last Friday in November (November 30, 2001).

III. Submission of Additional Material

The Foundation Professor Selection Committee will request additional material, including but not limited to supporting recommendations from the nominee ' s department, chair and dean, for each of the final candidates selected in part II. This material will be submitted to the committee no later than the second Friday in January (January 11, 2002).

IV. Final Selection

The University Foundation Professorship Committee shall review all material submitted, conduct personal interviews with the candidates, and recommend the finalists to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research no later than the third Friday in February (February 15, 2002). The Provost shall transmit the recommendation, along with his own recommendation, to the President who shall notify the successful candidates. The Provost will notify the unsuccessful candidates. Announcement of the awards to the university community will be made in a timely way through appropriate university publications and the local news media.

V. Expectation

The Foundation Professor is expected to serve as an exemplar for the academic community. It is expected that the unique talents of the recipients will be shared with colleagues, in particular with junior members of the University faculty. The salary supplement of \$5,000 for a Foundation Professor assumes employment at full salary. There will be a proportionate reduction in the salary supplement for Foundation Professors who are not in full-time status at full salary, e.g. leave without pay for a semester or academic year sabbatical at one-half salary.

Motion: To adopt the following four recommends as proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workload

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In view of the fact that many seemed unaware of the existence of the current policy, it is recommended that the current policy, or its revised version, be widely circulated to both faculty and administrators.
2. The Committee recommends that Eastern move in the direction of reducing teaching loads. The Committee recognizes that because of the size and diversity of a comprehensive university, it is not possible and, probably not desirable, to have a simple and uniform set of rules governing faculty workload. A policy has to be flexible enough to allow for the many differences across disciplines and departments. We recognize that a uniform reduction in the standard teaching load from 12 hours to 9 hours is not likely to be feasible under current circumstances. However, it is quite possible that adjustments in teaching load are feasible in a number of areas. Because of the wide variation in disciplines, it is best handled at departmental levels.

It is proposed that a department, or discipline within a department, that wishes to have a reduced teaching load formulate a plan regarding scholarly activity and teaching load. Such a plan would indicate how the department proposes to generate its FTE credit hours, or an equivalent measure of output, and the nature of its research and scholarly activities. The plan would also include the plans of individual faculty in the department regarding research and scholarly activity. Where appropriate, the plan would also deal with the service responsibilities of the department. The plan would be submitted for approval to the Dean of the College and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. On approval, the plan would provide the framework for decisions regarding the allocation of workload in the department or discipline, as the case may be.

3. It is recommended that a benefit-cost analysis of the role of technology in the university be undertaken. Such a study would examine the effectiveness of technology in enhancing instruction and its cost in both monetary expenditures and faculty time.
4. It is recommended that the policy regarding advising be examined.

Executive Summary

Key Indicators of Progress toward Postsecondary Reform Enrollment and Retention

Higher education reform began in Kentucky with a special session of the General Assembly in 1997. The agenda for Kentucky's system of postsecondary education is set forth by the Council on Postsecondary Education in Vision 2020. Five key questions to measure progress have been asked:

- (1) Are more Kentuckians ready for postsecondary education?
- (2) Are more students enrolling?
- (3) Are more students advancing through the system?
- (4) Are we preparing Kentuckians for life and work?
- (5) Are Kentucky's communities and economy benefiting?

Higher education reform changed the way higher education institutions receive funds from the state. Prior to reform, the vast majority of dollars appropriated to the institution came as a single appropriation to the university's general fund and these dollars could be allocated for any purpose within the university consistent with state law. The 1997 legislation created several trust funds with specific purposes. For example, certain funds can only be used to support enrollment and retention efforts, faculty development, the endowment of professorships or the purchase of equipment. In some cases these various trust funds must be matched with university dollars.

In the Fall of 2000, EKV received \$755,000 from the Enrollment and Retention Trust Fund. These dollars have been used to support and enhance both student recruitment and retention efforts. Staff and counselors have been added to the

Admissions Office to increase our capacity to successfully recruit students. Minority student and international student recruitment have been enhanced. Full-time advisors have been hired to work with undeclared and developmental students. Dollars have been allocated to support various retention programs including increased tutoring services for students. One hundred thousand dollars has been used to fund retention scholarships.

In order to retain these dollars on a continuing basis ECU must meet certain performance goals. The goals established for these key performance indicators are delineated below, together with Eastern's progress in meeting these goals.

Enrollment

Key Indicators of Progress toward Postsecondary Reform

Are more students enrolling?

Undergraduate Enrollment									
	<u>Actual</u>			<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Goals</u>				
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
EKU	13,480	13,274	12,909	12,907	13,029	13,159,	13,291	13,424	13,558

Undergraduate enrollment is a total head count of all full and part-time undergraduate students.

Graduate Enrollment									
	<u>Actual</u>			<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Goals</u>				
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
EKU	1,922	1,914	1,748	1,855	1,800	1,836	1,892	1,930	1,960

Graduate enrollment is a total head count of all full and part-time graduate students.

Retention

Are more students advancing through the system?

One-year retention rates of first-time freshmen/Three-Year Average

	<u>Actual</u>			<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Goals</u>				
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
EKU	62.6%	62.0%	62.6%	65.0%	63.6%	64.8%	66.0%	67.0%	68.0%

Cohort: All fall first-time degree seeking full-time and part-time freshmen. First-time freshmen, who enrolled in the summer and as full-time students at the same institution in the following fall semester, and first-time sophomores, who earned college credit before graduation from high school will also be included. A three-year average is calculated.

While presently not tied to the allocation of funds the CPE is also tracing the six-year graduate rate of bachelor students.

Six-Year Graduation Rate of Bachelor Students

	<u>Actual</u>			<u>Actual</u>	<u>Goals</u>				
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
EKU	26.8%	31.5%	30.0%	TBD	32.0%	33.5%	35.5%	37.5%	40.0%

Cohort: Fall first-time freshmen (baccalaureate, full-time). First-time freshmen who enrolled in the summer and as full-time students at the same institution in the following fall semester and first-time sophomores, who earned college credit before graduation from high school will also be included.

Five-Year Graduation Rate for Transfer Students/Three-Year Average

	<u>Actual</u>		<u>Actual</u>	<u>Goals</u>				
	1998-2000 Three-Year Average		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
EKU	52.1		TBD	53.0%	54.0%	55.0%	56.0%	57.0%

Cohort: All first-time transfer students (baccalaureate, full-time) with 30 or more credit hours in the fall semester.

Meeting and exceeding these enrollment and retention goals is critical for Eastern Kentucky University. The entire university community is committed to helping our students succeed and contributing to the progress of postsecondary reform in Kentucky.

The complete set of goals for all of Kentucky's public institutions follows beginning on page four.

Key Indicators of Progress toward Postsecondary Reform

4

Are more students enrolling?

Undergraduate Enrollment

Institution	Actual			Goals					% Change	
	1998	1999	2000	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	1998-06	2000-06
Eastern Kentucky University	13,480	13,274	12,909	13,029	13,159	13,291	13,424	13,558	0.6	5.0
Kentucky State University	2,205	2,277	2,129	2,400	2,500	2,550	2,600	2,650	20.2	24.5
Morehead State University	6,743	6,645	6,755	6,979	7,025	7,123	7,196	7,268	7.8	7.6
Murray State University	7,349	7,299	7,492	7,700	7,800	7,900	7,950	8,000	8.9	6.8
Northern Kentucky University	10,643	10,672	10,859	11,800	12,100	12,400	12,700	13,000	22.1	19.7
University of Kentucky	17,157	16,847	16,899	17,050	17,175	17,300	17,400	17,500	2.0	3.6
University of Louisville	14,647	14,710	14,477	14,420	14,370	14,300	14,300	14,300	(2.4)	(1.2)
Western Kentucky University	12,713	12,921	13,272	14,100	14,200	14,300	14,400	14,500	14.1	9.3
Subtotal	84,937	84,645	84,792	87,478	88,329	89,164	89,970	90,776	6.9	7.1
Lexington Community College	6,118	6,807	7,214	8,000	8,160	8,323	8,490	8,660	41.5	20.0%
KCTCS	45,529	46,035	52,201	60,938	65,204	70,094	75,351	78,365	72.1	50.1
Total Public Institutions	136,584	137,487	144,207	156,416	161,693	167,581	173,811	177,801	30.2	23.3
Independent Institutions	24,173	24,099	25,159	25,200	25,700	26,200	26,700	27,200	12.5	8.1
System Total	160,757	161,586	169,366	181,616	187,393	193,781	200,511	205,001	27.5	21.0

Key Indicators of Progress toward Postsecondary Reform

Are more students enrolling?

Graduate/Professional Enrollment

Institution	Actual			Goals					% Change	
	1998	1999	2000	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	1998-06	2000-06
Eastern Kentucky University	1,922	1,914	1,748	1,800	1,836	1,892	1,930	1,960	2	12.1
Kentucky State University	98	116	125	125	127	133	140	147	50	17.6
Morehead State University	1,520	1,526	1,572	1,623	1,647	1,670	1,689	1,709	12.4	8.7
Murray State University	1,554	1,615	1,649	1,740	1,780	1,820	1,860	2,000	28.7	21.3
Northern Kentucky University	1,156	1,104	1,242	1,385	1,445	1,520	1,570	1,610	39.3	29.6
University of Kentucky	6,552	6,219	6,217	6,550	6,679	6,740	6,784	6,817	4	9.7
University of Louisville	5,562	5,424	5,627	5,705	5,768	5,872	5,902	5,937	6.7	5.5
Western Kentucky University	2,169	2,202	2,244	2,340	2,350	2,360	2,370	2,380	9.7	6.1
Total	20,533	20,120	20,424	21,268	21,632	22,007	22,245	22,560	9.9	10.5

Are more students advancing through the system?

One-Year Retention Rates of First Time Freshmen

Three-Year Average

Institution	Actual			Goals					% Change	
	1998	1999	2000	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	1998-06	2000-06
Eastern Kentucky University	62.6%	62.0%	62.6%	63.6%	64.8%	66.0%	67.0%	68.0%	5.4%	5.4%
Kentucky State University	56.2%	61.4%	63.7%	64.7%	65.7%	66.7%	68.0%	70.0%	13.8%	6.3%
Morehead State University	66.5%	63.6%	61.7%	63.5%	64.4%	65.4%	66.3%	67.2%	0.7%	5.5%
Murray State University	70.2%	69.4%	69.8%	70.8%	71.3%	71.8%	72.4%	72.9%	2.7%	3.1%
Northern Kentucky University	63.4%	63.6%	63.3%	65.0%	65.8%	66.6%	67.5%	68.3%	4.9%	5.0%
University of Kentucky	78.6%	78.5%	79.2%	79.5%	80.0%	80.5%	81.0%	82.4%	3.8%	3.2%
University of Louisville	70.7%	70.1%	70.2%	72.2%	73.2%	74.2%	75.2%	76.1%	5.4%	5.9%
Western Kentucky University	65.4%	66.5%	67.9%	69.1%	69.7%	70.3%	70.9%	71.5%	6.1%	3.6%
Lexington Community College	61.1%	61.4%	62.0%	63.0%	63.0%	63.0%	63.0%	63.0%	1.9%	1.0%
KCTCS	53.0%	53.3%	53.5%	55.2%	56.0%	56.8%	57.6%	58.5%	5.5%	5.0%

Key Indicators of Progress toward Postsecondary Reform

Are more students advancing through the system?

Six-Year Graduation Rates of Bachelor's Students

Institution	Actual			Goals					% Change	
	1998	1999	2000	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	1998-06	2000-06
Eastern Kentucky University	26.8%	31.5%	30.0%	32.0%	33.5%	35.5%	37.5%	40.0%	13.2%	10.0%
Kentucky State University	17.7%	31.3%	31.2%	32.0%	33.0%	34.0%	35.0%	36.0%	18.3%	4.8%
Morehead State University	40.1%	44.0%	38.6%	42.0%	43.0%	44.0%	45.0%	46.0%	5.9%	7.4%
Murray State University	38.5%	40.9%	46.3%	47.7%	48.4%	49.0%	49.7%	50.4%	11.9%	4.1%
Northern Kentucky University	30.1%	32.3%	35.4%	36.0%	36.5%	37.0%	37.5%	38.0%	7.9%	2.6%
University of Kentucky	50.8%	52.2%	55.3%	56.4%	56.8%	57.4%	58.0%	58.6%	7.8%	3.3%
University of Louisville	29.9%	31.6%	30.8%	34.7%	36.7%	38.6%	40.6%	42.6%	12.7%	11.8%
Western Kentucky University	39.1%	37.7%	41.5%	41.6%	41.8%	42.0%	43.2%	44.4%	5.3%	2.9%

Key Indicators of Progress toward Postsecondary Reform

Are more students advancing through the system?

Five-Year Graduation Rates of Transfer Students

Three-Year Average

Institution	1998-2000	Goals					% Change
	Three-Year Average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2000-06
Eastern Kentucky University	52.1%	53.0%	54.0%	55.0%	56.0%	57.0%	4.9%
Kentucky State University*	35.3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Morehead State University	55.0%	56.0%	57.0%	58.0%	59.0%	60.0%	5.0%
Murray State University	60.6%	62.0%	62.5%	63.0%	63.5%	64.0%	3.4%
Northern Kentucky University	55.3%	55.4%	55.5%	55.6%	55.7%	55.8%	0.5%
University of Kentucky	49.2%	51.5%	52.0%	52.5%	53.0%	54.0%	4.8%
University of Louisville	38.6%	41.9%	42.2%	42.4%	42.7%	43.1%	4.5%
Western Kentucky University	62.4%	62.2%	62.3%	62.4%	62.5%	62.6%	0.2%

*Cohort sizes are too small