Faculty Senate Agenda
November 4, 2002
3:30 p.m.

Call to order

Approval of Minutes:

October 7, 2002

Reports:

Report from the President: Senator Glasser
Report from the Executive Committee Chair: Senator Johnson
Report from the Faculty Regent: Senator Schlomann
Report from the COSFL Representative: Senator Siegel
Report from the Provost: Senator Wasicsko
Report from the Student Government Association: Lucas Hammons
Report from Standing Committees:
      Budget Committee: Senator Wade
      Rules Committee: Senator Yoder
      Rights and Responsibilities Committee: Senator Gillaspie
      Elections Committee: Senator Everett
      Committee on Committees: Senator Wolf
Report from Ad Hoc Committees:
      Lecturers/Part-Time Lecturers: Renee Everett, chair
      Compensation and Benefits Committee: Senator Rahimzadeh
      Plus/Minus Grading: Senator Fisher

Unfinished Business:

Motions by Senator Reed:
    I move that the Faculty Senate:
1.   Formally express concern about attorney General John D. Ashcroft's description of Professor Steven Hatfill as a "person of interest" and the potential threat that similar departures from constitutional procedures may pose for the academic integrity and mission of our nation's universities.

2.   Create a committee charged with clarifying post-9-11 academic challenges and how the University can best maintain the academic integrity, freedom, and responsibilities of faculty and administrators.
Or,
 In lieu of creating a new committee, in the interests of shared governance expand the title and responsibilities of the Faculty Rights and Responsibility Committee to include Faculty-Administration Rights and Responsibilities and give them the charge stated immediately above.

3.   Ask COSFL to address post-9-11 academic challenges, freedom, and responsibilities, including the firing of Professor Steven Hatfill.

Motion by Senator Dunston:

> Be it therefore resolved:
>
> That the number of Administrators (includes executive and administrative officers and professional non-faculty) at this Institution has increased and continues to increase (516 in '99, 572 in '00, 599 in '01);
>
> That the Administrative searches underway be terminated and that Interim Administrative personnel "make do" until a better economic future is proposed;
>
> That as monies become available, said funds be allocated first for teaching faculty replacement positions at Eastern Kentucky University and then for hiring additional teaching faculty (680 in '99, 643 in '00, 643 in '01).

New Business:

Report from the Council on Academic Affairs: Senator Wasicsko
1.   Course by Special Arrangement
2.   Protocol for Dual Degree Agreements

Compensation and Benefits Committee Motion(s)

Rules Committee Motion

University Athletics Committee Report (Informational Item Only - will be open for discussion at the December meeting) - [distributed by e-mail prior to Senate agenda mailing]

University Research Committee Report

Interdisciplinary and Team Teaching Task Force Report

Adjournment

Faculty Senate Minutes
October 7, 2002

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, October 7, 2002 in the South Room of the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Johnson called the second meeting of the academic year to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.

The following members were absent:

J. Allison*, M. Baxter, D. Carter*, L. Collins*, J. Dantic, S. Fister, B. Gadd*, L. Gillaspie, D. Jones, L. Patterson, M. Pierce, and E. Rini.

*Indicates prior notification to the Senate Secretary.

Visitors to the Senate were:
Lucas Hammons, Student Government Association; Ken Johnston, Finance; Jack Lengyel, Athletics; Derita Ratcliffe, Athletics; Jennifer Rogers, *The Eastern Progress*; Bob Rogow, Business and Technology; Aaron Thompson, Academic Affairs; Janna Vice, Business and Technology; Elizabeth Wachtel, Academic Affairs; and Doug Whitlock, Administrative Affairs.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Senator Johnson announced that Sigma Nu wished to express their appreciation to all EKU faculty. As a token of their appreciation, they donated two cakes as refreshments for the senators and guests at today's meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The September 9, 2002 minutes were approved with the following corrections.

On page 3 under COSFL report change the following sentence from:
"Currently COSFL is in search of a new head of the Council on Postsecondary Education" to:
"Currently COSFL is participating in the search for a new head of the Council on Postsecondary Education.

On page 5 under Budget Committee Election, change "Senator Rini was elected to serve as a one-year replacement for Senator Rink on the Budget Committee." to "Senator Rainey was elected to serve as a one-year replacement for Senator Rink on the Budget Committee."

PRESIDENT'S REPORT: Senator Glasser
President Glasser announced that when the finalists for the head of CPE are known, she will share that information with the Senate.

The Council on Postsecondary Education held a two-day conference last week in Lexington for all university Presidents and Board members to discuss higher education and the current financial environment. President Glasser stated that all universities throughout Kentucky, and throughout the country, are experiencing financial crunches due to the national recession, but also to how state-wide economies are responding to the recession. Because of the Governor's continued support, higher education has been held relatively harmless from all the cuts that have taken place on all state agencies with the exception of one cut. While official notification has not been received, all the presidents have been told to prepare for a budget cut or reallocation of resources. Preparations have begun for the proposed budget cut, which is predicted to be between 3-5 percent. Everything depends on the state's financial condition after the first of the year as to whether or not an additional cut is to be made.

President Glasser asked for the Faculty Senate's support during these difficult financial times. Eastern's financial situation is even more complex because of the lack of deferred maintenance on campus and the electrical problems that have been experienced in the past six months. President Glasser expressed hopes that Eastern can draw upon its strength as a strong, united community to weather this financial storm.

Emphasis on faculty and staff and student services continues to be high priority for President Glasser. To the extent possible, the President wants to protect employees' jobs and hopes to maintain health insurance coverage. In addition, the President has created a budget council that will be meeting next week to start on budget deliberations. Input from faculty is welcomed. The President reiterated her offer to visit all departments to speak with faculty regarding their concerns and issues. At this point she has visited five departments and has discussed EKU's financial condition openly and candidly with faculty.

A list of university committees is now available online. If there are any questions or comments about the new university committee structure, please let either Dr. Wasicsko or the President know.

President Glasser will be giving her recommendations for the alcohol policy to the Board of Regents at the November Board meeting. She commended the Alcohol Task Force Committee for their excellent work on their report. The task force recommended that the current alcohol policy be expanded to include Stratton and Perkins and the new Business and Technology Building when it comes online in the future. The President is considering expanding the recommendations to include the Keen Johnson Building for events and receptions, the Giles Gallery for art exhibits and theater receptions, and the Moberly Building for receptions. However, her recommendation will include absolutely no provisions for alcohol in any of the residence halls or in any of the classroom buildings.

The parking committee has been asked to forward their recommendation to the President before the end of the academic semester for at least one, and possibly two, new lots to deal with the parking shortage, in particular for commuter students.

The rural Law Enforcement Building dedication is going to take place this Saturday in Hazard. President Glasser, Congressman Hal Rogers and Mayor Goreman will dedicate the building.

President Glasser announced that the United Way Campaign will begin on campus on October 23. She indicated that EKU's participation in the last couple of years has fallen short in comparison with both public and private schools in Kentucky. She encouraged everyone to participate.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR'S REPORT: Senator Johnson.
Senator Johnson reported that the Executive Committee met on September 23.

At the request of the Athletics Committee, The Athletic Committee's report was deferred to the next Executive Committee meeting.

The Executive Committee discussed the request to postpone the sick leave policy indefinitely.

The Faculty Senate budget cut was discussed and the committee were in agreement to change the refreshments to cover the budget reduction. Aramark will continue to be used for coffee and punch; however, cookies will be purchased off campus for the Senate. Senator Johnson requested input from the Senators as to whether or not to continue with refreshments. Comments should be e-mailed to him.

Senator Dunston was in attendance to present a proposal for a motion concerning replacing faculty positions.

FACULTY REGENT: Senator Schlomann
Senator Schlomann reported that most of the Board members attended the Governors Conference on postsecondary education trusteeships. The Board did manage to meet informally during this time and discuss current finances at Eastern.

Senator Schlomann announced that the next Board of Regents meeting will be on November 8.

COSFL REPORT: Senator Siegel
Senator Siegel reported that COSFL met on September 14 in the W.T. Young Library at the University of Kentucky. At that meeting the following officers were elected: Rick Felkhoff, University of Louisville - President; Carol Bredemeyer, Northern Kentucky University - Vice - President; Carolyn Siegel, Eastern Kentucky University - Treasurer; and Bill Pierce, University of Louisville - Secretary.

A wide-ranging discussion was initiated concerning COSFL's relationship with CPE and its staff. Richard Freed, CPE faculty representative, reported that COSFL will be included in meetings with presidential search finalists around the third week of October.

COSFL's participation in the workshop session on Shared Governance at the Governor's Conference for Trustees and Regents on September 22-23 was explained.

Senator Siegel shared with the Senate information received from the September 22 CPE meeting stating that:

1. As of Fall 2002, there is a 4.9 percent increase (8,838 more students) in enrollment in Kentucky's public colleges and universities than in Fall 2001.
2. Since 1998, enrollment in Kentucky's public colleges and universities has increased 19.9 percent (over 31,500 students). Almost 190,000 are enrolled.
3. Since 1998, the Kentucky Community and Technical College System has increased enrollment by 45.8 percent (20,800 students).
4. Enrollment in the Kentucky Virtual University has grown from 230 students and nine programs in Fall 1999 to 9,732 students and 32 programs in Fall 2002.

COSFL will meet in mid-October in Frankfort with CPE staff and again in November after revenue forecasts have been made public.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT REPORT: Lucas Hammons

Mr. Hammons reported that SGA office renovations are now complete.

The senators were issued an invitation to attend the student reception on Tuesday from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Mary Hall, SGA Vice President, will lead a campus safety walk on Tuesday, October 8 to address concerns dealing with safety.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Budget Committee. Senator Wade reported that the committee met twice since the last senate meeting and discussed several budget issues. Vice President Johnston spoke with the committee and addressed some concerns raised, especially pertaining to the Athletics area. The University Athletics Committee report, when available, should answer most of the questions raised.

Senator Wade mentioned that the committee reviewed the University's 5% budget cut and found that most of the reduction was handled by the President off the top, with only 1.36% taken from the various units on campus. The portion of the Athletics budget cut was over $33,000.

AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Plus/Minus Grading Committee. Senator Fisher reported that the Plus/Minus Grading Committee has met four times this year. The Ad Hoc Committee will develop a plan to meet the original motion passed by the Senate in May and hopes to present the plan at the November 4 Faculty Senate meeting. The members of the committee are: Dr. Martin Diebold, Lance Melching (undergraduate student), Matt Schumacher (graduate student), Dr. Daniel Thorne, Dr. Meredith Wells, and Dr. James Wells.

Compensation and Benefits Committee. Senator Rahimzadeh reported that the committee met on September 12 and again on September 26. The committee will bring forward a motion or motions on merit pay and salary inequities at the November or December Senate meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Sick Leave Policy. Senator Banks moved to postpone the sick leave policy indefinitely, seconded by Senator Miranda. The motion to postpone indefinitely was approved by the Senate.

Motions Regarding an LSU Faculty Member's Termination. Senator Reed proposed three motions.

Motion 1: Senator Reed moved that the Senate formally express concern about Attorney General John D. Ashcroft's description of Professor Steven Hatfill as a "person of interest" and the potential threat that similar departures from constitutional procedures may pose for the academic integrity and mission of our nation's universities.
The motion was seconded by Senator Siegel for discussion.

Motion 2: Senator Reed moved to Create a committee charged with clarifying post-9-11 academic challenges and how the University can best maintain the academic integrity, freedom, and responsibilities of faculty and administrators.
Or,
In lieu of creating a new committee, in the interests of shared governance expand the title and responsibilities of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee to include Faculty-Administration Rights and Responsibilities and give them the charge stated immediately above.
The motion was Seconded for discussion by Senator Dunston.

Motion 3: Senator Reed moved to ask COSFL to address post-9-11 academic challenges, freedom, and responsibilities, including the firing of Professor Steven Hatfill.
The motion was seconded by Senator Siegel for discussion.

Senator Johnson indicated that as these are substantive motions, discussion and voting will be postponed until the next Faculty Senate meeting. Senator Reed invited the senators to e-mail their comments regarding the motions to him.

NEW BUSINESS:

<u>Report from the Council on Academic Affairs</u>. Senator Wasicsko moved approval of the following five items, seconded by Senator Fisher. The Senate approved the motion.

1. Graduate Record Exam Changes **(Information Item Only)**
2. Insurance (BBA) - Program Reactivation
3. Medical Transcription Certificate - Suspend
4. Leisure Studies Department Name Change
5. Insurance & Risk Management (BS) - Suspend

<u>Motion Concerning Faculty Replacement Positions</u>. Senator Dunston moved that the Senate recommend the following resolution, seconded by Senator Long:

Be it therefore resolved:
That the number of Administrators (includes executive and administrative officers and professional non-faculty) at this institution has increased and continues to increase (516 in 1999, 572 in 2000, and 599 in 2001);

That the Administrative searches underway be terminated and that Interim Administrative personnel "make do" until a better economic future is proposed;

That as monies become available, said funds be allocated first for teaching faculty replacement positions at Eastern Kentucky University and then for hiring additional teaching faculty (680 in 1999, 643 in 2000, 643 in 2001).

Senator Johnson ruled that as this is a substantive motion, voting will be deferred to the next Faculty Senate meeting.

<u>Report from Interdisciplinary Team Teaching Task Force</u>. Senator Johnson announced that the committee requested to postpone their report until the November Senate meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

Senator Wasicsko moved to adjourn at approximately 4:50 p.m.

In response to suggestions, I have revised motion #2 in a way that combines the original motion and suggestions from others. Tom

I move that the faculty senate:

1. Formally express concern about Attorney General John D. Ashcroft's description of Professor Steven Hatfill as a "person of interest" and the potential threat that similar departures from constitutional procedures may pose for the academic integrity and mission of our nation's universities.

2. Create a committee charged with clarifying post-9-11 academic challenges and how the University can best maintain the academic integrity, freedom, and responsibilities of faculty and administrators.

Or, in lieu of creating a new committee, in the interests of shared governance expand the title and responsibilities of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee to include Faculty-Administration Rights and Responsibilities and give them the charge stated immediately above.

3. Ask COSFL to address post-9-11 academic challenges, freedom, and responsibilities, including the firing of Professor Steven Hatfill.

SEEKING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE:

Last Spring, the President in a statement before the Senate requested the termination of all "non-essential" searches, thereby ending a search by the History department for a Diplomatic Historian. Since that time, this Department has faced two great gaps in the curriculum design of its three degree programs with the loss of the Latin American specialist and the 19th Century American specialist. The Department's teaching faculty agreed to "make do" until the University's financial system became better and we could begin to rebuild the programs by hiring essential replacements. However, at the first Senate meeting of the 2002-2003 school year, the President informed the Senators about four national searches for Administrative officers, two of which are already underway. By this action, one might assume then that there is at the very least monies available to replace teaching faculty at this teaching University and the Department will not have to "make do" for much longer.

Based on information which I have received from my Department Chair, this is NOT the case. All faculty positions remain frozen. If this is true, then this University is on its way to becoming even more "top-heavy" and in the process, denying the essential relevance of the teaching faculty. It does not make financial or ethical sense to replace interim administrative officers and leave programs such as ours without the necessary personnel to continue to effectively serve the History Department majors and minors, the General Education program, the Graduate School, and the College of Education. This Department cannot be the only one facing such a crisis.

Be it therefore resolved:

That the number of Administrators (includes executive and administrative officers and professional non-faculty) at this Institution has increased and continues to increase (516 in '99, 572 in '00, 599 in '01);

That the Administrative searches underway be terminated and that Interim Administrative personnel "make do" until a better economic future is proposed;

That as monies become available, said funds be allocated first for teaching faculty replacement positions at Eastern Kentucky University and then for hiring additional teaching faculty (680 in '99, 643 in '00, 643 in '01).

G.D. Dunston, Senator
Department of History

Course by Special Arrangement
October 15, 2002

A course by Special Arrangement is a course that is part of the approved curriculum program but is being offered to a student during a term or at a time when it is not scheduled. It should be employed only in cases of extreme scheduling conflict when no substitution is appropriate. Prior to registration, students must file the Course By Special Arrangement Petition. This petition requires the signature/approval of the instructor, program chair and dean. An additional $100 per semester hour fee is assessed in addition to regular tuition and fees.

PROTOCOL FOR DUAL DEGREE AGREEMENTS

BETWEEN EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

AND FOREIGN EXCHANGE INSTITUTIONS

The following policies and procedures shall govern arrangements to award dual degrees to foreign students who attend Eastern Kentucky University and to EKU students who attend foreign exchange institutions under the auspices of exchange agreements or other agreements:

1. The dual bachelor's degree agreement shall be developed by the deans of participating colleges in cooperation with appropriate representatives from foreign exchange institutions and shall be submitted to the Provost for final approval.

2. The deans and department chairs shall determine exactly which courses need be taken by the foreign candidates to complete the major in each given field of study, and these courses must be specified. Likewise, they shall determine which courses EKU students must take at the foreign institution to complete their EKU degrees.

3. Dual degree arrangements will normally require at least one full academic year in residence at the host institution (25% of the total semester hours) and three years at the home institution (75% of the total semester hours). However, other variations may be approved by the deans of the colleges for their respective colleges.

4. Each institution shall accept all course work from the other either as elective credit or as credit for required courses, based on transfer equivalency evaluations.

5. If dual degrees are awarded concurrently, the program must at minimum meet SACS, CPE, and the college, departmental, and program requirements for general education, either by taking the general education courses or by transfer credit or by a combination of these means. If the foreign degree is awarded a year or a semester in advance, then the candidate will be awarded post-baccalaureate status and the general education requirement will no longer be applicable.

6. A copy of each dual degree agreement approved by the Provost shall be kept on file in the International Education Office, and that office shall also maintain a file of EKU students who are attending foreign institutions under dual degree agreement as well as foreign students who are attending EKU under dual degree agreement.

Whereas salaries must remain competitive if the University is to attract and retain outstanding faculty, thereby maintaining a position of strength relative to its benchmarks; and

Whereas meaningful annual salary increases for those who perform satisfactorily are the best way to avoid long-term salary inequities and real dollar losses in earnings,

The Ad Hoc Committee on Compensation and Benefits recommends the following motions to the Faculty Senate:

1. The University's standard faculty salary award should reflect the Cost of Living Allowance based on the National Consumer Price Index. Any remaining funds allocated for salary increases should then be used toward merit pay.

2. The University should provide a pool of money each year to address salary equity issues. The procedures according to which equity adjustments are made shall be recommended to the Faculty Senate by an ad hoc committee comprised of the Faculty Welfare Committee and administrative representatives selected by the President.

STANDING RULES

1. At the organizational meeting in May, the Chair of the Senate shall distribute to the members of the Senate:
    - (a) A compendium of <u>Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised</u>, which governs the conduct of the meetings of the Faculty Senate.
    - (b) A copy of the <u>Organization of the Faculty</u> and the <u>Special Rules of Order and Standing Rules of the Faculty Senate</u>.
    - (c) A list of the current standing committees and <u>ad hoc</u> committees.
    - (d) Notification of the location of Faculty Senate files, indexes, and minutes.

2. The Secretary of the Senate shall prepare a seating chart of the Senate each fall, and members of the Senate shall be assigned permanent seats alphabetically.

3. The hour of regular Senate meetings shall be 3:30 p.m. and meetings of the Senate shall adjourn by 5:30 p.m.

_____

Changes pending approval by Faculty Senate:

1. At the organizational meeting in May, the Chair of the Senate shall ~~distribute to the~~ inform the members of the Senate of:
    - (a) The web location of an electronic copy of a ~~A~~ compendium of <u>Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised</u>, which governs the conduct of the meetings of the Faculty Senate.
    - (b) The web location of an electronic copy of a ~~A~~ copy of the <u>Organization of the Faculty</u> and the <u>Special Rules of   Order and Standing Rules of the Faculty Senate</u>.
    - (c) The web location of an electronic copy of a ~~A~~ list of the current standing committees and <u>ad hoc</u> committees.
    - (d) ~~Notification of t~~The location of Faculty Senate files, indexes, and minutes.

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COMMITTEE

UNIVERSITY-FUNDED RESEARCH PROJECTS

Application Packet

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Purpose

Eastern's university-funded research policy has a threefold rational. First, that despite the fact that Eastern is primarily a teaching institution, research remains an indispensable element of the academic function. Second, whatever limited internal funding for research exists is meant to serve as 'seed money' for attracting substantial external funding for faculty research. Third, that it is an institutional expectation that faculty should seek external funding for their research endeavors.

Membership

As of July 1, 2003, voting membership of the committee shall consist of the Dean of the Graduate School and two faculty members from each college and a professional librarian nominated by the Faculty Senate and appointed by the president. The Director of the Division of Sponsored Programs will serve continuously as a non-voting member. Up to two graduate student members may be appointed annually by the Dean of the Graduate School as nonvoting observers. Faculty members and the librarian shall serve a staggered three-year term.

Duties and Responsibilities

1. To promote quality research and Scholarship.
2. To encourage and evaluate grant proposals and make recommendations regarding internal funding for research.
3. To prepare the annual report of research committee activities.
4. To encourage recognition of research and scholarship by faculty.

The Committee may recommend to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research the suspension of any of its duties and responsibilities, if necessary for budgetary reasons.

Meetings

The committee will meet at least four times a year as scheduled by the Chair. Members missing two consecutive or a total of three regular committee meetings during the academic year may be automatically dropped from committee membership. After missing two consecutive meetings and/or three regular committee meetings during an academic year, the members will be notified in writing of attendance requirements and/or his/her standing on the committee. If necessary, the Faculty Senate will be asked to recommend two possible replacements from the same constituency to serve out the unexpired portion of the term, of which the President will appoint one.

Officers

Chair – Dean of the Graduate School who shall vote only in case of a tie; Vice Chair—Director of Sponsored Programs (non-voting).

Minutes and Proposals Copied To

Minutes and proposals copied to the Provost, the committee members and the University Research Committee Award Collection, Crabbe Library.

Support Services

Academic Affairs, Division of Sponsored Programs.

UNIVERSITY-FUNDED RESEARCH PROJECTS

Introduction

One purpose of the University Research Committee (URC) is to promote research activity within the academic community. The committee assists with the administration of the fund for research by evaluating research proposals and establishing the terms for committee funded research grants. The committee's highest funding priority is for junior faculty to help establish their research program and the basis for future external support, and for senior faculty and professional librarians who have maintained a productive research program and have continually sought external funding for their research.

Eligibility for Funding

1. Grants are awarded only to faculty and professional librarians, with preference being given to full-time, tenured or tenure-track, teaching faculty. Visiting and adjunct faculty members are not eligible for grants.

    Where, exceptionally, research funding is sought by a part-time faculty, before the research proposal can properly be considered by the University Research Committee, the applicant should provide the Chair and Vice Chair of the committee with sufficient justification for their preliminary determination as to why an exception should be made to the general policy in relation to his/her specific research proposal. Such justification should include (a) an articulation of the importance of the research project, (b) its potential for attracting external funding, (c) that the project will be jointly conducted by the applicant faculty *and at least one full-time faculty as co-researcher;* and (d) that it has the support of both the Department Chair and College Dean.

2. Applicants are only eligible to receive one grant award per year, and if an applicant has been previously funded by the University Research Committee, a new proposal will be considered only if the final report has been received.

3. After an applicant has had a total of three proposals funded (from any URC programs) by this committee, a new proposal will only be considered provided the applicant can demonstrate the following accomplishments:

    a. Applicant has presented or published a MINIMUM of TWO papers and/or presentations that were generated from one or more of their last three URC funded research projects. The papers must have been presented at a state, regional, national, or international meeting. This eligibility requirement applies to all current grant recipients and all previous and future grant recipients. (see Review of Applicant Funding and Past Productivity Form). Although paper presentations and published abstracts are acceptable, priority will be given to applicants who have published their research in refereed national journals within their field. The lack of publications for recipients of three or more previous research grants may result in a decision not to fund.

        and

    b. Applicant has applied for EXTERNAL RESEARCH FUNDING to support their research program at some point since their first award after July 1, 2002.

        It should be noted that these requirements do not apply retrospectively to July 1, 2002 (i.e., awards received prior to July 1, 2002 do not count towards the limit of three).

4. Neither academic degree work, institutional research (research that represents a self-study of a department, college or an academic program, etc.), curriculum development, or proposals that emphasize student recruiting as a primary focus will be supported.

Application Procedures

The proposal forms can be downloaded online from the URC web site at (www.research.eku.edu/URC/default.htm)**,** and included with proposals. Number all pages of narrative in the upper right corner and all pages must be collated and stapled in the upper left corner prior to submission to the committee. **No handwritten copy will be reviewed (including forms).** To apply, submit 17 **word-processed,** stapled copies of the proposal including the following eight items in the order indicated.

Item 1.   COVER PAGE (includes PROJECT SUMMARY)

Item 2.   REVIEW OF APPLICANT FUNDING AND PAST PRODUCTIVITY (use Form)

Item 3.   NARRATIVE (10 pages maximum   including bibliography, double spaced, font no smaller than 12 point, and written in third person)

            Form & Style
            Check for accuracy of spelling, grammar and punctuation. As the committee is interdisciplinary in membership, ensure that the narrative is clear to a lay audience and avoid using professional jargon. The narrative must include in order all the sections A-H below. Subheadings must be clearly labeled. Avoid omission of sections by referencing previous discussion.

The narrative constitutes the principal basis for judging the merit of the proposed project. Therefore, care should be taken to present <u>clearly</u> and <u>concisely</u> the information requested under the following subheadings: (note Proposal Evaluation Form for points awarded by section)

A. **Major Objectives**. This section should include a brief rationale and statement of the project with the objectives expressed explicitly and clearly measurable and stated in <mark>outcome</mark> format.

B. **Literature Review and Rationale**.   If possible, a CURRENT <mark>(most recent 5 years),</mark> comprehensive, scholarly description of the research topic focused on the specific research area.

C. **Project Description**. (a) Detailed description of the research methodology and (b) Strength of the research design and its relationship to the objectives.

D. **Evaluation**. Describe how the project will be evaluated (e.g., objectives versus outcomes, peer review, statistical analysis, etc.).

E. **Management**. Adequacy of management of the project as to available time, subjects, facilities**,** equipment, and support. MUST include a timeline that provides a detailed breakdown, scope, and sequence of project.

F. **Significance**. The significance of the research must be clear to a lay reader. Describe the significance of the project in the applicant's field on a local/regional, national, or international level.

G. **Utilization of Project Findings**. Describe a plan for the dissemination of findings (presentation and/or publication) in scholarly journals, professional meetings, etc. (e.g., project findings used to seek external grants to expand/continue research in area). Highest priority will be given to those projects which describe a plan to pursue external grant funding.

H. **Staff Identification**. Identify ALL faculty and students who will be conducting and/or assisting in the research. Describe EXPERTISE of applicant, involvement of students, other assistants, and/or co-researchers and indicate pertinent skills and accomplishments, including publications and papers.

Item 4. BUDGET REQUEST FORM (see page __ guidelines)

Item 5. ITEMIZED BUDGET DESCRIPTION (one page, front only, font no smaller than 12 point**,** see page __ guidelines)

Item 6. VITA (one per applicant, CURRENT, not to exceed two pages, front only, font no smaller than 12 point**,** may be single spaced)

Item 7. APPENDICES (3 pages maximum, double or single spaced, font no smaller than 12 point). Should include support letters, equipment justification, and other relevant information.

Item 8. <mark>Copy of the <u>application form Cover Page</u> submitted to the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects OR Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, <u>if appropriate</u>. Awards will be approved pending the Notification of Protocol Review from the IRB or IACUC.</mark>

The submission dates will be announced but can be expected to be the **first Monday** in **October, December, February and April**. No exceptions will be made for the announced deadlines. The completed proposal is to be submitted to the University Research Committee chair. The proposals will be reviewed by the committee, which will recommend funding based on the evaluation criteria and the funds available. Proposals not recommended for funding by the committee will be returned to the applicants with reviewer comments.

<u>Nature of Proposals</u>

1. Research of any nature within an applicant's academic specialty may be funded to a maximum of $5,000. The committee may reduce the maximum amount of grants in the event of URC budgetary deficiencies.

2. Support and cost-sharing for student wages, equipment, copying, and publication costs should be sought within the applicant's department and/or college. Student participation in the project is encouraged.

3. Any proposal that involves the collection of data from human subjects must be cleared by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects in   Research. Evidence that the paperwork has been submitted to the IRB or an approved IRB Notification of Protocol   Review form <u>must be</u> included with the research proposal before review by the University Research Committee (Contact the IRB Chair). No award will be granted until appropriate approval is received.

4. Any proposal that involves the collection of data from animal subjects must be cleared by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). Evidence that the paperwork has been submitted to the IACUC or an approved IACUC Notification of

Protocol Review form <u>must be</u> included with the research proposal before review by the University Research Committee (Contact the IACUC Chair). No award will be granted until appropriate approval is received.

5. A proposal will be considered <u>only</u> if:

   a. the applicant is eligible.
   b. the applicant has not received another grant from the committee in the same year.
   c. the following forms are completed:
      - Cover Page
      - Review of Applicant Funding and Past Productivity
      - Budget Request
   d. proposals involving human or animal subjects have also submitted the necessary paperwork to the appropriate committee to avoid delays in granting the award.
   e. the proposal is submitted to the University Research Committee by 4:30 p.m. on the announced closing date.
   f. the proposal follows all application procedures.
   g. the requested amount is not greater than $5,000.
   h. the proposal meets pagination restrictions.

   Proposals that do not follow these guidelines will not be reviewed by the Committee.

6. During the review process, the committee may request additional information from the researcher to enhance the review or may seek advice from other scholars in the applicant's field.

7. Faculty and professional librarians are strongly encouraged to collaborate in joint effort with other faculty and/or students when appropriate. Cross-departmental efforts are encouraged.

8. Each applicant is eligible for only one grant per year as an individual investigator, however, may also serve as Co-PI on one other cross-departmental project as well.

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>

Proposals will be evaluated by the following criteria:

1. Clearly measurable objectives of the research stated in performance format.

2. Clearly stated research design and its relationship to the objectives under investigation and evaluation of the project.

3. Budget - accuracy of rates and requests.

4. The identification and review of current literature related to proposed research.

5. Description of how the project will be evaluated.

6. Adequacy of management of the project including the establishment of a time sequence, facilities, and support.

7. Significance of the study to the researcher's academic specialty on a regional, national, or international level.

8. Proposed utilization of the project findings (presentation, publication, or potential external grant proposal submissions).

9. Expertise of applicant, involvement of students, other students, and/or co-researchers.

10. Form and Style - accuracy, clarity, pagination, organization of proposal.

<u>Project Reporting</u>

The grant recipient is required to account for ==all== University research funds. The committee expects that a report of the research will be published in a scholarly journal or read at a professional meeting. In all cases, the researcher must acknowledge that support for the research was made available in whole or in part by the University Research Committee, Eastern Kentucky University.

1. The grant period will provide approximately 12 months to expend all grant funds at which time grant recipients will be required to return to the University any unexpended or unencumbered funds. REQUESTS FOR GRANT EXTENSIONS WILL <u>NOT</u>

BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE unless extenuating circumstances have been documented, submitted and the committee votes that an extension is appropriate.

2. An abstract of the final report will be submitted to the University Research Committee on the Final Report form. In addition, the grant recipient will submit two copies of either a reprint of the paper(s) or publication(s) reporting the research or a detailed final report to the University Research Committee that includes how the objectives stated in the proposal were met. The final report will be submitted no later than 90 days following the ending date of the project. Following receipt of the final report or reprints of paper(s), publication(s) or abstracts, the University Research Committee will place these materials, together with a copy of the original grant proposal, in the University Research Committee Award Collection, in Crabbe Library.

3. Researchers who fail to comply with the above conditions will be automatically disqualified from further funding by the committee until all paperwork and reports have been received.

Ownership Rights

The Patent and Copyright section of the Faculty and Staff Handbook (Pg. 103) determines research ownership rights, ownership of inventions, discoveries, and copyright materials. Equipment remaining after the completion and/or termination of any project financed with a University Research Committee grant becomes the property of EKU. Library materials purchased with grant funds will be transferred to the Crabbe Library at the termination of the grant. (See Transfer of Grant Materials Form).

1.   Student Salaries. Faculty salary support is not eligible for funding, including summer salary. Student assistants will be paid minimum wage up to a maximum of $8 per hour and Graduate Students a maximum of $10 per hour. If proposal is approved, money allocated for student assistants cannot be reallocated to another line item category. When possible, students already supported by institutional or federal work-study funds should be employed. In that event, their salaries and wages will not be included as a line item in the grant budget. Research Committee funds may not be used for the support of Graduate Assistantships.

2.   Fringe Benefits. Contact the Director of Sponsored Programs for current fringe benefit rates (available on the web at www.research.eku.edu by clicking on Basic Information). Fringe benefits do not apply to workstudy students.

3.   Travel. Must be requested at CURRENT University mileage and per diem rates (available on the web at www.research.eku.edu by clicking on Basic Information). Funds for conference travel (mileage and per diem) shall be awarded only if surplus funds are available. Professional membership and conference fees will not be funded.

4.   Supplies. Restricted to items necessary for carrying out the proposed project, not available from other sources (e.g., department, college, etc.), that cost less than $500.

5.   Communications. Telephone calls and postage, and then only if funds are not available within the originating academic department.

6.   Library Materials. Restricted to reference materials, books, manuscripts, journals, newspapers, and/or computerized literature searches, which cannot be expeditiously purchased through the Crabbe Library. At the termination of the project, materials financed with a University Research Committee grant become the property of EKU for use in the Crabbe Library, see Transfer of Grant Materials Form.

7.   Equipment. Defined as those items that have a cost of over $500. The equipment must be integral to the project and not available within the department. Equipment purchase requests must include a justification and documentation statement(s), and evidence of vendor cost. The committee would look favorably upon the proposal that includes some departmental matching costs and letters of support from the department chair and/or colleagues. Equipment remaining after the completion and/or termination of any project financed with a University Research Committee grant becomes the property of EKU for use in the originating department, see Transfer of Grant Materials Form.

8.   Computer Services. Restricted to services (e.g., purchasing services to digitize audio, video, or graphics) not presently available on campus at no charge. Programming services are allowable expenditures.

9.   Copying. Restricted to copying needed to carry out the proposed research not available from other sources.

10. Exhibition. May include costs of presenting work.

11. Media. Justify the numbers requested, e.g., CDs, video, software. Any media remaining after the completion and/or termination of any project financed with a University Research Committee grant becomes the property of EKU for use in the originating department, see Transfer of Grant Materials Form.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM
University Research Committee

URC Evaluator Name: _____

Proposal Title: _____
Applicant: _____
Proposal Number: _____

EVALUATION CRITERIA	**POINTS POSSIBLE**	**POINTS SCORED**
1. MAJOR OBJECTIVES: Clearly measurable and stated in performance format?	10 Points	_____
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:		
Design methodology clearly stated?	15 Points	_____
Directly relate to objectives?	15 Points	_____
3. BUDGET Current, accurate, justified	10 Points	_____

4. LITERATURE REVIEW AND RATIONALE:

Current (<5 years or justify lack of current literature) comprehensive, summarized?   10 Points   _____

5. EVALUATION:

Proposal includes an evaluation plan (e.g., objectives versus outcomes, peer review, statistical analysis).   5 Points   _____

6. MANAGEMENT:

Timeline within acceptable limits?   5 Points   _____

Facilities and support meet guidelines?   5 Points   _____

7. SIGNIFICANCE:

Project has significance in the applicant's field on a local/regional, national, or international level?   10 Points   _____

8. UTILIZATION OF PROJECT FINDINGS:

Proposal includes a method for the utilization of findings (presentation, publication, external grant proposal submission)?   5 Points   _____

9. STAFF IDENTIFICATION:

Expertise of applicant, involvement of students, other assistants, and/or co-researchers?   5 Points   _____

10. FORM AND STYLE:

Accuracy, clarity, pagination, organization of proposal   5 Points   _____

TOTAL   100 Points   _____

COVER PAGE

RESEARCH PROPOSAL
University Research Committee

I. COVER PAGE

a. Applicant(s) _____ Campus Address _____

b. Rank _____ Check one: _____ Tenured
                                                                         _____ Tenure Track

c. Department _____

d. Title of Research Proposal _____

_____

e. Type of Research (check one)   ___Basic Research   ___Applied Research

f. Signature of Department Chair

Signature _____ Date _____

II. USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (Answer all questions)

a. Will the proposed research involve human subjects?   Yes _____   No _____

b. If YES, the application must be submitted to the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects before it can be reviewed. Attach IRB Cover   Page as last page of this application.

III. USE OF ANIMALS (Answer all questions)

a. Will the proposed research involve animals?   Yes _____   No _____

b. If YES, the application must be submitted to the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee before it can be Reviewed.. Attach IACUC Cover Page as last page of this application.

IV.   **PROJECT SUMMARY** (The Project Summary should include a <u>statement of objectives</u>, <u>description of the research</u> <u>methodology</u>, and the <u>significance of the proposed research to the advancement of knowledge or education</u>. It should be informative and understandable to a lay reader. Single spaced, font no smaller than 10 point, summary confined to space provided below, and written in third person.)

_____
| Applicant(s) Signature | Date | Campus Telephone |

(Submit <mark>17</mark> copies of the proposal to the University Research Committee chair. Proposals must be collated and stapled in the upper left corner prior to submission to the Committee. It is recommended that proposals be hand delivered to 414 Jones Building and not mailed through campus mail.)

URC Research Proposal Form
Revised 2002

REVIEW OF APPLICANT FUNDING AND PAST PRODUCTIVITY FORM

RESEARCH PROPOSAL
University Research Committee

Applicant(s) _____

Title of Research Proposal _____

(1)   Have you ever submitted a proposal to the University Research Committee?
      Yes _____   No _____

(2)   If yes, please list proposals submitted <mark>since July 1, 2002</mark> and indicate if they were funded, amount funded, and the year of the award.
      (Attach sheet if necessary.)

Proposal Title	Funded		Amount Funded	Year of the Award
	Yes	No		

(3)   Have you attempted to obtain grants from external funding sources for any other research project?
      Yes _____   No _____

(4)   If yes, please list and indicate if they were funded, amount funded, and the year of the award. (Attach sheet if necessary.)

Proposal Title	Funded		Amount Funded	Year of the Award
	Yes	No		

(5)   Have you attempted to obtain grants from external funding sources for the <u>attached</u> proposal?
      Yes _____   No _____

(6)   If yes, please list external agency, indicate the date submitted, amount funded, or amount requested.

External Agency	Date Submitted	Amount Funded	Amount Requested

(7)   If previously funded through URC, list any ensuing presentations or publications generated from those grant awards.

Presentation/Article Title	URC Grant Project Title	Year of the Award

BUDGET REQUEST FORM

RESEARCH PROPOSAL
University Research Committee

Applicant(s) _____

Title of Research Proposal _____

Project Period _____

Total Amount Requested _____

BUDGET LINE ITEMS	AMOUNT REQUESTED	DEPARTMENT/ OTHER SUPPORT	AMOUNT APPROVED (for Committee)
1. Student Salaries	_____	_____	_____
2. Fringe Benefits	_____	_____	_____
3. Travel	_____	_____	_____
4. Supplies	_____	_____	_____
5. Communications	_____	_____	_____
6. Library Materials	_____	_____	_____
7. Equipment	_____	_____	_____
8. Computer Services	_____	_____	_____
9. Copying	_____	_____	_____
10. Exhibition	_____	_____	_____
11. _____	_____	_____	_____
12. _____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL	_____	_____	_____

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Round all amounts to nearest $1.

2. **Attach one-page, front only, font no smaller than 12 point, "Itemized Budgetary Description."** It must include details under each Budget Line Item so that the nature of the item and its function is clear.

FINAL REPORT FORM

Final Report of Grant Funded by the
University Research Committee

Title of Research Project _____

Department _____

Name of Grant Recipient(s) _____

Date of Final Report _____ Date Grant was Funded _____
                              (Mo./Yr.)   (Mo./Yr.)

Amount for which grant was funded $_____ Amount expended $_____

Budget Account Number: _____

Summary:

Final use of project results, e.g., Where was it published? At what professional meeting was it presented? How was it disseminated to the academic or regional community? Have you submitted to an external grant funding source?

TRANSFER OF GRANT MATERIALS FORM

Transfer of Grant Materials Funded by the
University Research Committee

DATE: _____

TO: University Research Committee Chair

FROM: _____
      (Applicant)

_____
(Department)   (College)

Title of Research Project _____

The following grant equipment has been transferred to the Department of: _____

ITEMS	**QUANTITY**

The following materials have been transferred to the Crabbe Library:

ITEMS	**QUANTITY**

_____   _____
Applicant's Signature   Department Chair's Signature

_____
Dean of Libraries Signature (If Library Materials)

FACULTY SENATE
A Motion Related to Interdisciplinary and Team Teaching

Whereas: There is ample evidence that interdisciplinary and team taught classes are professionally rewarding for faculty who participate in them and academically stimulating and rewarding for students who take such classes; and

Whereas: The Office of the Provost indicated support for increasing interdisciplinary and team teaching at EKU by appointing the Interdisciplinary and Team Teaching Task Force in the Spring of 2002 to develop *"appropriate, functional guidelines for supporting and rewarding interdisciplinary and team teaching at Eastern Kentucky University";* and

Whereas: the Interdisciplinary and Team Teaching Task Force (the full report of which is attached for reference) has identified the University's practice of assigning student credit hour production to the department or unit identified in the course prefix rather than having credit hours follow faculty as the single greatest disincentive to interdisciplinary or team teaching; and

Whereas: the Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment is currently developing a reporting format for tracking credit hour production by both (a) course designation; and (b) by faculty member; and

Whereas: the Interdisciplinary and Team Teaching Task Force determined that faculty workload assignments must reflect the fact that the effort required to teach a fully-integrated team taught course can be equal to an independently taught course on the part of all faculty involved; and

Whereas: the Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment has confirmed that there is no limitation to the Banner system for a single course generating a full in-load faculty workload assignment for more than one faculty;

Be it therefore moved that a new section be added to *Part V: Instruction/ Academic Policies and Proce*dures of the <u>Faculty Handbook</u> immediately after the section on Foundation Professorships (pg. 93) as follows:

INTERDISCIPLINARY AND TEAM TEACHING

"Team Teaching" is defined as a collaborative activity in which content is integrated and all participating faculty are involved in the planning, delivery and evaluation of the course**.** It is specifically distinguished from "multidisciplinary teaching" in which faculty may divide course content into separate units that are planned and delivered independently.

In the case of team-taught courses, the responsibility for determining student credit hour division and faculty workload assignments rests with the department(s) of the participating faculty. Student credit hours shall be divided equally among participating faculty unless all participating faculty mutually agree upon an alternate arrangement for credit hour distribution. Such agreements shall be spelled out in a memo for approval by the appropriate dean(s) signed by all faculty who teach the course and their chairs. Higher minimum enrollments may be necessary to sustain certain team-taught courses. Any adjustment in minimum enrollments to justify a team teaching model should be roughly proportional to normal faculty load expectations for viable courses.

Interdisciplinary and Team Teaching Task Force
Final Report
Submitted July 31, 2002

Members: Thomas Fisher (Occupational Therapy), Carole Garrison (Criminal Justice and Police Studies), Douglas Robertson (Teaching & Learning Center), Judith Spain (Management, Marketing & Administrative Communication), Deborah Whitehouse (Nursing), Frank Williams (Philosophy & Religion), and Alice Jones (Geography), chair.

CHARGE issued by Provost Michael Marsden March 12, 2002:
The Interdisciplinary and Team Teaching Task Force is directed to survey best practices at comparable universities with regard to appropriate, functional guidelines for supporting and rewarding interdisciplinary and team teaching at Eastern Kentucky University. The formulated guidelines are to be prepared for consideration by the Faculty Senate and the administration in a timely fashion."

Rationale

Interdisciplinary and team teaching can be stimulating and enriching for faculty and students alike. Students and faculty benefit from cross-disciplinary discussions that deepen and broaden their own perspectives on a subject, and gain a better understanding of how their own disciplinary expertise fits within the broader realm of knowledge. Additional benefits to faculty include the opportunity to reflect upon and improve their own teaching by observing and sharing a classroom with a colleague, and advancing research interests by interacting with faculty with similar interests from other disciplines. The differing values and conflicting viewpoints of an interdisciplinary classroom more closely reflect the increasingly multicultural world our students will enter, and the experience can help them begin viewing their college education as a whole rather than a series of disjointed required courses. And, as one Pace University faculty member noted, "students seem to take over more responsibility for the learning when they see teachers learning from each other."[1]

Summary of Survey of Benchmark Institutions

We conducted telephone interviews with academic administrators at 17 of EKU's 18 benchmark institutions during March and April of 2002. Our findings indicate that the majority conceptually support interdisciplinary and team teaching, but only one has a formal policy. All of our benchmark institutions indicated that they are accommodating limited interdisciplinary and team-teaching on an ad-hoc basis, but would like to see more. There was also general agreement that the major administrative difficulties lie in the areas of:
  a) crediting faculty workloads in a manner that recognizes that the amount of effort involved for a truly integrated team-taught course can be equal to an independently taught course on the part of all faculty involved;
  b) appropriately distributing student credit hours produced in team-taught courses to the home academic units of the participating faculty, and
  c) creating what one provost called "an institutional environment of trust" between faculty, chairs, deans, and upper administration in which faculty (and chairs, and deans) feel they will be rewarded for experimenting with innovative teaching pedagogies rather than penalized for them because of perceived potential "losses" in FTE production in a given semester or a given course.

---

[1] Meyer, Jeanine. Pedagogical Pattern #4: Team Teaching Pattern. *The Pedagogical Patterns Project.* http://www-lifia.info.unlp.edu.ar/ppp/.

Recommendations

We determined that the single greatest disincentive to interdisciplinary or team teaching at EKU is the University's practice of assigning student credit hour production to the department or unit identified in the course prefix rather than having credit hours follow faculty. Therefore, our recommendations are as follows:

1. **Student credit hours should follow the faculty who actually teach a course (team taught or not), regardless of the departmental or other prefix attached to the course number (with the exception of courses offered through the Honors Program[2].)** Higher minimum enrollments may be necessary to sustain certain team-taught courses. Any adjustment in minimum enrollments to justify a team teaching model should be proportional to normal faculty load expectations for viable courses.

2. **In the case of team-taught courses, the responsibility for determining student credit hour division rests jointly with the departments of the participating faculty.** Student credit hours shall be divided equally among the home departments of the participating faculty unless an alternate arrangement for credit hour distribution is mutually agreed upon by the home departments of all participating faculty. Such agreements shall be spelled out in a memo to the appropriate dean(s) signed by all faculty who teach the course and their chairs.

Suggestions for Future Consideration

In addition to the recommendations above, the Task Force explored several additional policies that have been used at other institutions to encourage team teaching and may be worthy of implementation at EKU some time in the future.

1. Formalize a faculty workload banking system at the department level to keep track of faculty workloads generated from team taught courses in order to facilitate appropriate reassigned time [e.g. "released" time] decisions.

2. Provide administrative support for the development of team-taught courses, through the creation and funding of a University Summer Stipend program. We envision a competitive program that provides a minimum of $1,000 per faculty member for three weeks of work devoted to development of a team-taught course.

3. *Encourage fully integrated interdisciplinary teaching*—namely courses where all faculty are engaged from beginning to end during all class periods; and *discourage disjointed interdisciplinary teaching*—which can amount to little more than "baton-passing" among several disconnected mini-courses on a particular topic. This might be accomplished by adjusting faculty workloads to reflect the level of collaborative effort required, based on Davis's[3] four criteria of planning, content integration, teaching, and testing and evaluation (see Appendix).

---

[2] Faculty who team-teach in the honors program are reassigned to the Honors Program, and the student credit hours are attributed to said program.
[3] Davis, James R. (1995). Interdisciplinary Courses and Team Teaching: New Arrangements for Learning. Series on Higher Education, American Council on Education. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Appendix

Excerpts from Davis, James R. (1995). <u>Interdisciplinary Courses and Team Teaching: New Arrangements for Learning.</u> Series on Higher Education, American Council on Education. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

---X----X----X---

Davis concludes that team teaching comes in many forms and that the best way to approach it is in terms of the degree of collaboration involved: "The question to ask about team teaching, therefore, is not: Is this team teaching? The more important question is: If this is team teaching, what is the type and level of collaboration among the team members" (p. 8)?   Davis delineates four criteria for determining the degree of collaboration: (a) planning, (b) content integration, (c) teaching, and (d) testing and evaluation.

Planning:
 "What is the involvement of the faculty in planning this course? Are all members of the team involved in planning or do some members of the team play a more important role in planning the course than others? Does the leader of the course (its coordinator) have more responsibility and more authority for planning the course than other team members? To what extent does the team use collaborative decision-making (democratic) processes in planning the course? How much time and effort have gone into planning the course? How well have the goals of the course been elaborated and to what extent do the goals of the course reflect the views of all the participants" (p. 8)?

Content integration:
 "In what ways, and to what extent, have the multiple disciplinary perspectives of the faculty been represented? Are the differing perspectives seen as contradictory or complementary? Do the various disciplines provide different lenses for viewing the same phenomena, or do the disciplines examine different phenomena? Are the perspectives distinct and related in some logical way, such as serial or chronological order, or have the perspectives been integrated to produce some new way of thinking about the substance of the course? Is some unifying principle, theory, or set of questions used to provide unity and coherence to the course" (pp.8-9)?

Teaching:
 "Who will do the teaching and how will it be done? Do all team members participate more or less equally in the delivery of the course? Is there a core of key faculty who teach regularly but are supplemented by less frequent guests? Are there assistants or consultants who play roles that are different from faculty roles? Are teaching responsibilities broken into identifiable time segments, such as a term or a unit of instruction, or do faculty intermingle their instruction day by day? Do faculty sometimes work together during a single class session? How are decisions made about what teaching strategies to employ and what readings and other materials to use" (p. 9)?

Testing and evaluation:
 "How is agreement reached about what kind of learning outcomes are to be measured and how they are to be measured? What kinds of tests, papers, and other devices are used to measure student achievement? How are the various components of the testing and evaluation process weighted? Who writes and who grades the exams and papers? How do the course faculty involve themselves in this process? Who is included and who is left out? Who takes charge of this process and where is the highest court of authority when students challenge the process, including their grade? In addition, who decides what mechanisms will be used to get faculty feedback about the course, not only on what students appear to be learning, but on their satisfactions and concerns about the course" (p. 9).