

Faculty Senate Agenda

April 3, 2006

3:30 p.m.

Call to order

Approval of Minutes

March 6, 2006 Minutes

President's Report Overview & Questions: Senator Glasser

Unfinished Business:

- Academic Integrity Policy in Handbook Language
- Amendment motions to the University Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations for Promotion & Tenure (Dieckmann, & Schlomann)

New Business:

- Motion on Senate Alternates/Substitutes
- Senate Chair nominations

Report Overview & Questions:

Executive Committee Chair: Senator Siegel

Faculty Regent: Senator Schlomann

COSFL Representative: Senator Ware

Provost: Senator Chapman

Student Government Association: Kyle Moon

Standing Committees:

Budget Committee: Senator Eakin, Chair

Rules Committee: Senator Johnson, Chair

Rights and Responsibilities Committee: Senator Robles, Chair

Elections Committee: Senator Randles, Chair

Committee on Committees: Senator Vance, Chair

Welfare Committee: Senator Collins, Chair

Reports from Ad Hoc Committees:

Centennial: Senator Hensley, Chair

Futures: Doris Pierce, Chair

Membership: Senator May, Chair

For the Good of the Order:

Strategies for Improving Faculty Life at EKU: Recommendations for Facilitating Faculty Teaching, Research, and Service Effectiveness

Adjournment

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

March 6, 2006

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, March 6, 2006, in the South Room of the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Siegel called the seventh meeting of the academic year to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.

The following members were absent:

A. Ault*, S. Black*^, M. Ciocca*, D. Clay, L. DeBolt, H. Hensley, M. Hessee, C. Hubbard*^, S. Hyndman, S. Konkel, S. Shaffer, and D. Vance*^

*Indicates prior notification to the Senate Secretary

^Michael McDermott attended in place of S. Black; ^Karen Janssen attended in place of C. Hubbard;

^Susan Godbey attended in place of D. Vance

Visitors to the Senate: Jim Conneely, Student Affairs; Kelly McKinney, *Eastern Progress*; Debbie Newsom, Financial Affairs; Aaron Thompson, Academic Affairs; Virginia Underwood, Chief of Staff; and Marc Whitt, Public Relations & Marketing

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The February 6, 2006 minutes were approved as written.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT: Senator Glasser

March 1 is the official kick-off of the "Healthy You! At ECU" annual wellness program. For more information on the Health Fair on March 6 and the wellness program, please contact Adrienne Bauer in Human Resources. Additionally, the University's Fitness and Wellness Center has now been opened to all current benefits-eligible faculty and staff on a paid annual membership basis. For more information, please contact Billy Martin, Director of Campus Recreation.

A new giving initiative was launched in the fall called the "Circle of Opportunity", which encourages alumni and friends to give at the one thousand dollar level and up. A special event recognizing all "Circle of Opportunity" members is scheduled for the Friday of Homecoming, October 13th.

This spring, a new initiative is being launched to encourage graduating seniors to give back to their soon-to-be Alma Mater. This student-led initiative will be getting underway in the next few weeks, with a special recognition event for graduating seniors to be held the Friday evening before the May Commencement.

Senator Glasser shared a copy of her testimony to the House Budget Review Subcommittee and Senate Appropriations & Revenue Committee.

Senator Glasser provided an update to her written report on the state budget process. The Governor's recommended budget for ECU was \$1.2 million for fiscal year '07 and \$600,000 for fiscal year '08. The Appropriations and Revenue Committee approved the Governor's recommendation for '07 funding and increased funds from \$600,000 to \$800,000 for fiscal year '08. This is about 1/3 of what CPE had originally proposed for Eastern. The proposed budget now goes before the Senate for approval, and the amount of funding could decrease or increase based on the Senate's recommendation.

The State Appropriations & Revenue Committee recommended putting back CPE's original recommendation of \$54 million for ECU's new Science building. Assuming the Senate approves this recommendation, the new building will need to be phased in over a period of time.

Another grim bit of news is that CPE has decided that tuition increases will be based on the level of what CPE recommended plus whatever state appropriations are approved. Therefore ECU's tuition increase will be \$533 per year which is about a 11.4% increase. This is considerably less than the \$800 per year ECU's Board had originally approved.

The Student Government Association and the President's Office are sponsoring a student forum focusing on tuition. This forum, scheduled for March 7 at 5 p.m. in the Kennamer Room, will provide an opportunity for students to learn more about the roles tuition and state appropriations have on funding the operation of ECU and to ask questions about tuition and related issues.

The University's internal budget process for 2006-07 is well underway. There is much work being done in identifying areas of need in support of the University's academic purpose and in conjunction with the Strategic Plan.

Senator Glasser shared the following campus updates:

- The Business and Technology project is close to completion.
- Programming for the new Science Building will be complete in the next two weeks. The project will then be placed on hold until the budget allocation process is completed.
- The electrical project is substantially complete with only the Samuels Track lighting and some miscellaneous change orders remaining.
- Questions around the transfer of the property for the new Manchester Center remain, and the Finance Cabinet and other parties in Frankfort continue in their attempts to resolve the situation.
- ECU passed the heat plant stack test with flying colors (30+ times under the limit).
- The proposal outlining the joint education doctorate program being developed by ECU and WKU has been posted on the CPE web for review and comment as is required.
- The money for the design and development of the dairy merger with UK at our Meadowbrook Farm facility was appropriated in the last state budget (\$270,000) to the Council on Higher Education. Planning for this project is underway.
- The Smoke-Free Zone Task Force has completed a draft of a proposed policy. The task force will share the draft policy with campus constituents for feedback and comment during the month of March.

- The Eastern Committee on Responsible Environmental Stewardship (ECRES) held a forum on February 23 at the Teaching and Learning Center. The forum provided an opportunity for the committee to discuss its mission, the University community to become acquainted with ECRES, and committee members and forum participants to exchange ideas related to the mission and purpose of the committee.

Senator Glasser shared a list of dates for upcoming events in March:

- March 2, the Chautauqua Lecture entitled "How is Global Justice Possible?" with Tomas Pogge.
- March 3, the 45th Annual Meeting of the Kentucky Political Science Association, with Congressman Ben Chandler as Keynote Speaker.
- March 4, Pre-Concert Reception for "Appalachian Variations" with Richard Crosby, followed by POPs for Music Sake.
- March 9 & 10, SACS QEP Workshop entitled "Facilitating Critical & Creative Thinking" with Dr. Gerald Nosich, Center for Critical Thinking and Professor of Philosophy at Univ. of New Orleans .
- March 9, Senator Glasser will present opening remarks at a program in Frankfort in honor of the late Vic Hellard, an EKU alumnus and longtime director of the Kentucky Legislative Research Commission.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Amendment Motions to the Promotion and Tenure Report.

Amendment 1 (from February meeting): Senator Reed asked to substitute a replacement motion (listed below) for the motion proposed at the December 2005 meeting. The majority of the Senate were in agreement and the amended motion carried.

Substitute motion to be added to Part IV, item 9:

When the chair's recommendation opposes the granting of promotion or tenure, supporting documentation should demonstrate that the faculty member in question received fair and timely notice of the possibility of this judgment and opportunities to clarify any role ambiguities or relevant circumstances. At a minimum such notice should be given the faculty member in writing as part of the formal evaluation process that covers the time period when any substandard performance was first observed. The written notice will be given no later than the Fourth Year Review Period.

Amendment 3 (from February meeting): Senator Dieckmann asked to replace the motion (see below) from December 2005 to reflect changes requested at February's meeting. Senator Siegel ruled the amended motion substantive and postponed the vote to the April meeting.

To change Part 1, Section C, #8 as follows:

Part I: Main Recommendations

C. Promotion in Faculty Rank

8. a. The university shall ~~continue to permit~~ prohibit faculty ~~to apply~~ from applying for promotion in rank to associate professor prior to being considered for tenure.
- b. Tenure will not be granted ~~without concomitant promotion~~ to faculty at the rank of assistant professor.

Note: Part 1, Section B, #7 states: "The probationary period for tenure shall be six years, and, if awarded, tenure shall begin in the seventh year. Exceptions concerning the probationary period shall be specified in writing at the time of initial employment in a tenure-track position." This allows for prospective faculty to negotiate for tenure (and therefore promotion) to occur more quickly than six years based on previous experience, but that intention must be explicitly determined at the time of hire.

New Amendment. Senator Schlomann moved approval of the following amendment, seconded by Senator Johnson. Senator Siegel ruled the motion substantive and postponed the vote to the April meeting.

Under Part I, Section A, add number five, to read as follows:

- a. If all recommendations are positive, the sequence of reviews of all applications for promotion and tenure are as follows: Department committee, Department chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, Dean, Provost, President, and Board of Regents.
- b. If a candidate is not recommended for tenure by the Department committee, Department chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, or Dean, the application will automatically be reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee prior to being forwarded to the Provost.
- c. If a candidate is not recommended for promotion by the Department committee, Department chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, or Dean, the application shall not be considered further, unless the candidate appeals to the next level. If the candidate does appeal, the sequence of the process shall follow that stated in b.

Senate Membership Motions.

Motion 1: Senator May presented an amendment to motion 1 (proposed at the February meeting). The majority of the Senate were opposed to the amended Motion 1 and the motion failed for lack of support.

Motion 2: Senator Kristofik moved to amend Motion 2 to change the wording from "...forego membership for one **term**" to "...forego membership for one **year**", seconded by Senator Jones. The majority of the Senate were in favor and the amendment to the motion carried.

The amended motion was approved with a vote of 29-22.

Senator Schlomann moved to further amend motion 2 to the following, seconded by Senator Jones. The motion to amend carried.

Under 2f change the following statement from "Elected members shall serve no more than two consecutive terms;" to "Elected members shall serve no more than two consecutive **full year** terms".

NEW BUSINESS:

Report from Council on Academic Affairs. Item 1a (clarification of final examination policy) was listed as an informational only item.

Senator Chapman moved approval of 1b (course repeat policy), seconded by Senator Collins. The motion carried.

Senator Chapman moved approval of item 2 (New Mathematics Teaching minor), seconded by Senator Eakin. The motion carried.

Senator Chapman moved approval of item 3 (suspend certificate program in School Psychology), seconded by Senator Winslow. The motion carried.

GENERAL & STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT: Senator Siegel

Senator Siegel reminded faculty to wear their academic regalia on Friday, April 28 for the rededication of the Keen Johnson Building.

Senator Siegel thanked Dr. Conneely for his help in making the Faculty Dining Room more attractive and usable.

Senator Siegel reminded faculty to visit the newly renovated Faculty Club Lounge. She further announced that the "Ladies Swooning Room", the small room at the south end of the Lounge is being set up as a small conference room. Once available, room reservations can be made with Jennifer Goins in University Programs at 622-2222.

Senator Siegel asked the Senators to share with their faculty the topic for April's *For the Good of the Order* discussion: "Strategies for Improving Faculty Life at EKU: Recommendations for Facilitating Faculty Teaching, Research, and Service Effectiveness".

A Senate representative is needed to serve on the QEP Committee. If anyone is interested, please contact the Senate Chair ASAP.

It was the consensus of the Executive Committee to discontinue the Meet and Greet sessions prior to the Senate meetings. However, an "Eat and Greet" luncheon for faculty will be scheduled in the Faculty Dining Room at least once a month with the first luncheon scheduled for the last Tuesday in March. Additional information will be forthcoming.

The Senate Executive Committee is charged with the administrative review of the President. A letter will be distributed this week to all eligible faculty introducing the company that will be handling the survey and the process that will be used. The letter will be sent in hard copy as well as in e-mail format. The survey itself will be available online from March 20th through midnight the 31st.

REPORT FROM FACULTY REGENT: Senator Schlomann

Since the last Senate Meeting there have been no Board or Board Committee meetings.

Dr. John Moore of Penson Associates was recently on campus for three days to assist the Board in the evaluation of President Glasser. Approximately 150 individuals, representing all constituent groups, were interviewed during this time. If you did not have opportunity to be involved in this process or wish to add more comments, send a letter to Dr. Penson at 1634 Monarch Drive, Venice, Florida 32493. While a signature is required, all comments will be held confidential by Dr. Moore.

The next Board meeting is March 27. Committees will be meeting in the coming weeks in preparation for that.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST: Senator J. Chapman

The first Compliance written reports addressing the SACS standards are beginning to be reviewed. These early reports show us to be in compliance on all of the issues that have been reviewed to date. However, as problems arise, we can immediately begin to remedy those to bring us into compliance before the review team's visit next spring.

We continue to make progress in developing a Quality Enhancement Plan. On March 9 and 10 Dr. Gerald Nosich, Professor of Philosophy at the University of New Orleans, will provide us with a workshop. The workshop will emphasize the practical application of concepts in the classroom and provide further preparation for designing curriculum or program initiatives for the QEP. Please attend and learn more. For more information, contact Hal Blythe or Onda Bennett.

The Promotion and Tenure process is almost complete. Before next year's process begins, Senator Chapman plans to develop a checklist which will easily identify if all required standards are met. In addition, written summary statements will be required at each level in the process indicating why the candidate meets the requirements, or why not. Also, a written record will be required from the candidates who appeal stating what they are appealing and why.

Senator Chapman stressed that new hires must meet the minimum standards that will allow them to progress through the academic ranks.

Senator Chapman stated that in order to be able to put forward new programs unconditionally, Kentucky institutions must show progress in six of the eight components of the Kentucky Plan. EKV achieved that unconditional status by making progress in six areas. Two areas for continued improvement is the Six-Year Graduation Rate for Degree-Seeking Kentucky Residents based on the Fall 1999 Cohort and in Employment of African-Americans as Faculty. The attentiveness of this year's search committees to diversifying our faculty is very encouraging.

Based on the current and projected budget for the Summer sessions, CE&O recommends for this summer that the MOST we do is increase faculty salaries to 8% (for a three credit-hour course) with the \$4,500 cap. We will assess the situation this summer with the intention of increasing to 9% for the summer of 2007, and increasing to 10% the summer of 2008.

REPORT FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT: Kyle Moon

The Kentucky Board of Student Body Presidents will hold its rally on March 8th. Hopefully students across the State will have a positive influence on the General Assembly in getting them to fund Higher Education.

In continued efforts to work with the city on improving campus and community relations, SGA has established a ride-along program with Richmond Police that will allow students to ride with Police Officers during Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights.

Budget Committee. Senator Eakin reported that the Budget committee completed a preliminary questionnaire for the faculty on alternative class patterns last month. Further action was halted until the Senate's *For the Good of the Order* discussion today.

Rules Committee. The Rules Committee opted to review the two motions on senate membership. The committee believes that both of these motions could put undue hardships on small departments and therefore recommends against the passage of both motions.

The committee continues to work on updates to the Faculty Senate section of the Faculty Handbook. We are also working on a revision concerning lecturer positions for the faculty handbook.

Rights & Responsibilities Committee. The University counsel provided the committee with the information below dealing with on-campus solicitation. The information was taken directly from the faculty handbook at:

<http://www.universityprograms.eku.edu/facultyhandbook/PART6.php#solicit>

"The resale of complimentary examination copies of textbooks is unethical and unprofessional. Furthermore, the activities of textbook solicitors are restricted by invitation only under present administrative policy on the campus of Eastern."

The committee is in the process of writing the Academic Integrity Policy into Faculty Handbook format.

Elections Committee. Senator Randles reminded everyone that Senate Chair nominations will be solicited at the April Senate meeting.

Welfare Committee. Senator Collins reported that the University Benefits Committee recommended the following three vendors for administering our university self-funded health care insurance:

Medical Insurance Coverage - Anthem (our current administrator)
Pharmacy Prescriptions - Express-Script
Mental Health Coverage - Behavioral Medicine Network (formerly known as St. Joseph's)

The health care plan design and level of benefits will not change. There is a possibility that another tier of coverage (Parent(s) and one child) may be added. The exact cost of the plan to the institution and the participants has not been determined at this time.

Senator Collins gave a brief update on the six charges the committee has been working on:

- 1) **faculty recognition awards program** - This issue has been resolved by action of the full senate
- 2) **the need for a faculty Ombudsperson** - The committee previously recommended against establishing an Ombudsperson. When the committee addressed the issue again, it was determined that this might be an appropriate role for the Senate Vice Chair.
- 3) **salary equity distribution** - The Provost previously reported concerning the number and manner of equity distribution.
- 4) **role of academic coordinators at EKU** - The committee surveyed benchmark institutions and found little or no consistency in the manner that coordinators are selected, compensated and/or released from teaching responsibilities to perform their duties. The committee is trying to obtain information from the Office of University Programs which did a similar survey with many of the same issues addressed.
- 5) **policies for temporary, short-term suspensions of the tenure clock** - This matter is in the hands of the full senate for resolution.
- 6) **junior faculty mentoring programs** - The committee is contacting the Deans for a copy of all mentoring programs in their colleges. These will be analyzed and a report of our findings will be delivered to the senate.

Ad Hoc Senate Centennial Committee. Two special events in recognition of the ECU Centennial has been scheduled. The first, an Emeritus Tea in honor of retired faculty, is planned for Monday, March 20, 2006. ECU Centennial tins of a special blend of tea will be presented to those in attendance. The second event is the rededication of the Keen Johnson building during Alumni Weekend on Friday, April 28 at 2:30 p.m. Approximately 250 to 300 attendees are anticipated.

FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER:

The topic of discussion was "Alternative Strategies for Class Schedule Patterns".

Senator Dieckmann spoke in favor of a free Friday or Monday to allow for extended periods of time for field study which is required for Biological Sciences students.

Senator Winslow spoke in favor of a free Monday or Friday as a way to increase faculty scholarship.

Senator Yoder indicated that the Math department preferred class patterns with the same amount of class time.

Senator Houston suggested a Monday-Thursday Tuesday-Friday class pattern with Wednesdays used for a reading-type day.

Senator Kristofik agreed with the Monday-Thursday Tuesday-Friday idea, but thought the extra day should be used for classes equivalent to existing evening classes. This could be advantageous to commuter and non-traditional students who could take two or three classes in one day.

Senator Schuster spoke in favor of field trips. Also, his department liked the idea of flip Fridays. Departmental meetings were easier to schedule when the flip Friday schedule was available.

Senator Noblitt mentioned that the Paralegal program's main competition is Sullivan University which now has a Monday-Wednesday Tuesday-Thursday schedule.

Senator Collins reminded everyone that if an additional two-day pattern is used, "x" number of sections of instruction will be lost.

Senator Rainey spoke in support of the Monday-Wednesday Tuesday-Thursday class pattern. Most professional meetings occur on either Monday or Friday, and this would allow faculty the opportunity to attend more professional meetings.

Senator Johnson spoke in favor of all classes being the same time length. However, he was concerned about how a Monday-Wednesday Tuesday-Thursday class pattern might be perceived in Frankfort in terms of fund allocations.

Senator Wolf stated that in the Music Department, it is very difficult to have 75 minute class periods.

Senator Jones indicated that Sullivan offers two-day class patterns as well as one-day and four-day class patterns which allows for greater flexibility in scheduling. She stated that with the number of Monday holidays, that should be considered the extra day.

ADJOURNMENT:

Senator Chapman moved to adjourn at approximately 5:30 p.m.

To: Faculty Senate
From: Joanne K. Glasser
Re: President's Report
Date: March 29, 2006

I wish to express my appreciation to those of you who were able to attend the Campus Update this morning and hope that you found the update and slide presentation informative. The slide presentation is available on the ECU website.

The following updates for my April report include a number of items that came before the Board at its regular quarterly meeting on March 27, 2007, and also information that I shared in my remarks this morning:

State Budget Update

The general assembly has been in negotiations in recent weeks to develop the 2006-07 state budget. The higher education community has been intensely interested and involved in those discussions. I have spent a considerable amount of time in the state capitol and on the telephone with our elected leaders throughout Kentucky, articulating the needs of ECU, our academic programs, our faculty and our students, current and future. As reported in the media in recent days, the Executive Budget, House Budget and Senate Budget have varied in their recommendations for support for the Kentucky postsecondary education system. I wish to share with you, as of today, that ECU anticipates receiving for FY 06-07 state appropriations in the amount of \$1.2 million. It is important to note that although state appropriations have risen the last two years after two years of decline and budget cuts, ECU has experienced a net five-year decrease in appropriations per full-time-equivalent student.

With respect to capital project funding, I remain cautiously optimistic that the House-Senate Conference Committee will fund our new science building at the \$54 million level. While this would be very good news for us, this amount is well below the \$83 million we requested, and we will have to build the facility in phases if we are funded at the \$54 million level. I want to thank Dr. Malcolm Frisbie for shepherding the programming and design process for this critical project.

Also, our dairy merger project with the University of Kentucky was fully funded at approximately \$5 million in both the House and Senate budgets.

Additionally, I remain hopeful that our state appropriations will be increased and that we will also receive additional funding for a new Manchester campus.

Tuition Increase

At Monday's Board meeting, our Regents approved a tuition increase of \$266 per semester for full-time, in state, undergraduate students. Even with this increase there is no expectation of any change in our relative position as one of the most affordable institutions of higher education in Kentucky. The bold step our Regents took last year to raise our 2005-2006 tuition looks even wiser now in hindsight. As you may recall, last

April the Board approved a larger increase for 2006-07 of \$400 per semester when it approved two years of tuition increases – one for 05-06 and another for 06-07.

The Board's action on Monday was in response to the CPE's action that placed a cap on tuition increases at all public universities in Kentucky. On April 5, 2006, I will be going before the CPE to formally request its approval of Monday's revised tuition increase, which is the maximum allowed by CPE. As a result of the cap imposed by the CPE, our gross tuition revenues will be \$3.5 million less than the revenue that would have been generated under the original Board-approved tuition plan for 06-07. This certainly limits our ability to fund a number of initiatives that would have otherwise been possible.

While no decision to increase tuition is made lightly, we must have adequate revenues to support our mission. I believe ECU remains a tremendous educational value for our students, a quality education that is both affordable and accessible.

FY 2006-07 Budget Guidelines

The new tuition rates, along with a proposed increase for FY 2006-2007 of \$1.2 million in state appropriations and some internal reallocations form the basis of the budget guidelines that the Board also approved at Monday's meeting. It is important to keep in mind that the internal reallocations are not cuts and these are guidelines, not the final budget. Should the remainder of this General Assembly session result in state appropriations substantially different than we expect today, we'll make any necessary adjustments and go back to the Board with new recommendations. The final budget will be presented for Board approval on June 12, 2006.

Although we are disappointed that we are unable to carry through with our original Board-approved tuition plans for 2006-2007, we still believe this to be a progressive budget for the University and one that will allow us to continue to move forward in academic programs and services, recruit and retain quality faculty, and maintain health care benefits.

After months of thorough and thoughtful analysis, the Budget Advisory Council made budget guideline recommendations to me, which I, in turn, recommended to the Board of Regents. The Budget Advisory Council is chaired by Provost Chapman and comprised of the deans, the Faculty Senate Chair, the Staff Council Chair, the Executive Vice-President of the SGA, and representatives from administrative units across campus.

While not ideal, the recommended guidelines are designed to meet our immediate needs, move our Strategic Plan forward, and position the University as well as possible for continued growth and success.

I wish to share with you some highlights from these guidelines that incorporate the following academic initiatives and priorities recommended by the Provost to support faculty and academic programming:

PGA/PGM Program

\$230,000

Faculty Initiatives (recommended by the Provost)	
Staff three-tier advising in University college	\$270,000
Partial funding for faculty computer replacement plan (3 year replacement plan)	<u>\$130,000</u>
	\$630,000

This new funding is in addition to the \$750,000 pool of funds provided to the Provost in the FY 05-06 budget for academic initiatives. Among other initiatives, these funds have been allocated for 5 new faculty positions (Social Work, Justice and Safety, Teacher Education, Master-Public Health, and Baccalaureate Nursing).

Additionally, these budget guidelines incorporate an across-the-board 3.5 percent cost-of-living salary adjustment. The estimated cost of this increase, along with corresponding benefits, is approximately \$3.9 million dollars.

We are also requesting an additional \$150,000 in new funding to support strategic initiatives recommended by our Strategic Planning Committee and initial funding in the amount of \$100,000 to begin to establish a pool of funds for the QEP.

The guidelines also include funding for fixed costs increases in the amount of \$3.1 million. These fixed costs increases include insurance, facilities costs including utilities, and benefits costs increases (health plan and retirement).

Other Board Action

In other business, the Board:

- Approved recommendations for promotion and tenure and faculty emeritus nominations
- Approved Resident Hall rate changes and proposed dining rate changes
- Approved a health insurance recommendation that maintains all current benefits, adds a fourth tier/option in all three plans offered (PPO High, PPO Low, and Economy Plan) to give employees another cost savings option over the family plan, and provides for the following third party administrators for health insurance and related benefits:
 - Medical – Anthem (current provider)
 - Pharmacy – Express Scripts
 - Mental Health – Behavioral Medicine
 - Employee Assistance Plan – Behavioral Medicine
- Approved the dedication of land adjacent and north of the Ashland fire science and laboratory building to the Department of Agriculture for laboratories to include soil judging and surveying.

I also shared with the Board the attached summary of faculty accomplishments since our last Board meeting.

Capital Campaign

The Capital Campaign total has now exceeded thirteen million dollars in gifts and pledges. Cash gifts year to date are running forty-two percent ahead of last year this time. (\$2.1 million current year to date versus \$1.5 million last year to date).

Alumni Weekend

Please make your calendars for Alumni Weekend, April 28-30. Events include the rededication of the Keen Johnson Building on the afternoon of April 28, 2006 and the Hall of Distinguished Alumni Induction Banquet on the evening of April 29, 2006.

Thank you for your continued dedication to Eastern Kentucky University and your service on Faculty Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

Joanne K. Glasser
President

MISCELLANEOUS EKU ACCOMPLISHMENTS
JANUARY-MARCH 2006

- Ferrell Wellman, assistant professor of communication, will be inducted in April into the Kentucky Journalism Hall of Fame. His background in broadcasting and journalism includes time as the Frankfort reporter for WAVE-TV and stints with various radio stations. He is a past recipient of the Scripps Howard National Journalism Award for Radio News, as well as the National Headliner Best of Show Award.
- English professor Dr. Christine Delea has published her first full-length book of poetry, "The Skeleton Holding Up the Sky," which placed first runner-up for the 2005 Main Street Rag Poetry Book Award. The book features 49 poems, including "To My Unknown Ancestor," "God Is an Irishman Living on the South Shore of Long Island," and "In the White House Bar in Fishkill, New York." Author Alice Friman called Dr. Delea "Whitman's kid cousin with an attitude."
- David Afsah-Mohallatee, associate professor of art and design, has received a Kentucky Arts Council Al Smith Individual Artists Fellowship, valued at \$7,500. His works have been exhibited in 22 states, including Alaska and Hawaii, as well as several foreign countries.
- Tom Thurman, an associate professor in the Department of Loss Prevention and Safety, was interviewed on campus recently for a pilot program for a Discovery Channel series on the "Forensics of Terrorism." Professor Thurman, a 1969 graduate and son of former Alumni Relations Director "Spider" Thurman, played a key role in the investigation into the Pan Am Flight 103 explosion over Lockerbie, Scotland, which killed 270 people in 1988. Professor Thurman was serving at the time as a special agent in the FBI's explosives unit. The program will air later this year. Also, Professor Thurman's book, "Practical Bomb Scene Investigation," was published recently. It is considered the first comprehensive reference that not only provides essential information on locating and safeguarding evidence at the scene of an explosion, but takes the investigator through all phases of the inquiry.
- Retired head athletic trainer Dr. Bobby Barton was among five individuals inducted into the first Hall of Fame class of the Kentucky Athletic Trainers Society. Dr. Barton started the first accredited educational program in Kentucky devoted to trainers and served a term as president of the National Athletic Trainers Association. He was named in 1996 to the National Athletic Trainers Association Hall of Fame.
- Dr. Tim Ross of our Technology faculty is one of the only 12 professors selected nationally to participate in the National Leadership Academy sponsored by the Center for Research in Career and Technical Education at The Ohio State University. Also, Dr. Ross will participate in a one-year mentorship program

designed to develop a cadre of leaders who have the necessary knowledge and skills to improve the quality of workforce education programs.

- Dr. Carole Garrison, chair of the Department of Criminal Justice and Police Studies, was among the honorees at the first Ohio Women of History Dinner, held recently in Canton. Dr. Garrison, who earned her doctorate in public administration with a concentration in criminal justice from The Ohio State University, chaired the Ohio Council of Criminal Justice Educators and served on the National Council for Research on Women.
- Dr. Janna Vice, associate dean of the College of Business & Technology, received the Outstanding Researcher Award at the Association for Business Communication-Southwestern United States Conference. Dr. Vice and colleague Dr. Lana Carnes received the 2006 Distinguished Paper Award at the conference.
- Dr. David Gale, dean of the College of Health Sciences, has been selected to serve on the Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education of the American Dietetic Association.
- “Plant Life of Kentucky” a book by biology professor Dr. Ron Jones, was nominated by the Council on Botanical and Horticultural Libraries as a Significant Work in Botanical or Horticultural Literature. The book is now in its second printing by the University Press of Kentucky.
- Staff members of The Eastern Progress won both on-site deadline competitions and took home 14 other awards at the Kentucky Intercollegiate Press Association annual convention Feb. 24-25 in Lexington.
- EKU teams finished second and tied for eighth place in the recent Mock Trial Regional Competition at Bellarmine University. Sheena Moran, a psychology and criminal justice and police studies major from Horse Cave, was the top-ranking attorney, and Rob Morris, a psychology major from Richmond, and paralegal studies major Dale Petty from Stamping Ground were honored as Outstanding Witnesses. EKU will compete against 63 other teams in Des Moines, Iowa, April 7-9. Only the top 10 to 15 percent of teams nationwide qualify to compete at this level. Other qualifying programs include the University of Virginia, Harvard and Columbia.

B. Academic ~~Honesty~~ **Integrity** Policy

Eastern Kentucky University is a community of shared academic values, foremost of which is a strong commitment to intellectual honesty, honorable conduct, and respect for others. In order to meet these values, students at Eastern Kentucky University are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity. These standards are embodied in the Eastern Kentucky University Academic Integrity Policy, which all students shall pledge to uphold by signing the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code. By honoring and enforcing this Academic Integrity Policy, the University community affirms that it DOES not tolerate academic dishonesty.

~~Eastern Kentucky University faculty and students are bonded by principles of truth and honesty which are recognized as fundamental for a community of teachers and scholars. The University expects that students will honor and that faculty will honor and enforce these principles which contribute to a foundation upon which a quality education can be built. With this premise, the University affirms that it will not tolerate academic dishonesty~~

Academic integrity is a fundamental value for the Eastern Kentucky University community of students, faculty, and staff. It should be clearly understood that INCIDENTS OF academic dishonesty will have serious consequences. Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as responsible as the student who accepts such assistance and shall be subject to the same sanctions. Academic dishonesty can occur in different forms, some of which include cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication.

1. Plagiarism

~~Plagiarism is the act of presenting ideas, words, or organization of a source (published or not) as if they were one's own, without acknowledgment of the source. Since university instructors assume material presented by students is their own unless otherwise indicated, all quoted material must be in quotation marks, and all paraphrases, quotations, significant ideas, and organization must be acknowledged by footnotes or by some other form of documentation acceptable to the instructor for the course. Plagiarism also includes presenting material which was composed or revised by any person other than the student who submits it, as well as the deliberate falsification of footnotes. The use of the term "material" refers to work in any form including written, oral, or electronic (as in the case of computer files).~~

Plagiarism occurs when a student represents work taken from another source as his/her own. It is imperative that a student gives credit to information, words, ideas, and images that are integrated into his/her own work. Acknowledgement of a source of information in any form should consist of complete, accurate, and specific references and, if verbatim statements are included, quotation marks as well. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- **Using words, ideas, or images from another source (including the Internet); whether in quotation marks or not, without giving credit to that source in the form of a bibliographic citation;**
- **Using facts, statistics, or other supporting materials that are not clearly common knowledge without acknowledgment of the source.**

2. Cheating

~~Cheating includes buying, stealing, or otherwise fraudulently obtaining copies of examinations or assignments for the purpose of improving one's academic standing. During examinations or in class work, it includes receiving information from others and referring to unauthorized notes or other unauthorized information. In addition, copying from others, either during examinations or in the preparation of homework assignments, is a form of cheating.~~

~~Computers should not be used to acquire or provide information in conflict with the academic honesty policy. Furthermore, the Code of Ethics for Computing and Communications makes it the responsibility of computer users to keep information, data, and programs in their computer accounts secure from others.~~

Cheating is an act or an attempted act of deception by which a student seeks to misrepresent that he/she has mastered information on an academic exercise.

Cheating includes, but is not limited to:

- **Giving or receiving assistance not authorized by the instructor or University representative;**
- **Participating in unauthorized collaboration on an academic exercise;**
- **Using unapproved or misusing electronic devices or aids during an academic exercise.**

3. Fabrication

Fabrication is a form of deception and occurs when a student misrepresents written or verbal information in an academic exercise. Fabrication includes, but is not limited to:

- **Citation of information not taken from the source indicated. This may include the incorrect documentation of secondary source materials;**
- **Listing sources in a bibliography not directly used in the academic exercise;**
- **Submission in a paper, thesis, lab report, practicum log, or other academic exercise of falsified, invented, or fictitious data or evidence, or deliberate and knowing concealment or distortion of the true nature, origin, or function of such data or evidence;**
- **Submitting as your own any academic exercise (verbal, written, electronic, or artistic work) prepared totally or in part by another person.**

3. Co-Responsibility

~~Anyone who knowingly assists in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered as guilty as the student who accepts such assistance. Students should not allow their work to be copied or otherwise used by fellow students, nor should they sell or give unauthorized copies of examinations to other students.~~

4. Pledge

“I hereby affirm that I understand, accept, and will uphold the responsibilities and stipulations of the Eastern Kentucky University Honor Code and Academic Integrity Policy.”

4. Institutional Procedures

~~In instances of academic dishonesty, the instructor shall confront the student as soon as possible. The instructor may take any of four sanctions, depending on the seriousness of the infraction:~~

- ~~a. The instructor may assign a failing grade for the assignment;~~
- ~~b. The instructor may assign a failing grade for the course, in which case the instructor shall notify the chair of the department, the dean of the college in which the course is offered, the dean of the college of the student's major, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, if appropriate, and the Registrar;~~
- ~~c. The instructor may refer the matter to the departmental committee on academic practices for consideration and possible referral to the Student Disciplinary Council;~~
- ~~d. If the student is assigned a grade of "F" and the instructor thinks the matter is serious enough, the instructor may submit the case to the departmental committee on academic practices with the recommendation that the student, if otherwise eligible, not be permitted to graduate with honors. This recommendation shall be made no later than the date on which the faculty member submits to the Registrar the grade report on which the "F" for plagiarism or cheating is assigned. At the time the recommendation is submitted to the academic practices committee, the Registrar shall be informed that the recommendation has been submitted.~~

~~If the departmental committee on academic practices decides that the offense is serious enough to prohibit the student from being graduated with honors, the case shall be submitted to the Student Disciplinary Council for review. If the Student Disciplinary Council concurs with the departmental academic practices committee that the student should be prohibited from being graduated with honors, the chair of the Student Disciplinary Council shall inform the Registrar in writing. The Registrar shall keep a list of students prohibited from being graduated with honors because of plagiarism or cheating and shall check the graduation list for names of such students.~~

5. Procedures for Dealing with Academic Integrity Cases

Step 1. When a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy is suspected:

If an incident of alleged violation of the AI Policy is suspected, any member of the EKU community can initiate the process of review by reporting the incident, in writing, directly to the responsible faculty/staff member. The responsible

faculty/staff member may elect to conduct his/her own review of the allegations or may elect for the matter to be referred to the Academic Integrity Office.

Option A: The Faculty/Staff Member Conducts a Review of the Allegations:

If the responsible faculty/staff member chooses to continue the review of the allegations autonomously, the faculty/staff member should obtain and assess the applicable information in determining whether a violation of the AI policy has occurred. If the faculty/staff member determines that an AI policy violation has occurred, a notification of the violation must be made to the Office of Academic Integrity for recordkeeping. At this point, the faculty/staff also notifies the student in writing of the allegation, the sanction, AND the right to contest the allegation and sanction according to the AI Policy procedure. If the student accepts responsibility for the violation and the sanction in writing, the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. Upon determination of responsibility, the AI Coordinator will enter the report data in the database. If the student does not accept responsibility and chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the process proceeds to Step 2. Note: The faculty/staff member involved in Step 1 should request information from the AI Coordinator regarding the student's previous violations of the AI Policy *prior* to rendering a sanction in this particular case.

Option B: The Faculty/Staff Member Refers the Case to the Academic Integrity Office:

If a faculty/staff member chooses to refer the case directly to the AI Office, the AI Coordinator will meet with the student to discuss the alleged violation. If the student chooses not to contest the allegation and sanction, the sanction is imposed and the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. If the student contests the allegation and/or sanction, the AI Office will schedule a hearing, as soon as practicable, with the specific College Academic Integrity Committee from which the incident occurred. (Then proceed on to Step 3.)

Step 2. When an Academic Integrity charge or sanction is contested:

After the faculty/staff member and student have met and the student chooses to contest the charge and/or sanction, the faculty/staff member will refer the case to the AI Office, within five academic days of the meeting. The AI Coordinator will meet with the student to discuss the charge and/or sanctions and the right to contest these. If the student chooses not to contest the charge and sanction, the case is closed. There is no appeal from this decision. Notification of the violation is made by the AI Office into the database for recordkeeping. If the student contests the allegation and/or sanction, the AI Office will schedule a hearing, as soon as practicable, with the specific College Academic Integrity Committee from which the incident occurred. (Then proceed on to Step 3.)

Step 3.

At the College Academic Integrity Committee hearing, both the student and the faculty/staff member will present their information. The Committee members will review all of the information presented and then deliberate in private. At the discretion of the Chair of the Committee, the proceeding may be extended to an additional meeting. At this level of hearing and continuing throughout the process, the student has the option of having a Peer Advisor present. Absent exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student as determined by the Chair of the Committee, if the student who has been notified of the hearing fails to appear, the proceeding may take place in his/her absence and the Committee's decision will be binding. If the Committee determines that the student has violated the AI Policy, before the sanctioning stage of the hearing, the AI Coordinator will provide the Committee information regarding whether the student has any previous AI Policy violations recorded and sanctions imposed. The Committee will deliberate again in private in order to determine the appropriate sanction for this violation. The Chair will announce the decision of the Committee to those present at the conclusion of the hearing.

Step 4.

A student can appeal the decision of the College Academic Integrity Committee to the University Academic Integrity Committee. This appeal can only be made based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The student will notify, in writing, the AI Office of their request to appeal to the University Academic Integrity Committee within 5 academic days of the College Academic Integrity Committee's decision, and a meeting of the University Academic Integrity Committee will be scheduled as soon as practicable.

Step 5.

At the University Academic Integrity Committee appeal review meeting, the Committee members will consider all the written information supplied by the student. The Committee can modify or set aside the applied sanction, refer the case back to the College Academic Integrity Committee, or uphold the decision. The Chair of the Committee will notify the student of its decision, in writing, within five academic days of the hearing. The decision of the University Academic Integrity Committee is final, unless the Committee determines suspension or expulsion is the appropriate sanction to be imposed.

Step 6 through Step 9.

The following steps will ONLY be necessary if it is determined that the student may face the sanctions of suspension or expulsion for the alleged AI Policy violation. According to KRS 164.370, Eastern Kentucky University's Student Disciplinary Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student.

KRS 164.370 provides that:

“Each board of regents may invest the faculty or a committee of the faculty and students with the power to suspend or expel any student for disobedience to its rules, or for any other contumacy, insubordination, or immoral conduct. In every

case of suspension or expulsion of a student the person suspended or expelled may appeal to the board of regents. The board of regents shall prescribe the manner and the mode of procedure on appeal. The decision of the board of regents shall be final.”

Step 6.

If the College Academic Integrity Committee or University Academic Integrity Committee or AI Coordinator determines that the sanction of expulsion or suspension is appropriate for the AI Policy violation and the student wishes to appeal the sanction, the student must notify, in writing, the AI Office, within 5 academic days of the decision of the College or University Academic Integrity Committee’s decision, of his/her desire to appeal. As soon as practicable, the AI Office will schedule a hearing before the Student Disciplinary Council.

Step 7.

At the Student Disciplinary Council hearing, both the student and the faculty/staff member will present their information. The Council will review all of the information presented and then deliberate in private. At the discretion of the Chair of the Student Disciplinary Council, the proceeding may be extended to an additional meeting. Absent exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student as determined by the Chair of the Council, if the student who has been notified of the hearing fails to appear, the proceeding may take place in his/her absence and the Committee’s decision will be binding. If the Council determines that the student has violated the AI Policy, before the sanctioning stage of the meeting, the AI Coordinator will provide the Council information regarding whether the student has any previous AI Policy violations recorded and sanctions imposed. The Council will deliberate again in private in order to determine the appropriate sanction for this violation. The Chair will announce the decision of the Council to those present at the conclusion of the hearing.

Step 8.

If the student chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the student can appeal to the Provost. The student will notify, in writing, the AI Office of his/her request and grounds for such request, within five class days of the Student Disciplinary Council’s decision. An appeal to the Provost can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The Provost will render a decision, in writing, within 10 academic days of receipt of the appeal.

Step 9.

If the Provost upholds the decision of the Student Disciplinary Council, and if the student chooses to contest the allegation and/or sanction, the student can appeal to the Board of Regents. The student will notify, in writing, the AI Office of his/her request and the grounds for such request, within five academic days of the Provost’s decision. An appeal to the Board of Regents can only be based upon irregularities

in procedure, new evidence not available at the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The decision of the Board of Regents is final.

~~5. Further Actions~~

~~Students who are assigned a grade of "F" in a course due to academic dishonesty will not be permitted to drop the course.~~

~~If a student fails more than one course as a result of academic dishonesty, the dean of the college of the student's major shall refer the case directly to the Student Disciplinary Council for further action.~~

6. Sanctions

Minimum Sanction: The standard minimum sanction for an AI Policy violation shall be the assignment of an "F" for the test, assignment, activity in which an incident of academic dishonesty occurred. The student will not be allowed to retake or rewrite the test, assignment, or activity. A student so assigned an "F" will not be permitted to drop or withdraw from the course.

Minimum Sanction for student with one previous Academic Integrity Policy violation: The standard minimum sanction for an AI Policy violation for a student with one previous AI Policy violation will be an "FX" recorded for the course on the student's transcript. The "FX" grade denotes failure in the course due to academic dishonesty. A student so assigned an "FX" for a course will not be permitted to drop or withdraw from the course.

Sanctions: In addition to the minimum sanctions for an AI Policy violation, other appropriate educational sanctions may be assigned. These sanctions may be given even if this is the first violation of the AI Policy. Such sanctions could include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Removal from the course
- Educational sanctions
- Community service
- Restriction of computer access
- Precluded from graduating with Honors
- Assigned an "F" for the course
- "FX" notation on transcript
- Suspension *
- Expulsion *

* Note: According to KRS 164.370, Eastern Kentucky University's Student Disciplinary Council is the only body authorized to suspend or expel a student, Steps 6 through Step 9.

"FX" Notation: The "FX" grade will be changed to an "F" on the student's transcript upon completion of the educational sanctions so specified by the

faculty/staff (Step 1) or other hearing bodies. A course with a grade of “FX” may not be repeated until the “FX” grade is changed to an “F”. The student can then choose to repeat the course with the grade earned in the later taking replacing that of the “F” grade.

6. Helpful Definitions

Scheduling of hearings: Hearings will be scheduled as soon as practicable after the AI Coordinator receives written notification of the charge of an Academic Integrity violation.

Coordinator: The AI Coordinator is a faculty member who coordinates the ECU Academic Integrity Policy and procedure. The AI Coordinator does not take part in any actual hearings, but is available to answer procedural questions. The Coordinator is responsible for maintaining all records of all incidents involving the ECU Academic Integrity Policy.

College Academic Integrity Committee: The College Academic Integrity Committee is comprised of five members (1 faculty from the department where the incident arose, 2 faculty from the college at large, and 2 students from the college at large but not from the department where the incident arose.) If this case involves a graduate student, at least one of the students on the Committee will be a graduate student. One member, elected by the Committee, will serve as Chair. The Committee is responsible for determining the facts, and, if the student is found to have violated the AI Policy, the Committee must determine the appropriate sanction. To determine that a violation has/has not occurred, four of the five Committee members must agree. To determine the sanction, three of the five Committee members must agree.

Student Disciplinary Council: The Student Disciplinary Council is comprised of seven members, one faculty from each of the Colleges, and two students (one undergraduate and one graduate student) named by the President of the University. One member, elected by the Council, serves as Chair.

University Academic Integrity Committee: The University Academic Integrity Committee is comprised of six members. At the beginning of the academic year, there will be two names (1 faculty, 1 student) from each college and one name (faculty/staff) from the Library submitted to the President’s office for appointment to the Committee. For each AI hearing, the College from which the incident arose will have both the faculty and student serve as members of this specific Committee. The remaining members of the Committee will be randomly drawn from two separate categories in order for the make-up of the Committee to be three faculty and three students. One member, elected by the Committee, will serve as Chair. An appeal to this Committee can only be based upon irregularities in procedure, new evidence not available for the first hearing, or punishment not consistent with the violation. The Committee can modify or set aside the applied sanction, refer the

case back to the College Academic Integrity Committee, or uphold the decision. The decision of the University Academic Integrity Committee is final, unless the Committee determines suspension or expulsion is the appropriate sanction to be imposed.

Peer Advisor: An accused student has the right to have another willing student act as his or her advisor/advocate and to assist the student throughout the process, beginning at Step 3 and continuing through Step 9. The student can be any presently enrolled ECU student.

Silent Advisor: An accused student has the right to have an attorney present at any proceeding at Step 3 and continuing through Step 9. The attorney is not permitted to speak in any hearing through this process.

To: Faculty Senate
From: Senator Melissa Dieckmann, Department of Earth Sciences
Date: November 28, 2005

Based on discussion at the January meeting of the Faculty Senate, I have revised the amendment that I brought forward at the December meeting as follows:

AMENDMENT 2:

To change Part 1, Section C, #8 as follows:

Part I: Main Recommendations

C. Promotion in Faculty Rank

8. a. The university shall ~~continue to permit~~ prohibit faculty ~~to apply from applying for promotion in rank to associate professor~~ prior to being considered for tenure.
- b. Tenure will not be granted without concomitant promotion to faculty at the rank of assistant professor.

Note: Part I, Section B, #7 states: "The probationary period for tenure shall be six years, and, if awarded, tenure shall begin in the seventh year. Exceptions concerning the probationary period shall be specified in writing at the time of initial employment in a tenure-track position." This allows for prospective faculty to negotiate for tenure (and therefore promotion) to occur more quickly than six years based on previous experience, but that intention must be explicitly determined at the time of hire.

JUSTIFICATION OF THE AMENDMENT:

- 8a:** If, as is the common practice, promotion to associate professor prior to tenure implies that all requirements for tenure (except for time in service) have been met or exceeded, then the university is, in effect, granting early tenure by granting promotion prior to tenure. A candidate who achieves promotion then is denied for tenure would have just cause to question the action if the criteria are identical. The university should be very leery about making a decision that has implications for lifetime employment after only three years of employment at ECU, and it must be questioned whether three years of employment at ECU provides sufficient knowledge of the long-term success of one's teaching, scholarship and service. Success in teaching, research and service at another university do not necessarily translate into success at ECU, but in circumstances where the department feels that this is the case, an exception can be negotiated at the time of hire.
- 8b:** The recommendations put forth by the ad hoc committee add one year to the probationary period for tenure, which allows greater time for success in teaching, scholarship and service. Additionally, the Faculty Senate has already passed an amendment for extension of the tenure clock under circumstances to be negotiated by the faculty member and relevant administrative bodies (e.g., department chair, Dean).

Therefore, there is ample opportunity for all members of the faculty, including those with child care issues, family health care issues, and medical challenges to be provided sufficient time to meet the requirements of both tenure and promotion. Additionally, since most departments currently have EXACTLY THE SAME requirements for promotion and tenure except for time in service, most faculty at ECU are currently required to be successful candidates for promotion in order to receive tenure.

Both: Joint granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor are common, best management practices at universities throughout the country. The separation of these two actions provides significant ambiguity and variance of policy throughout the university. Often, the practice at the departmental level is to have two standards for promotion – if a faculty member wishes to apply for promotion to associate professor prior to tenure, then the expectation is that the faculty member significantly exceeds the standards required for tenure. On the other hand, these same departments are willing to grant tenure to a faculty member who does not meet the requirements for promotion to associate professor. This inconsistent application of criteria is a legal landmine.

To: Faculty Senate
From: Senator Pam Schlomann
Date: February 8, 2006

I would like to bring forward at the March meeting a motion to add the following amendment to the Ad Hoc P & T Committee report:

Under Part I, Section A, add number five, to read as follows:

- a. If all recommendations are positive, the sequence of reviews of all applications for promotion and tenure are as follows: Department committee, Department chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, Dean, Provost, President, and Board of Regents.
- b. If a candidate is not recommended for tenure by the Department committee, Department chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, or Dean, the application will automatically be reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee prior to being forwarded to the Provost.
- c. If a candidate is not recommended for promotion by the Department committee, Department chair, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, or Dean, the application shall not be considered further, unless the candidate appeals to the next level. If the candidate does appeal, the sequence of the process shall follow that stated in b.

Justification:

The last Senate meeting there was a tied vote, broken by the Senate chair to delete section 5.

During the debate important issues were noted on both sides of the debate:

1. The importance of protecting the integrity of the academy by ensuring that a) individuals are not inappropriately promoted or tenured and b) peer review is not undermined.
2. The importance of protecting the rights of individuals by ensuring a) they are not capriciously blocked from promotion and tenure and b) the doctrine of no surprises is not violated.

Additional points were noted:

1. Without opportunity to consider positively evaluated applications, evaluating the appropriateness of a negatively evaluated application is difficult.
2. Due to proximity, the department on one hand is most knowledgeable about the candidate, but also may be least objective.

This proposed amendment seeks to balance all of the issues and not to weigh solely on one side or the other. Having both positive and negative recommendations go to a college committee provides an opportunity for additional peer recommendations from those not as closely connected with the applicant and yet who still share some common understandings of the discipline. This provides protection to both the academy and to the individual. It also provides the college committee an opportunity to compare positive and negative recommendations.

Additionally, the proposed amendment addresses one of the concerns which initiated the creation of the Ad Hoc P & T Committee. The work of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee is enormous. Each year they must review applications for tenure and promotion from approximately 75 individuals. Approximately 25% of these have received a negative recommendation from a lower level. In order for this committee to thoroughly review these appeals, reducing their total workload is appropriate. It is not unusual to have an appeal committee only review cases which have had negative outcomes

Motion on Senate Alternates

All voting members of the Senate are elected to represent the faculty in their departments. In order to ensure consistent and accurate representation, each department is also asked to elect an alternate for a three-year term in addition to their regular Senator(s). Each election unit shall be entitled but not required to elect alternate delegates (as many as the unit deems feasible) to ensure voting rights for their faculty. The alternate may attend for any Senator in departments with more than one representative. Elected alternates will possess full voting rights and attend meetings when the elected Senator is unavailable. In situations where an alternate is either not elected or is unable to attend, a substitute may attend. Substitutes are allowed to speak to issues and report back to their departments, but substitutes do not have voting rights. The Senate Chair and/or Secretary should be notified in advance whenever an alternate or a substitute will attend a Senate meeting in place of a Senator.

**Faculty Senate Chair's Report
Executive Committee Meeting
20 March 2006**

Dear Senators:

The following notes detail the business conducted at the last Executive Committee meeting and include several information items since that meeting. If you have questions or comments, don't hesitate to contact me at carolyn.siegel@eku.edu or by voice mail at 622-4973. See you at Senate on the 3rd!

ANNOUNCEMENTS/INFORMATION ITEMS

Academic Regalia Day and Rededication of Keen Johnson – April 28, 2006 – 2:30 pm

Mark your calendars for Friday, April 28, 2006, the day of the official Rededication of the Keen Johnson Building. We are calling on all ECU faculty and staff to wear their academic regalia the day of the rededication to mark ECU's Centennial Year. Many thanks to Senator Hensley and his incredible Senate Centennial Committee for developing this event as well as the two formal teas held March 20th for retired faculty and professional staff. The event was planned with the assistance of the ECU Centennial Committee and the ECU Development Office.

Faculty Eat and Meet in Faculty Dining Room, Powell Building

We held our first ever Faculty *Eat and Meet* on March 28th and it was terrific! Over 20 faculty came to eat and discuss a myriad of topics. It was wonderful to meet new folks and renew contact with others. Please consider whether we should hold another get together in April. Special thanks to Vice President Dr. James Conneely for initiating changes in the Faculty Dining Room that make it so much more inviting. The Room is much more congenial with improved seating arrangements, white tablecloths, and table accoutrements.

“For the Good of the Order” Discussion Topic

April: “Strategies for Improving Faculty Life at ECU: Recommendations for Facilitating Faculty Teaching, Research, and Service Effectiveness”

May: Because we hold two May meetings (regular and elections) we will not hold a discussion at the first May meeting. Sorry! I believe these discussions have been a highlight of the past two years. I hope they will continue in the 2006-2007 Academic Year.

NOTES FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Senator Eakin, Vice-Chair, chaired the meeting until the Senate Chair returned from the retirees tea being held concurrently on the second floor of Keen Johnson. By that time, the Senate Chair had imbibed far too much tea and was on a caffeine high!

NEW BUSINESS:

In 2003 the FS Executive Committee ruled that faculty alternates could substitute for Senators in the Senator's absence, but alternates would not be eligible to vote on issues. In light of recent events, the Executive Committee revisited the issue and it was the consensus of the current committee that an alternate or alternates should be elected by individual departments at the same time the Senate representative is elected. If a Senator(s) or Alternate(s) is unavailable to attend meetings, then a substitute could attend the meeting and report back to departments, but would not be eligible to vote on Senate issues. A motion on substitutes and alternates will be brought to the Senate in April for consideration. It was the consensus of the Executive Committee that the May Senate elections be handled as stated in the Senate rules. Therefore, nominees for Senate chair will be taken in April and nominations and elections for Senate Vice-Chair and

standing committees will occur at the May organizational meeting. The Executive Committee approved the proposed schedule for the 2006-2007 Senate meeting dates.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Budget Committee - Senator Eakin reported that Senator Taylor has been working on the class pattern survey and it's almost complete and ready to be distributed.

Rules Committee - Senator Johnson announced the Rules Committee will meet next week.

Welfare Committee - Senator Hubbard reported the committee will be meeting next week.

Arlington Board - Senator Flanagan stated that the next Board meeting will be in mid-April.

General Education - Senator Hubbard reported the committee will meet next week.

Futures Committee - Senator Siegel reported the committee will submit a report for April's Senate.

Provost Report

Senator Chapman noted the Promotion and Tenure process for this year is almost complete. He plans to develop a checklist before next year's process begins which will help quickly determine if someone has all the required credentials to apply for promotion and/or tenure. The budget process for next year is underway. Senator Chapman mentioned that one of the strategic planning goals is to make sure all of the classrooms are technologically current. One of his immediate goals is to develop a three-year rotation plan for wireless computers for everyone, with faculty needs as a top priority.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:25 p.m.

To: Faculty Senate
From: Pam Schlomann
Date: March 27, 2006
Re: Regent's Report

The Board had its regularly scheduled meeting this morning. During the past week three Board committees—Finance and Planning, Internal Affairs, and Student Life, Discipline and Athletics—have met.

Some of the actions approved by the Board meeting include:

- a. Tuition increase of approximately 11.4 %; increase for residence hall/dining rates
- b. 3.5% salary adjustment for full time employees and \$250,000 for merit
- c. Guidelines for allocation of new revenues in the development of the 06-07 budget. These guidelines included necessary adjustments to fixed costs, six advising positions to be housed in the colleges, faculty computer leasing/replacement plan, continued (though slower than originally planned) staff equity adjustments, QEP funding, continue need-based scholarship funding at the present level/increase other financial aid to reflect increased tuition; initial funding for PGA/PGM program.
- d. In order to address concerns and to increase flexibility to employees, changes will be made in the health insurance plan. The administrators will be divided among providers as follows:
 - Medical: Anthem
 - Pharmacy: Express Scripts
 - Mental health and an employee assistance program: Behavioral MedicineThe same three options will continue to be offered however an additional tier (employee and children) will be offered.
- e. Personnel actions (including promotion, tenure, faculty emeritus, RTP).

At the various meetings, reports were also received about the capital campaign, construction, projects, contracts, scholarships, etc.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Pam Schlomann
622-1959
pam.schlomann@eku.edu

COSFL REPORT

COSFL has not met recently.

The AAUP/COSFL Second Academic Conference is scheduled for April 22 in Frankfort. Registration information is available at:
aaupkyconference@insightbb.com.

**Report to the Senate
Interim Provost
April 3, 2006**

There are two things that I want to mention to you in this report. The first is a summary of questions and concerns that arose during the Promotion and Tenure process. The second is an elaboration of the two academic initiatives that the President mentioned in the convocation and were funded for next year's budget—assuming that we receive the currently projected allocation from the Legislature.

PROMOTION AND TENURE

As the Senate reviews the Recommended Changes for Promotion and Tenure, it might be helpful for you to be aware of a few questions and concerns that were encountered during this year's process.

Questions:

1. Should work for which an individual receives additional compensation, whether it be internal or external, be considered in the promotion and tenure review?
2. Should work done prior to coming to ECU count toward promotion?
3. Is a significant publication record required for promotion to professor? To any rank? That is unclear from what was sent forward through the process.
4. Are publications in process, no matter what the stage, counted or not counted?
5. Can a person be promoted with no teaching responsibilities as part of his or her basic assignment?
6. Should a person receive a complete review if he or she withdraws since earlier decisions are occasionally reversed?

Concerns:

1. The Ad Hoc Committee made a number of recommendations for standards for tenure. Currently the Handbook states, "A faculty member shall be eligible for tenure after completing a five year probationary period of continuous full-time service and attaining the rank of assistant professor or above. If, by the end of the five year probationary period, promotion beyond the rank of instructor cannot be justified or if for any other reason a faculty member is not recommended for tenure, a one year terminal contract shall be tendered." Unless there are other specific criteria put forward by the department, serving five years and attaining the rank of assistant professor is all that is needed to achieve this major commitment of appointment from the University.
2. The Ad Hoc Committee specifies for both tenure and promotion that the individual have a terminal degree "relevant to the faculty member's appointment." As the Committee recommends, "terminal degree" needs to be defined and delineated, and any exceptions need to be noted clearly at the time of hire.
3. With regard to the Senate amendment that positive as well as negative recommendations continue to be reviewed by committees as well as administrators as is the current practice, it should be noted that several individuals without appropriate or with questionable relevant credentials made it to the provost level without any such notation or concerns in

the file. This would support the continuation of even positive reviews.

4. It should be required that each reviewer provide a written statement recommending either support for or denial of the application and the reasons for that decision stated in terms of the standards. With just check marks indicating approval or non-approval, it is difficult for subsequent reviewers to determine why earlier reviewers supported or denied the candidate's request. As a result the process must begin anew rather than build on the previous reviewers' work.
7. There needs to be specific criteria established for special title series and categories of employees, so that the candidates from the beginning of their employment and the reviewers in the promotion and tenure process know what the standards are.
8. There should be included in the file documentation if the individual has received credit toward tenure.
9. Another problem that arose in tenure cases (that is, barely meeting the minimal requirements set for Assistant Professor) will be addressed if tenure and promotion to associate professor, except in special circumstances, occur at the same time. This will raise the bar to require meeting the standards of Associate Professor prior to receiving tenure.

Observations:

1. In my two years at ECU, I have noted that appeals often contain personal and emotional information not relevant to the candidate's case for achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. In my opinion appeals should be made strictly on material added to the dossier and considered at the next highest level and not at the level making the decision that is being appealed.
2. One final observation is a recommendation that no files undergo review outside of the college for years 1, 2, 3, and 5. The only formal reviews that must go through the entire process should be at the 4th and 6th years. This would allow for quicker response and more meaningful review of the candidates in the two crucial years.

2006-2007 ACADEMIC INITIATIVES

There were two academic initiatives that were funded in this year's budget guidelines: advisors for a three-tiered advising program and a three-year rotation of faculty computers.

Three-Tiered Advising

Last year a committee chaired by Larry Collins conducted a study of advising. It noted a number of deficiencies that need to be addressed. To address some of those concerns, a three-tiered approach to advising has been proposed and will be funded if we receive the state funds the President mentions in her report. Support for advising undecided students is in place in Enrollment Management; and faculty advise majors. Where improvement most commonly is needed is in the 0-75 credit range for those who have decided but are not upper-level. This plan will put six advisors—two in CAS and one at each of the other colleges to supplement the individuals they have doing graduation checks and change the focus of these individuals to advising these students as well as checking credentials. A new system will be developed to make sure all students are receiving the information they need to make wise choices and move toward graduation.

Three-Year Replacement of Faculty Computers

As part of our new Strategic Plan we need to make sure that equipment for faculty and in classrooms is current and effective. What we are proposing to do is to provide 3-year rotation of computers for all tenure-track faculty. This would be done by leasing laptops and docking stations. The laptops would be PC's from one vendor or, if the faculty member prefers, a Mac. They would be high performance machines with wireless and CD/DVD capability. Benefits of this method would be that it would

- Allow faculty to have a machine in the classroom that they understand

- Allow for ease of repair, service, and replacement

- Negate the need for VCR, DVD, computers, and possibly overheads to be stored in classrooms. Only needed would be a projection device, which could be secured

- Allow the unlocking and better utilization of a number of classrooms

- Finish making all classrooms wireless with projection devices by the fall

- Allow faculty to have computers for library research since it too is wireless

- Provide for ease of installation and disposal of computers.

The allocation from the new money is about \$130,000. From funds the Provost's Office received this year, I will provide the rest of the money for the first year lease payment; the deans have committed to back that up from their funds next year and thereafter, if new funds are not available from the state appropriation. This will eliminate the need for the colleges to budget for faculty computers in the future. We also will be able to cascade current faculty computers to staff and part-time faculty. The next phase will be to put all staff computers on a three-year rotation as well.

We are making good progress on a number of fronts. Thank you for your hard work and dedication to ECU.

Jim Chapman

For Faculty Senate:

Student Government Association President's Report

- Thank you to all of those who helped with our Rally for Higher Education and encouraged students to write letters to representatives.
- SGA is quickly coming upon elections. It is hard to believe that it has already been a year. Elections will occur April 18th and the newly elected students will be officially sworn in at our banquet on May 2nd. Elections will take place on computer again.
- The biggest news currently in SGA is that our Student Activities Council is bringing MTV's Campus Invasion Tour to ECU. The event will take place on April 13th in the Alumni Coliseum. MTV will have events going on all day that will ultimately lead up to the concert that starts at 7 P.M. The concert will feature Motion City Soundtrack, Straylightrun and hellogoodbye.

Thank you.

Kyle Moon
Student Government Association President

BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

Senator Eakin

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee has continued the development of a university-wide survey to explore the possibility of alternative scheduling for classes. Since our last meeting in Senate we have received an unsolicited summary document from Dr Rob Christensen [Department of Curriculum and Instruction]. I think you will see for yourself why this is so extraordinary. Rob did his undergraduate degree at California State University San Marcos using a form of the alternative scheduling we are exploring. The Committee believes that his summary report will help all of us in Senate to jump-start discussions with and among our departmental constituents. Please note that Rob has several possible scenarios with similar permutations - some starting at 7:00 a.m., some at 7:30 a.m. and others at the traditional 8:00 a.m. I hope you will join with me and the Budget committee in expressing sincere appreciation to Dr. Christensen for this excellent work.

One facet not covered in his textual summary was Dr Yoder's concern about the length of time between class sessions. I think we all feel that the amount of time for assimilation of material be as evenly distributed as possible. So there is the possibility of a MR-TF schedule that would even the time out between class sessions [as opposed to MF-TR or even MW-TR]. From my personal view, the great demand by students to get all their classes on TR [part of what has caused our parking problems] is a clear indicator that the four-day week is not only feasible - but an improvement.

**EKU Alternative Class Schedule
Format Proposal Draft**

By

Dr. Rob Christensen

Introduction

I generated this proposal to address the issue raised in the March 2006 EKU Faculty Senate meeting. During the discussion in the EKU Faculty Senate, faculty members raised numerous issues related to academic scheduling. Those issues included pedagogy, research/service activity time, classroom scheduling/space, and parking. This proposal will address each previous point briefly. Additionally, I will provide different course scheduling alternatives, but I will readily claim that further investigation is needed to address this issue in a comprehensive and thorough manner.

Pedagogy

The issue of pedagogy was presented at the Faculty Senate meeting. There were a variety of options regarding the issue of alternative course scheduling format.

Several EKU Faculty Senators raised significant pedagogical concerns regarding alternative scheduling. Senator Wolf (Music Department) noted that certain courses are well-suited to a two 75 minute class periods; however, Senator Wolf noted that music performance courses are not well suited to a two 75 minute class period format. Another faculty senator from another department raised pedagogical concerns on how an alternate schedule may affect instruction in that field.

Other faculty senators advocated for entertaining an alternative schedule format. Senator Dieckmann from the Earth Sciences Department articulated that an alternative scheduling format would permit science faculty to conduct field lab courses on a day that regular courses were not taught. Another faculty, including me, find a two 75 minute period more conducive to conduct courses that allows for a variety of instructional practices that are difficult to use in the three 50 minutes periods. Those instructional practices can include the use of in-class activities or informal labs, case study analysis, and other practices that may require a significant length of time to use these instructional practices without interruption.

There are advantages and disadvantages to considering alternative course scheduling formats. However, the fundamental question that should drive a discussion of alternative course scheduling formats is: What is the best pedagogical practice for the majority of academic departments and programs?

Research/Service Activities

A second issue discussed during the EKU Faculty Senate meeting related to the alternative course scheduling issue was that there is not enough time available in the current course scheduling format to conduct research and service activities. One faculty member noted that the current course schedule does not facilitate the time necessary for department meetings and administrative activities that academic departments need to conduct. An alternative course-scheduling format may allow faculty members to use an instructional free day for research and/or service activities.

Classroom Scheduling and Capacity

Another issue that was addressed during the Faculty Senate discussion of alternative course scheduling formats was classroom scheduling/space. Depending upon the structure of alternative course schedule format, it may not lead to a significant reduction in course time blocks or a significant adverse impact upon classroom space. However, if EKU decides to utilize an alternate course-scheduling format may require instruction to begin earlier in the day or end later in the instructional day.

Parking

Another issue that was presented was how an alternative course-scheduling format may relieve parking concerns. An alternative course scheduling format that allows the vast of majority of students to enroll in one of two day course scheduling formats (MW or TR; MR or TF) may allow a more even distribution of students on campus across the academic week, and thus perhaps alleviate some parking concerns. However, any change of course-scheduling formats should not be driven exclusively by parking concerns.

Alternative Course Scheduling Formats

There are four issues that are related to the issue of whether EKU should proceed with an alternative course-scheduling format, and those issues are pedagogy, research/service activity time, classroom scheduling/classroom capacity, and parking. Any alternative course scheduling format will need to address the previous issues with pedagogy being the primary issue and research/service activity time, classroom scheduling/space, and parking being secondary issues related to alternative course scheduling. There are two potential alternative course-scheduling formats described below along with graphics illustrating the two alternative course-scheduling formats on pages 4-6.

MW and TR Alternative Course Schedule Format

The first alternative course-scheduling format is a Monday-Thursday academic week format with multiple options (see pages 5-11). If EKU decided to schedule courses on a Monday-Thursday academic week format with classes meeting on Monday-Wednesday or Tuesday-Thursday, this may allow departments that have pedagogical concerns regarding having classes meet only on two days to conduct classes on Monday-Wednesday-Friday format with those courses beginning at the same time that the MW courses begin.

In addition, there are various evening course configurations. Colleges, departments, and programs could elect which option to utilize given the needs and wants of its late afternoon and evening students.

Furthermore, a potential instructional free day on Friday may allow for the following activities. College committees, university committees, departments could hold meetings these meetings on Fridays. If department, college, or university meetings are not planned on Fridays, then faculty could use this potentially instructional free day to conduct scholarly endeavors.

MR and TF Alternative Course Schedule Format

The second alternative course-scheduling format is Monday-Friday academic week with Wednesday as an instructional free day. If EKU decided to implement this alternative course schedule, this would restrict the flexibility of departments or programs to conduct Monday-Wednesday-Friday classes. However, this alternative course schedule format may serve the majority of departments in terms of pedagogy and permitting faculty to use a variety of instructional strategies (informal labs, case-study analysis, simulations) that are difficult to use in a course scheduled in a MWF format.

The second alternative course-scheduling format also allows multiple evening course configurations. Colleges, departments, and programs could elect which option to utilize given the needs and wants of its late afternoon and evening students

Moreover, the second alternative course-scheduling format may allow for the following activities. College committees, university committees, departments could hold meetings these meetings on Wednesdays. If department, college, or university meetings are not conducted on Wednesdays, then faculty could use this potentially instructional free day to conduct scholarly endeavors.

Conclusion

This alternative course-scheduling document is a draft. There are many issues that administrators, faculty, staff, and students will need to consider before the campus embraces any change in the course-scheduling format. Additionally, the university will need to collect survey data from different university constituencies (administrators, faculty, staff, and students) to answer the following questions:

- 1.) Is there a widespread dissatisfaction with the current course-scheduling format among different university constituencies?
- 2.) If there were a change in the current course-scheduling format, what alternative course-scheduling format would the different university constituencies desire (i.e. MW and TR, MR and TF course scheduling formats)?
- 3.) If different constituencies desire a change in the course-scheduling format, would different constituencies favor starting the academic day at 0700 or 0730 hours to accommodate an alternative course-scheduling format (MW and TR or MR and TF course scheduling formats)?
- 4.) If different constituencies desire a change in the course-scheduling format, would different constituencies favor ending the academic day later at 2145 or 2215 hours to accommodate an alternative course-scheduling format (MW and TR or MR and TF course scheduling formats)?
- 5.) If different constituencies desire a change in the course scheduling format, are different constituencies equally willing to entertain either teaching or taking courses in either 2 day course scheduling format (MW or TR; MR and TF)?

The previous questions are only a partial list of questions that are needed in any survey to determine the level of support in the university community for changing the current course-scheduling format to an alternative course-scheduling format.

However, the fundamental questions are: Will a change of course scheduling lead to better instructional outcomes and make course offerings more available to traditional and non-traditional students along with day and evening students? The previous questions should drive any discussion to change the course-scheduling format at Eastern Kentucky University.

**Monday-Wednesday or Tuesday-Thursday Day Classes
Starting at 0700 Hours**

Option A: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1900 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0700-0815					
2		0830-0945					
3	2	1000-1115					
4		1130-1245					
5	3	1300-1415					
6		1430-1545					
7	4	1600-1715					
8		1730-1845					
E1	5	1900-2145					

Option B: Two 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1600 and 1900 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0700-0815					
2		0830-0945					
3	2	1000-1115					
4		1130-1245					
5	3	1300-1415					
6		1430-1545					
E1	4	1600-1845					
E2	5	1900-2145					

Option C: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1700, 1730, or 1800 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0700-0815					
2		0830-0945					
3	2	1000-1115					
4		1130-1245					
5	3	1300-1415					
6		1430-1545					
E1	4	1700-1945 or 1730-2015 or 1800-2045					

Note: If logistically feasible, departments or colleges could select to start time for the evening course that best serves its students/clients.

**Monday-Thursday or Tuesday-Friday Day Classes
Starting at 0700 Hours**

Option A: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1900 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0700-0815					
2		0830-0945					
3	2	1000-1115					
4		1130-1245					
5	3	1300-1415					
6		1430-1545					
7	4	1600-1715					
8		1730-1845					
E1	5	1900-2145					

Option B: Two 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1600 and 1900 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0700-0815					
2		0830-0945					
3	2	1000-1115					
4		1130-1245					
5	3	1300-1415					
6		1430-1545					
E1	4	1600-1845					
E2	5	1900-2145					

Option C: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1700, 1730, or 1800 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0700-0815					
2		0830-0945					
3	2	1000-1115					
4		1130-1245					
5	3	1300-1415					
6		1430-1545					
E1	4	1700-1945 or 1730-2015 or 1800-2045					

Note: If logistically feasible, departments or colleges could select the evening course start time that best serves its faculty, students, and staff.

**Monday-Wednesday or Tuesday-Thursday Day Classes
Starting at 0730 Hours**

Option A: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1930 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0730-0845					
2		0900-1015					
3	2	1030-1145					
4		1200-1315					
5	3	1330-1445					
6		1500-1615					
7	4	1630-1745					
8		1800-1915					
E1	5	1930-2215					

Option B: Two 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1630 and 1930 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0730-0845					
2		0900-1015					
3	2	1030-1145					
4		1200-1315					
5	3	1330-1445					
6		1500-1615					
E1	4	1630-1915					
E2	5	1930-2215					

Option C: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1700, 1730, or 1800 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0730-0845					
2		0900-1015					
3	2	1030-1145					
4		1200-1315					
5	3	1330-1445					
6		1500-1615					
E1	4	1700-1945 or 1730-2015 or 1800-2045					

Note: If logistically feasible, departments or colleges could select the evening course start time that best serves its faculty, students, and staff.

**Monday-Thursday or Tuesday-Friday Day Classes
Starting at 0730 Hours**

Option A: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1930 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0730-0845					
2		0900-1015					
3	2	1030-1145					
4		1200-1315					
5	3	1330-1445					
6		1500-1615					
7	4	1630-1745					
8		1800-1915					
E1	5	1930-2215					

Option B: Two 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1630 and 1930 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0730-0845					
2		0900-1015					
3	2	1030-1145					
4		1200-1315					
5	3	1330-1445					
6		1500-1615					
E1	4	1630-1915					
E2	5	1930-2215					

Option C: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1700, 1730, or 1800 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0730-0845					
2		0900-1015					
3	2	1030-1145					
4		1200-1315					
5	3	1330-1445					
6		1500-1615					
E1	4	1700-1945 or 1730-2015 or 1800-2045					

Note: If logistically feasible, departments or colleges could select the evening course start time that best serves its faculty, students, and staff.

**Monday-Wednesday or Tuesday-Thursday Day Classes
Starting at 0800 Hours**

Option A: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1830 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0800-0915					
2		0930-1045					
3	2	1100-1215					
4		1230-1345					
5	3	1400-1515					
6		1530-1645					
7		1700-1815					
E1	4	1830-2115					

Option B: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1700, 1730, or 1800 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0800-0915					
2		0930-1045					
3	2	1100-1215					
4		1230-1345					
5	3	1400-1515					
6		1530-1645					
E1	4	1700-1945 or 1730-2015 or 1800-2045					

Note: If logistically feasible, departments or colleges could select the evening course start time that best serves its faculty, students, and staff.

**Monday-Thursday or Tuesday-Friday Day Classes
Starting at 0800 Hours**

Option A: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1830 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0800-0915					
2		0930-1045					
3	2	1100-1215					
4		1230-1345					
5	3	1400-1515					
6		1530-1645					
7		1700-1815					
E1	4	1830-2115					

Option B: One 3 Hour Evening Course Starting at 1700, 1730, or 1800 hours

	Lab Block	Time/Day	Monday	Tuesday	Wed.	Thursday	Friday
1	1	0800-0915					
2		0930-1045					
3	2	1100-1215					
4		1230-1345					
5	3	1400-1515					
6		1530-1645					
E1	4	1700-1945 or 1730-2015 or 1800-2045					

Note: If logistically feasible, departments or colleges could select the evening course start time that best serves its faculty, students, and staff.

**Inclement Weather Delay Schedule Given
The Academic Day Normally Begins at 0700 Hours**

	Lab Block	Regular Time/Day	Delay Time/Day	M	T	W	R	F
1	1	0700-0815	1000-1050					
2		0830-0945	1100-1150					
3	2	1000-1115	1200-1250					
4		1130-1245	1300-1350					
5	3	1300-1415	1400-1450					
6		1430-1545	1500-1550					
Any Classes That Begins at 1600 Hours or After Follows Regular Course Schedule								

**Inclement Weather Delay Schedule Given
The Academic Day Normally Begins at 0730 Hours**

	Lab Block	Regular Time/Day	Delay Time/Day	M	T	W	R	F
1	1	0730-0845	1000-1050					
2		0900-1015	1100-1150					
3	2	1030-1145	1200-1250					
4		1200-1315	1300-1350					
5	3	1330-1445	1400-1450					
6		1500-1615	1500-1615					
Any Classes That Begins at 1630 Hours or After Follows Regular Course Schedule								

**Inclement Weather Delay Schedule Given
The Academic Day Normally Begins at 0800 Hours**

	Lab Block	Regular Time/Day	Delay Time/Day	M	T	W	R	F
1	1	0800-0915	1000-1050					
2		0930-1045	1100-1150					
3	2	1100-1215	1200-1250					
4		1230-1345	1300-1350					

The Rights & Responsibilities Committee

Committee Members: Marcel Robles, Paula Kristofik, Nina Coyer, Mixon Ware, Susan Fister

The committee finished revising the wording of the Academic Integrity Policy into Faculty Handbook language. The revision will be brought to Senate at this meeting and voted on at the next Senate meeting.

There has been ongoing discussion regarding the P&T proposal on the Senate Floor.

Report of the Ad Hoc Centennial Committee – April 3, 2006

The EKU Centennial event, as prophesied in our last report, was one of elegance, gentility, and sincere appreciation for our retired faculty.

Approximately 120 attendees, including retired faculty and guests, President Glasser, Provost James Chapman, and members of the Faculty Senate Centennial Committee, were treated to a delightful afternoon for which all were appreciative. All those present termed the event a “great success.”

Many thanks to the Faculty Senate, the Senate’s Ad Hoc Centennial Committee, and the University Centennial Committee, for making the event possible.

As concerns the April 28th Rededication of the Keen Johnson Building, details for that special EKU Centennial event are in place, as described in last month’s report.

Again, all members of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Centennial Committee are appreciative of the opportunity to work on such delightful projects.

The Ad Hoc Centennial Committee:

Hal Blythe, Joseph Foster, Charles Hay, Hunter Hensley, Dot Kirkpatrick, Sharon Shasby, Carolyn Siegel,, Marc Whitt, Joyce Wolf.

The Faculty Advisory Committee for the Analysis of Change at EKU

Committee Purposes:

- Identify, study, and discuss specific aspects of change in EKU that are of particular concern to, or have significant impacts on the future of, the Faculty.
- Disseminate to the Faculty data-based analyses of specific aspects of change in EKU that are of particular concern to, or have significant impacts on the future of, the Faculty.
- Suggest possible courses of action in response to these changes to appropriate entities.
- Advise the Provost on the growth and development of the Faculty.

Need: The quality and development of the Faculty are critical to the success of the University in all its aims. In recent years, rapid and unrelenting change has impacted EKU's Faculty in a multitude of ways. Collaborative discussion between the Faculty and the Provost, data-based analysis, and dissemination of descriptions of these trends to EKU's Faculty would assist EKU in proactively dealing with change at individual, group, and institutional levels. Potential solutions may also be suggested by these efforts. A Committee with such a charge would enhance faculty and staff work life, student educational experiences, and EKU's reputation as a forward-thinking university. Exchange and discussion of information on change at EKU would enhance understanding, pride, and the sense of shared community at EKU. Some of the changes in EKU that may be of interest to such a Committee might be: demographics of faculty, staff, and students; intra-University communication; faculty scholarship; tuition and state budgets; grant funding; the expression of academic community; traditions marking EKU's unique identity; or relation of the University to its service region.

Procedures: The Committee will meet monthly with the Provost to discuss a wide range of topics that center on the nature of academic change at EKU, as well as how such changes are reflected at state and national levels. The areas to be discussed, and the amount of time spent on each aspect of change, are to be determined by the Committee. Topical discussions of change will be supported by descriptive data whenever possible. A summary report will be given to the Faculty Senate each semester.

Committee Makeup: One Senator elected by the Faculty Senate; five Faculty Members, one elected from each College by the Faculty Members of their College at their Fall College Meeting; and the University Provost. The Faculty Members serve three year terms, with initial appointment of Faculty Members being staggered to enable two members to rotate off of the Committee every year. Determination of staggered term lengths will be determined by the Committee at its first meeting. The Committee is to be chaired by a Faculty Member.

Faculty Member selection should be based on (1) personal and professional objectivity in regard to issues of change; (2) awareness of the values and goals of the institution; and (3) willingness to work for change.

(The above recommendations were produced by the Senate Futures Committee, at the request of the Senate Chair, and with feedback from the Provost. Senate Futures Committee: Ann Chapman, Larry Collins, Stephen Fardo, Richard Freed, Doris Pierce, and Doug Whitlock.)

**Academic Regalia Day
&
Rededication of Keen Johnson
Building
Friday, April 28, 2006
2:30 pm**



Join us for the official Rededication of
the Keen Johnson Building
at the heart of the ECU campus

A special 100-person chorus will sing
Reception after in Walnut Hall

**EKU faculty and staff are encouraged to
wear their full academic regalia on this
very special day**

The Keen Johnson building was built in 1939 as a WPA project. Originally it was the student union building at Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College. Named in honor of Keen Johnson (1896-1970), former governor and ECU regent, the Colonial Revival style building is the most notable and arguably best-loved landmark on

Senators: Please post this to the ECU and campus e-mail lists.

The rededication ceremony was planned by your ECU Faculty Senate with the assistance of

the ECU Centennial Committee and ECU Development Office.

2006-2007 Standing Committee List

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

(continuing members: James Chapman, Charlotte Hubbard, Pam Schlomann)

(five replacements needed in addition to new Senate chair and new Senate vice-chair)

(members to replace:

John Flanagan, Keith Johnson, Steve Konkell, Paula Kristofik, and Sharon Shasby)

Faculty Senate Budget Committee

(continuing members: Allen Ault, James Chapman, Dave Eakin, Edmund Fenton, David May, Christiane Taylor)

(one replacement needed in addition to Senate new chair)

(member to replace: Joyce Wolf)

Faculty Senate Elections Committee

(continuing members: Louisa DeBolt, Edmund Fenton, David May & Ted Randles)

(one replacement needed)

(member to replace: N. Faye Deters)

Faculty Senate Rules Committee

(continuing members: Melissa Dieckmann, Nancy McKenney, and Jane Rainey)

(two replacements needed)

(members to replace: Keith Johnson and Margaret Yoder)

Faculty Senate Committee on Committees

(continuing members: None)

(Six leaving - only five replacements needed)

(members to replace: Nina Coyer, N. Faye Deters, Susan Fister, Sharon Shasby, Diane Vance, and Joyce Wolf)

Faculty Senate Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee

(continuing members: None)

(Five replacements needed)

(members to replace: Nina Coyer, Susan Fister, Paula Kristofik, Marcel Robles, and Mixon Ware)

2006-2007 Standing Committee List (continued)

Faculty Senate Welfare Committee

(continuing members: Gary Barksdale [ex-officio], Larry Collins, Charlotte Hubbard, and Marco Ciocca)

(Two replacements needed)

(members to replace: Cheryl Jackson, Keith Johnson)

COSFL Representative

(one rep and two alternates appointed yearly)

(member whose terms are up: Mixon Ware, Representative; Pam Black, Alternate; and Marcel Robles, Alternate)

University Withdrawal Committee

(1 year appointment - appointed by Executive Committee)

2005-2006 Rep: Steve Konkel

University Residency Appeals Committee

(1 year appointment - appointed by Executive Committee)

2005-2006 Rep: Sharon Shasby (2005-2006)

University General Education Committee

(1 year appointment - appointed by Executive Committee)

2005-2006 Rep: Charlotte Hubbard

Arlington Board Representative

(1 year appointment - appointed by Executive Committee)

[must be an Arlington member to serve on the Board.]

2005-2006 Rep: John Flanagan