CALL TO ORDER

ATTENDANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   September 10, 2018

EKU FORWARD

PRESIDENT’S REPORT: Senator Benson

GUEST SPEAKERS:
   • Shirley O’Brien – Provost Search Update
   • Sarah Pitt – Changes in Healthcare Benefits (See: 2019 Benefits Guide)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:
   • Policies
     • Policy 4.1.15 – Grade Appeals (Action)
       (FS approved in February – additional changes recommended from Chairs Association)
     • Policy 4.3.8 – Posthumous Degrees (Action)
       (FS reviewed in December - additional changes recommended from Provost Council)
     • Policy 4.2.4 – Transfer Credits from Academic Institutions (Action)
     • Policy 4.4.14 – Laboratory Safety (Action)
     • Policy 4.6.5 – Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty (Action)
     • Policy 4.7.7 – Outside Activities (Action)

NEW BUSINESS:
   • Report from Council on Academic Affairs – Vice Provost Robinson
     (See separate PDF file for the curriculum forms – 34 Pages)
   • Other (if any)

REPORTS & QUESTIONS:
   Executive Committee: Senator Winslow
   Faculty Regent: Senator Day
   COSFL Representative: Senator Eser
   Provost: Senator Whitehouse

STANDING COMMITTEES:
   Academic Quality Committee: Senators Koger & Shannon, Co-Chairs
   Budget Committee: Senator Ciocca
   Elections/University Nominations Committee: Senator McCardle
   Information Technology Committee: Senators Cogdill & Huffman, Co-Chairs
   Rights & Responsibilities Committee: Senator Gershtenson, Chair
   Rules Committee: Senator Bishop-Ross, Chair
   Welfare Committee: Senators Bentley & Cogdill, Co-Chairs

ADJOURNMENT
The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met on Monday, September 10, 2018, in the South Ballroom in the Keen Johnson Building. Senator Winslow called the first meeting of the academic year to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.

The following members were absent: K. Engebretson*, Z. Eser*, J. Fitch*, A. Gossage*, E. Randall

* Indicates prior notification of absence

ALT Bill Phillips attended for K. Engebretson
ALT Ginny Whitehouse attended for J. Fitch
ALT Caroline Walz attended for A. Gossage

ANNOUNCEMENT:

Chair Winslow announced that as a cost-saving measure, the Senate would revert to an earlier version of digital voting software. The most notable change will be that everyone must use the clickers to record votes. The smart phone app does not work with the older software version.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Senator Woodruff moved approval of the May 7, 2018 regular and organizational minutes, seconded by Senator Dyer. **Motion carried.** (Due to a computer glitch in the digital voting software, total votes and individual votes are not available to post for this meeting.)

EKU FORWARD:

Chair Winslow introduced EKU Forward as a new agenda topic where senators can share ideas for moving EKU forward and making EKU a better place for faculty and students.

Some suggestions shared included:
- Provide opportunities for our diverse faculty, graduate assistants and students to assist with both on-campus and e-Campus international recruiting.
- Provide more advisor training for faculty which could positively affect student retention.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: Senator Benson

On the Monday of Faculty Senate, refreshments will be available in the Faculty Center from 7am until 6pm.

The Board of Regents is meeting two weeks from today. The meeting will be hosted by Rusty Carpenter in the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center. Board meetings are open to the public.

We talk often about how, given the opportunity, that EKU students can compete favorably on the national stage, even in academic competitions against students from bigger-name schools.

The same is true for our faculty. As if we needed any further proof, consider Dr. Margaret Ndinguri of our chemistry department, and Dr. Lindsay Calderon, from biological sciences, who have teamed up to earn a U.S. patent, with 15 claims approved, for their discovery of a chemical
compound that better targets specific types of reproductive cancer tumors. They are truly on the leading edge of science to improve treatments for specific cancers by providing a personalized therapy.

Just as our undergraduate students have been involved in that important project, other undergrads are involved with faculty members Dr. Stephen Richter, from biological sciences, and Dr. Michael Bradley, from the Department of Recreation and Park Administration, in some interesting work in the Red River Gorge, where they are tracking the behavior of copperhead snakes in an effort to minimize human-snake interactions in the popular recreation area.

Dr. Angela Aaron, staff psychologist and training coordinator in our Counseling Center and a two-time EKU alum, is the 2018 recipient of the Counseling Center Outstanding Early Career Psychologist Award presented by the American Psychological Association. Dr. Deborah Givens, chair of our Department of Communication, was elected vice president of the International Society of Weekly Newspaper Editors. And Dr. Clint Pinion, of our Environmental Health Science faculty, has been named president of the Association of Environmental Health Academic Programs.

Elsewhere, our undergraduates are gaining valuable career-related experience by virtue of partnerships that various academic programs have established throughout the area. For example, a new general aviation facility at Blue Grass Airport opened this summer and is already giving our professional flight and aerospace management students a head start on their careers.

One student who may be even better known as our 2017 Miss EKU recently distinguished herself in a national student entrepreneurship competition. Rose Pidgorodetska was one of only 21 finalists in a pitch competition this summer in Detroit. She gave credit to several EKU business faculty members who helped her perfect her pitch, as well as to the Kentucky Innovation Network office on our campus.

Dr. Erik Liddell has lined up another impressive set of speakers for our Chautauqua lectures, related this year to the theme “Truths and Consequences.” One, for a special Homecoming Week event, is our own professor and award-winning author, Dr. David Zurick, who’ll talk about his latest book, “A Fantastic State of Ruin: The Painted Towns of Rajasthan.” Before that, on September 27, well-known Chicano activist Bobby Verdugo (for whom a center on campus is named) and Yoli Rios will reflect on the L.A. school walkouts of 50 years ago.

Less than 7 percent of the world’s business programs can claim accreditation from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, and EKU is one of them. The five-year re-accreditation covers the School’s baccalaureate degree programs in all majors, as well as its revamped MBA program.

Our Master of Public Administration (MPA) Program also met the high standards for continuing accreditation by the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration. The program, which is available in online and on-campus formats, is accredited through 2025. Several faculty and staff members have recently won significant awards or have been elected by their peers to serve in important positions.
We’re approaching the college ranking “silly season” (the same might be said for elections as well), but there is one ranking that is fairly unique that EKU has managed to make for its 9th consecutive year: *Forbes* Magazine’s Top Colleges in America. Considering that there are over 3,000 four-year degree-granting colleges and universities in the United States and this ranking is limited to the top 650, EKU is in good company.

Lastly, as many of you know, our Model Laboratory School underwent quite a facelift this past summer, with fresh paint, improved lighting, new safety features, and much more. As Superintendent John Williamson has noted, together with some programmatic changes, this will help the school in its ongoing quest to be a leader in successful teaching and learning practices.

**GUEST SPEAKERS:**

**Open Meeting Laws.** Amye Bensenhaver, Former Commonwealth Assistant Attorney General gave a brief presentation on the correct procedures to follow for open meeting/open records laws. Two helpful links she provided that are available on the Attorney General website are: [Protecting Your Right to Know](#) and [Your Duty Under the Law](#).

**Ombud Minute.** Ombud Joan Beck reminded that the Office of the Ombud adheres to the principals of the International Ombudsman Association, which are: Independence, Impartiality and Neutrality, Confidentiality and Informality.

An ombudsman is a dispute resolution resource. An Ombud assists people as they endeavor to solve interpersonal conflict.

An Ombud can be a mediator. A mediator is a go-between, a neutral person who facilitates conversations between people in conflict. The mediator helps those parties clarify the cause of the difficulty, and then helps them craft a solution that will work for them.

The Ombud doesn’t make policy, take a side, or advocate a position. Talking to the Ombud does not put the University on notice of a claim. The Ombud is not part of the legal system or the human resources system or the tenure system or any other system in the university. But the Ombud may be able to help clarify a course of action, by engaging in a thoughtful conversation.

Ombud Beck’s regular office hours in Commonwealth Hall are Monday through Wednesday, 8:00 – 4:30, or by appointment.

**Provost Search Update.** Chair Winslow announced that tomorrow the committee will begin to narrow down the pool from approximately 50 applicants to 10 or 12. Video interviews of the smaller pool will take place next week. Based on those interviews, 3-5 candidates will be invited to campus. The open forums will be scheduled for the first week in October. Please plan to attend the forums if at all possible and encourage your colleagues to attend as well.

**University Printer Program.** Steve Caudill gave an overview of the new university printer program. In the spring semester the Budget Advisory Committee recommended that the university transition to a university printer program similar to the successful copier program. The program will include printers and toner, and all maintenance services will be provided by the vendor. The program will be implemented in four different phases with the first phase replacing existing networked printers with new printers. The second phase will be at the regional...
campuses and one remote location student lab. The third phase will be replacing personal non-networked printers with centrally located networked printers, if possible. The fourth phase will address all printer needs in special situations.

Student Government Association. President Ryan Wiggins gave a brief update.

- Colonel Pride, an initiative started last year to increase student attendance at events on campus, has increased from only 7 events last year to 15 already scheduled for the fall semester.
- Student Government approved the budget and fund allocation will begin soon. One of the main goals this year is to bring about more diversity awareness throughout the campus for students, and the diversity grant funds were increased to help with this initiative.
- The first joint branch meeting for Student Government is scheduled for September 18.
- SGA Orientation is scheduled for September 30.

NEW BUSINESS:

Election for Committee Vacancy.

- **Rules Committee – 1 Vacancy**
  Senator Woodruff was elected by acclamation.

Policy Updates. The following three policies were reviewed and acted on by the Board of Regents in June and were presented to Faculty Senate for information only. Questions on these policies should be directed to Barbara Kent, Director of Policy and Legal Operations.

- **Policy 1.3.1 – Service and Assistance Animals** (approved by BoR on 06-25-18)
- **Policy 1.3.2 – Assistance Animals in University Housing** (repealed by BoR on 06-25-18)
- **Policy 1.3.3 – Service Animals** (repealed by BoR on 06-25-18)

The following policies were presented for first-read and will be on the October agenda for action.

- **Policy 4.1.15 – Grade Appeals** *(First Read)*
  *(FS approved in February – additional changes recommended from Chairs Association)*
- **Policy 4.3.8 – Posthumous Degrees** *(First Read)*
  *(FS reviewed in December - additional changes recommended from Provost Council)*
- **Policy 4.2.4 – Transfer Credits from Academic Institutions** *(First Read)*
- **Policy 4.4.14 – Laboratory Safety** *(First Read)*
- **Policy 4.6.5 – Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty** *(First Read)*
- **Policy 4.7.7 – Outside Activities** *(First Read)*

Posthumous Degree for Mohannad Alrayes. Chair Winslow stated that the Registrar reviewed the request and has confirmed that Mohannad Alrayes meets the requirements necessary to be considered for a posthumous degree. Senator Liddell moved approval of the recommendation, seconded by Senator Dyer. Motion carried. *(Due to a computer glitch in the digital voting software, total votes and individual votes are not available to post for this meeting.)*

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

REPORT FROM SENATE CHAIR: Senator Winslow

Chair Winslow shared the **charges** for each of the Senate standing committees for the 2018-19 academic year.
REPORT FROM FACULTY REGENT:  Senator Day

The Board of Regents will meet on Monday, September 24 at 1pm in Library 318, the new Teaching and Learning Center.

REPORT FROM PROVOST:  Senator Whitehouse

We performed very well on performance funding metrics in 2017-2018 and are in a strong position among the regional universities moving into 2018-2019. Enrollment numbers continue to be a primary focus across the state.

As part of the planning for the current academic year, deans identified thoughts and innovative strategies for continued progression and success, including:

- using strategic decision-making to support talented faculty and staff, ensure the success of our excellent accredited programs, and promoting the Eastern experience;
- remaining focused on the University’s mission to engage students;
- identifying essential components for excellence while letting go of non-essential practices;
- promoting innovative faculty development opportunities by utilizing the renovated Keen Johnson faculty meeting space for interdisciplinary engagement and the new, cutting-edge Faculty Center for Teaching & Learning, which represents the heart of our mission;
- engaging future generations of students through outstanding summer camps; and
- strategically refining curriculum to remain progressive while removing bottlenecks and barriers.

The state’s chief academic officers met this summer to discuss state policies and priorities for the upcoming academic year. As part of their discussion, the CCAOs talked about how we define academic quality to guide policy. The Council on Postsecondary Education has adopted a statewide definition of academic quality that program faculty should keep in mind as they prepare for their program reviews in 2019-2020:

"Academic Quality – Defined

Academic quality is the measurable degree to which an educational experience is coherent, engaging, and transformational for all learners.

- A coherent educational experience is well organized and scaffolded with a clear connection between general education and majors.
- Engaging learning opportunities intentionally address student interest, facilitate active involvement, and motivate students to pursue their academic and professional goals.
- Transformational refers to positive change in knowledge, skills, and perspectives."

The Faculty Center for Teaching & Learning is now open in Crabbe Library 318.

This year’s Teaching & Learning Innovation Series schedule is available. The TLI Series provides faculty opportunities to join colleagues in discussions focused on teaching and learning. Faculty can register for workshops at https://studio.eku.edu/tli.

Please mark the following upcoming dates on your calendars:

- **September 24** – EKU Board of Regents’ Meeting
- **September 28** – Assurance of Learning Day (Day classes will be dismissed to provide faculty the opportunity to meet and discuss student learning in their programs.) (Classes resume at 4 p.m.)
STANDING COMMITTEES:

**Budget Committee.** Senator Ciocca reported that the committee met in special session on Wednesday, September 5 to set the calendar for the semester. Senator Ciocca was elected to serve as chair for the academic year.

**Elections & University Nominations Committee.** Senator McCardle reported that the committee met on September 7 to set the calendar for the semester. Senator McCardle was elected to serve as chair for the academic year.

The committee also began the process for soliciting nominations for a new part-time faculty representative.

**Faculty Welfare Committee.** Senator Bentley reported that the committee met on September 10 to set the calendar for the semester. Senators Bentley and Cogdill were elected to serve as co-chairs for the academic year.

ADJOURNMENT:

Senator Whitehouse moved to adjourn at approximately 5:30pm.
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TO: The Eastern Kentucky University Faculty Senate
FROM: Senator Michael T. Benson
DATE: October 1, 2018
RE: October Campus Report

An unmistakable positive vibe permeated the first Board of Regents meeting of the new academic year on Monday, September 24.

All the reports shared with the Board, whether about the demographics of our newest freshman class, our many diversity initiatives, budget implementation, the Board Innovation Fund or the various summer camps that bring many prospective students to our campus, give us great cause for optimism and excitement as we move forward after such a difficult and trying year.

And I am especially glad that the meeting was held in our new Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning in Crabbe Library, and that our Regents learned from Dr. Rusty Carpenter about the difference the center is already making in the work of our faculty and, ultimately, in the success of our students.

All those positive reports come on the heels of a month of several highlights for the University. To recap, here are just a few:

- We have made great strides in recent years in attracting more of the best and brightest students, with our last four freshman classes successively becoming the best prepared academically in Eastern history. Starting next fall, even more high school seniors will be eligible for a scholarship based on their high school academic performance. This expansion of our merit scholarship program also includes an incentive to reside on campus, which is in itself a major factor in student success.
- More and more prospective students consider a school’s commitment to environmental sustainability when making their college choice. So I trust they will take note of the fact that the second phase of our new Science Building recently earned LEED Gold honors, testifying to the University’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design. Also last month, we learned that Eastern ranks fourth nationally among colleges and universities in the water management category of the 2018 Sustainable Campus Index, published by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education.
- Students also notice, appreciate and benefit from an institutional commitment to diversity. For the third consecutive year, EKU received the annual Higher Education Excellence in Diversity (HEED) Award from Insight into Diversity magazine. EKU is the
only regional university in Kentucky to receive the award and will be featured along with 95 other recipients nationally in the November 2018 issue of the magazine.

- Our acclaimed aviation program is certainly no stranger to national attention, and it received some terrific exposure on the national stage again on Sept. 13. That is when Program Coordinator Dennis Sinnett participated alongside high-ranking airline executives on a panel at the Federal Aviation Administration’s day-long Aviation Workforce Symposium in Washington, D.C., which addressed the severe shortage of pilots and airplane mechanics. EKU was one of only two public universities nationwide represented on panels at the event.

- It was announced in September that our online enrollment is up 13 percent over a year ago. This increase is attributed to new program offerings, increased interest in degree completion and sustained enrollment in foundational programs.

- Dr. Clint Pinion, assistant professor of environmental health science here, has been named president of the Association of Environmental Health Academic Programs.

I also want to call your attention to a couple of events this month.

One is a rather unusual exhibit in our Giles Gallery Oct. 1-25. EKU graduate Dr. Deborah Alexander has put together a collection of photographs that chronicle her long, distinguished career with the U.S. Department of State, circling the globe as a diplomat and field program manager, often helping to rebuild war-torn countries. If you remember nothing else about Dr. Alexander, it is important to take note that at the time this first-generation student was offered a study-abroad experience as a sophomore social work major here in 1974, she possessed neither a suitcase nor a camera. She had never even been on an airplane. On that study-abroad experience, she worked alongside Mother Teresa in India, and Dr. Alexander will tell you she has never been the same since. She said she considers this exhibit her “love letter” to EKU for the opportunities her alma mater afforded her. The opening reception is this Thursday, Oct. 4, from 5 to 7 p.m. in Giles Gallery. An exhibit by our own David Afsah-Mohallatee runs concurrently with the Alexander exhibit.

If it’s October, it means that Homecoming is near, and this year’s celebration features some new scheduling wrinkles. The Homecoming Parade will be held on Friday, Oct. 19, beginning at 6 p.m. and proceeding along its usual route. A town-and-gown tailgate will precede the parade at 5 p.m. The annual but newly named J.W. “Spider” Thurman Alumni Awards and Pioneer Brunch will be held on Saturday, Oct. 20, at 9:30 a.m. Then, that afternoon at 3, the Colonels will take on Murray State University at Roy Kidd Stadium. Additional information and a complete schedule of events are available online at www.homecoming.eku.edu.

I’d like to call your attention, in case you haven’t seen it, to a feature on our EKUStories web portal about one of our custodians who became a standout student in our Department of Recreation and Parks Administration. In fact, Kenna Smith’s first exposure to the program or even the very notion of a career in the field came while she was a custodian in the Begley Building, where the program is housed. Assisted by our employee tuition waiver, she began
attending classes there while still wearing her custodial uniform. Now that is the Essential Eastern: a place so welcoming and so nurturing, a place where faculty make academic programs so interesting and so exciting that those like Kenna who work so hard to keep our facilities in tip-top shape take notice, are inspired and energized to become students and then succeed beyond their wildest dreams.

Finally, we had a CPE meeting last week in Frankfort during which Moody’s reported on the financial stability of both the State of Kentucky as well as on the individual colleges and universities. In the data that was shared with the CPE Board, it was noted the student composition of each campus and the percentage of students from Kentucky. As you know, EKU has the highest percentage of native Kentucky students. Attached is a WICHE report on the high school graduation trends in Kentucky projecting up through 2032.
45,100 high school graduates, on average, projected per year between school years 2011-12 and 2031-32.

The total number of graduates in Kentucky is not projected to increase after 2011-12, ending at 43,700 in 2031-32.

### Kentucky

#### Reported Counts of High School Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIVATE SCHOOLS TOTAL</th>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOLS TOTAL</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>40,611</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>36,957</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>33,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>40,067</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>36,337</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>32,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>41,146</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>37,654</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>33,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>41,559</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>37,787</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>33,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>42,117</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>38,399</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>33,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>42,090</td>
<td>3,641</td>
<td>38,449</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>33,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>43,127</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>39,099</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>33,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>43,613</td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>39,339</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>34,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>45,788</td>
<td>3,937</td>
<td>41,851</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>36,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>46,722</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td>42,664</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>36,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>47,158</td>
<td>4,127</td>
<td>43,031</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>36,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>46,882</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>42,642</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>36,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>47,290</td>
<td>4,402</td>
<td>42,888</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>36,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>46,929</td>
<td>4,237</td>
<td>42,692</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>36,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>46,251</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>41,956</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>35,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>46,223</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>42,245</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>35,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>45,461</td>
<td>3,869</td>
<td>41,592</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>34,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>46,388</td>
<td>3,877</td>
<td>42,512</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>35,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>46,380</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>42,585</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>35,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>44,613</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>41,097</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>33,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>44,820</td>
<td>3,456</td>
<td>41,364</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>33,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>44,497</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>41,089</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>33,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23</td>
<td>43,487</td>
<td>3,246</td>
<td>40,240</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>32,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-24</td>
<td>44,897</td>
<td>3,598</td>
<td>41,298</td>
<td>4,332</td>
<td>33,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024-25</td>
<td>45,846</td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>42,185</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>33,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-26</td>
<td>45,623</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>42,054</td>
<td>4,429</td>
<td>33,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-27</td>
<td>44,857</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>41,360</td>
<td>4,499</td>
<td>33,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027-28</td>
<td>43,292</td>
<td>3,382</td>
<td>39,910</td>
<td>4,317</td>
<td>31,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028-29</td>
<td>42,969</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>39,588</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>31,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029-30</td>
<td>43,313</td>
<td>3,404</td>
<td>39,909</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>31,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030-31</td>
<td>43,306</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>39,912</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>31,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031-32</td>
<td>43,662</td>
<td>3,421</td>
<td>40,241</td>
<td>4,278</td>
<td>31,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projections of High School Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIVATE SCHOOLS TOTAL</th>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOLS TOTAL</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2032-33</td>
<td>44,562</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>42,054</td>
<td>4,429</td>
<td>33,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033-34</td>
<td>44,306</td>
<td>3,404</td>
<td>39,909</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>31,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034-35</td>
<td>43,313</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>39,912</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>31,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-36</td>
<td>43,662</td>
<td>3,421</td>
<td>40,241</td>
<td>4,278</td>
<td>31,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036-37</td>
<td>43,306</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>39,912</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>31,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037-38</td>
<td>43,313</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>39,909</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>31,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038-39</td>
<td>44,306</td>
<td>3,404</td>
<td>39,909</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>31,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039-40</td>
<td>44,562</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>42,054</td>
<td>4,429</td>
<td>33,753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Available Data for Additional Race Categories

- Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- Two or More Races

Notes: School Year refers to the K-12 calendar running fall to spring and may include graduates from any point in that school year, including the summer after the year end. The Grand Total is the sum of the Private Schools and Public Schools totals. The Private Schools Total includes schools not supported primarily by public funds, religious and non sectarian, but not including homeschooling students. Private Schools projections begin in school year 2011-12. The Public Schools Total will not exactly equal the sum of the race/ethnicities columns, which are projected separately. Prior to 2010-11, data were not available separately for Asian and Pacific Islander students, and Two or More Races students. Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and Two or More Races counts are displayed separately in the years they were reported for informational purposes, but are included in the race categories in the projected years. For more detailed information, see Appendix C: Technical Information and Methodology at www.wiche.edu/knocking.

Grade Appeals

Policy Statement

Evaluation of individual assignments resulting in a final course grade is the responsibility of the faculty. The faculty member is responsible for establishing and communicating clearly defined standards for assigning grades, and maintaining accurate records to support those grades. Students are responsible for reading and understanding grading practices as specified in the course syllabus.

In the event that a student decides to contest a final course grade, this Grade Appeals Policy establishes a clear, fair process by which it can be challenged. A grade appeal shall be confined to charges of unfair action toward an individual student and may not involve a challenge of an instructor's grading standard. Further, the grade appeal considers whether a grade was determined in a fair and appropriate manner; it does not attempt to grade or re-grade individual assignments. It is incumbent on the student to substantiate the claim that his or her final grade represents unfair treatment. In the absence of compelling reasons, such as clerical/computational error, prejudice, or arbitrariness, the grade assigned by the instructor of record is to be considered final.

This process cannot be used for students appealing a grade of F or FX assigned due to academic dishonesty. Further this process cannot be used for allegations covered under Policy 1.4.1, Non-Discrimination and Harassment.

Entities Affected by the Policy

- Colleges
- Departments
- Faculty
- Students

Procedures

If a student wishes to appeal a course grade, the procedure below shall be followed:

1. The student will consult with the instructor in an effort to seek a satisfactory explanation.
2. If the student is not satisfied with the explanation from the instructor, the student may appeal the course grade in writing to the Department Chair/Unit Head, after consulting with the instructor, the student believes that a grievance exists, the student may present a complaint in writing outlining the basis of the grievance to the department chair within 30 calendar days after the beginning of the next semester, exclusive of summer session.
   a. The written appeal shall include the basis for the appeal and any supporting documentation, including evidence that Step 1 was completed. The Department Chair/Unit Head shall provide a copy of the appeal and supporting documents to the instructor of the course.
The instructor shall provide a written response to the appeal, with any supporting documents, to the Department Chair/Unit Head within 10 calendar days. A copy of the instructor’s response shall be made available to the student.

If the Department Chair/Unit Head is the instructor for the course, the appeal will skip Step 2 and be submitted to the Chair of the department’s Academic Practices Committee. The Committee is composed of the department chair, two faculty members from the department and one student.

- The members of the Committee are elected by a majority vote of the department faculty no later than September 10 of the year in which the Committee will operate.
- Thereafter, a faculty alternate member shall be elected to serve in the event that one of the regular members is the person against whom the complaint has been lodged, or one student member.
- The student member and a student alternate, who shall serve if the member is not available or if there is a conflict of interest, shall be selected by a procedure determined by the department chair. All members of the committee shall have voting privileges. In cases where the department has an insufficient number of faculty members to make the above procedure workable, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the dean of the college in which the course is offered shall appoint an appropriate committee.

Meetings of the departmental Academic Practices Committee shall be scheduled at a mutually agreed-upon time, when all relevant parties can reasonably be expected to participate. A student who has agreed to a time for a meeting of the departmental Academic Practices Committee and who does not appear at that meeting may forfeit the right to present evidence beyond that furnished in the original letter of appeal.

After considering the evidence and any rebuttals submitted by the student and/or the instructor, the committee shall make a decision that which shall be binding. All parties shall be informed of this decision within ten calendar days after the Committee meets with the parties.

Appeals from the committee’s decision may be made on procedural grounds only and must be made within 20 calendar days following notification of the departmental committee decision. Such an appeal should be made to the dean of the college in which the course is offered and, if necessary, then to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Provost’s decision is final.

A copy of the student’s response shall be made available to the student.

If the grade appeal process results in a change in the final course grade, the faculty member is responsible for submitting a Change of Grade form to the Registrar.

All parties involved in the grade appeal process shall respect confidentiality throughout the process and shall adhere to all requirements of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Definitions

Calendar Day Throughout this document calendar day shall be interpreted to mean no later than the specified number of calendar days following the day of notification. If the final calendar day occurs on a weekend or holiday, the due date shall be on the first day on which University administrative offices are open. The time for response may be extended upon agreement by both parties.

Responsibilities

adhere to all requirements of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).
College Dean  The Dean is responsible for reviewing appeals upon an allegation of violation of procedural grounds of this policy.

Department Academic Practices Committee  The Academic Practices Committee is responsible for
• reviewing all materials for the appeal and rendering a decision,
• notifying the student and the instructor of the decision.

Department Chair/Unit Head  The Department Chair/Unit Head is responsible for
• providing a copy of the appeal and supporting materials of a grade appeal to the instructor,
• making the instructor response and supporting materials available to the student,
• reviewing all materials for the appeal and rendering a decision,
• notifying the student and the instructor of the decision.

Instructor  The course instructor is responsible for
• establishing and communicating clearly defined standards for assigning grades, and maintaining accurate records to support those grades,
• responding to students' queries regarding final course grades,
• providing a response to a grade appeal and supporting documents or other materials as requested,
• submitting a Change of Grade form to the Registrar if the appeal results in a grade change.

Provost  The Provost is responsible for reviewing appeals upon an allegation of violation of procedural grounds of this policy.

Student  The student is responsible for
• reading and understanding the grading practices as specified in the course syllabus,
• consulting with the instructor when a question arises regarding course grades,
• providing a written appeal and supporting documents or other materials as requested.

Interpreting Authority
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
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Commented [RS4]: Eliminate “rendering a decision” and add “facilitate an informal mediation between instructor and student”
Posthumous Degrees

Eastern Kentucky University recognizes the importance of acknowledging significant student achievement at all times, including following the tragic death of a student who has made substantial progress towards the completion of a degree and who has made noteworthy contributions to the University community.

The University will award a posthumous degree upon approval of the Faculty Senate if the following conditions are met:

1. the student had completed 75% of degree requirements for an associate, baccalaureate, or graduate degree, and
2. the student was in good academic standing in his/her program of study.

If the above conditions have not been met, consideration will be given upon documentation of a student’s noteworthy contribution to the University community during his/her tenure, or explanation of extraordinary circumstances, such as active military or public service personnel killed in the line of duty.

It is therefore proposed that posthumous degrees be considered by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate if all of the following conditions are met:

1. At the time of his/her death, the student had achieved senior standing or was within one year of graduation in the case of a Bachelor’s degree; fourth semester standing or within one semester of graduation in the case of an Associate’s degree; have obtained Candidacy plus completed 75% of program requirements for the Master’s degree.
2. The student had been in good academic standing in their program of study at the time of their death.
3. Documentation is provided of the student’s noteworthy contributions to the University community during his/her tenure at the University.

Entities Affected by the Policy

- Students
- Colleges
- Departments
- Office of the Registrar

Procedures

1. A student meeting the condition of this Policy may be nominated for a posthumous degree by the department chair/unit head of his/her major department. Nomination letters shall indicate that the student met the conditions for awarding a posthumous degree or, if conditions have not been met, shall provide documentation or explanation of the student’s contributions to the University community or of other extraordinary circumstances. The student is nominated by the Chair of his/her major department.
2. Nominations for posthumous degrees should be forwarded to the Chair of the Faculty Senate and copied to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research Registrar.

3. The Registrar shall verify that the conditions for awarding a posthumous degree have been met and shall report the findings to the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

4. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will consider nominations and will forward positive recommendations to the Faculty Senate, unless there is an emergency situation.

5. Upon approval by the Faculty Senate, the Chair of Faculty Senate will notify the Registrar, who shall coordinate with the appropriate College to make arrangements with the student’s family. The appropriate degree would be awarded at the Commencement at which the student would have been otherwise recognized or at a commencement acceptable to the University and the student’s family. The student’s family will be asked to identify an appropriate person to receive the diploma when the student is recognized at the appropriate time in the Commencement ceremony. Except for the fact that the individual receiving the diploma on behalf of the student would not be attired in cap or gown, there would be no other changes in the ceremony.

Responsibilities

Department Chair/Unit Head
The Department Chair/Unit Head is responsible for submitting nominations of students for posthumous degrees and providing any necessary supporting documentation.

Faculty Senate Chair
- The Chair of Faculty Senate is responsible for ensuring posthumous degree nominations are considered by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as well as the Faculty Senate.
- The Chair of Faculty Senate is responsible for communicating positive recommendations to the Registrar.

Registrar
- The Registrar is responsible for verifying that the nominated student has met the conditions for a posthumous degree.
- The Registrar is responsible for coordinating with the College to make arrangements with the student’s family.

Interpreting Authority

Senior Vice President for Academics and Provost

Policy Adoption Review and Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Revisions</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 4, 2017</td>
<td>Board of Regents President</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 1, 1999</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Issued</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 5, 2000</td>
<td>Board of Regents</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 20, 1999</td>
<td>Council on Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eastern Kentucky University accepts credits transferred from regionally accredited postsecondary institutions, credits earned by examination from nationally recognized tests that meet EKU standards, and it awards credits for certain types of military experiences. Additionally, EKU will award credit for non-collegiate training experiences provided the training occurred under a University approved articulation agreement (see Policy 4.2.1). International transfer credits from institutions with which Eastern Kentucky University does not have an articulation or exchange agreement but that are accredited by appropriate accrediting bodies within their country are recorded as free elective credits at the lower division level after they have been evaluated by an an EKU-approved international credential evaluating agency (e.g., World Education Services or Silney and Associates). Students may present supporting documents from transfer courses recorded as free electives to appeal to department chairpersons for departmental credit.

Credits earned at a non-regionally accredited institution will only be transferred on a course by course basis and only after the courses are evaluated through the process defined in the academic catalog.

EKU adheres to the Kentucky General Education Transfer Agreement. The University will honor transfer general education courses from regionally accredited out-of-state or Kentucky private colleges and universities. The transferred general education courses will then be applied toward the student’s EKU general education requirements where needed and as appropriate.

The applicability of transfer credit to requirements for a major is at the discretion of the relevant department.

Students with transfer credit should note that they must successfully complete all their curriculum requirements as well as earn a cumulative and institutional (EKU) GPA of 2.00 in order to graduate with a degree or University certificate from EKU.

**General Education**

In an effort to promote a seamless transfer between Kentucky two-year and four-year public institutions, the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) developed a policy to facilitate the transfer of credits from one Kentucky public college or university to another. This policy, implemented in 1996, and revised in 2011, is called the General Education Transfer Agreement and allows for the automatic transfer of a block of courses to satisfy general education degree requirements, in addition to articulating individual courses as meeting statewide general education categories.

Students transferring to EKU from another Kentucky public college or university may be (1) category certified, or (2) core certified, or (3) fully certified in general education by the Registrar of the school where the course work was taken. EKU will honor any of these designations and is guaranteed to apply the KY public school transferred general education courses into EKU’s General Education curriculum in a manner that best serves the transferring student. The General Education Transfer Agreement also applies to students transferring from EKU to another Kentucky public university.

EKU will honor transfer general education courses from regionally accredited out-of-state or Kentucky private colleges and universities. Students may bring in documentation (school catalog listings of courses with relevant general education designations) to the EKU Registrar’s Office. The transfer general education courses will then be applied toward the student’s EKU general education requirements where needed and as appropriate.
Entities Affected by the Policy

- Office of the Registrar
- Students

Procedures

Procedures for transferring credit from institutions are described in the Eastern Kentucky University Catalog.

Transferring Previously Unevaluated Courses
When an acceptable transfer course, which has never been evaluated before, is presented to EKU for consideration, EKU records the course as acceptable for credit but unevaluated. The Transfer Center contacts the student and requests course descriptions and syllabus information for review. The Transfer Center forwards the course description to the appropriate academic department for their review and consideration. The academic department determines whether an exact equivalency, a subject/discipline elective, or a generic free elective is appropriate depending on course content and learning objectives. In some instances the department will request that the student provide a syllabus in order to evaluate the course. The academic department or Transfer Center can recommend that a course be considered for general education applicability even if an exact equivalency is not awarded. Students wishing to appeal the evaluation of transfer credit should consult with the Student Outreach and Transition Office.

Transferring Courses Taken Elsewhere while Enrolled at EKU
Currently enrolled students who desire to take courses elsewhere and transfer them back to Eastern Kentucky University should consult with the EKU Transfer Center and also obtain the approval of their college dean prior to enrolling. The University will not take responsibility for courses transferred without prior approval. Students should be aware that there are limits to the number of credit hours a student may earn in any one term (see Catalog, Academic Load). Credit and grades earned in transfer are posted to the student’s EKU transcript.

Posting of Previous Degrees on an EKU Transcript
Degree-seeking transfer students who have already attained a post-secondary or graduate-level degree will have that earned degree noted in their EKU academic record. Details of the academic work counting toward a degree earned at another institution will not be posted, course by course, onto the EKU transcript; only the earned degree is recorded from the official transfer school transcript.

Definitions

Regionally Accredited Postsecondary Institution
Regionally accredited postsecondary institution refers to any post-secondary institution accredited by an accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. An institution must be accredited at the time the credit was earned.

Interpreting Authority

Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs
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Laboratory Safety

Policy Statement

It is the policy of Eastern Kentucky University to ensure compliance with proper safety measures in all University teaching and research laboratories. In doing so, the University complies with applicable provisions of the Chemical Hygiene requirements issued under the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and other regulatory requirements.

This policy establishes requirements for practices and procedures to help ensure that faculty, staff, and students at the University are protected from health and safety hazards associated with University laboratories, including hazardous chemicals, physical hazards, radiation, and biohazardous materials.

The Associate Vice President for Research shall serve as the Institutional Official for providing Laboratory Safety Assurances to regulatory agencies.

Entities Affected by the Policy

- Deans
- Chairs
- Faculty and staff responsible for University research and teaching laboratories and/or studios or classrooms where hazardous chemicals, physical hazards, radiation, and biohazardous materials are present
  - Undergraduate and graduate students engaged in laboratory-based activities

Procedures

Establishing the Laboratory Safety Committee

The Laboratory Safety Committee shall consist of a minimum of eight members to include: the Director, two personnel from the Environmental Health and Safety Department, Officer or his/her designee, the Director of Sponsored Programs, the Associate Vice President for Research or his/her designee, a representative from Model Laboratory School and a minimum of five faculty members, one faculty or staff member from each College, selected from recommendations of the College Deans, and a minimum of one laboratory support staff. Committee members shall serve two year terms, which are renewable. The Director of Environmental Health and Safety, Officer or his/her designee, a senior official from Environmental Health and Safety (Manager or above or their designee) shall serve as chair of the committee. Other members of the Environmental Health and Safety Department or appointees by the Associate Vice President for Research may serve as resource members in an ex officio capacity.
Identifying Affected Units

1. In July of each year, the Laboratory Safety Committee will conduct a survey of all Department Chairs to determine whether potentially hazardous chemicals, physical hazards, radioactive materials or other potentially dangerous materials are used for research or educational purposes within the Department. Survey information will be reviewed by the Laboratory Safety Committee and those departments that have identified lab safety issues covered under this policy will be designated as Affected Units by the Committee.

2. Annual requirements for reporting, training, and site visits, in accordance with the Laboratory Safety Handbook, will be provided to the Departmental Chairs of the Affected Units with copies to the College Dean by no later than August 15.

3. Department Chairs failing to submit surveys by the Committee’s deadline will automatically be assumed to be Affected Units for the academic year.

Preparing the Laboratory Safety Handbook and Laboratory Safety Plans

1. Detailed procedures applicable to laboratory safety, including filing of appropriate Laboratory Safety Plans, annual inspections, training requirements, and other guidelines are published in the EKU Laboratory Safety Handbook. This handbook is prepared by the Laboratory Safety Committee. Procedures in the Handbook are to be reviewed annually by the Laboratory Safety Committee and amended, as needed, to assure regulatory compliance.

2. Department Chairs in Affected Units shall work with faculty and staff within their units to develop a Laboratory Safety Plan for each laboratory, classroom, or studio where hazardous chemicals or other hazardous materials are present.

Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affected Units</td>
<td>Departments or other units that use potentially hazardous chemicals, physical hazards, radiation, and biohazardous materials for research or educational purposes, or units designated by the Laboratory Safety Committee as Affected Units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Material</td>
<td>A chemical, radioactive material, blood borne pathogen or other material for which there is statistically significant evidence, based on at least one study conducted in accordance with established scientific principles that acute or chronic health effects may occur in exposed employees. The term “health hazard” includes chemicals which are carcinogens; toxic or highly toxic agents; reproductive toxins; irritants; sensitizers; hepatotoxins; nephrotoxins; neurotoxins; agents which act on the hematopoietic systems; and agents which damage the lungs, skin, eyes, or mucous membranes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>A facility where the “use of hazardous chemicals or other hazardous materials” occurs. It is a workplace where relatively small quantities of hazardous chemicals are used on a non-production basis. For the purposes of this policy, “laboratory” may include studio, clinic, or any similar facility where hazardous materials may be used as part of the University’s research, service, or educational mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Safety Handbook</td>
<td>EKU document outlining appropriate procedures and training requirements related to laboratory safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Safety Plan</td>
<td>A written program developed and implemented by the University which sets forth procedures, equipment, personal protective equipment and work practices that (i) are capable of protecting employees from the health hazards presented by hazardous chemicals, physical hazards, radiation, and biohazardous materials used in that particular workplace and (ii) meet the requirements of 29 CFR 1910.1450(e) and other relevant safety regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Hazards</td>
<td>Machinery or other equipment requiring specialized training in which could cause physical harm to the person operating specialized equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responsibilities

**College Dean**
- Provide recommendations for membership on Laboratory Safety Committee
- Seek resources within the College or the University, as necessary to maintain applicable laboratory safety standards for all laboratory facilities in the College
- Assist in identifying Departments within the College that are subject to the Laboratory Safety Policy

**Department Chair**
- Work with faculty and staff to develop and implement a Laboratory Safety Plan for each laboratory, classroom, or studio where hazardous chemicals, physical hazards, radiation, and biohazardous materials are present.
- Ensure that each laboratory has a specific person designated as the “Laboratory Supervisor” individual who will be the “designated person in charge” of for the laboratory. This is especially important for labs that have many users, such as teaching labs.
- Make budget arrangements for health and safety improvements
- Support the safety program
- Ensure that faculty and staff adhere to the Laboratory Safety Policy and to accepted safety practices
- Maintain a current copy of the Laboratory Safety Plan for each laboratory in the department in the departmental offices
- Complete annual survey conducted by the Laboratory Safety Committee to determine Affected Units
- Report significant accidents or incidents to the Environmental Health and Safety Office

**Environmental Health and Safety Office**
- Assist faculty and staff with issues relating to chemical storage, handling, disposal, labeling, and safety
- Assist the Laboratory Safety Committee with training and informing laboratory faculty, staff, and student workers about safety issues
- Assist the Laboratory Safety Committee in conducting annual internal inspections of labs for health and safety reviewing information obtained from self-auditing inspections performed by departmental laboratories
- Provide chair of Laboratory Safety Committee

**Faculty and staff (including teaching and research assistants)**
- Comply with all the requirements of this Policy and follow accepted safety practices
- Ensure that all of their laboratory workers comply with this Policy and follow accepted safety practices
- Develop a Laboratory Safety Plan, in collaboration with the Department Chair, identifying hazards unique to their individual laboratories, to address safety issues pertinent to these special hazards.
- Know Document what chemicals are stored and used in their laboratories and the hazards associated with them
- Maintain a current inventory of chemicals present in the laboratory
- Maintain safety sheets and other records for any chemicals covered by this policy
- Ensure that safety equipment and supplies are present and functional and that laboratory workers use this equipment as needed
- Request funds needed for specific health and safety improvements.
- Report significant accidents or incidents to the Department Chair
- Ensure that the information on laboratory identification signs is current
- Correct any safety deficiencies identified during inspections

**Laboratory Safety Committee**
- Conduct the annual review of the Laboratory Safety Plan and modify as needed
• Provide technical advice to Department Chairs, Laboratory Supervisors, Designated Person in Charge, and workers concerning requirements of the Laboratory Safety Plan
• Make recommendations to the Department Chairs and College Deans for safety improvements
• Serve as a liaison between safety personnel and the departments to improve communication
• Maintain documentation relating to the Laboratory Safety Plan, including training records, internal inspection records, and copies of meeting minutes and memos
• Inform and train laboratory faculty, staff, and student workers about chemical safety as required by the Laboratory Safety Plan
• Conduct annual internal inspections of labs for health and safety and submit written reports of the inspection to the Associate Vice President for Research
• Chemical Safety Officer (CSO) will aggregate the data from the internal laboratory inspections and submit a written report to the Associate Vice President for Research
• Publish an annual survey to be sent to all department chairs

Laboratory workers, including students
• Comply with all health and safety standards and rules
• Successfully complete and required training as specified in the Laboratory Safety Plan
• Report all hazardous conditions to the laboratory supervisor
• Wear or use prescribed protective equipment
• Report any suspected job-related injuries or illnesses to the laboratory supervisor and seek treatment immediately
• Refrain from the operation of any equipment or instrumentation without proper instruction and authorization
• Remain aware of the hazards of the chemicals in the lab and handle hazardous chemicals safely
• Request information and training when unsure how to handle a hazardous chemical or procedure

Statutory or Regulatory References

OSHA Laboratory Standard:

Violations of the Policy

Policy compliance is the joint responsibility of all involved. If non-compliance issues are identified by the Laboratory Safety Committee, corrective action may be necessary and shall be completed following consultation with the faculty member, respective Dean, Department Chair, and/or Associate Vice President for Research. Any actions deemed necessary in response to policy non-compliance may be appealed to the Provost.

Interpreting Authority

• Associate Vice President for Research
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Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

Policy Statement

Eastern Kentucky University, as a matter of principle, complies with the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) 1989 “Statement on Procedural Standards in the Renewal or Nonrenewal of Faculty Appointments” and the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges and Universities “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.” These AAUP statements address policy and procedural expectations for a wide variety of institutions of higher education. With these statements in mind, EKU has established criteria and processes by which tenure-track faculty will be evaluated. EKU’s policy ensures that processes are clearly articulated and published and are available to all persons in the university community.

EKU’s policy for evaluation of non-tenured tenure-track faculty respects the uniqueness of disciplines within the University and provides for appropriate professional flexibility at College and Department levels.

Entities Affected by the Policy

- Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty
- Departments
- College- and University-level Administrators

Principles

1. The Department shall have the primary responsibility for evaluating non-tenured tenure-track faculty. Throughout the evaluation process, Department evaluations shall be given weight which appropriately reflects this responsibility.
2. The recommendations in the decision-making process shall be based on documented and verifiable evidence and the review process shall be transparent.
3. Throughout the process, the principle of confidentiality shall be respected.
4. Review processes at each level shall include appropriate evaluations of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. These evaluations shall become part of the individual evaluation file.
5. Review processes at each level shall be limited to professionally relevant considerations and shall include documented evidence of performance from the faculty member, students, other faculty, and College- and University-level administrators. The documented evidence shall be part of the individual evaluation dossier.
6. The justification for or against reappointment shall be clearly stated in writing and maintained in the faculty member’s evaluation dossier at every step in the process.
7. The Department and College procedures not determined by Policy 4.6.5P, Evaluation of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty, shall be developed and approved by tenure-track faculty comprising these units. Such procedures shall be made available to the faculty in these units.
Faculty shall be evaluated annually. Recommendations and decisions for reappointment shall be based on the evaluation of performance in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service. In reviewing all three areas, collegiality shall be considered.

Criteria

Faculty shall be evaluated annually. Recommendations and decisions for reappointment shall be based on the evaluation of performance in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service. In reviewing all three areas, collegiality shall be considered.

Procedures

Conducting Annual Evaluations for Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

General Guidelines for Evaluations

1. All evaluations shall be conducted in an ethical manner, with recommendations and justifications based upon relevant, documented, and verifiable information.
2. A record of meetings of the committee shall be maintained in the Department Chair’s office and will include names of attending members and a record of the vote count.
3. All committee recommendations shall be based on secret ballot and majority vote. A tie vote is considered a negative vote on the recommendation.
4. Administrative reviewers (Chair, Dean, and Provost) should ensure that annual evaluation recommendations are consistent with the goals and needs of the areas within their scope of responsibility.
5. The Department Chair and the College Dean, in conjunction with the chairs of the respective annual evaluation committees, shall ensure that the membership of annual evaluation committees do not pose a conflict of interest in evaluating and voting upon applicants. If such a conflict exists, the Chair shall arrange for an elected alternate at the department level and the Dean shall arrange for an elected alternate at the college level.
6. Department Chairs shall not serve as members on annual evaluation committees. Furthermore, the Department Chair shall not be present during committee deliberations unless stipulated by Department policy.

Initial Review of First-Year Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Non-tenured tenure-track faculty in their first full academic year at EKU shall submit a curriculum vita to the Department Chair in accordance with Department deadlines.
2. The Chair shall meet with the first-year non-tenured tenure-track faculty member no later than January 15. The Chair shall provide an evaluation of the faculty member’s performance during the academic year to date, including a recommendation regarding reappointment.
3. The faculty member may respond to the evaluation and recommendation by one of the following:
   (1) Accepting the evaluation and recommendation. The report is then forwarded to the Dean.
   (2) Filing a statement, including supporting documentation, to be appended to the evaluation. This statement shall be submitted to the Department Chair within five days of receipt of the evaluation report.
4. No later than February 1, the Chair shall forward the evaluation (including the curriculum vita, the recommendation and, if applicable, an appended statement and any supporting documentation) to the Dean.
5. The Dean shall review the material provided by the Department Chair and make a recommendation regarding reappointment. If the Dean does not concur with the Department Chair, the Dean shall state in writing the reasons for the differing recommendation.
6. No later than February 15, the Dean shall notify the faculty member in writing of the Dean’s recommendation.
7. The recommendation and the evaluation file shall be forwarded to the Provost.
8. The Provost shall review the evaluation and recommendations. If the Provost does not concur with the recommendations of the Department Chair and/or the Dean, the Provost shall state in writing the reasons for the differing decision.
9. No later than March 1, the Provost shall return the signed evaluations to the Dean, who shall notify the faculty member, with a copy to the Department Chair. The Dean shall provide a copy of the final report to the faculty member. The faculty member shall sign the last page of the report acknowledging receipt of a copy of the report.
10. Appeals of a non-reappointment decision shall follow the procedure below.
THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES APPLY TO FACULTY IN YEARS TWO THROUGH FIVE:

The Department Annual Evaluation Committee
Department annual evaluation committees shall be composed as determined by the full-time tenure-track faculty of the Department, within the following guidelines:

a) The Department committee shall consist of no fewer than three voting members, which shall be elected from the full-time tenured faculty. If a Department is too small to provide such a committee, the Department may select a full-time tenured faculty outside the Department with the advice of the Dean of the College. In this case, the faculty member may not serve on the promotion and tenure committee of more than one Department.

b) The maximum number of members shall be determined by the Department.

c) If a person in a faculty member’s family/household is being evaluated under this policy, the faculty member may not serve on the committee that year. The Department procedures shall provide for an alternate who shall serve throughout the year. If the Department cannot comply with this provision because of the size of the Department or other unique circumstance, the procedure in (a), above, shall be followed.

d) The committee shall be elected no later than September 10 of the year in which it is to function.

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee may serve as the annual evaluation committee for non-tenured tenure-track faculty. The Department, by majority vote, shall determine whether to use the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee or to use a separate committee for non-tenured tenure-track faculty.

Evaluation Procedures
Non-tenured tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated on an annual basis and shall be assessed on their professional performance since their last evaluation, including responsiveness to previous evaluations. Non-tenured tenure-track faculty applying for promotion shall submit an application for promotion that shall include all documentation for the annual self-evaluation and shall be additionally evaluated under Policy 4.6.4, Promotion and Tenure. Evaluation of these faculty members shall include committee recommendations for both annual evaluation and promotion.

Faculty Member
1. The non-tenured tenure-track faculty member shall complete a self-evaluation, which shall include a narrative analysis of the faculty member’s professional performance for the previous academic year. In all cases, the faculty member shall provide accurate and complete details of any potentially relevant, documented, and verified information. The faculty member shall assemble the evaluation file as follows:

   a. Terms of Initial Appointment and, if applicable, any previously agreed-upon exceptions to Policy 4.6.4, Promotion and Tenure.
   b. A copy of a current curriculum vita.
   c. Copies of previous non-tenured tenure-track annual evaluation reports by evaluators.
   d. The self-evaluation on the appropriate form.
   e. Supporting documentation.

2. The faculty member shall submit a self-evaluation and supporting materials to the Department Chair, who has the responsibility to get the evaluation and all materials to the Department committee in accordance with Department deadlines. In the process of being evaluated, faculty members must allow their self-evaluations and supporting materials to be open to their peers on the Department annual evaluation committee.

Department Annual Evaluation Committee
1. The Department committee shall review the evaluation file and all supporting materials required by the Department. The department committee may request additional materials to clarify submitted material as necessary.

2. The Department committee shall consider the faculty member’s evaluation file and the following:

   a. performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service;
   b. formal student evaluations;
   c. the Department’s second systematic method of assessing teaching performance, which shall include a consideration of the perspectives of students, colleagues, and supervisors and shall be clearly defined and communicated in Department policy;
   d. data provided by the Chair of the Department.
3. The Department may also consider as part of the application the following:
   a. mandated external review;
   b. peer opinions (not limited to committee members) but not anonymous opinions.
4. The Department committee shall make a written recommendation, stating reasons for or against reappointment, and shall complete the appropriate recommendation form(s) for reappointment. Members of the committee shall sign the form(s), indicating the report’s accuracy as it was approved by the majority of the committee. The evaluation file, the written recommendation, and the signed form(s) shall be submitted to the Department Chair.

**Department Chair**
1. The Department Chair shall review the evaluation file and the Department committee’s recommendations. The Chair may consult with the Department committee and/or the faculty member prior to making a recommendation. If the Department Chair concurs with the committee’s recommendation, the Chair may write a separate recommendation regarding reappointment. If the Department Chair does not concur with the committee’s recommendation, the Chair shall write a separate recommendation with justifications for the differing recommendation.
2. The faculty member shall be notified in writing by the Department Chair of the recommendations of the Department committee and of the Department Chair, with justification for these decisions.
3. The Department Chair shall meet with the faculty member and review the recommendations, provide the faculty member with a copy of the report (and all addenda), and secure the faculty member’s signed acknowledgment of receipt of the report.
4. The faculty member may request reconsideration of the Department committee’s recommendation, the Department Chair’s recommendation, or both within ten (10) calendar days of notification.
5. The Department committee, the Department Chair, or both shall reconsider the faculty member’s evaluation in light of the request for reconsideration. The request for reconsideration should only address concerns raised by the Department committee and/or the Department Chair and may include additional information submitted by the faculty member in support of that clarification.
6. The faculty member shall be notified in writing by the Department Chair of the results of reconsideration. The reconsideration report shall be included in the evaluation file.
7. The recommendation and the evaluation file shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College.

**College Dean**
1. The Dean shall review the evaluation and recommendations. The Dean may consult with previous decision makers and/or the faculty member prior to making a recommendation. The Dean shall provide a separate recommendation regarding reappointment. If the Dean does not concur with the recommendations of the Department committee, the Department Chair, or both, the Dean shall state in writing the reasons for the differing recommendations.
2. The Dean shall notify the faculty member in writing of the Dean’s recommendation, with justification for the recommendation.
3. The recommendation and the evaluation file shall be forwarded to the Provost.

**Provost**
1. The Provost shall review the evaluation and recommendations. The Provost may consult with previous decision makers and/or the faculty member prior to making a decision. The Provost shall provide a separate decision regarding reappointment. If the Provost does not concur with the recommendations of the Department committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, or all three, the Provost shall state in writing the reasons for the differing decision.
2. The Provost shall return the signed evaluations to the Dean, who shall notify the faculty member, with a copy to the Department Chair. The Dean shall provide a copy of the final report to the faculty member. The faculty member shall sign the last page of the report acknowledging receipt of a copy of the report.
3. Appeals of a non-reappointment decision shall follow the procedure below.

**NON-REAPPOINTMENT**
1. The Provost shall notify the President of non-reappointment recommendations, including the results of any appeals, in sufficient time to comply with the deadlines below.
2. **University Faculty**

Faculty members in their first year of a tenure-track appointment at EKU shall receive official notification of non-reappointment from the President no later than March 15 unless an appeal has been filed, in which case the deadline is March 30. Faculty members in the second year of a tenure-track appointment at EKU shall receive official notification of non-reappointment from the President no later than December 15. Faculty members in their third through six years in a tenure-track appointment at EKU shall receive official notification of non-reappointment from the President at least twelve months prior to the faculty member’s termination of employment at the University.

**Model Laboratory Faculty**

In accordance with KRS 161.750, faculty at Model Laboratory School shall receive official notification of non-reappointment from the Superintendent and the President no later than May 15 of the school year during which the appointment is in effect unless an appeal has been filed, in which case the deadline may be extended until the completion of the appeal process. Model Laboratory School faculty will not receive a terminal year.

**Appeals**

1. In the event of a negative decision by the Provost, the faculty member may appeal the decision. Acceptable grounds for requesting such an appeal are:
   a. decision is arbitrary, capricious, or not supported by factual data
   b. violation of procedural due process
   c. violation of academic freedom

2. The faculty member will submit a written request for appeal to the Provost within ten (10) calendar days of notification of the Provost’s decision, with a copy to the Dean of the College. The request shall state the grounds for an appeal, shall provide relevant, documented, and verified evidence not previously submitted in support of such grounds.

3. The Provost shall convene the Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee (FEAC) to review the appeal. The Provost shall meet with the faculty member upon appeal of a non-reappointment decision, if such a meeting is requested by the faculty member.

4. The FEAC shall evaluate the body of evidence as it relates to the grounds for appeal. The FEAC may meet with decision makers, meet with the faculty member, or consult with others as necessary in order to evaluate the grounds for appeal. Based on its findings, the FEAC may recommend a reconsideration of the Provost’s original decision. The FEAC shall report its findings and recommendations to the Provost— with a copy to the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Dean— within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the appeal, except in extenuating circumstances.

5. Possible actions by theProvost could include, but are not limited to:
   a. Affirming his/her original decision, with written justification
   b. Reversing his/her original decision, with written justification
   c. Reconvening the FEAC to meet with appropriate decision makers and report additional findings.

6. The Provost shall notify the faculty member in writing of the appeal decision, with a copy to the Dean and the Department Chair. All appeal decisions are final.

### Responsibilities

**Department Chair**

At a minimum, the Chair is responsible for:
- providing the Department committee with such documentation and data as policy and committee needs require.
- informing the faculty of policies, procedures, and criteria for annual evaluation.
- making a recommendation regarding reappointment.

**Department Evaluation Committee**

At a minimum, the Department Evaluation Committee is responsible for:
- for providing the appropriate professional interpretations for the discipline.
- ensuring that criteria applied in the evaluation are consistent with department criteria.
- writing the evaluation report and for making a recommendation regarding reappointment.
College Dean
At a minimum, the College Dean is responsible for:
- making decisions on reappointment of non-tenured tenure-track faculty
- notifying faculty in writing of such decisions

Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee
At a minimum, the Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee is responsible for
- ensuring appeals are reviewed only on the grounds stated in this policy.
- reviewing the appeal and the evidence submitted by the faculty member.
- submitting findings and recommendations to the Provost.

Faculty Member Being Evaluated
- The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for knowing and adhering to the principles and criteria set forth in this policy.
- The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for submitting a self-evaluation and other applicable materials by the established Department deadline.

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
At a minimum, the Provost is responsible for:
- making decisions on reappointment of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty
- ultimately ensuring that criteria applied in the evaluation are consistent with the terms of agreement established in writing at the faculty member’s initial appointment in a tenure-track position.
- meeting with faculty members appealing a non-reappointment decision, if such a meeting is requested by the faculty member.
- making decisions on appealed cases.

Definitions

Calendar Day
Throughout this document calendar day shall be interpreted to mean no later than the specified number of calendar days following the day of notification. If the final calendar day occurs on a weekend or holiday, the due date shall be on the first day on which University administrative offices are open. The time for response may be extended upon agreement by both parties.

Collegiality
The ability of an individual to interact with colleagues with civility and professional respect; to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks necessary to meet Department, College, and University goals; and to work productively with faculty, students, and staff. Collegiality should not be confused with sociability or likability but rather is the professional criterion relating to teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service.

Confidentiality
The principle of limiting access to information or documents only to those persons authorized to have such access. Documents and communications in the evaluation, tenure, and promotion processes will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law.

Full-time Tenure-Track Faculty
Faculty employed full-time who are tenured, eligible for tenure, or in a pre-tenure probationary period.

Provost
Refers to either the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or his/her designee.

University
Eastern Kentucky University

Interpreting Authority

Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
Relevant Links

Policy 4.6.4P, Tenure and Promotion
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Outside Activities

Policy Statement

Full-time members of the University faculty are expected to devote their major energies to their contracted responsibilities. However, it is recognized that certain forms of outside activity contribute to the professional development of the individual and reflect credit upon the University. Whether such activities are performed with or without remuneration, there should be no interference with the fundamental responsibility of faculty to meet their regularly assigned duties and obligations. University faculty are obligated by professional ethics to keep their various activities in reasonable balance and to make a careful determination of priorities.

Specific Interpretations Governing Professional Outside Activities of Faculty

1. **Time Limitation.** Full-time faculty of the University may carry out professional activities outside the University with or without pay up to the equivalent of one work day a week, averaged throughout the number of weeks of their employment in a given year, Saturdays and Sundays excluded. When faculty members are not under contract with the University and during official vacation and holiday periods, they may engage in outside activities without time restrictions.

2. **Division of Sponsored Programs and/or Continuing Education and Outreach.** Faculty who are employed full-time are limited to 4 days per month or 36 days during the academic year (August 15 - May 15) on outside funded projects through Division of Sponsored Programs and/or Continuing Education and Outreach. Requests for outside employment forms are to be filed for each activity since outside funding is involved. If faculty need to exceed 36 days during the academic year, then release time should be provided for in the project budget.

   Faculty who do not teach during the summer term may be employed on projects through Division of Sponsored Programs and/or Continuing Education and Outreach in keeping with University policies and approved internal budgets. Compensation may not exceed one-ninth of the prior academic year salary for anyone month during the period May 16 - August 14. Requests for outside employment forms are to be filed in advance for each activity.

   Faculty employed full-time during the summer term are limited to one day per week. Faculty employed less than full-time in the intersession or summer term may be approved for additional days on a pro rata basis. Requests for outside employment forms are to be filed in advance for each activity in the intersession and summer term.

3. **Approval Procedure.** Each outside activity, with or without pay, should be thoroughly discussed with the chair of the department before it is accepted. A clear, written statement of the nature of each activity and the amount of time it will likely require, including time away from the institution, should be submitted to the department chair and written approval obtained. This makes it clear that the faculty member has discussed the nature of each outside activity with the department chair and a mutual understanding has been reached. In order that the University may be cognizant of outside activities of faculty, the department chair will then submit the recommendation to the college dean, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President for their consideration. Appropriate forms can be obtained from the office of the department chair.

4. **Appeal Procedure.** Any faculty member who has reason to believe that a request for approval of an outside activity which falls within these general guidelines has been denied has the right to make an appeal through procedures that now exist or may be established.

This policy has not yet been reviewed under Policy 1.1.1. For purposes of cataloging, it has been placed in an abbreviated form of the policy template. It remains an official university policy and will eventually be reviewed under Policy 1.1.1.
5. **Use of University Resources.** At the time of approval of the activity, appropriate arrangements for the use of and/or reimbursement for University resources shall be made and shown as a matter of record on the approval form.

6. **Use of University Name.** The University's name shall not be used in connection with any outside activity unless contracted through or otherwise approved by the University.

7. **Outside Teaching.** Teaching at other institutions is governed by the principle that outside activities should not encroach upon the faculty member's primary responsibilities to this University, and the approval procedure outlined in 3. above should be followed. Shared instructional service may be negotiated by the faculty member and appropriate administrative officers of the two institutions. In all cases, accreditation standards must be respected.

8. **Legal Responsibility.** The University cannot accept legal responsibility for privately initiated activities.

9. **Conflict of Interest.** Every precaution should be taken to avoid any possible conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest. See the AAUP/ACE conflict of interest statement (AAUP Policy Documents and Reports [Washington, D.C., 1984] pp. 158-60) for more thorough guidance regarding conflicts of interest.

10. **Implementation and Monitoring of the Policy.** Primary responsibility for compliance with the provisions of this policy rests with the individual faculty member. Faculty members are required to include a description of the professionally related outside activities as part of their annual merit report. This description should be in sufficient detail to meet accreditation standards.

### Entities Affected by the Policy

- Colleges
- Departments
- Faculty

### Interpreting Authority

Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs

### Policy Adoption Review and Approval
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<th>Date</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 29, 1966</td>
<td>Council of Instruction</td>
<td>Recommended Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 15, 1966</strong></td>
<td><strong>Board of Regents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adopted</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This policy has not yet been reviewed under Policy 1.1.1. For purposes of cataloging, it has been placed in an abbreviated form of the policy template. It remains an official university policy and will eventually be reviewed under Policy 1.1.1.
TO: Members of the Faculty Senate  
FROM: Sherry Robinson, Chair, Council on Academic Affairs  
DATE: September 26, 2018  
SUBJECT: CAA Items for October Faculty Senate Meeting  

As a result of the Council on Academic Affairs meeting on September 20, 2018, the following items are presented for the Faculty Senate’s agenda on October 1, 2018.

**Curriculum Proposals**

### Program Revisions

**College of Business and Technology**

*Department of Applied Engineering and Technology*

#### 1. Network Security and Electronics B.S.

- Rename the program Cyber Systems Technology.
- Split the BS degree program into two concentrations:
  - a. Network Security & Electronics
  - b. Tech Systems; with a common core and supporting course requirements.
- Include 25 hours of coursework in each concentration:
  - a. Network Security & Electronics concentration: EET 251, 257; NET 344, 395, 454; 6 hours of CSC/CIS/INF courses above CSC 160, or above CIS 215, or above INF 130); CHE 101 and 101L(1) or higher in ⁶Element 4.
  - b. Tech Systems concentration: 25 hours of computer systems, electricity & electronics, and networking related technical electives as approved by major advisor. This is the recommended option for transfer students.
- Expand Supporting Course requirement from ECO 230 to included ECO 130 or higher in ⁶Element 5B.
- Expand section of Mathematics classes from MAT 114 or higher, to MAT 112A/B or higher in ⁶Element 2.
- Drop MAT 120 from Supporting Courses.
- Drop AEM 310 from Supporting Courses.
- Update number of free electives from to 5-6.
Program Revisions

College of Business and Technology

Department of Applied Engineering and Technology

2. Technology A.A.S.
   Expand Supporting Course requirement from to include ECO 130 or higher in Element 5B.
   Expand section of Mathematics classes to MAT 112A/B or higher in Element 2.
   Expand programming coursework to include CIS 215 or higher
   Drop MAT 120 from the Computer Electronics concentration.
   Require either NET 395 (Special Topics in NET) or NET 403 (Advanced LANs & PC Communications) in the Computer Electronics concentration

Department of Management, Marketing, and International Business

3. General Business B.B.A.
   Add a Business and Marketing Education/Teaching Concentration

College of Health Sciences

Department of Exercise and Sport Science

4. Exercise and Sport Science B.S.
   Drop ATR 225 and 225L from the curriculum. Add new courses ATR 325 and 325L.
   Update course requirements to reflect changes in EMC 110 (6) to a 3 hour course and add EMC 110L as a 2 hour course. This change was included in the fall 2018 catalog and the impact on the BS in ESS: Pre-AT/PT concentration was just identified.
   Change credit hours of ESS 313 from 2 to 3.

General Studies

College of Science - Department of Geosciences

5. General Studies A.A. Geography Concentration
   Update requirements to respond to dropped course

6. General Studies A.A. Geographic Information Systems Concentration
   Correct some course numbering errors in the AGS concentration and add an elective

7. General Studies A.A. Geology Concentration
   Update requirements to reflect current course offerings and geology curriculum
Executive Committee report
Oct. 1, 2018
Submitted by Matthew Winslow

Quarterly Board of Regents meeting (Sept. 24, 2018)

My report to the Board contained information about the charge to the Academic Quality Committee about large class size, and about EKU Forward. Several Board members inquired about EKU Forward and indicated their appreciation of it. In fact, they were so positive about it that I invited the members of the Board to attend our Faculty Senate meetings (which are open to the public in any case). Should they attend our meetings I hope we will welcome them with the hope that we can improve the relationship and communication between the Senate and the Board. Although it may appear at times that we disagree on the direction and priorities of the University, I believe that both bodies have the interests of EKU and our students in mind.

The Board also discussed President Benson’s evaluation, for which the XC contributed a report of faculty opinion. While no official action was taken, the Board seemed very positive about President Benson’s performance, and expressed their appreciation for our report. For his part, President Benson accepted the praise but promised to work on the areas of weakness indicated in the various reports.

Vice Provost Robinson was unable to attend the September XC meeting because she had to attend the Board of Regents meeting on the same day, and the Board meeting ran longer than anticipated. This meant that discussion of policy changes was delayed until the next XC meeting. I also attended the Board meeting and was unable to attend the XC meeting.
To the Faculty:

Folks,

The EKU Board of Regents held its fall quarterly meeting on Monday, September 24th in the new Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning (Library 318). Today, I’d like to share with you a few of the highlights.

Barry Poynter shared some preliminary budget data showing total E&G Revenue down by approximately $8 million compared to this time last year. This is due to a combination of factors but $2.6 million of that is due to decreased fall tuition revenue. There will still be some additional fall tuition revenue from online courses yet to be received. Special use fees including the Asset Preservation fee have been moved into restricted accounts, so there is actually more revenue this year, but the restricted funds do not show up as E&G Revenue. State Appropriations are down $257,000 to date.

The Board received an update on the performance of our auxiliary units so far this year and with the exception of the Airport FBO, all units are self-sustaining - and the Airport is only down $22 thousand. This is a substantial improvement over recent years. Housing revenue is up more than $2 million, the Center for the Arts is up about $300 thousand, parking is up, and the Club at Arlington is operating in the black by almost $27 thousand.

David McFaddin and Tanlee Wasson brought the Board up-to-date on the Implementation Team’s work on meeting the FY 19 budget goals. It was essentially the same information shared with the campus via email on August 31st. They also shared data on performance funding.
## FY 2019 State Allocation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018 Total Allocation</th>
<th>$65,045,200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.25% Enacted Cut</td>
<td>($4,065,325)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Budgeted Allocation (not including PF)*</td>
<td>$60,801,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Funding Allocation by Outcomes</td>
<td>$1,729,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Performance Allocation</td>
<td>$1,657,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Total Allocation</td>
<td>$64,189,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from FY18 to FY19</td>
<td>($856,200)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last year EKU’s state allocation was ~$65 million. A 6.25% cut dropped our FY 19 allocation to $60,801,700.

The state’s 6.25% cut totaled $57 million for the whole sector. (EKU’s share of the cut was ~$4 million.) Then the state put $31 million of that amount back into an “additional performance allocation.” This year institutions were “held harmless.” So, most of that money was used to “prop up” those institutions that would have lost money otherwise. $24 million was distributed to 4-year institutions, with the balance going to KCTCS.

In essence, the 6.25% cut funded the performance pool, and we must compete for those dollars with other institutions, including UK. EKU performed relatively well, gaining $1.7 million over its contribution, but still ended up with ~$850,000 less than last year.
Performance Funding

- EKU’s $54,278,600 contribution represents 10.8% of the total funds in the performance pool ($504,883,300). When the percent of funds awarded for a specific outcome exceeds the percent contributed, the institution has earned funding for that outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contribution Percentage</th>
<th>Credit Hour Share</th>
<th>Square Feet Share</th>
<th>Inst Support Share</th>
<th>FTE Student Share</th>
<th>Success Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UofL</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKU</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSU</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MuSU</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKU</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKU</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EKU contributed 10.8% of all the money in the performance pool. The way the system works, any place where we went above that percentage, we gained dollars. Below that percentage, we lose dollars. If you notice the square footage share, EKU was actually second in adding square footage last year. But everyone was so dominated by UK’s ability to build ($650 million, last I heard) and we actually ended up losing money on that indicator.

Our Student Success share came in at 10.9%. Here’s a breakdown of that component with gains in green and loses in red.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contribution Percentage</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degrees</th>
<th>STEM-H Degrees</th>
<th>URM Degrees</th>
<th>LI Degrees</th>
<th>Progress 30 CH</th>
<th>Progress 60 CH</th>
<th>Progress 90 CH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UofL</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKU</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSU</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MuSU</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKU</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKU</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the exception of URM Degrees (underrepresented minority), which is a full two points below target, all other components are above or very near or 10.8% target.

**Performance Funding**

- EKU gained $1.7 M above its contribution to the formula based on performance (not including the additional allocation)
- There was a 1% stop loss in place for FY19 so the institutions that would have lost funding due to performance did not lose to the extent noted in this table. The additional funds allocated to performance fund covered those losses and provided additional funding for the other institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes Total</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>152,994,000</td>
<td>157,452,600</td>
<td>$4,458,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UofL</td>
<td>111,523,900</td>
<td>110,752,900</td>
<td>($771,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKU</td>
<td>54,278,600</td>
<td>56,008,100</td>
<td>$1,729,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>14,356,400</td>
<td>7,566,500</td>
<td>($6,789,900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSU</td>
<td>31,578,800</td>
<td>28,099,800</td>
<td>($3,479,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MuSU</td>
<td>37,363,300</td>
<td>36,831,000</td>
<td>($532,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKU</td>
<td>42,702,400</td>
<td>46,173,000</td>
<td>$3,470,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKU</td>
<td>60,085,900</td>
<td>61,999,400</td>
<td>$1,913,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full implementation of the performance funding model is not due until 2022, but it is already clear that the comprehensive universities are much less likely to prosper under this plan.
Performance Funding

- In order to remain on an upward projection for the individual metrics, institutions should increase above the weighted, rolling 3-year sector average for each of the components.

- The table below shows how each institution is performing in relation to the sector average. A check in a column indicates the institution performed above the average for that component.

- Failure to increase at a rate equal to or above the sector average indicates that the institution is losing ground on that metric compared to the other institutions in the sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Credit Hour Share</th>
<th>Square Feet Share</th>
<th>Inst Supp. Share</th>
<th>FTE Share</th>
<th>Bach Deg</th>
<th>STEM-H Deg</th>
<th>URM Deg</th>
<th>LI Deg</th>
<th>30 hrs</th>
<th>60 hrs</th>
<th>90 hrs</th>
<th># Above</th>
<th># Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UofL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MuSU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **long-term projection** shows EKU meeting five components. You will notice the bachelor’s degree component is not checked. This is because the projections are based on a rolling 3-year average within the sector, and even though we outperformed on this item, somebody else grew faster than we did and we are projected to lose ground on this component.

With UK performing above the sector average in all categories - and despite the fact that EKU ranks third with 5 categories marked - it is probably useful to see this slide as a predictive indicator of the areas where we are likely to find future success under this model. So, EKU is performing well. But the challenging part for us is that the R1 institutions are resourced in such a way that, while we may perform above the sector average and above our own goals, we still may lose funds under this model.

The governor was at a town hall forum in Richmond last week, was asked about performance funding, and remains committed to full implementation of the model in 2022 without any safety nets.

The model is set for review in 2020 and discussions have already begun with the hope of separating the R1s from the comprehensive’s sector.
The comprehensives carry the burden of a pension obligation that the R1s don’t and we are under-resourced for competition with UK. President Benson is in conversation with other regional university presidents who are committed to pushing for a re-bifurcation of the sectors when it comes up for review in 2020. He pointed out that we want UK and UofL to do well, but we are fundamentally different institutions. Benson told the Board, “We will compete with everyone below that UofL line, and look how well we did.” The administration believes EKU will compete quite well within the group of regional institutions.

The Board also agreed to delegate authority for management of the university’s Optional Retirement Plan to the president. This “housekeeping item” rectifies an omission that probably ought to have been handled at the time the ORP was established. As I understand it, the Board set up ORPs some number of years ago but failed to grant the president the authority to make adjustments in a timely fashion. Changes had to await approval by the Board. That kind of delay can hamper the institution in making timely adjustments in its investments as economic factors change. Typically, one would want their investment advisors to move quickly when opportunities appear.

The resolution calls for the creation of an oversight committee. In fact, a small ad hoc faculty and staff committee, including Ben Woodruff and Burke Christensen from Finance, has been operating for a little while. With passage of the resolution, the committee will now be formalized into the university’s committee structure. Members will be required to have an appropriate level of financial acumen.

**Eastern Kentucky University**

**Board of Regents**

**RESOLUTION**

**WHEREAS,** KRS 161.567 authorizes an optional retirement plan for certain eligible, designated employees of public postsecondary education institutions;

**WHEREAS,** KRS 161.567 requires the Board of Regents to select two (2) to four (4) companies from which to purchase contracts under the optional retirement plan under a statutorily-designated set of criteria;

**WHEREAS,** the Board of Regents is vested with authority to delegate responsibility to the President of the University;

**WHEREAS,** the President may utilize an appropriate committee(s) and/or consultant(s) to assist with the development and execution of the Retirement Plan Investment Policy Statement;

**BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED** that the Eastern Kentucky University Board of
Regents hereby delegates authority and responsibility to the President of Eastern Kentucky University for the selection of the optional retirement plan providers;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the President is authorized to execute and amend Retirement Plan Investment Policy Statement to provide parameters to the retirement carriers and consultants as it relates to adding and removing investment "fund" choices for the Plan; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Eastern Kentucky University Board of Regents recognizes that the President may utilize an appropriate committee(s) and/or consultant(s) to assist with the development and execution of the Retirement Plan Investment Policy Statement.

Done this the 24th day of September, 2018, by the Board of Regents of Eastern Kentucky University.

Consistent with Policy 4.8.1, the Board of Regents concluded an **evaluation of the president of the university** at Monday’s meeting. Chairman Turner asked me to lead the process which put before the members data collected from the faculty, staff and a number of external stakeholders. The president also submitted a self-evaluation of his first five years at EKU. I believe it is accurate to say that for the first time in university history the Board of Regents discussed the performance of the president in public session.

**Executive Summary: Evaluation of President Michael T. Benson**

When the EKU Board of Regents set out in 2013 to attract the University’s 13th president, it declared that it was seeking an innovative and visionary leader with demonstrated abilities in budgetary and financial management, one who was committed to academic excellence, diversity and fundraising, and accomplished in interpersonal communications and human relations, including success in the external political environment.¹

Recent surveys of EKU faculty, staff and external stakeholders confirmed general satisfaction with the performance of President Michel Benson, particularly his representation of the University around the state, as he enters his sixth year at the helm.

The faculty survey obtained a strong 55 percent return – typical response rates for internal surveys range from 30 to 40 percent. Since it was decided to poll
every faculty member rather than conduct a random sample, the results cannot be generalized, but the strong response produced useful information.ii

Overall, 55 percent of faculty and 69 percent of staff rated President Benson as effective or very effective. Both groups scored the president most highly on governmental relations, meeting the ongoing commitments of the University’s Strategic Plan, exhibiting integrity and compassion, offering vision, effective communications, visibility, personal relations, and maintaining a safe campus. iii

The surveys suggested opportunities for improvement in the areas of maintaining positive morale, delegating authority to appropriate individuals, evaluating performance, obtaining and distributing resources for personnel development, and offering competitive salaries. Since 2013, $15.3 million have been added to the total faculty and staff payroll, including various across-the-board and equity raises, plus the attendant fringe benefits.iv Unfortunately, increases in faculty and staff spending power were significantly offset by rising benefit costs as the University grappled with continued declines in state appropriations and resulting budget cuts.v

In a separate survey, 100 percent of external stakeholders rated President Benson as either effective or very effective.vi

President Benson’s tenure has been distinguished by a comprehensive campus revitalization initiative designed to transform the living and learning experience of EKU students. In the last two years alone, the University has opened the second phase of its Science Building, three new residence halls, a new dining hall and a parking garage, among other improvements, generally financed by innovative public-private partnerships. In late 2019, the University will open a new recreation center and a renovated student union, both financed by a Student Senate-approved student fee.

Other recent accomplishments include record levels of private support, a very successful national re-accreditation, a doubling of the four-year graduation rate and improvements in freshman retention, and near-record enrollments.

President Benson’s new book, co-authored with former colleague Hal Boyd, is titled “College for the Commonwealth: A Case for Higher Education in American Democracy” and will be available October 22.

After an open discussion of the evaluation, the Board approved the following statement: “The Board thanks President Benson for furthering the lives of EKU students and for sustaining the mission and values of the University. We appreciate his great work, his leadership and his impact on students. President Benson has a talent for personal relations, and that contributes greatly to the mission of the University and to our development efforts.”
The Board also said in its statement that it is “encouraging the president to look for opportunities to raise faculty and staff salaries to competitive and equitable levels.”

Board members were also advised that a new revision of KRS 164.321 has necessitated a review of University Policy and Board of Regents Bylaws regarding “an annual evaluation of the president of the university.”

While the law does not directly address annual evaluations of the president as a requirement, it does list failure to conduct an annual evaluation as one factor that “shall be cause for the governor to remove all appointed members of the board...” What constitutes an annual evaluation is not specified, so it would seem the Board has some latitude to describe in policy how such evaluations would occur. An abbreviated process most years, with a formal review every three years, or so, would fit our current practice.

My initial thoughts were that a formal annual evaluation of the president was overly ambitious. But after going through this process, I find myself increasingly favoring a process that annually reviews the president, at the same time we annually review our institution’s progress against the strategic plan.

Further, the law seems to establish a baseline expectation for each Board of Regents:

- to hold quarterly meetings
- to elect a chairperson annually
- to establish a quorum
- to adopt an annual budget
- to set tuition rates
- to conduct an annual evaluation of the president of the university
- to carry out its primary function to periodically evaluate the university's...progress in implementing its mission, goals, and objectives to conform to the strategic agenda
- or to otherwise perform its duties

The Board agreed to charge the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents with reviewing current policy and bylaws and outlining a new process for annual evaluation of the president.

The next meeting of the Board of Regents is scheduled for December 3rd at 10:30am in Martin Hall.

Respectfully,

Richard

---

1 OK, so technically, the Board was seeking its 12th president at the time Benson was selected. But subsequently, Mary Roark was retroactively declared to be EKU’s 2nd president and Benson became #13.
Under **Policy 4.8.1**, the faculty-at-large contributes to this review by completing a survey conducted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee which assesses the president’s leadership, management, communication, personal relations, fairness, and an overall evaluation. The Faculty Senate went beyond the policy adding a new section to the survey which assesses the institution’s progress against its Make No Little Plans: Vision for 2020 Strategic Plan. An objective summary of faculty input was reported to the Board in March, 2018.

The faculty’s view of the president is generally positive but opinions are spread widely. Overall, 55.26% of the faculty rated the president as effective or very effective. But 26.43% rated him as ineffective or very ineffective, with 18.32% neutral on the question. The assessment of the staff was more positive with 69% rating the president as effective or very effective overall, but that percentage is down from 71.15% in 2015.

This is a total of $10.5 million base funds; with an estimated 46% composite fringe rate, that adds another $4.8 million, for a total salary and benefits of $15.3 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3.7 million</td>
<td>2.5% across-the-board increase</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500K</td>
<td>Step-in-Grade Program</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 million</td>
<td>IPEP Phase I (26% of total need)</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.3 million</td>
<td>IPEP Phase II (67% of total need)</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
<td>2.5% across-the-board increase</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
<td>FLSA requirements left in place</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part of the challenge of accurately reading survey data is to find the story that the numbers tell. This is not fully possible without random sampling, but with a survey of this type, it is more important that all constituents “have their say” than it is to structure the survey in order to employ the benefits of inferential statistics. But if we look to the extremes, it is possible to get a sense of how the president is viewed in terms of strengths and weaknesses. For example, if we were to arbitrarily accept that any item where more than 2/3rds of the respondents identified a strength, is a strength - and similarly that any item where more than 1/3 identified a weakness, is a growth area - then we might conclude the following based on the faculty results: President Benson exhibits integrity; is visible; represents the University effectively; shows respect for students, faculty, staff and other administrators; has plans for accomplishing long- and short-term goals; uses appropriate channels to convey information on a timely basis; is genuinely concerned with the needs of others; shows consideration for others’ time and effort; adheres to procedures in the Faculty handbook; and is compassionate. He is an advocate for increased support for higher education, and is committed to promoting service and maintaining a safe campus. Growth areas for the president include maintaining morale; choosing competent subordinates; delegating authority to appropriate persons; obtaining resources to further personnel development; and avoiding giving preferential treatment to individuals, departments and colleges/units. He should increase support for the liberal arts core; promote financial efficiency and transparency; and raise faculty and staff salaries to competitive and equitable levels.

Overall Performance Rating Percentage by Respondent Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Type</th>
<th>Very Ineffective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (N=333)</td>
<td>11.41%</td>
<td>15.02%</td>
<td>18.32%</td>
<td>30.03%</td>
<td>25.23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (N=379)</td>
<td>5.54%</td>
<td>11.08%</td>
<td>14.78%</td>
<td>33.77%</td>
<td>34.83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKU Internal Boards¹ (N=29)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>72.41%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Stakeholders² (N=17)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>94.12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Includes Alumni Board, Foundation Board, and Board of Regents
²Includes Higher Education peers, local community leaders, and state leaders
Last week, I attended EAB’s Academic Affairs Forum in Washington, D.C., which focused on two main themes:

**Cross-Disciplinary Advancement and Governance**

The first major theme was emerging efforts at universities to create broader divisions of faculty groups with similarities working collaboratively to advance interdisciplinary skills for future societal needs. There is a growing trend in interdisciplinary degrees and administrative structures as universities strive to foster both disciplinary knowledge and broader humanitarian skills in tomorrow’s thinkers and workers. Some examples include adaptive spaces and cross-collaborative faculty groups that target teaching and research interests. Early experiments include migration to cross-disciplinary governance as a way to engage broader faculty groups in administration. Collaboration and efficiency are increasingly important across the country as universities respond to changing needs for today’s learners and enhance student success with decreasing external support.

**Reducing Demographic Disparities and Achievement Gaps**

EAB’s second major theme this year involved research to help universities identify practices and policies that create demographic disparities in academic performance, student engagement, and post-graduate success. From pre-college academic preparation through post-graduate follow-through, there are an astonishing number of opportunities for at-risk students to encounter barriers to success, and simply looking at the most common student success metrics – retention, graduation, and post-graduate outcomes – may not help guide effective change. When metrics such as first-year retention rates, term-to-term persistence, DFW rates, and four- and six-year graduation rates are analyzed for our most at-risk demographic populations, we can begin to understand how institutional policies and practices may be promoting inequity and impacting students’ sense of belonging. Universities were challenged to drill further down into their data and identify solutions to reduce barriers to success for their unique student populations.

**Assurance of Learning Day**

EAB’s focus on the concept of meaningful change is something we’re already very familiar with at EKU. Our previous provost, Janna Vice, often quoted Tom Sugar (from Complete College of America) in saying, “Access without success is an empty promise – and a missed opportunity with severe economic consequences...”. As many of you know, Assurance of Learning Day was originally implemented by Dr. Vice as a way to promote student success by dedicating a day for all faculty to engage in a data-driven discussion of ways to enhance student learning in their programs. We just completed our 7th annual Assurance of Learning Day last Friday, and I was pleased to visit with some of your departments and programs and see all of the hard work you’re doing to ensure success in our programs. Thanks to all of our faculty for another productive Assurance of Learning Day.

**4th-Week Report**

Overall participation in the 4th-Week Report has hovered above 75 percent for the past five semesters, and 76 percent of undergraduate CRNs reported for Fall 2018. I would particularly like to acknowledge those departments reporting at or above 90 percent of their CRNs. Thanks to all faculty who participated in this early intervention best practice!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department/Unit</th>
<th>% CRNS Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJS</td>
<td>Fire Protection &amp; Paramedicine Sciences</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; Park Administration</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>Health Promotion &amp; Administration</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 4th-Week Report is “best practice” to enhance early problem detection and connect students with academic support services and intervention strategies. While EKU’s participation rate is generally positive, there is still room to build on our success. Student progress by the fourth week goes unreported for nearly a quarter of undergraduate CRNs, meaning that more of our students could be receiving the early intervention they need to succeed.

Posters-at-the-Capitol (P@C): Call for Abstracts
The deadline for students to submit their abstracts to the Posters-at-the-Capitol (P@C) is October 12, 2018. The P@C is hosted collaboratively by Kentucky state institutions to help members of the Kentucky Legislative System and the Governor gain a better understanding of the importance of involving undergraduates in research, scholarly, and creative work. Faculty are encouraged to have their students submit an abstract to the P@C. Selected students will participate in the event held at the State Capitol in Frankfort to help those in Kentucky who fund higher education understand why these experiences are so important.

Poster presentations are sought from undergraduates in all disciplinary areas. Posters-at-the-Capitol will be held on February 21, 2019. Please go to the following site to submit poster abstracts: [http://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/postersatthecapitol/](http://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/postersatthecapitol/) then click “Submit Undergraduate Poster Abstract” in the Author Corner menu on the left.

EKU Honors: Call for Course Proposals for 2019-2020
An ongoing goal of the EKU Honors program is to provide outstanding EKU faculty an opportunity to experiment with innovative pedagogies and creative interdisciplinary courses, energizing pedagogical innovation and excellence campus-wide. To that end, the Honors Program seeks innovative proposals for honors interdisciplinary seminars for the 2019-2020 academic year. Honors seminar proposals are due to Honors Program Director, Dr. David Coleman, by Friday, October 19.

Faculty from all EKU colleges are encouraged to consider either individual proposals or creative team-teaching proposals with colleagues from other disciplines. For further information and questions regarding Honors teaching or the proposal process, contact Professor David Coleman at david.coleman@eku.edu.

EKU Forward
Finally, I commend Senator Matt Winslow and each of you on the “EKU Forward” initiative. EKU Forward presents an exciting pathway to focus energy on academic quality and develop collaborative strategies to complete critical work throughout all aspects of faculty engagement and student success. EKU will benefit from the interdisciplinary, innovative ideas this think-tank initiative produces. What better group to analyze and innovate for our programs, students, and emerging structure in this era of higher education’s evolution! I look forward to seeing faculty engage in this new initiative.

Respectfully,

Deborah Whitehouse
Important Dates
Please mark the following upcoming dates on your calendars:

**October 12** – Posters-at-the-Capitol Abstract Submission Deadline
([http://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/postersatthecapitol/](http://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/postersatthecapitol/))

**October 19** – 2019-2020 Honors Course Proposals due to Dr. David Coleman

**October 26** – Proposals due for the 2018 Showcase of Teaching & Learning Innovations
([https://studio.eku.edu/2018-tli-showcase](https://studio.eku.edu/2018-tli-showcase))

**November 1** – Application deadline for the 2019 Faculty Leadership Institute ([https://studio.eku.edu/faculty-leadership-institute](https://studio.eku.edu/faculty-leadership-institute))

**December 5** – 2018 Showcase of Teaching & Learning Innovations

**February 21, 2019** – Posters-at-the-Capitol