Positions Contingent Upon Outside Funding

It was recommended that the Board approve the contracts for the persons listed below. The positions are contingent upon and supported by outside funding.

Educational Talent Search Program

M. Beth Sullivan - Director, effective 9/1/87-8/31/88, at a salary of $21,665 for 12 mos.

Jennifer Cady - Career/Financial Aid Counselor, effective 9/1/87-8/31/88, at a salary of $17,286 for 12 mos.

Mr. Harper made a motion to approve these changes, and Mr. Nusz seconded the motion. The roll was called and the following members voted "aye": Mr. Cox, Mr. Gillis, Dr. Gray, Dr. Gross, Mr. Harper, Mrs. Moore, Mr. Nusz, Mr. Spurlock and Mr. Stratton. There were no nay votes.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Amendments to Organization of the Faculty Senate

Under the provisions of the Faculty Senate and following its approval, the President of the Faculty-at-Large must present to the Faculty-at-Large any amendments to the Organization of the Faculty Senate. Two amendments were placed before a meeting of the Faculty-at-Large on August 17, 1987 and approved by that body.

President Funderburk recommended that the Board of Regents approve the two amendments listed below, as approved by the Faculty Senate and the Faculty-at-Large:

1. Change Section 3.3.1 of the Organization of the Faculty Senate to read: The Secretary shall be elected annually at the organizational meeting in May by the members of the Senate. The term of the Secretary shall be for one year and shall begin on January 1 following the election.

2. Change Section B, 1.2 to read: The Vice Presidents of the university and the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research.

Dr. Gray made a motion to approve these amendments and Ms. Moore seconded the motion. It was passed by voice vote.

Student Opinion of Instruction Policy

At its meeting on April 6, 1987 the Faculty Senate approved the adoption of the "Student Opinion of Instruction" policy as amended and as presented to the Board.

Dr. Funderburk recommended approval of the policy by the Board of Regents. Dr. Gray moved for approval of the recommendation and Mr. Gillis seconded the motion. After some discussion regarding utilization of the student opinions in improvement of instruction, the motion was passed. The policy follows:
Student Opinion of Instruction Policy

Adopted by the Faculty Senate - April 6, 1987

1. Each academic department shall be given primary responsibility of administering the IDEA Evaluation Program and/or another evaluation questionnaire for student opinion of instruction chosen by the department.

2. Student opinion of instruction is required for all full-time tenured and non-tenured faculty including administrators who teach.

3. All full-time non-tenured faculty members shall have questionnaires administered in at least two fall semester classes and two spring semester classes each year. These shall be four different courses when possible.

4. All full-time tenured faculty members shall have a questionnaire administered in at least one fall semester class and one spring semester class each year. These shall be two different courses when possible.

5. Student questionnaires, in addition to those mentioned in Items 3 and 4 above, may be required by the academic department.

6. Student opinion questionnaires shall be administered at a time chosen by the instructor, provided that it is after mid-term and prior to final examination week.

7. Student opinion questionnaires shall not be administered by nor in the presence of the instructor. The instructor shall have no access to the completed questionnaires or answer sheets (including any written student comments) until the semester has officially ended.

8. The Office of Institutional Research shall be responsible for acquisition, distribution, and security of the IDEA evaluation forms and the appended questionnaire and for distribution of IDEA evaluation reports and appended questionnaire reports.

9. Departments using the IDEA program may decide to use either the long or short forms of that instrument.

10. An additional sheet of paper on which students may add comments will be provided each student evaluator.

11. For those departments choosing that instrument. IDEA shall furnish two copies of the Diagnostic Summary Report. The Office of Institutional Research shall distribute one copy to the instructor and one copy to the chair of the department in which the instructor teaches.
12. Each department chair shall maintain a file on each instructor containing either IDEA diagnostic reports or other student opinion instruments for at least the last three years of employment, and this file shall be routinely submitted to departmental promotion and tenure and merit pay committees at the time for consideration of these matters. The file shall also be made available to the college promotion and tenure committee upon the request of either the instructor or the committee.

13. All instructors shall have, each semester, the opportunity to add to the file their own written interpretation of the student opinion results.

14. The student opinion results and any written interpretative comments from instructors shall be retained in this file for a period of at least three years, after which time they may be removed at the option of the instructor.

15. Each department shall develop and use other systematic method(s) evaluating teacher effectiveness. It is understood that while comments obtained from students or colleagues in an informal or casual manner may be used as evidence of teaching effectiveness, such a procedure shall not qualify, for the purposes of this provision, as a "systematic method."

16. Each college shall establish procedures for aiding instructors who have been identified as having substandard instructional skills and for helping instructors who, though adequate in their teaching effectiveness, still wish to improve themselves.

17. Matters relating to this evaluation system not covered in the above provisions are left to the discretion of the various departments.

18. Funds for administration of the IDEA program and/or other student opinion questionnaires chosen by academic departments shall be provided, upon reasonable request, by the University through the Office of Institutional Research.

19. Specific Procedures for IDEA Administration adopted earlier shall remain in effect for those departments choosing that instrument.

20. Faculty with unusual teaching loads (e.g., those teaching predominantly private lessons) should work out a process of evaluation which is in keeping with the spirit of this set of policies. This must be done at the department level with the advice and consent of the dean of the college.

21. These policies supersede the original policies adopted by the Faculty Senate on February 6, 1984, April 1, 1985, and October 28, 1985 and shall be in effect for the Fall Semester 1987.
The President feels we have made good progress the last two years in our reallocation of internal resources. He reported we would have had 2 1/2 % less this year had we not done this and commended all those who helped in the reallocation and asked for continued assistance in this process. The planning process had a significant impact in this budget and will also significantly effect the 1988-90 biennial budget.

He announced that contracts for 1987-88 were placed in the campus mail and the Board approved Donald R. Dizney and Robert B. Morgan for honorary degrees.

On Monday night, April 13, candidates for Governor will appear in Louisville to talk about education. The Board of Regents were invited to attend. This program will be televised on KET.

Report From the Chair

Chair Grise announced the annual Senate elections will be held at the next meeting. Nominations for committees will be made just prior to the election and nominations for Chair of the Faculty Senate will be made at this meeting.

A memorandum was distributed showing the positions to be filled in May and listing the continuing members of each committee. 1 It was noted a COSFL representative would also be elected in addition to those on the list.

Senator Costello requested a correction to the list of positions to be filled on the Committee to Administer the Excellence in Teaching Award. She requested the College of Social and Behavioral Science and the College of Applied Arts and Technology be added.

The Chair encouraged attendance at the COSFL meeting and corrected a statement in the Eastern Progress. She was quoted as encouraging attendance so Eastern would have greater attendance than other schools, but the Chair said she did not say that, as the purpose of COSFL is cooperation between member schools.

Standing Committee Reports

Committee for the Oversight of Student Evaluation and Instruction

Senator Masagatani reported from the Committee for the Oversight of Student Evaluation and Instruction the committee reviewed Senator Ellis' proposal. The committee still recommends a single evaluation instrument be used. Faculty were surveyed and the soft data was noted. The surveys returned showed faculty preferred an open-ended narrative form and a common instrument. She noted Dr. Acker was present and would answer questions from the Senate. Senator Hale reported the Art Department was not in favor of using the IDEBA form.
Senator Ellis moved the adoption of the document "Faculty Senate Policies--Student Opinions of Instruction" which he prepared for the agenda. Senator Blackwell seconded the motion. Senator Ellis then discussed the proposal item by item and stated why he preferred this proposed policy rather than the currently used policy for student evaluation of instruction. Chair Grise asked Senator Ellis if he would accept an editorial change in Item 1 after "appended to" add "or used instead of." It was not agreed to make this change. Considerable discussion followed from Senators Sowders, Lee, and Falkenberg.

Senator Falkenberg moved to delete "and/or" in Item 1 and replace it with "and if desired." Senator LeVan seconded the motion. After a long discussion by several senators, Senator Hale called for the question and Senator Baugh seconded the motion, and the question passed.

The Chair then called for the vote on the amendment to Item 1. The amendment failed. Senator Ellis then proposed another amendment to Item 1 which placed a period after format and then followed, "In all department decisions for merit pay, promotion, and tenure, the department will decide which of these they will use." The proposal failed for lack of a second.

Senator Blackwell moved to amend Item 1 by placing a period after instruction and deleting the remainder of Item 1. Senator Hale seconded the motion. After much discussion Senator Sowders proposed to add "chosen by the department" after the word instruction, followed by a period. Senator Hale agreed to the change. After further discussion the amendment was passed.

Senator Heberle moved to strike "and the appended questionnaire" from Item 8. Senator MacKinnon seconded the motion. Following discussion the amendment was withdrawn.

Senator Falkenberg moved to omit Item 18 and renumber the following items. Senator Surplus seconded the motion. After discussion the motion failed.

Senator Jennings moved Item 21 be changed to delete "for the Fall Semester 1987" and add after the word effect "only when procedures for faculty evaluation of administrators are in place." The motion was seconded by Senator Heberle. After discussion the motion failed.

The entire Faculty Senate Policies on Student Opinion of Instruction was put to a vote, and the motion was passed.

Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

Senator Heberle read a report from the committee. The Senate requested the committee to submit a proposal for 1) guidelines for consulting/teaching in the Division of Special Programs for faculty and administrative staff, and 2) guidelines for consulting/teaching in the Division of Grants and
Contracts for faculty and administrative staff. The committee concluded "The primary responsibility for insuring faculty and staff do not overcommit themselves to responsibilities over and beyond their contractual responsibility to the university lies with the department chairs, deans, vice presidents, and/or other immediate supervisors." They further recommended $360.00 per diem for "consultation/teaching" to the administrators involved.

Report of the Faculty Regent

Senator Gray submitted a written report and gave a brief report to the Senate.¹ She stated several faculty had asked her if their contract, promotion, or tenure had been approved and the answer was the Board approved all those recommended. Also, Model faculty were told they could expect their contracts for 1987-88 by June 1, 1987.

Report from the COSFL Representative

Senator Heberle urged senators to attend the Annual COSFL meeting in Lexington on Friday evening and Saturday morning, April 10-11.

New Business

Senator Hale asked to speak to the Senate without bringing a motion to the floor. No objection was made. He stated the Art Department is concerned about the policy of summer session classes and the decisions made relating to cancel classes due to lack of meeting enrollment standards, the problems resulting in advising students, and the choice of teachers involving guaranteed and non-guaranteed summer faculty.

Chair Grise announced nominations for the Senate Chair were in order. Senator Gale nominated Senator Masagatani, Senator Gray nominated Senator Heberle, and Senator Smith nominated Senator Williams.

Report from the Council on Academic Affairs

Senator Enzie reported there was no business to come before the Senate.

Adjournment

Senator Hale moved for adjournment at 5:21 p.m., and the Chair declared the Senate adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Lihward Doak
Acting Secretary, Faculty Senate

¹Copies of this report have been distributed to all Faculty Senators and will remain a part of the permanent record of this meeting.
1. Student evaluation of instruction is required for all full-time tenured and tenure-track non-tenured faculty including administrators who teach.

2. All full-time non-tenured faculty members shall have the long form of the IDEA instrument administered in two fall semester classes and two spring semester classes each year. These should be four different courses when possible.

3. All full-time tenured faculty members seeking promotion shall have the long form of the IDEA instrument administered in one class in the fall semester and one class in the spring semester each year. These shall be two different courses when possible.

4. All other full-time tenured faculty members shall have the IDEA instrument administered in one fall semester class and one spring semester class each year. These should be two different courses when possible. Either the short or long form of IDEA may be elected by the faculty members.

5. Full-time faculty and administrators teaching less than a full load may reduce the number of classes evaluated proportionately.

6. Additional use of the IDEA instrument is discouraged except where permitted by the department. This would not preclude departments or colleges developing their own evaluation instruments for use with part-time faculty, graduate assistants, temporary faculty and any other faculty who do not fit into those categories treated in Items 1, 2, 3 and 4 above.

7. The IDEA shall be administered at a time chosen by the faculty member, provided that it is after mid-term and prior to final exam week.

8. Faculty with unusual teaching loads (e.g., those teaching predominantly private lessons) should work out a process of evaluation which is in keeping with the spirit of this set of policies. This must be done at the department level with the advice and consent of the dean of the college.

9. Student evaluation questionnaires ( IDEA) shall not be administered by, nor in the presence of, the instructor and the instructor shall have no access to the completed questionnaire or answer sheets (including any written student comments) until the course grades have been officially reported.

10. The core questions included in the IDEA questionnaire may be supplemented with 25 additional questions submitted by the faculty member, department and college. An additional sheet of paper on which students may add any comments they wish will be provided each student evaluator. Students shall not be required to identify themselves on either the answer sheet or the comment sheet.

11. IDEA shall furnish two copies of the Diagnostic Summary Report which shall be distributed by the Office of Institutional Research in the following manner:
   1 copy to the instructor
   1 copy to the chair of the department in which the instructor teaches

The Office of Institutional Research shall provide access for each instructor to the national and institutional norms provided by IDEA. The acquisition and distribution of evaluation forms and distribution of evaluation reports shall be handled by the Office of Institutional Research which shall be responsible for the security of the data.
12. Each departmental chair shall maintain a file on each instructor containing the diagnostic reports for at least the last three years of employment and this file shall be routinely submitted to departmental promotion and tenure committees at the time for consideration of these matters. The file shall also be made available to the college Promotion and Tenure Committee upon the request of either the instructor or the committee. The results of student evaluations will be a factor in determining merit pay raises.

13. All faculty shall have, each semester, the opportunity to add to the file their own written interpretation of the student evaluation results.

14. The student evaluation results and any written interpretive comments from instructors shall be retained in this file for a period of at least three years, after which time they may be removed at the option of the faculty member.

15. Each department shall develop and use some other systematic method(s) of evaluating teacher effectiveness. It is understood that while comments obtained from students or colleagues in an informal or casual manner may be used as evidence of teaching effectiveness, such a procedure shall not qualify, for the purposes of this provision, as a "systematic method." The IDEA Diagnostic Summary Report shall not be used for tenure and promotion considerations unless this additional systematic method(s) is also a part of the considerations.

16. Each college shall establish procedures for aiding faculty who have been identified as having substandard instructional skills and for helping instructors who, though adequate in their teaching effectiveness, still wish to improve themselves. When the Office of Faculty Development is filled, that office should assume a substantial role in providing these services for faculty members.

17. Matters relating to this evaluation system not covered in the above provisions are left to the discretion of the various departments.

18. The Oversight Committee on Student Evaluation of Instruction shall review this evaluation system periodically and make recommendations concerning changes and improvements. A voting majority of this Committee shall consist of full-time teaching faculty and committee membership shall be rotational.
committees have chairs of long-standing appointment. No specific rotation system is being recommended. The motion to accept the resolution then carried.

Chair Weaver reported President Powell will be unable to come to the March 5 meeting of the Faculty Senate, but will instead come for dialog with senators at the April 2 meeting. Senators are encouraged to transmit issues to the Executive Committee so that an agenda of those issues and questions can be formulated. The Executive Committee will meet February 15 and March 19.

Chair Weaver reported that Senator Gray had approached the Executive Committee with her concern that a student who had participated in an activity that was academically dishonest might, under the present system, be granted the diploma notation "With Distinction" or "With High Distinction" on the basis of the grade point average earned. Senator Rowlett stated that a subcommittee of the Council on Academic Affairs will examine the question and report to the Council. Any recommendations will then come to the Faculty Senate. Chair Weaver added if senators have concerns about academic integrity, the Executive Committee invites their comments.

COSFL did not meet on February 4 as had been anticipated; therefore there was no COSFL report.

Reports of Standing Committees

Committee on Student Evaluation of Instruction Oversight

Senator White, chair, noted that the consideration of the Student Evaluation of Instruction recommendation was tabled until the committee provided the Senate with a statement of the purposes for which the evaluations will be used and with some suggestions of tools which should be available to insure that improvement of teaching would occur. He distributed to each senator a copy of the 1981 revision of the original document concerning student evaluation of instruction and a copy of a new document amending that revision to incorporate changes recommended in the report of the current committee. On another sheet the committee listed some suggestions for departments or colleges to consider as they address ways to assist instructors who seek help in improving their teaching effectiveness. Dr. White then moved that this item be taken from the table for reconsideration. Senator L. Sexton seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Senator Gray asked if evaluations would routinely be used for promotion and tenure purposes. Senator White replied that Item 10 in the original document stated that evaluations would be used by promotion and tenure committees. Senator Reed, a member of the committee, noted that Item 10 remains in effect unless the Senate votes to change it. Senator Gray thought faculty should be made aware that such a statement is included in the document. Senator White again pointed to the wording of Item 10 when Senator Bland asked who would receive information from the evaluations. Senator Gray asked if the committee had completed its charge of defining any and all uses of the evaluations. Is the committee recommending only two purposes—improvement of instruction and promotion and tenure considerations? Senator White said this was true. Senator
Reed added that the committee was confirming the uses in the original document and adding only a method of evaluation. Senators White and Freed suggested that amendments could be added if other uses, such as merit pay considerations, were desired by the Senate. Senator Gray then moved that an Item 18 be added to the document stating the additional use. The following statement was formulated by a consensus of the Senate: It is to be understood that the results of the student evaluations will be a factor in determining merit pay raises. Senator Freed seconded the motion. Senator Rowlett added an amendment for breadth—"and may be used for other purposes in the assessment of teaching excellence." Senators Gray and Freed agreed to this addition. Senator Mutersbaugh wanted an enumeration of the persons authorized to use evaluation results and of the purposes of this use. Senator Laird was concerned about privacy. He thought the amendment opened the possibility of the use of evaluation results to too many committees. He suggested that use should be by permission of the faculty member. At that point Senator Rowlett withdrew his amendment to the motion. Senators W. Sexton, Laird, Rowlett, and Riggs discussed the issue of access to evaluations by chairs, deans, vice presidents, and the President. Senator Reed asked that the Senate review thoroughly any major change from the limitation to two purposes found in the original document. With a division of the house, the motion carried.

Senator Anderson then moved to reconsider the motion. Senator Gray seconded. The motion to reconsider carried.

Senator Anderson moved that Item 18 read, "It is to be understood that the results of student evaluations will be considered as one factor in merit pay raises." Senator Smith provided a second. Senator Vice suggested that "may be considered" might be a better wording to express Senator Anderson's concern. Senator Anderson wanted "will be" retained. With a show of hands, the motion failed.

Senator Ogden called for the question. The Senate then voted on the motion to adopt the recommendations of the Committee on Student Evaluation of Instruction Oversight as amended. The page of suggestions accompanying the recommendations was not a part of the motion. The motion carried.

**Reports of Ad Hoc Committees**

**Committee to Study the Organization of the Faculty Senate**

Virginia Falkenberg, chair, gave a progress report from the committee. The committee has concluded its deliberations. Each senator was given a section of the total report of the committee. The remainder of the report will be mailed to each senator within the week. The committee will present its total report at the March meeting of the Faculty Senate. Senator Falkenberg requested senators call any member of this committee with questions they might have.

**Old Business**

There was no old business.
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

April 17, 1978

The Faculty Senate of Eastern Kentucky University met at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, April 17, 1978, in Room 318, Combs Building, on the campus of the University for a called session. A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Jack Culross.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Mr. Dixon Barr
Mr. Neal Donaldson
Mr. Lloyd Graybar
Mr. Stephen Henderson
Ms. Dorothy Jeffrey

Mr. Robert Posey
Ms. Nellie Rogers
Mr. Billy Thames
Ms. Carolyn Walko

Chairman Culross recognized the Senate the following visitors who are members of the Executive Committee's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Student Evaluation of Faculty: Ms. Virginia Falkenberg, Ms. Friscilla McKeehan, and Mr. Frank Williams. Mr. Culross also introduced two senators as members of the Subcommittee: Mr. Wallace Dixon; and Mr. Joe Wise. The Chairman then recognized Ms. Carol Teague and Ms. Laura Ramey as resource persons who were in attendance to answer questions regarding data processing. Due to the large number of students and faculty visitors, the Chairman did not introduce other persons individually to the Senate.

Old Business

*Report of the Executive Committee's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Social Security

Chairman Culross noted that the Subcommittee report previously had been circulated to all faculty. Mr. Schwendeman moved to accept the report and Mr. Nixon provided a second to the motion. Mr. Ellis, Chairman of the Subcommittee, announced that the results of the faculty questionnaire which accompanied the report would be made available to the Senate at its May 3 meeting. There being no questions from the floor, the Senate voted to accept the Subcommittee's Report on Social Security.

Report of the Executive Committee's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Student Evaluation of Faculty

Chairman Culross recognized Mr. Dixon to present to the Senate the Report of the Executive Committee's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Student Evaluation of Faculty, as the Chairman of that Committee was not a member of the Senate. Mr. Dixon moved acceptance of the Subcommittee's recommendation #1; a second was provided by Mr. Rowlett. Mr. Dixon announced that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee members were present to answer any questions.

*A copy of this report will be filed with the Official Minutes of this meeting.

**These materials previously were distributed to all faculty and will be retained as part of the Official Minutes of this meeting.
Mr. Ellis asked to hear from those committee members who did not support recommendation #1 of the Report. Mr. Wise stated his reasons as follows: student evaluations should be provided only to the instructor; other possible abuses may occur; and a shotgun approach should not be used to identify the problems of a few faculty members. Ms. McKeenan concurred with Mr. Wise. Ms. Holmes, a member of the Subcommittee, was not present. In her behalf, another Subcommittee member reported that Ms. Holmes voted against the recommendation on the basis that most faculty members appeared to be opposed and therefore felt that the faculty should be polled on this recommendation. Mr. Wise added that he was concerned about the possibility of student evaluations creating a popularity contest with resulting grade inflation.

Mr. Rowlett asked to hear from those who supported the recommendation. With the concurrence from the Senate, Chairman Culross recognized Mr. Williams to report for the majority of the Subcommittee. Mr. Williams identified the following reasons for recommendation #1 of the Subcommittee Report: improved support for university policy regarding the importance of teaching; a reduction of abuse possibilities; and a tool which is extremely helpful in the improvement of one's own teaching.

Mr. Lewis requested to know additional information about the proposed global question to be used in the evaluation instrument. Mr. Williams replied that available information indicates that the response to a global question typically correlates more highly with actual instruction performance than any other question which might be asked. Further, a global question obviates the need for weighting of individual questions. Mr. Dixon supported the response of Mr. Williams by describing experiences at Boston University.

In response to a question by Mr. Sharp, Mr. Williams stated that the use of the faculty evaluation instrument has resulted in improved instruction. Mr. Williams continued by emphasizing that this is one of the two main purposes of the evaluation instrument. The second purpose of faculty evaluations by the students is to provide one additional means for the evaluation of faculty. Citing the findings of the Southern Educational Board Survey, Mr. Williams reported that this body had found no overwhelming improvement of instruction as a result of student Evaluations of Faculty but that there was probably some improvement.

Mr. Taylor, while commenting on several points of the report and the administration of such an evaluation program, concluded that evaluations should be important for the improvement of instruction but not for promotion of faculty. He also noted that evaluations of those teaching required courses are likely to differ from those teaching elective courses.

Without objection from the Senate, Chairman Culross recognized Mr. Duggins, President of the Student Association. Mr. Duggins recognized that Student Evaluations of Faculty should be only one tool in the evaluation process for faculty members. Students normally only observe faculty in the classrooms but this is an important set of observations and, therefore, Mr. Duggins concluded that students should have this opportunity for evaluation.

At this point, Mr. Sexton moved that the Senate receive the report. Following a second by Mr. Gale, the Senate voted to receive the report with one dissenting vote. Mr. Webb moved to amend the original motion with a three-part amendment. Mr. Jenkins provided a second for the amendment. Following lengthy discussion of the amendment, Mr. Lewis moved to divide the proposed amendment into three parts. Following a second by Mr. Klein, the Senate voted to approve this division for their consideration.
The first amendment addressed itself to the first sentence of paragraph 13, recommendation #1 and changed wording as follows: "Each college and department..."in lieu of "Each department..."). The Senate voted to approve this amendment. The second amendment was a statement to be added following the last sentence of paragraph 13, recommendation #1:

...no mandatory student evaluation shall be supplied to any department chairman until a plan for another kind of evaluation is submitted by each college and each department to the college dean and approved by the dean.

The Senate voted to defeat this separately amendment.

The third amendment concerned paragraph 14, recommendation #1, and changed the implementation date from the fall semester 1978 until the spring semester 1979. Mr. Rowlett moved and Mr. Hansson seconded a motion to amend this portion of the amendment to provide that the mandatory evaluation system should begin operation not later than the 1979 spring semester. Upon a vote by the separation of the house, 27 Senators voted in favor of this amended amendment and 14 Senators voted against this amended amendment. As amended by the Senate, the first sentence of paragraph 14 was thus revised to read: "The mandatory evaluation system herein described shall begin operation not later than the 1979 spring semester."

After several Senators spoke in favor and against the original motion to adopt recommendation #1 as amended, Mr. Miller moved to amend the amended motion to approve implementation for one calendar year. Mr. Miller's proposed amendment died for lack of a second.

Mr. Jones moved and Mr. Lewis seconded a motion to amend paragraph 16, recommendation #1 to read as follows:

The University Senate shall appoint a standing committee whose responsibility will be to review this evaluation system periodically and to make recommendations concerning changes and improvements. A voting majority of this committee shall consist of full-time teaching faculty and committee membership shall be rotational.

Upon a call by Chairman Culross, the Senate approved this amendment.

Mr. Rowlett, speaking to the purposes of the amended motion, stated that he recognized the need for many methods of evaluating faculty and strongly supported moving forward with mandatory student evaluations of faculty. Mr. Rowlett also recognized the need to evaluate administrators as described in recommendation #2 of the amended motion. He concluded by emphasizing that the over-riding purpose of the amended motion under consideration is to improve instruction.

Mr. Lewis moved to amend recommendation #1, paragraph 7, sub-paragraph 2 as follows:

The common core of questions shall include questions designed to ascertain whether the instructor is fulfilling minimal instructional duties (such as: Fairness of grading policy, respect for student opinions, clarity of assignments and objectives, and the like).
Mr. Nixon provided a second to the motion. Mr. Smith pointed out that in other institutions, the so called global question became so important that faculty members had to get an 80% vote or be subject to removal from the University. He therefore supported Mr. Lewis's amendment. Mr. W. Jones emphasized that the global question is always sorted out, while others are set aside. With no further questions, the Senate voted to approve the amendment of paragraph 7.2, recommendation #1.

Mr. Helfrich asked the Committee what they had in mind in regard to the administration of the evaluation of the faculty members, i.e., who should administer the evaluation in the classroom. Ms. Falkenberg replied graduate assistants might be used to administer the evaluation, or a student selected from the class could administer the evaluation, place the evaluations in a sealed envelope, and immediately deliver same to the departmental secretary.

Mr. Laird moved to amend recommendation #1, paragraph 2 as follows:

Each instructor shall administer student evaluation questionnaires at least once per academic year in a section of each different course with an enrollment of 5 or more students per section s/he teaches during the year. More frequent administration is permissible at the instructor's option.

Upon a second by Mr. Blanchard, the Senate voted to approve this amendment.

Following further discussion, the Senate approved recommendation #1 as amended: 30 in favor, 13 opposed.

Addressing recommendation #2 of the Subcommittee, Mr. Dixon moved approval of the following revised statement:

The Senate recommends mandatory faculty evaluation of academic administrators; and furthermore, that a committee be established to determine how this should be accomplished.

Upon second by Mr. Rowlett, the motion passed the Senate without exception.

**Proposed Revision of Faculty Handbook Tenure Statement, Page 22**

Mr. Rowlett moved adoption of the Proposed Revision of the Tenure Statement as follows:

Obtainment of tenure status by a faculty or staff member shall remain in effect until age 65, or unless just cause shall be shown for terminating status. After age 65, based on evaluations by appropriate university officials, an annual contract may be tendered to the employee. The mandatory retirement age is 70.

Following a second by Mr. Ellis, the Senate voted to approve the proposed revision of the Faculty Handbook Tenure Statement.
traditional and liberal arts studies which must be preserved and strengthened, and for his efforts to keep the faculty informed on the issues involved. Be it further resolved that the faculty seek to communicate to the constituencies of the institution the importance of these issues and how they may affect the future of Eastern Kentucky University.

Mr. Jenkins moved that the Senate approve the resolution presented by the Executive Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Culross and approved by the Senate.

Mr. Blanchard moved that the following recommendation regarding evaluation of faculty instruction be referred to the Committee on Improvement of Instruction and that they report back to the Faculty Senate in its October, 1977 meeting:

1. That all faculty will administer evaluation instruments to each of their classes each semester.

2. That instructors will be allowed to use either the university teaching evaluation form or an instrument of their own choosing.

3. That the results of these evaluations be made available to the instructor, the department chairperson, and the department Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rowlett and approved by the Senate.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Senate, Mr. Rowlett moved that the Senate adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Blanchard and approved by the Senate with adjournment at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William E. Sexton
Secretary