

Senate Council  
April 4, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, April 4, 2016 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Andrew Hippisley called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

1. Minutes from March 28, 2016 and Announcements

The Chair said there were no corrections sent in for the minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from March 28, 2016 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair announced that University Senate (Senate) Parliamentarian Catherine Seago was unable to attend the Senate meeting in May but had recommended a senator from Libraries with parliamentary experience. He said that senator would be tapped as Seago's replacement for May unless someone from SC had another suggestion.

Because of the presence of invited guests, the Chair suggested moving Old Business to the end of the day's agenda and there were no objections.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Teaching and Course Evaluation Implementation Ad Hoc Committee

i. Final Report

Guest Jonathan Golding (AS/Psychology), chair of the Senate's Teaching and Course Evaluation Implementation Ad Hoc Committee (TCEIC), presented the TCEIC's final report. Grossman **moved** to accept the TCEIC's report and Mazur **seconded**. There were a variety of questions from SC members, but the bulk of the discussion focused on two matters: forcing a student to complete the teacher-course evaluation (TCE) would improve the response rate but at the risk of also increasing the likelihood of mischievous responses; and the report's suggestion that student grades be held for eight days if a student does not complete the online TCE. There were a number of guests present, with G. T. Lineberry (EN/Mining Engineering, associate provost for faculty advancement) Brett McDaniel (Academic Technology Group), T. Lynn Williamson (deputy general counsel), and Don Witt (University registrar) participating in the discussion. Throughout the discussion guests and SC members reiterated the near-universal desire to improve the response rate for TCEs, acknowledging that there were different opinions regarding how to go about doing so.

Williamson explained that in court cases where institutions withheld grades, most cases were not resolved in the institution's favor. He said he would be more comfortable if the date to receive grades was changed and extended by eight days, but a student who completed their TCEs could receive their grades early. Williamson said that such a change would change the suggestion from being a penalty to being a reward, noting that the primary problem with the sanction approach was that there was no process for appeals. Mullen, president of the Student Government Association (SGA), spoke against the waiting period, saying that some students might need to see their grades quickly in order to be able to sign up for additional summer courses if necessary.

Witt and McDaniel offered comments about technical aspects of the suggestion to delay the release of grades if a student did not submit a TCE. Witt noted that the Registrar's office monitors the load on *myUK* as grades are submitted because students will check *myUK* frequently throughout the day, if not sooner, to see if their grades were posted yet. McDaniel said that SAP could not support an automatic release of grades now upon submission of a TCE, but that he had talked with the vendor and it could be done even though it was not set up to do so now. Emails about TCE are automatically sent to students

and could be filled out on smartphone or tablet, in addition to filling them out on a laptop or PC. Golding commented that the TCEIC deliberations included thoughts on how to improve the culture surrounding student submissions of TCE. Although changing the culture is important, it would also require additional resources and buy-in across campus. Golding added that delaying the release of grades was just one option to help increase the number of students who submit a TCE but it was also the preferred option among TCEIC members.

McCormick thanked Golding for an excellent job and said she appreciated the efforts of the TCEIC. She said that the discussion really began with concerns from faculty about an overreliance on TCEs in evaluating teaching effectiveness. Lineberry said that he was aware of the tendency in some circles to overly rely on TCEs as the only method to evaluate teaching effectiveness.

Gower commented that if she was very busy but forced to do a TCE outside of class, she would be inclined to answer questions quickly and without thinking them through, just to get it done. She spoke in favor of a single opt-out question instead of the opt-out option for every question.

Wood suggested adding residency courses and research courses as exceptions, similar to independent study courses and Golding was amenable to that change. McCormick suggested changing “study abroad” to “education abroad” to better match UK’s terminology. In response to a question from Lineberry, Golding said that the TCEIC settled on eight days as being not too long and not too short, but not for any specific reason. Witt commented that the Registrar’s office was studying other ways to reach students instead of via email, as that was a dying mode to use for communicating with students. Gower explained that every college has student ambassadors or an SGA senator; if those students were better informed about why it is important to submit meaningful TCEs, those students could share that information via word of mouth with other students, which would be better received than something sent via email.

When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to accept the TCEIC report and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) - Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed New Master of Science in Research Methods in Education [to be discussed pending receipt of SAPC recommendation]

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. She noted that there was a core, required course that had not yet made it to the SC office. Schroeder suggested the SC recommend approval to the Senate, but that the proposal not be sent to Senate until the course arrived and was reviewed. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MS in Research Methods in Education, in the Department of Educational Policy and Evaluation within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was no discussion and no questions.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

ii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Research Methods in Education [to be discussed pending receipt of SAPC recommendation]

Schroeder explained the proposal. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Research Methods in Education, in the Department of Educational Policy and Evaluation within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no questions or comments from SC members.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

iii. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Nutrition for Human Performance [to be discussed pending receipt of SAPC recommendation]

Schroeder explained the proposal. Schroeder noted that the only concern raised in SAPC was the requirement that a student earn a B grade or better in all courses to receive the certificate. The justification was that the certificate intended to be academically rigorous. Schroeder said that some members of SAPC did not support that requirement but overall the SAPC viewed the proposal very positively.

The Chair said the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Nutrition for Human Performance, in the Department of Human Health Sciences within the College of Health Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There was brief discussion about the requirement for a B grade or higher requirement in the proposal. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with nine in favor and two opposed.

iv. Proposed Deletions of BA/BS Classics, BA/BS Japanese Language and Literature, BA/BS Russian, BA/BS French, BA/BS German, and BA/BS Chinese Language and Literature [to be discussed pending receipt of SAPC recommendation]

Schroeder explained the proposal. The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation that the University Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the deletion of six existing BA/BS: BA/BS Classics, BA/BS Japanese Language and Literature, BA/BS Russian, BA/BS French, BA/BS German, and BA/BS Chinese Language and Literature, in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures, and Cultures within the College Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Schroeder explained that the deletions were necessary because the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures, and Cultures had recently received approval for a degree program that was intended to replace the six programs under discussion. The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) alerted UK that if the old degrees were not deleted soon, the CPE would revoke approval of the newly approved degree because an institution cannot have multiple programs with the same CIP code.

A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

v. Professional Degrees [to be discussed pending receipt of SAPC recommendation]

Schroeder explained that the SAPC was asked to weigh in on a proposed definition for professional degrees, what information should be included in any request for a professional degree, and what changes to the *Senate Rules* would be appropriate regarding professional degrees. Schroeder noted that there is growing interest in colleges to offer professional degree programs, but there is no standard definition at UK or from the CPE regarding what constitutes a “professional” degree. The *SRs* primarily define professional degrees as being comprised of 800- and 900-level courses. Schroeder said the SAPC

was not comfortable proposing a definition for professional degrees, but did offer suggestions on what should be included in a professional degree proposal and what *SR* changes were appropriate. She noted that the SAPC suggested striking language about subcommittees because the SAPC was so small that any subcommittee would be comprised of one or two members.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAPC was to officially expand the purview of the SAPC to review professional degree programs. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. SC members discussed the report, primarily focusing on the changes to the *SRs*. Wood said she was very concerned that the proposed change would result in unintended consequences in other sections of the *SRs*. Grossman suggested just having SC refer all professional degree programs to SAPC and not changing the *SRs*. Ms. Brothers commented that the purpose of the request to SAPC was to outline a formal process for professional degree proposals. Currently there is a bread-crumbs trail in tangentially related *SRs* which makes it difficult to explain the appropriate approval path when asked about it.

Wood **moved** to return the SAPC's suggested changes to the *SRs* to the SAPC for further deliberations, which would include the SREC. Porter **seconded**. Schroeder noted that there was one SAPC meeting remaining and it was doubtful the SAPC could address the issue again this year – it would have to wait until fall if it was referred back to SAPC. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

d. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Ernie Bailey, Chair

i. SAOSC Report

ii. Proposal for New Lewis Honors College

iii. Proposed Changes to *Governing Regulations VII* ("University Organization")

Bailey, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained that the SAOSC met and digested the suggestions that SC offered at the last meeting. Bailey said that there were a lot of details in the proposal for a new Lewis Honors College, but that there were two basic points: 1. establishment of the Lewis Honors College and hiring the dean and faculty in accordance with the changes to *Governing Regulations VII* ("University Organization"); and 2. establishment of a Lewis Honors College Transition Committee to deal with the details of the College. Bailey noted that deans and faculty councils sent in letters of support with great comments; the proposal was not controversial. He commented that many people were concerned with the College's long-term sustainability and with its impact on existing colleges. Bailey explained that the SAOSC suggested that Provost Tim Tracy appoint the Honors College Transition Committee (HCTC) but do so with strong input from SC, the interim Honors director (Snow), and college deans. The HCTC should take advantage of existing Honors faculty expertise and also include department chairs and a couple members chosen by the Provost. Bailey summarized that the proposal and all its details was difficult to endorse due to all the options included therein, but the SAOSC saw the establishment of the College (and deans and faculty in accordance with *GR VII*) and establishment of the HCTC were the main discussion points that Senate should focus on at the April meeting, which included the specific charges to the HCTC.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SAOSC was a recommendation that Senate endorse the establishment of a new Lewis Honors College (as expressed in the proposed revisions to *GR VII*), including leadership by a dean and governance by faculty of the College; and endorse the establishment of the Honors College Transition Committee to design a precise structure for subsequent review by the University Senate in fall 2016, with membership and charges as follows:

Senate Council  
April 4, 2016

The Honors College Transition Committee (HCTC) will be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the University Senate Council and college deans and broadly representative of the University of Kentucky community. The recommended composition is 15 members (six from the current Honors faculty of record, four department chairs, one Honors undergraduate student, two elected University Senators, and two representatives of the Provost). The HCTC should consult with the entire Honors faculty of record, and with the chairs of the following Senate committees: Academic Organization and Structure, Academic Programs, and Academic Planning and Priorities.

The recommended charge to the HCTC is to:

1. Assist in recruitment of new dean for the Lewis Honors College (January 2017 appointment)
2. Determine the overall composition of the faculty for the Honors College and a regulatory structure to govern faculty eligibility and involvement
3. Consider the appropriate staffing for the Honors College
4. Determine the criteria for participating in faculty governance in the Honors College.
5. Determine how to ensure diversity of both faculty and students in the Honors College as well as access for students of diverse economic and social backgrounds.
6. Recommend how to ensure effective consultation of the Honors College Dean and Faculty with the Deans of other colleges, faculty participating in the program (associate faculty), and the External Advisory Committee.
7. Assess the plans for economic sustainability of the Honors College
8. Recommend an initial Honors Faculty of Record for the Honors College and develop a governance for membership terms and renewals by Fall 2016.
9. Identify how the proposal will ensure success for other colleges as well as provide unique educational opportunities to students.

Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

SC members discussed the SAOSC's report at length, with additional comments from three invited guests: Provost Tim Tracy, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers; and Interim Director of the Honors Program Diane Snow. SC members offered their appreciation of the SAOSC's work and, along with guests, offered the suggestions below for the report itself, which Bailey said he was amenable to. Bailey noted that the SAOSC expected the HCTC to give a report in fall 2016 with information about progress towards achieving what it is charged to do. At that time SC and Senate can help evaluate if the HCTC can is done or not.

- Towards the bottom of the first page, where the report describes what the proposal asks the Senate to recommend, in the section beginning with "Item 1 is subject...", remove the second sentence ("How this will be accomplished...") and remove the third sentence ("Overall, this item was not...").
- Include language in the charge to the HCTC that gives that group the responsibility for identifying when their work will be completed and the HCTC can be dissolved, although there

Senate Council  
April 4, 2016

should be some flexibility in case the new dean of the Lewis Honors College wants to utilize the HCTC as a part of the new dean's transition process.

- Ensure that the entire membership of the HCTC is broadly representative of the University, so that one college is not represented by multiple members on the HCTC.
- The student members on the HCTC should be a current Honors student.
- There should be two elected faculty senators on the HCTC, not just one.
- The portion of the membership representing department chairs can be current department chairs or those who served in the position recently.
- HCTC members with nine-month appointments may need to be given stipends to support their efforts over the summer months.
- The Provost's representatives are people of his choosing and do not have to be faculty employees.

SC members and guests had additional comments about the proposed Lewis Honors College.

- The existing Honors program staff employees should be available to the HCTC as resources of historical knowledge and as consultants.

SC members largely thought the proposed revisions to *GR VII* would help in the Senate discussion – it had sufficient details to help frame the discussion without having so many details as to tie the hands of the HCTC.

The Chair noted that SC members had asked him to invite Provost Tracy to the discussion because SC members recognized that the success of the proposed Lewis Honors College was largely dependent upon the collaborative efforts of UK's current college deans. The Provost acknowledge the concern as a fair one and said that his meetings with college deans also involved shared governance and he did not expect to have to force deans to work with the proposed Lewis Honors College. The Provost said that as the dean search process neared completion, he wanted to identify a person who was collaborative and understood how to work well with other colleges. Provost Tracy said that the discussions thus far with deans regarding the proposed Lewis Honors College focused on how Honors enhances the work of the colleges and benefits students in all colleges. He said he doubted it would come to a situation where deans were mandated to collaborate, but if necessary, he would allocate resources as needed for the Lewis Honors College. The Provost said he preferred to facilitate collaboration, such as suggesting that whomever is appointed to be the Lewis Honors College dean to meet with other college deans on a regular basis.

Regarding financial sustainability, the Provost said that his office had cash-flowed the proposed Lewis Honors College through 2028 and they were very comfortable with the results. He added that a successful Lewis Honors College would likely stimulate additional philanthropy. Provost Tracy said he was comfortable with the funding mechanisms for the new Lewis Honors College and the College would

be in a good position to continue for 12 years and beyond. Regarding the HCTC, the Provost said that group could begin working very soon, if not immediately.

SC members discussed whether or not two readings were necessary for the proposed Lewis Honors College. After deliberation, there was agreement that the SAOSC's two recommendations to Senate did not constitute a major policy decision, in part because Senate was endorsing an academic organizational structure, not academic policy. There were also no rebuttals to the comment that the proposed Lewis Honors College has been widely discussed on campus, the deliberations involved solicitations to all faculty councils, and the proposal was the topic of a town hall meeting sponsored by SC that was well attended – the proposal should not come as a surprise to anyone.

The Chair suggested it was time for a vote. The **motion** on the floor (from the SAOSC) was a recommendation that Senate endorse the establishment (as expressed in the proposed revisions to *GR VII*) of a new Lewis Honors College and associated faculty and a dean, as well as endorse the establishment of the Honors College Transition Committee. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Withers publicly thanked Snow for all her hard work on the proposal, noting that she had convened the Honors Program faculty of record within a week on multiple occasions to respond to comments and suggestions. The Chair thanked Withers for his work, too.

c. Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL) - Roger Brown, Chair

i. Proposed Changes to Senate Rules Regarding Absences from DL/Hybrid Courses: SR 5.1.8.3 ("Permissive Withdrawals"); SR 5.2.4.2 ("Excused Absences"); SR 5.1.8.1 ("Unilateral Removal for Failure to Attend First Two Class Periods"); SR 9.1 ("Definitions")

Brown, chair of the Senate Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning (SCDLeL), explained the proposed changes. Wood asked if the SCDLeL had considered adding language specifically for distance-learning (DL) courses, instead of removing what was there for traditional classroom courses. Brown stated that SCDLeL believed that email was ubiquitous and could be used by a student in any class, regardless of delivery mode. Wood thought that the language was no longer as clear for a classroom-based course. McCormick asked how the policy would be affected by a student enrolled in a course who poked around the learning management system [Blackboard, soon to be Canvas] to see what files were there, but did not actively do anything, such as submit an assignment or email the instructor. Brown replied that the policy was likely exercised by very few faculty and he believed that faculty who use the language would like to have clear language in advance of the start of the course. He said that instructors would be encouraged to add explicit language to syllabi to explain what would constitute “course participation.”

Grossman **moved** to send all the proposed changes to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) and Wood **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and three abstained.

4. Tentative Senate Agenda for April 11, 2016

SC members discussed the tentative agenda. Suggestions to move the Title IX language and proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations 2:2* to the May meeting were met with widespread support. SC also reordered the agenda slightly so that the proposed Lewis Honors College discussion occurred

Senate Council

April 4, 2016

immediately after discussion on new programs. Schroeder **moved** to approve the tentative Senate agenda as revised by SC and McCormick **seconded**. There were no objections.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Blonder, Brown, Gower, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, McCormick, Mazur, Mullen, Schroeder, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Kelly Bradley, Marcy Deaton, Jonathan Golding, G. T. Lineberry, Brett McDaniel, Tonya Prince, Tim Tracy, Lisa Wilson, T. Lynn Williamson, Don Witt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, April 6, 2016.