

Senate Council
February 23, 2015

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 23, 2015. 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 3:02 pm.

1. Minutes from February 2 and Announcements

The Chair said that he conveyed to President Eli Capilouto the SC's opinions on the two candidates for the position of provost. The Chair said he received emails from other faculty who asked that their comments be conveyed, which the Chair did.

During a recent meeting with Bill Swinford, the President's chief of staff, the Chair learned that the Kentucky House of Representatives has voted to give UK \$132 million towards a new research building. In response to questions from the Chair about whether the building will be only for medical- or health-related researchers, Swinford said that the building will be used by anyone with an emphasis in multidisciplinary research, but that researchers will need to earn their way in. The Chair asked that the information that the building was not dedicated to one specific field of research be made very clear to the campus community. The Chair passed on Swinford's suggestion to invite Vice President for Research Lisa Cassis to SC to help clarify the function of the building.

There was brief discussion about the correct spelling of a recent guest attendee's name. There being no further edits, the minutes from February 2 were **approved by unanimous consent**.

2. Old Business

a. Update from Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action

The Chair invited Watt, chair of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action, to give an update on the status of the Committee's work since the last update. Watt said that he will send the Chair a draft regulation on the faculty disciplinary policy in the near future. The proposed regulation is the result of some 10 hours of consultation between Watt and members of UK's Legal Counsel. The report itself is nearing completion although there are a handful of concerns that have been raised by Committee members. Watt said that if the concerns could not be addressed and fixed, he would include the concerns in a cover memo for the report, as well as other recommendations. Watt offered additional comments. The Chair said that he welcomed the report and planned to put it on the SC agenda for March 2. There were a handful of questions from SC members. In response to one particular question about whether the contents of the Committee's report would apply to administrators as well as to rank-and-file faculty, Watt said that the President made it clear in conversation that the proposed policy would apply to him [the President].

The Chair asked SC members to be scrupulous in their review of the Committee's report prior to the SC meeting next week, as well as to come with questions and comments. He said he would allot a good amount of time for discussion on the Committee's report. If the SC approves sending the report to the Senate, there will be a first reading in March and a second reading in April, with edits and amendments in the interim period. This will allow the report to receive final Senate vetting prior to May 1, per the President's request.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) - Greg Graf, Chair

i. College of Health Sciences Proposed Student Appeals Policy

The Chair asked Guest Greg Graf, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), to explain the proposal, which he did. Guest Randa Remer (Health Sciences assistant dean for admissions and student affairs) also was present and participated in the discussion.

There were a number of questions from SC members. Although SC members largely understood the impetus for the proposal, there were some major concerns, which are summarized below.

- As written, students may not understand that the proposed policy is merely a documentation of internal college procedures. Students could think that the Health Sciences (HS) policy supersedes the University-wide appeals process, which is outlined in the *Senate Rules (SR)*.
- Currently, the *SR* presumes that any appeals processes that are separate from the processes outlined in the *SR* are those in colleges that have an academic honor code, but HS does not have an honor code. If the HS appeals policy were to be approved, it would require a change to the *SR*, too. Another option would be for HS to create an honor code, which would then allow a college-level appeals process.
- As written, the policy facilitates a student's ability to appeal all the way to the University Appeals Board (UAB), but there is no similar process for a faculty member who wants to uphold a penalty.
- If the appeals language is not clear on the appeals process, or if it conflicts with other, related University-wide rules, a student may have grounds to claim violations of their due process.
- The proposal needs to be edited to be clear that a faculty member is not obligated to change a student's grade based on colleagues' comments or a committee's determination – only the instructor of record and the UAB can change a grade and a faculty member's autonomy should not be undermined.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) was that the SC recommends Senate approval of the proposed new College of Health Sciences Student Appeals Policy. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required.

Porter **moved** to table the proposal and Christ **seconded**. Both Porter and Christ **accepted** Grossman's **friendly amendment** to have the proposal tabled until the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) can review and comment upon the proposal. McCormick asked that the review and comments take the form of assisting HS to move forward, not merely a "yes" or "no" response from the SREC.

In response to a comment from Grossman, Remer explained that it was unlikely that HS faculty would want to create an honor code.

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

4. Proposed Change to PhD Music

The Chair briefly explained the path that a program change proposal takes, from the department level to the time when Senate approves a program change on a 10-day web transmittal. He noted that when a transmittal is posted, it is done so on behalf of SC. Therefore, because some concerns were raised regarding a particular program proposal, he was presenting it to SC to determine if it should be placed on a 10-day web transmittal. The Chair explained that the proposed change to the PhD in Music Education involved a few changes, the major one being the creation of a new specialization in Music Therapy. He drew SC members' attention to pertinent sections of the proposal in which it is clearly stated that funding is not available for a faculty member to teach in the Music Therapy specialization. Furthermore, the proposal quotes the program's own accreditation language that requires an additional faculty member to offer the Music Therapy specialization courses. The Chair asked SC members for their thoughts on the proposal. There were a number of questions from SC members and lengthy discussion.

Christ **moved** to return the proposal to the Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee in the College of Fine Arts for revisions so that the only changes included are those that can be currently resourced by the College of Fine Arts. Bailey **seconded**. SC members discussed the motion. Concerns were raised about what could happen if the new track was approved and students attempted to enroll, only to find out the track was not actually offered. Those SC members offering comments were supportive of the motion

and the sentiment behind it. There was also discussion about how a new track is a significant change to a program and may warrant review by the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC).

As discussion wound down, the Chair commented that the proposal would be routed back through the Graduate Council (GC) for another review; he asked Porter, the SC's rep to the GC, to mention the SC's concerns during the GC's review. McCormick wondered if that request would put Porter in a difficult situation, as the GC previously voted to not consider resource issues in the review of curricular proposals. The Chair replied that the GC was not obligated to review resource issues, but Porter would not be out of line for simply reporting the SC's concerns. A **vote** was taken on the motion (with the added inclusion of GC review) and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Grossman **moved** that the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) be asked to consider whether new tracks [undergraduate level], new concentrations [master's level], and new specializations [PhD level] within existing programs should be processed as new academic programs. Brown **seconded**. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. Christ asked if such a proposition should also be reviewed by the SAPC. The Chair opined that the SAPC chair could be invited to the meeting when it is discussed by the SREC.

The Chair asked that the agenda be reordered, to address teacher-course evaluations prior to the other items. There were no objections from SC members.

6. Teacher-Course Evaluation Discussion

The Chair explained that SC members had before them a summary of senators' comments from the recent discussion on teacher-course evaluations (TCE) at the February Senate meeting. There was extensive discussion among SC members about the best path forward. Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers attended as a guest; he offered background information from the Senate's last action on TCE (in 1990) and also participated in discussion.

SC members were still supportive of the proposed common set of TCE questions; those offering opinions believed that the proposed TCE was a huge improvement over the current TCE. The vast majority of comments dealt with three particular concerns.

1. There are still concerns that the new TCE, like the current TCE, will be inappropriately used as the sole instrument to evaluate teaching effectiveness.
2. There is a complete lack of information on how the new TCE will be implemented, including issues of who will review and approve additional questions and whether additional questions will have a cost associated with them.
3. There are many concerns about mandating that everyone use the new TCE, even those areas that opted out of the Senate-approved evaluation tool from the early 1990s almost immediately upon Senate approval.

There were additional comments about ensuring the TCE meets the needs of distance learning courses and determining if the new provost was as enamored with a common set TCE as the previous provost. As discussion continued, SC became more comfortable with the idea of first suggesting that the Senate approve the proposed new TCE as a baseline course evaluation form with the assumption that the questions will be mandatory with some exceptions. Second, exceptions and other implementation issues will be given to an implementation committee. There was continued discussion about whether these two issues should be decided in parallel, or one after the other.

SC members then discussed the idea of making the TCE mandatory only for those groups currently using the Senate-approved TCE. An implementation committee will be asked to determine the implementation-related questions and concerns. This idea gained traction and was the SC's final consensus.

5. Senate Meeting Roundtable

The Chair asked SC members to each give their thoughts on the February 9 Senate meeting. SC members praised the reports from the SAPC chair, stating that her thorough reports made the meeting discussions more efficient.

7. Changing Majors - Exit Survey

The Chair invited Christ, who asked for the discussion, to offer some information to SC members. Christ explained that it was sometimes difficult to measure attrition rates. As students move in and out of degree programs, it is hard to tell which students are leaving as a result of poor academics or are leaving (in good standing) to move to a degree program that better suits them. As a result, college faculty do not know what is motivating students to leave or arrive. Christ wondered if the process of changing majors could be done electronically, so that instead of a student walking paperwork from one office to another, the student can do it online. With online functionality, UK could also ask a few questions about why the student made the change; such information could be shared with the old and new programs/units. Christ added that she would oppose any roadblocks that prevent students from changing majors.

Kraemer noted that he will attend a campus-wide advising meeting soon and would bring up Christ's idea at that time. Withers opined that it was a great idea because switching majors has always been somewhat challenging for students.

There being no further business to attend to, Grossman **moved** to adjourn and Mazur **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Brown, Christ, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, McCormick, Oberst, Osorio, Porter, and Watt.

Invited guests present: Greg Graf, Randa Remer, and Ben Withers.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Thursday, February 26, 2015.