

Senate Council
November 17, 2014

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, November 17, 2014 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 3:01 pm.

1. Minutes from November 3, 2014 and Announcements

The Chair said that there were not any corrections to the minutes. There being no revisions or objections, the minutes from November 3, 2014 were **approved** by unanimous consent. The Chair had a series of announcements.

The Chair met with President Eli Capilouto. The President related his passion regarding student success and related that he had charged college deans with creating an actionable plan to improve student success. The Chair added that it was likely the President will want to discuss student retention issues, as well as research, when he meets with SC on December 1. The Chair explained that he and President Capilouto also discussed the draft 2014-2020 Strategic Plan and concerns that the consulting group was writing the Plan. The President explained to the Chair that the consulting group was assisting with the preparation of the Plan (researching things alluded to by Strategic Plan committees), but not writing it. The Chair said the President will present the Plan to the University Senate (Senate) through his role as Senate Chair.

The Chair also met with Provost Christine Riordan; he asked her to request that deans send updated college and departmental rules to her area, specifically to Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement G. T. Lineberry to check for conflicts with existing rules and regulations. When that check is complete, the Senate Council office posts the rules on the Senate web site. Another topic of conversation was the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) chair. The Provost reported to the Chair that she will ask the health care colleges to rustle up some nominations for a chair and she will select one and appoint that person as HCCC chair. The Chair and Provost Riordan also discussed the situation where a student is having trouble in a class and should drop the class, but cannot due to financial aid requirements regarding the number of credit hours a student has to take in a semester. The Chair reported that the Provost was already aware of the issue and would like to make better use of courses that begin after the last day to drop a class. The Provost will report back on this issue in due time, but in the meantime may interact with Senate's Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (SAPPC) about issues regarding compressed courses. The last piece of news is the intent to create a new College of Honors, made possible by a substantial philanthropic donation. The Chair said the proposal for the new college will likely come to the Senate in the spring.

The last announcement was a recap of the Chair's visit with associate deans, at the invitation of Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers. The Chair talked to associate deans about three issues. The first pertained to the need for more timely communication with a student who is planning to withdraw entirely from the University; if a student attempts to withdraw entirely, the last course is left active to require the student to take an extra step to completely withdraw. When the student does not realize that there is one more step to complete, they end up with an E on their transcript for a class they thought they dropped. Withers has worked to establish a new report that is run weekly to let associate deans know when a student is attempting to withdraw from UK. This will prevent the Senate's Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC) from receiving requests for a W when the last class is not actually dropped. The associate deans would like a triggered email sent directly to them whenever a student attempts to drop all courses.

The second issue the Chair discussed with associate deans is that of interactions with Senate committees should be through a committee chair. The Chair provided associate deans with a one- to two-sentence description of each Senate committee, along with the name of the chair. The third and final topic the Chair discussed with associate deans was that of the number of administrative errors that keep a

student off a degree list. Research indicates that per year, there are about three instances of administrative error for each of UK's four degree lists. The Chair requested that they try to tighten up on creating accurate degree lists.

2. Old Business

a. Governing Regulations XI ("Student Affairs") and Senate Rules - Update

The Chair reminded SC members that students expressed concern that some sections of the *Senate Rules (SR)* pointed to by *Governing Regulations XI* ("Student Affairs") were written in such a way as to be unsafe for students as well as for faculty. The students were therefore responsible for identifying revisions to *SR*. If that language is accepted, the students would then willingly endorse the proposed changes to *GR XI*. He asked Ingram to provide an update. Ingram explained that he charged the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Student Senate to review the *SR* that *GR XI* points to. Ingram said there was a miscommunication on his part – he thought the draft he received recently from the Committee was final, but they wanted to make additional edits. He asked the Committee to look at areas of potential ambiguity and if in the process they find substantive issues, those items should be added to a separate list. Therefore, their comments will be divided into revisions that are more cosmetic or editorial, and revisions that are substantive.

The Chair said he discussed the issue with Connie Wood, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC). The Chair suggested that the revisions recommended by the students should be immediately sent to SREC to determine which items are editorial and which items are substantive. For the items that are editorial or cosmetic, the SREC can let SC know that the proposed revisions would not change the intent; the editorial revisions would not need to be approved by the Senate. Even though the *SR* will not be formally updated until summer 2015, the students could endorse the proposed changes to *GR XI*, knowing that the changes will be incorporated in the summer. Ingram had no objections to that plan. Ingram said that on his end, a committee of the Student Senate will need to write up an endorsement of the changes to *GR XI*, after which the full Student Senate will vote on it. Ingram added that the Committee reviewing the *SR* was the same Committee which will write up the endorsement when the time comes. There was brief discussion about how the proposal would come to the Senate Council office, as well as the timing for approvals.

3. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed New Department of Integrated Strategic Communications (ISC) and Move of BA/BS in ISC to the Proposed New Department of ISC

The Chair said that the **motion** from SAOSC was to recommend that the Senate endorse the proposed new Department of Integrated Strategic Communications and the associated move of BA/BS in Integrated Strategic Communications to the proposed new Department of Integrated Strategic Communications (ISC). Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. Guest Ernie Bailey, chair of the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC), explained the proposal, which would move ISC from within the School of Journalism and Telecommunications to a free-standing department. There were a few questions from SC members. The Chair asked if there would be a follow-up proposal to change the name of the School of Journalism and Telecommunications. Guest Beth Barnes, director of the School of Journalism and Telecommunications, said that it would be up to remaining faculty to make such a proposal, but she did not think it was anyone's priority. There were a few more questions, all of which Barnes satisfactorily answered.

When there was no further discussion, the Chair reminded SC members that there was a motion on the table. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstaining.

4. Proposed Change to Senate Rules for College of Law

(Senate Rules 5.1.2.1.D ("Limitation on Pass/fail Units Creditable for College of Law Students") and Senate Rules 5.3.3.1.C ("Limitation on Pass/fail Units Creditable for College of Law"))

The Chair reminded SC members that he mentioned the proposal to them at the last SC meeting and asked for their guidance on how to review it – SC members ultimately recommended that the proposal bypass the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) and come directly to the

SC. The Chair introduced Guest Doug Michael, College of Law Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, who offered background information about the proposal to increase the number of pass/fail courses that Law students were allowed to take for credit.

There were a variety of questions from SC members; there were no objections to the proposal but there were a number of questions about the best way to phrase the intent. Michael had no objection to, in *SR 5.3.3.1.C*, referring back to *SR 5.1.2.1.D*, instead of repeating the language. There was some additional wordsmithing, which Michael agreed to.

When there were no further comments, there was a **motion** and a **second** to approve the proposed changes (with SC revisions) to *SR 5.1.2.1.D* ("*Limitation on Pass/fail Units Creditable for College of Law Students*") and *SR 5.3.3.1.C* ("*Limitation on Pass/fail Units Creditable for College of Law*") and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair asked Michael about an effective date and Michael replied that Law would like it to be made effective immediately.

5. Proposed Revision to Governing Regulations (Governing Regulations X ("*Employment*") and Governing Regulations XIV ("*Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct*"))

The Chair introduced Guest Associate General Counsel Marcy Deaton, who offered some background information about the proposed changes and then described the changes. There were a variety of questions from SC members. Grossman suggested minor editorial changes, agreed to by SC and Deaton.

After additional discussion, the Chair said he would entertain a motion that the SC recommend the Senate endorse the proposed changes to *Governing Regulations X* and *Governing Regulations XIV*. Grossman so **moved** and Brown **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with one opposed.

6. University Calendars

The Chair explained that the Senate is responsible for approving UK's academic calendars. Watt **moved** to approve the University academic calendars presented (2015 - 2016 Calendar; 2017 - 2018 Calendar, Tentative; 2015 - 2016 Dentistry; 2017 - 2018 Dentistry, Tentative; 2015 - 2016 Law; 2016 Summer I (four-week) Law; 2016 Summer Law; 2017 - 2018 Law, Tentative; 2018 Summer I (four-week) Law, Tentative; 2018 Summer Law, Tentative; 2015 - 2016 Medicine; 2017 - 2018 Medicine, Tentative; 2015 - 2016 Pharmacy; 2017 - 2018 Pharmacy, Tentative; 2015 - 2016 Winter Intersession; and 2017 - 2018 Winter Intersession, Tentative) and Christ **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

7. Proposed Change to 2014-2015 Pharmacy Calendar

The Chair explained that the proposed change was moving a workshop from January 2, 2015 (current) to January 5, 2015 (proposed). Porter **moved** to approve the proposed change to the 2014-2015 Pharmacy calendar and Christ **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

8. Senate Meeting Roundtable

(Senate's "Other Business": Encouraging Students to Submit Electronic Course Evaluations and Administrative Bloat)

The Chair asked SC members to go around the room and offer their thoughts about the recent University Senate (Senate) meeting; he asked they also comment specifically on the two issues that arose during "Other Business" during the November Senate meeting. Below are representative comments, by topic.

General Senate meeting comments:

- It was too bad that the motion about rescinding and bestowing a degree became cluttered with a lengthy amendment. The language about rescinding/bestowing at the Senate meeting was largely driven by a desire to be sure the student received the correct degree, not a desire to precisely describe the specific actions and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees and Senate. The Chair

pointed out that it was SC's responsibility to provide watertight language for proposals. Better to find the leaks at SC than on the Senate floor. It is important to be sure that motions sent to the Senate are correctly worded.

- The presentation on the new alcohol policy was good.

In response to electronic course evaluations:

- It was not clear what problem was occurring as a result of students not submitting electronic teacher-course evaluations (TCE).
- Even if the course is a distance-learning course in which students are accustomed to submitting work electronically, it is very difficult to get them to submit the TCE
- The loss of support staff has largely driven on college's use of electronic TCE, as there are no longer staff members available to type up the written comments. Although smaller numbers of students are submitting TCE, it is not clear if those TCE are of better quality than the paper TCE.
- Due to technological snafus, it is possible for a faculty member to receive a TCE for a course that individual did not teach. It seems unlikely that the move to electronic TCE had any effect on the quality of TCE submissions.
- One college currently requires electronic TCE and does not give a student their grade until the TCE is submitted. The concern with that practice is that it forces a student to submit the TCE, which may result in an angry student taking their irritation out on the professor. The presentation on the new alcohol policy was very good.
- One college requires students to fill out a paper TCE during the last day of class; there is almost a 100% return rate. (Due to smaller class sizes in this college, it is less onerous to process the paper forms.)
- The senator with the concern about TCE is from the College of Communication and Information, which offers a lot of online courses. If a student has never met or seen the instructor, it can be confusing for the student to be asked to evaluate the course. Without face-to-face interactions, it can be harder to form a personal connection with a faculty member and that may bleed into the lack of compliance in submitting electronic TCE in that College. If the TCE is too detailed, students are unlikely to take the time to fill them out.
- The TCE never asks what the student learned. Consideration should also be given to how TCE are used in evaluating a faculty member's teaching performance. There are other faculty who are concerned with new policies about what must be in a syllabus and what has to be assessed, and how. There are some concerns that accreditation requirements are beginning to infringe upon academic freedom of the faculty. The Senate may have a role to play in reducing bureaucratic issues.
- Students receive a lot of emails from UK and when those emails come during finals week students largely ignore them, including emails about TCE. It is easier to fill out an electronic TCE (easier to type than write) but they should be done in class, not outside of class. If the TCE was to be given at the start of class, students would be in better moods and more likely to submit the TCE. When the TCE is given at the end of the class period, students tend to rush through it to leave class as soon as possible. Putting the TCE online, and requiring students to complete in class, at the beginning of class, would likely result in better compliance.
- Some suggestions for improving the rate of student completion include the following: initiation of a small gift card awarded to randomly chosen students who submitted the TCE; not allowing a

student to register for classes until the student submitted all necessary TCE; and not giving a grade until a student completes the TCE (currently used in the College of Pharmacy).

. In response to administrative bloat:

- Many administrative positions are the result of outside mandates, most of which are from accrediting bodies and involve assessment. As faculty members are the reviewing members of accrediting bodies, the assessment requirements are coming from faculty themselves. Faculty tend to dislike administrators outside their area, but also tend to like the ones that assist them directly.

The Chair said there were a few options available to SC regarding TCE and their use in evaluating effectiveness in teaching, as well as the issue of possible administrative bloat. The TCE concerns could be sent to the ad hoc committee on TCE, or the Senate could have a discussion about it at its next meeting. Regarding concerns about administrative bloat, the SC could ask the Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee (SIFRAC) to review the amount of money spent on administrators. Another option would be to have an open discussion at a Senate meeting. There were further comments about TCE as a measure of instructional effectiveness.

- Knowing the academic standing of the student would make reviewing the TCE more effective for the faculty member. If the student is in the top third of the class, their comments are more valuable. Some evaluations are so full of profanity and ugliness that the TCE ought to be immediately discarded, regardless of any evaluative comments the student included.
- TCE are consumer satisfaction surveys but are not linked to any outcomes. TCE should be one part of a menu of strategies to evaluate teaching effectiveness, not the only strategy. The TCE is often filled out with a "do you like the teacher or not" attitude.
- College and department rules may limit the strategies used to evaluate teaching effectiveness, and those rules are well within the purview of the faculty of the unit. There should be more guidance on how the TCE scores are used.

SC members discussed what role, if any, the Senate has in the protection of faculty in relation to performance evaluations. There was interest among SC members in having the Chair broach the subject with Provost Christine Riordan perhaps to suggest a joint Senate-Provost ad hoc committee to review how teaching is evaluated and best practices for evaluation. There was additional discussion about how and when and what to report back to Senate.

The Chair will explain to the Senate that the SC thought there was merit in the TCE comments and will work towards identifying a two-pronged solution: first, send the issue of student submission of TCE to the SC's ad hoc committee on TCE; and second, request the Provost form a joint Senate-Provost committee to research and determine best practices for evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Regarding administrative bloat, SC was ultimately satisfied with the suggestion that the Chair let President Capilouto know that perceptions of growing administrative overhead are a regular concern of faculty. The Chair will inquire as to whether or not the President has any data about UK's administrative overhead and where UK is compared to our benchmarks. SC members were opposed to holding a general discussion about the matter in the Senate.

When there was no further discussion, McCormick **moved** to adjourn and Wilson **seconded**. The meeting was adjourned about 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Brown Grossman, Christ, Hippisley, Ingram, McCormick, Osorio, Pienkowski, Porter, Watt, and Wilson.

Absences explained in advance: Anderson and Oberst.

Invited guests present: Ernie Bailey, Beth Barnes, Marcy Deaton, Doug Michael, Kate Seago, and Ben Withers.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, November 18, 2014.