

Brothers, Sheila

From: Bird-Pollan, Jennifer
Sent: Saturday, November 10, 2018 9:58 AM
To: Firey, Abigail
Cc: Brothers, Sheila
Subject: Re: Engagement! A knot!

From: "Firey, Abigail" <afire2@uky.edu>
Date: Friday, November 9, 2018 at 11:32 AM
To: "Bird-Pollan, Jennifer" <jbirdpollan@uky.edu>
Subject: Re: Engagement! A knot!

Dear Jennifer,

It's so hard to strike a committee, I have learned. The best thing would be to have an ad hoc committee that brings together the chairs of the relevant existing committees, perhaps? Specifically for this issue? So, Admissions and Academic Standards, Academic Priorities and Planning, Rules, Diversity and Inclusion, and Distance Learning?

The text of a motion to convene this committee and define its charge could be something like this?

Motion to strike an ad hoc committee on Academic Engagement ("AE") for the purposes of analyzing the best practices for implementation of Title IV reporting on academic engagement, and presenting recommendations by [date] to Senate Council. The committee is charged to address the following, and possibly other, issues: 1.) the apparent discrepancy between Senate Rules (see notes below) and Federal Regulations (Title IV) on academic engagement; 2.) the necessity for universal removal of students reported for non-engagement from class rolls in the third week of the semester; 3.) whether the terms of asynchronous online courses match the implied expectations for academic engagement in the third week of the semester; 4.) whether there is disproportionate penalty for students receiving federal aid; 5.) use of the "N" grade as a possible mechanism in reporting, and possible extension of its availability from the beginning to the end of the semester.

Notes:

1. Discrepancy in rules and regulations. Senate rules on attendance include these sentences: : Each instructor shall determine his/her policy regarding completion of assigned work, attendance in class, absences at announced or unannounced examinations, and excused absences in excess of one-fifth of class contact hours (see Rule 5.2.4.2 below)... If the course syllabus does not require students to interact with other students, an instructor, or an instructor's proxy and if such interactions are not a criterion for a grade in the course, then the Instructor of Record shall not take any account of a student's excused or unexcused absence from such interactions when assigning a grade. [US: 2/8/2016; 2/12/2018

These sentences seem to say that, unless an individual instructor's syllabus specifies that engagement is required, there can be no penalty for non-engagement, as long as the student submits (and passes) the required assignments and exams, on the due dates. Removing students from class rolls in the third week appears to penalize them, and to intervene in the grading process.

2. Universal removal of students from the rolls. If the goal is to certify engagement of Title IV students, it would seem that only their engagement requires review. Removing all students brings equity, in that it does not discriminate against the economically disadvantaged, but it presents a false rationale for their

removal (that they do not meet Title IV standards for engagement). Current implementation seems to cast a huge net, full of quite a few fish, to catch a small number of select fish. The consequences of removal seem to differ for students receiving financial aid and those not receiving financial aid.

Let me know what you think should be cut, to make this all shorter, clearer, and most likely to be helpful.

Thanks SO much for your help with this tiresome issue. (I'm willing to toss students out; I just want it done fairly and thoughtfully).

Best,
Abigail.
