

Senate Council  
March 26, 2007

The Senate Council met at 3 pm on Monday, March 26, 2007 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless otherwise indicated.

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 pm. Those present introduced themselves. The Chair said that Grabau, Lesnaw and Odoi had alerted the Office of the Senate Council that they would be late; Thelin was absent due to illness; and Randall would leave early.

The Chair invited Piascik to share her experience when she and others met with a consultant brought in at the request of Work-Life's Employee Assistance Program Committee. Piascik said that the consultant had a specialty in employee assistance programs in higher education. Her purpose for coming was to review existing services and culture and then return to UK with suggestions; she had positive things to say about many employee assistance programs currently at UK. Piascik said the consultant would return with suggestions and cost analyses.

There being no objection, the minutes from March 5 were approved as distributed. The Chair then asked if the Senate Council (SC) wanted to see the progress report from the University Studies Program Reform Steering Committee (USPRC) before it was presented to the University Senate (Senate); it would be an update, not a matter for approval. Finkel opined that it was unnecessary to bring it to the SC since it was a status report. There being no additional comments, the Chair said he would ask that the presentation be made directly to the Senate.

The Chair shared with SC members that recent proposed changes to *Human Resources Policy and Procedure Manual 4.1.1.1* were no longer being sought by the administration. Provost's Liaison Greissman concurred.

Referring to recent discussion on the SC listserv, the Chair asked for a vote to approve appointing Professor of Law Brad Canon to serve as Senate Parliamentarian for the remainder of the semester. Wood **moved** thusly and Harley **seconded**. There being no comments, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Chair said he appreciated the recent discussions on the listserv regarding faculty in the clinical title series (CTS). He included [a document containing the six questions](#) in the agenda items, in order to have them reported in the minutes.

The Chair asked Yanarella if he had any further comments regarding the recent change in the timing of when Board of Trustees meeting agendas would be

posted. Yanarella replied that the matter had been sufficiently discussed on the SC listserv and in the media, so no further comment was necessary.

2. [Make the Difference Suggestion – Make the Last Day to Add a Class the Same Day as the Last Day to Drop a class \(w/o it appearing on student's transcript\)](#)

The Chair shared that the suggestion had originally come to the Senate a couple of years ago. He said the proposal was fairly simple, but significant. The Chair explained that the deadline for dropping a course was about two weeks before the deadline to drop (without a W appearing on the student's transcript). He said the suggestion would need to be discussed and then a decision made whether or not to pursue the idea, and if so, how. He invited Mary Sue Hoskins, director of Central Advising Service, to share details and rationale about her suggestion.

Guest Hoskins said that the proposal was initiated two and a half years ago by then-Provost Nietzel. She said the last day to add a class preceded the last day to drop a class by 10 days. She shared a [pictogram](#) explaining how students dropping after the last day to add a class negatively affected many other students. Hoskins said that if the last day to add were the same as the last day to drop a class, students could drop in time for others to add, resulting in full classrooms, not partial ones; shrinking waiting lists; rising retention rates due to students getting into courses they need; and a more effective allocation of resources. Grabau arrived at this time.

Hoskins then went over the charts in the handout and explained that the numbers of first fall to spring retention and first fall to second fall retention illustrated that as the advising conferences progressed, students were getting fewer and fewer courses they wanted. Enacting the proposal would save money for UK and increase retention. The Chair added that the suggestion did not include whether the time to add should be lengthened or the time to drop decreased. Hoskins said she thought the issue of the specific date was a faculty issue. She said that she did not intend to move the last day to add, but rather move the last day to drop. She said it might make students more intentional – it would lessen the number of students arriving late in the term.

The Chair invited Suanne Early, the chair of the Advising Network, to offer comments from advisors. Guest Early said that the feedback she received on the issue was generally positive, especially for an earlier drop date. Two respondents, though, were concerned that such a change could limit availability and urge premature decisions. The majority of responses were in favor. Early said that there was concern about the short amount of time for feedback a student could get if students were only in class for one week before the drop deadline. Early added that, since she had the opportunity, she would encourage further investigation into offering four-, six- and eight-week courses throughout the semester. She said it was an idea to consider, although not directly related to the suggestion on the agenda.

The Chair asked Associate Provost for Enrollment Management Don Witt to offer his opinion. Guest Witt said that from his perspective, the suggestion to solve the problem needed to be fully vetted to prevent unintended consequences. He said that if the last day to add was made later, he wondered about the success of students who might enter the class very late. Witt noted that late entries could change the dynamics of a class. He, too, requested additional faculty input. Guest Associate Registrar Jacquie Hager added that there were once-per-week classes in which students would not have met before the last day to drop (due to seasonal holidays), if the change were accepted. She said there would need to be an accommodation for those situations.

In response to the Chair, Witt said that students who withdrew before the first day of classes received a full refund; those who withdrew in the first week through third weeks received less; and students who withdrew after mid-term received nothing. She confirmed for the Chair that the dates for add/drop and the 50% refund immediately before midterm did not coincide. Hoskins said that the suggestion did not link them, either. Witt then shared that he received no negative comments from most of the undergraduate colleges.

The Chair invited Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Phil Kraemer for his opinion. Guest Kraemer said that from the point of view of an instructor, he worried more about the unusual dynamic of students coming into the class late and getting behind. He said moving the drop date was beneficial, as there was a problem with wasted seats. He said that while he did not know if there was a down side, the point about avoiding unintended consequences should be an important consideration.

Greissman said that with respect to the data in the charts, the advising conferences were not randomly spread out over the summer, but were on first-come, first-served basis. The data could be interpreted to show that those students who got earlier advising conferences had habits that would allow them to succeed academically. Lesnaw arrived at this point.

Yanarella thought that there was growing concern with respect to retention issues and within UCAPP's Undergraduate Subcommittee. He said that currently the proposal had a lot going for it, but that he suspected there would be unintended consequences that would make it appear less popular. Wood said that the pictograph did not necessarily represent a one-to-one relationship; there was an assumption that those students who dropped on the last day to drop (without receiving a W) would indeed drop the course more quickly if the date were different. She said that some students did not know they could not do well in a course until there was feedback.

Wood wondered if changing the date would release the seats. In the past, the date was changed to allow students time for feedback to decide if they should

continue in the class. It was done to encourage students to attempt new or different courses and give time for students to decide if they wanted to stay in or drop. Wood said that when her department scheduled classes, they were aware of that pattern of enrollment and correspondingly over subscribed the number of students. Wood expressed some concerns about the proposal, but thought it should go to a committee for review.

Finkel opined that the proposal tried to solve two different problems, that of adding and dropping. He said that if a course was not right for a student the students should drop. He said he sometimes advised students to sign up for more than they could take so they could drop a course that was not a good academic fit. He wondered which committee should review the suggestion.

The Chair replied that while the Calendar Committee might seem logical, the proposal was not just about ordering dates, but also about an academic standard. He said it should go to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, unless someone objected.

Hoskins said that for the better students, it was likely they would drop sooner. She said that Central Advising Service often saw students who procrastinated and waited until the last minute to withdraw; they would stop going to class, but would not drop until the last possible opportunity. The problem with advising students to sign up for more than they could take resulted in students with class loads far over what they could possibly handle, which filled up classes that other students wanted to enroll in.

There was brief discussion between Aken, Grabau and Hoskins about a short-lived proposal from then-Provost Nietzel who suggested an extra fee for students who regularly dropped too many courses. Grabau said that as a faculty member and teacher, he would hate to see an add date going farther into the semester. He said that shadow adds could still be done after the last day to add. Grabau thought that the issue Hoskins was attempting to rectify was access to classes. He said that if faculty advisors were telling students to enroll in more classes than they could take, that also harmed access to classes. If the times for add and drop were closer together, with current technology one student could drop and another student could, within seconds, add the same course.

Greissman seconded Grabau's comments. He thought the SC should pay careful attention to the time during the semester at which it would be too late for a student to catch up. He said he taught a UK 101 class – although it would be difficult for a student to add the class even later than is currently allowed, it could be done. He expressed concerns that students in building block courses in other disciplines would have far more trouble catching up.

There being no further questions, the Chair said he wanted to say a few things about the proposal. He said that as a former DGS, he was amazed at how the

Registrar and others could add a student later in the semester than normally done, as long as everyone agreed. The effect of the proposal would remove the professor from the equation – no longer would the professor be able to say that students could not join after missing the first two weeks. He said if the date for dropping a course was shortened, it would result in more Ws from students.

Hager noted that the add period used to be from a Wednesday to Wednesday. It was changed to go through Tuesday night after a rereading of the *Senate Rules*. Odoi entered the meeting at this time.

Wood expressed a desire to return to the Wednesday end; she said that if an instructor taught a Tuesday/Thursday class in which a student did not attend the first two classes, the student was dropped Tuesday night. If the add period were open through Wednesday, the spot that opened up on Tuesday night could more likely be found and added by a student.

Greissman thought that there were two issues at hand – that of academics (how late a student can add and still succeed) and of resources. He said academics and resources might not have the same goals, although there was an overlap between the two distinct principles.

Wood **moved** that the proposal to make the last day to add a class the same day as the last day to drop a class (without it appearing on the student's transcript) be sent to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. Finkel **seconded**. In response to the Chair, Wood clarified that sending it to the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC) implied that the SA&ASC was free to seek additional input and/or come up with other suggestions.

Odoi requested that the SA&ASC include student representation. Mrs. Brothers explained that because the Student Government Association president had failed to respond to requests for the names of students to serve in the Senate, there was no student representation on any Senate committee. In response to the Chair, Odoi said that he would identify a student to serve on the SA&ASC. The Chair said he first needed to check with the committee about adding a member this late in the semester. Greissman suggested the proposal be vetted with appropriate student bodies before it returned to the SC.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to send the proposal to make the last day to add a class the same day as the last day to drop a class (without it appearing on the student's transcript) to the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, with the understanding that the committee was free to seek additional input and/or come up with other suggestions. The motion **passed** unanimously.

### 3. Winter Intersession Report – Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Phil Kraemer

The Chair invited Kraemer to introduce the topic. Kraemer said that the report emphasized educational quality, in part because some individuals were concerned about the compressed calendar for the winter intersession (WI). He said that the idea stemmed from a visit he made to the University of Maryland to learn more about their WI. Kraemer reported back to then-Provost Nietzel that it was developed to allow students to catch up on progress toward a degree, not to be an additional revenue stream.

Kraemer then gave a presentation on the WI. During the presentation, there were a couple of questions. With regard to the jump in dissatisfaction over library services and in response to Greissman's question, Aken responded that there was no change in hours of availability, but that there were fewer professionals available to help students during WI. Wood noted that the grade distributions were extremely skewed. Kraemer said it could be the result of great instructors or highly motivated students. Wood replied that it could also be a result of easy grading.

Kraemer said that when he taught a statistics course in a four-week session, it was a good experience – there was no time for students to forget what was learned the week before, he had a lot of contact with the students, and it was likely that the student was only taking one course, allowing for more concentration. Wood noted that smaller class sizes also encouraged better performance.

After the presentation, Witt said that feedback he had received about WI was positive, overall. He heard from students that more course offerings were desired, especially for courses over-prescribed in the spring semesters. Lesnaw wondered if anyone had attempted to assess learning outcomes in the WI versus a fall/spring semester or a summer session, particularly in courses that were content driven. Kraemer responded that such assessment was not done for regular semesters, but that it would need to be done in the future. He said UK suffered from only evaluating seat time and credit hours – there was a need to accommodate good learning. He added that there was nothing sacred about 16 weeks of three hours of classes per week – learning could be more compressed while other courses might need 22 weeks.

Lesnaw agreed and said that some courses could be compressed. She asked for data regarding the time needed to assimilate and work with course material for compressed courses. Kraemer said that there was no such data available and that there was no rubric; if an instructor wished to teach a compressed course during WI, he would work with them. He thought the system at Colorado College, where students were taught only one course at a time during eight-week sessions, was advantageous to faculty and had collateral benefits.

Wood said that she would also like to see an assessment of learning outcomes, especially in light of the data in the presentation. She said she was concerned about the grade distribution in the WI statistics course. She said she had taught in a variable format before – STA 291 was taught in three two-week modules in which a student had to earn a grade of C before moving to the next module. She said it was pedagogically tremendous and a great teaching experience but an absolute nightmare for scheduling.

Kraemer said that Bluegrass Community and Technical College taught some eight-week sessions. For students who did poorly, they could retake the course right away, a situation in which compression was an advantage.

Greissman noted that at the University of Montana, the WI was free for fit students who were enrolled for the fall and spring semesters. He said it would be good for students to allow faculty to use WI as one course for their year's load. WI courses also helped students graduate in a timely manner.

Lesnaw asked for Kraemer's opinion, from the perspective of a professor of psychology, on what effect WI would have on a student toward the end of their undergraduate career. During a recent discussion in the Senate about a change to the university calendar, a portion of the discussion dealt with the need for a break for students mid-semester; she wondered what effect would be had if a student did not get a break over the winter holidays, but instead was enrolled in WI, a much more intense classroom experience. She asked for his opinion on four-week modules and noted that within the context of the discussion regarding add/drop previously in the meeting, such modules would magnify the add/drop problem tremendously.

Kraemer said that he was referring to one course during a four-week session, which would be no more intense than five courses taken at once (over the course of a semester). The cognitive investment would be different, though. He said there was compelling data regarding spacing and memory retention in such schedules. With regard to students who utilize the WI, he said some students looked for that type of activity and stimulation. He said another need was to identify which students were good candidates for the WI. He said that questions about who was dropping WI courses needed to be answered.

In response to Harley, Kraemer thought that there was at least one distance learning course offered. Although it could be expanded, Kraemer said that distance learning in the WI would not be effective for all courses and added that especially for distance learning courses, faculty (as opposed to graduate students) should be teaching them.

There being no further questions, the Chair thanked Witt and Kraemer and they departed. The Chair noted that the written progress report on WI had yet to be received – the SC would likely vote to formally receive it at the next meeting.

There was then a discussion about the wording of the motion to approve the WI calendar. Wood subsequently **moved** that the SC recommend that the Senate approve another three-year pilot (WI for 2007 – 2008; 2008 – 2009; and 2009 - 2010) of the WI so long as the courses involved were included in the Provost's learning outcomes assessment and that such data will be provided to the Senate Council and Senate in time for re-approval. Yanarella **seconded**.

The SC chose not to include language in the motion that would mandate the types of courses or the frequency of specific courses offered during WI, since the courses taught stemmed from the prerogative of faculty and their departments and colleges. In addition, the original approval did not include any restrictions on courses. There was also a discussion regarding faculty teaching loads and the wish that an appropriate incentive come from university administrators to encourage new courses be taught during WI. Currently, WI courses are an extra course, over the normal load of courses faculty were required to teach every year.

Lesnaw noted that some universities' WI did fall such that they were not broken by the Christmas holiday. In light of many comments about how to be creative with teaching schedules, she suggested that the entire calendar be revisited. She expressed distaste with the current four-year tyranny of college academics and said it should not be the force driving action; academics and learning should drive decision-making. She thought other entities on campus would be able to accommodate academic concerns if the calendar were drastically revised. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 4. [Winter Intersession \(2007 – 2008\) Calendar](#)

The Chair said that a motion was needed to approve the 2007-2008 WI calendar. Lesnaw **moved** thusly. Wood **seconded**. The Chair asked if there was any discussion, and also noted that the motion should include language that approval was recommended, pending approval by the Senate of the extension. Lesnaw and Wood **agreed** to the modified motion.

Finkel noted that there was a grammatical error in the second entry for December 19 in which the plural form should be changed to possessive – “students” should be “student’s.”

There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to approve the 2007 – 2008 winter intersession calendar, pending approval of the three-year extension of the WI by the Senate. The motion **passed** unanimously.

#### 5. [Proposed Changes/Combining of Administrative Regulations II-1.0-1 \(“Faculty Appt., Reappt., Promotion & Tenure”\)](#)

There being little time left in the meeting, the Chair asked Greissman to provide an overview of the proposed changes. The SC could then review the changes at the next meeting.

Greissman said that first and foremost, Provost Subbaswamy was committed to going as quickly or slowly as the Senate wished regarding the proposed changes to *Administrative Regulations (AR) II-1.0-1*. All other things being equal, the Provost hoped the proposed changes would be approved during the spring semester, so that they could be effective as of July 1. That said, Greissman reiterated that if a thorough faculty vetting was not possible this semester, it would wait until fall 2007.

According to Greissman, the AR Review Committee (ARRC) had a three-fold assignment. The ARRC divided into two groups – one group looked regs regarding financial affairs and the other group, broken down into to sub-groups, reviewed regs regarding student affairs and faculty, respectively. Greissman oversaw the student affairs and faculty sub-groups. The charge for those two sub-groups was to suggest changes to bring the ARs more in alignment with the provost model and to make the regs more readable. In addition, they were asked to identify policies and procedures that might benefit from possible review and revision.

Greissman apologized that the changes were not identifiable through “track changes.” He said that it was impossible to track multiple documents merged into one document. Although the vast majority of work was just moving language around and not changing it, there were some substantive changes. As a result, the substantive changes were outlined in narrative fashion. Greissman said that any comment about moved or changed language was welcome.

Language from the historical “provost’s memo” from the past, which in part guided the tenure and promotion process but was never codified, was inserted into the revised *AR*. Greissman said that the evaluative promotion and tenure process moved from the ground up, from department to college to university or provost level. Therefore, sections of the *AR* were reorganized to reflect that practice. In addition, three appendices were added in matrix form to help faculty and department chairs through the process. He asked that SC members read the proposed changes carefully and be able to discuss them on April 2.

In response to Lesnaw, Greissman said that four sections of the *AR (AR II-1.0-1 Pages I, II, III and IV)* were moved into one document, which accounted for the movement of language but no change in language. Occasionally sentence structure was tinkered with to make it clearer, but Greissman said they were careful not to change the meaning of the language without indicating the meaning was changed. He added that the ARRC was initially charged as a joint SC and provost venture. Jeff Dembo and Davy Jones were on the group in the beginning, and when they left, Kaveh Tagavi (SC Chair) began attending

meetings. Throughout, Larry Grabau was on the ARRC, too. There was a large steering committee with heavy faculty representation.

The Chair said that the SC would review the changes on April 2, before going to the Senate for a review. Greissman said that in the interim, the Provost would vet the changes with deans.

Wood asked about the next steps with regard to clinical title series faculty. It was ultimately decided that the comments by SC members would be discussed in a live meeting before being sent to Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson. Finkel left the meeting during this discussion.

It was also decided to postpone agenda item number six until April 2.

Odoi noted that the March 26 minutes incorrectly reflected that he was not present. Mrs. Brothers said she would make the change.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kaveh Tagavi,  
Senate Council Chair

Senate Council members present: Aken, Finkel, Grabau, Harley, Lesnaw, Odoi, Piascik, Randall, Tagavi, Wood, Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Non-SC members present: Heidi Anderson, Marcy Deaton, Suanne Early, Jacquie Hager, Mary Sue Hoskins, Phil Kraemer; Don Witt.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, March 28, 2007.