

Senate Council
May 9, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, May 9, 2016 in the Lexmark Public Room (209) 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. The Chair welcomed new Student Government Association President Rowan Reid, who will be a senior next year in economics and management. Reid offered a few comments about her academic goals and her goals as SGA president, including creating more inclusive environments. SC members introduced themselves.

1. Minutes from April 25, 2016 and Announcements

The Chair reminded SC members that the usual end-of-semester get-together at Pazzo's would occur immediately following the SC meeting. Faculty trustee Grossman noted that the budget update seen by the Board of Trustees at its recent meeting was the same information as what was presented to the University Senate (Senate) on May 2.

The Chair turned to the SC minutes from April 25. There being no corrections or objections, the minutes from April 25 were **approved** as distributed by **unanimous consent**.

2. Proposed Calendar Changes

a. 2016-17 Pharmacy Calendar

b. 2017-18 Pharmacy Calendar (tentative)

Wood **moved** to approve the proposed changes to both College of Pharmacy calendars and Bailey **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Proposed Nonstandard Calendar for EDP 605

Guest Jeff Reese (ED/Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology) explained the request. Schroeder **moved** to approve the one-time nonstandard calendar for EDP 605 and Wood **seconded**. After additional comments, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Advisory Committee on Disability Accommodation and Compliance (SACDAC) - Debra Harley, Chair

i. Endorsement of Universal Design

The Chair welcomed two guests, Debra Harley (ED/ Early Childhood, Special Education, & Rehabilitation Counseling, chair, Senate's Advisory Committee on Disability Accommodation and Compliance (SACDAC)) and Deborah Castiglione (Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching). Harley explained that the SACDAC's endorsement involved a recommendation that there be something formal to recognize the need for universal design considerations. She explained that accommodations such as changing test times or giving extended times to complete an exam were fairly routine at UK, but some types of instructional methodologies and access to certain technologies were challenging. She added that implementing aspects of universal design would be beneficial to all students, not just those with disabilities. Castiglione said that universal design would encourage faculty to investigate multiple ways to present course content so students select and choose those methods that would help them be most successful. An additional aspect of universal design is that it offers multiple ways to assess learning.

The Chair explained that the **motion** from SACDAC was a recommendation that the SC endorse the implementation of universal design. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was

required. He asked Castiglione to further explain what the endorsement would mean for the Center for Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT). Castiglione explained that there are no policies or structure on campus for universal design. If a student needs alternate access to course content and it is not provided, it could be grounds for a lawsuit. She said that in the prior year a student did not have access to course content because it was not captioned; it took two months of discussions to determine who would pay for the captioning expense and UK was fortunate that it did not lead to legal action. Castiglione opined that it should not take two months to help a student with a disability and that many schools are being sued for not providing course content in a way that all students can access. She said that many nonprofit organizations and the United States' Department of Justice were supportive of students who requested universal design accommodations. There was a relatively recent lawsuit against UK regarding the lack of closed captioning at Commonwealth Stadium which was resolved in favor of the complainant. The lack of universal design considerations is a known issue at UK and she was concerned that if UK did not become proactive it would be the next school in legal trouble. She noted that resolutions due to court action(s) were more expensive than if UK put things into place on its own.

Wood asked how a SC endorsement would help the matter. Harley said that SACDAC was looking at the current Senate policy on student accommodations and that universal design considerations could be added to the section in the *Senate Rules (SRs)* that pertains to student accommodations. Wood said that she supported the general premise but was concerned about who would pay for transcriptions, etc. and did not want to inadvertently take an action that would require individual departments to fund the various components of universal design. Castiglione explained that utilization of universal design was a top-down mandate at many schools, but in the absence of that at UK, she and others were attempting to create awareness of the situation and help faculty and administration to begin making decisions which would lay a groundwork. She said endorsement from SC could be shared with other entities to reinforce the critical good that universal design considerations would bring. She said the ultimate goal would be for the Provost's office to pay for universal design needs, not individual departments.

In response to a question from Porter, Castiglione further explained that universal design was not a cut-and-dried descriptor – it would depend on the type of class and the content matter. Captioning has been specifically called out due to so much reliance on video, in part because it would benefit many types of students, not just students who are hard of hearing. Closed captioning would allow students to access video content on a smart phone or other portable device. Grossman opined that there was a lot of faculty and administrative overlap in the issue of universal design and that it would be most useful for a joint faculty-administration body to review a variety of universal design-related considerations, not the least of which could be measures UK can take to encourage faculty to consider incorporating universal design into course design. Reid commented that endorsement would be a good first step for them to take to the Provost to start to demonstrate the support from affected groups and broaden the conversation to include those who do not have a direct stake in implementation of universal design components.

Blonder expressed concern that the requirements for universal design could fall on the faculty member who creates a course; use of technology, entertainment and design (TED) talks and YouTube videos are more and more common and she said she did not have the ability to caption those types of teaching tools. She wondered about additional issues, such as when captioning would need to be done, how she would know if she needed to do it, and how to resource the entire activity. Castiglione replied that the onus was currently on the faculty member, but if Provost Tracy provided funds, it could be resourced. She said there was a need to create future plans but the initial goal was funding for emergencies. Next

steps would include discussions with appropriate entities on discounts for captioning, as well as training students to do the work in-house.

The Chair commented that SC endorsement would send a message to the Provost that the SC agreed with SACDAC's suggestions and would like the Provost to investigate ways to do something about it. Brown said that eLearning Innovation Initiative (eLII) grants had specific requirements but that captioning was not one of them. He opined that the online environment was accessible now but that lacking captioning may destroy the accessibility that goes hand-in-hand with online learning. He was not sure how to actually caption a TED talk. It was a bit simpler if he creates a video of himself and knows in advance that it needs to be captioned; echo360 can assist with recording and automation is part of UK's Canvas system. Recording videos is much easier than captioning them. Castiglione responded that if a student is in a class and needs the accommodation of a transcript for a video, UK would be legally required to provide that; it is a legislative mandate that UK is not currently following. She said she and others wanted to make captioning as easy as possible for faculty but cannot do anything in that realm until senior leadership starts to pay attention to the issue and provide sufficient resources.

Kraemer said that he thought everyone present supported the general philosophy about ease of access; he said he was concerned about endorsing the concept and inadvertently implying that such activities should be processed through the SC or Senate. He also expressed concern about allowing students to choose pedagogy. Kraemer thought that the rules proposal for changes would indeed need to be routed through Senate, which could signal to the Provost that the funding needed to follow. He said he did not want the Provost to misread the endorsement of universal design as the creation of new *SR*.

The Chair stated that SACDAC's endorsement of universal design was certainly in line with that committee's charge, but said he did worry about the consequences of endorsing something that was not fully detailed. He wondered if SC would feel more comfortable about endorsement if there were more details about implementing universal design, as well as information on how the *SRs* would change if the endorsement were operationalized. He noted there was still a motion on the floor, from SACDAC, to recommend that the SC endorse the implementation of universal design. Grossman **moved to amend the motion** by changing "endorse" to "accept" and also add "and ask Provost Tracy to work with SACDAC to propose mechanisms by which the items proposed in the report can be more broadly disseminated among faculty, operationalized, and resourced." Grossman said the intent was to encourage people to think of these things but also do so realistically. Bailey **seconded**. There was additional discussion about who should be involved; Harley commented that SACDAC included representatives from the Disability Research Center, the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching, and the Equal Employment and Opportunity office, as well as the academic ombud. Grossman commented that SACDAC had the authority to include other individuals as resources.

Porter asked for an example of universal design, other than captioning. Castiglione said that students could be provided with a podcast of a lecture, as well as a written document, so the student could use the resource that most benefitted an auditory learner or a student who preferred to read content. Another form of universal design would be giving students the choice of a topic so a student could pick one that they are more comfortable with or know more about. Castiglione explained that universal design helps those with disabilities but is also concerned with giving all students the choices and options they need to succeed. Bailey asked what would happen if a faculty member had to spend thousands of dollars to upgrade materials to accommodate a student – he opined that if it happened to one of his classes, he would have to cancel the course entirely. He asked about how universal design would affect a field trip if one student had mobility problems. Harley explained that if a field trip was part of a class

assignment, the student with movement issues had the right to participate in the same activities as any other student in the class. The Disability Resource Center could assist with such a dilemma, possibly helping to identify an accessible vehicle so the mobility impaired student could participate, too. Castiglione suggested that universal design involved incorporating certain aspects into a course before it was needed. A specialized component would be described as “universal design” if it was built into the course; the same specialized component, if arranged for after the fact, would be considered “an accommodation.” There were additional comments from SC members. A **vote** was taken on the motion to amend and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

A **vote** was taken on the amended motion that the SC accept the SACDAC’s report on universal design and ask Provost Tracy to work with SACDAC to propose mechanisms by which the items proposed in report can be more greatly disseminated among faculty, operationalized, and resourced. The motion **passed** with none opposed and one abstained. McCormick noted that Brown chaired the Senate’s Committee on Distance Learning and eLearning and he might be a useful resource for SACDAC.

b. Senate Admissions Advisory Committee (SAAC) - Katherine McCormick, Chair

i. Final Report

McCormick noted that she and University Registrar (and associate provost for enrollment management) Don Witt had previously shared the information, but it had been in presentation format, not a written report. McCormick summarized that the Senate’s Academic Advising Committee (SAAC) recommended for fall 2016 an incoming freshman class of 5,150 and an average ACT score of 25.5.

There was discussion among SC members about how the SAAC works with administration to recommend enrollment and average ACT scores. Kraemer suggested that the SC see very detailed, comprehensive enrollment reports annually. He said he was not sure how many students were being admitted who by standards set by the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) were not prepared for college. He was concerned that the average ACT score hid the scores of students who are not prepared to be at UK. He said a report broken down by other demographics would be beneficial. Wood supported Kraemer’s comments, saying that quartiles and distributions were the key to understanding information. She referred in a complimentary way to Witt’s recent presentations to SC and Senate, which included box plots, mean, median, quartiles, and extremes. McCormick added that a good, additional goal for the 2016-17 year would be reviewing the participation of faculty in the awarding of scholarships. Reid suggested that the SAAC also look at the other attributes that a student brings with them to UK, in addition to test scores. She said that students cannot be defined by a singular aspect and that it would be interesting for SAAC to look into what qualifies a student for admission beyond a test score, which has not been quantified or described elsewhere.

The Chair noted that the Senate’s committee structure could be an item for discussion at the SC’s annual summer retreat. Wood **moved** to accept the SAAC’s report and Schroeder **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

c. Senate’s UK Core Education Committee (SUKCEC) - Karen Badger, Chair

i. UK Core Report

Guest Karen Badger, chair of the Undergraduate Council (UC) and of the Senate’s UK Core Education Committee (SUKCEC), gave a report to SC members on both UC and SUKCEC. Regarding UKCEC, Badger said it had been lacking a few area experts and there had been some courses in the queue for some time. At the present time, all area experts were in place and only five courses were awaiting UKCEC approval; she thought those five could be reviewed over the summer so UKCEC could start fresh in the

Senate Council
May 9, 2016

fall. Regarding the UC, Badger said that 289 individual proposals were reviewed and approved over the course of the academic year. Another 20 proposals were on the UC's agenda for the following day; if only half of them are approved, it would mean the UC exceeded the amount received and approved in any prior year. Badger reviewed the general statuses of a few of the UC's pending proposals. She said having SC deadlines for processing curricular approvals was very helpful in the planning process, although procrastinators seemed to come out of the woodwork at the end of the year, resulting in the UC being slammed at year's end. In response to a question from McCormick, Badger opined that the UC needed more members – some colleges were completely unrepresented and there were only 11 individuals in place to review proposals.

Grossman suggested that at the UC's summer retreat, it spend a little time on proposing changes to the *Senate Rules (SRs)* to change the size and composition of the UC to better carry out its duties. Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), commented that many program proposers were frustrated with the review process by the time their proposals reached the SAPC. Schroeder acknowledged that the UC was shorthanded, but wondered if there were any possible fixes. Badger commented, and Schroeder concurred, that one big problem was contact persons who are not engaged or responsive. Badger explained that the UC recently approved a proposal that was first reviewed by the UC in August 2015 – it was May 2016 before the contact person delivered the requested information! Badger also commented that there would be 10 new members on the UC, which would be a large learning curve and could slow down the approval process temporarily. She said that training would be offered at the summer retreat and that a new member was always paired with a seasoned member to help with onboarding. Another problem the UC encounters is that the *SRs* prohibit faculty from serving a second consecutive term.

Grossman **moved** to waive *SR 1.3.3.4* ("Undergraduate Council," "Terms and Vacancies") to allow the chair of the UC to identify up to five current members to be allowed to serve an additional three-year term. Bailey **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The Chair suggested, and Badger confirmed, that the UC would propose revisions to the *SRs* to accommodate a number of membership-related issues.

Badger then moved to a few of issues related to the UK Core curriculum. She explained that a subset of UKCEC had been formed to look into how to increase the diversity-related experiences that students get from UK Core. The growing sentiment was that learning about diversity was a developmental process and that a requirement for a single course will not create the change that UK needs. Students need opportunities for experiential, hands-on activities and ways in which to develop self-awareness and increase the number of interactions with diverse groups. One tangential issue is that UK accepts as transfer credits the work conducted for general education at another Kentucky university. Even if UK Core is adapted to improve diversity education, transfer students will not be affected due to the transfer agreements already in place. Badger said that it seemed more likely that there would be a tiered approach, such as an introductory-type class, followed by a course that follows up on the concepts introduced earlier in the curriculum. She said the diversity issue would be on the UKCEC's retreat agenda this summer. She said it was likely there would be a forum in the fall for faculty and students to offer their ideas, too.

Badger also related the UKCEC's intent to prevent double dipping within the major. She explained that some programs and majors were creating UK Core courses within a major so that students could take once course and satisfy both a program requirement and a UK Core requirement. Such courses have prerequisites that mean the courses are closed to any students other than those enrolled in that

particular major or program. There will be no movement backwards, but in the future, UKCEC will not allow UK Core courses to have prerequisites that limit the diversity of programs represented in an individual course. She also said that UKCEC was not likely to approve any additional 500-level UK Core courses – UK Core should be something completed earlier on in a student’s academic career. In alignment with these sentiments, she was happy to report that the Department of Philosophy was already developing a 300-level course on race and privilege. She said UKCEC would send out a call for diversity-related courses to all colleges.

Grossman encouraged Badger to reach out to certain involved students, such as the representatives of UK’s Black Professional and Graduate Student organization. Reid offered to send Badger the contact information for some relevant students who would be interested in engaging with UKCEC about diversity-related courses.

5. Nominees for Honors College Transition Committee

The Chair thanked SC members and senators who had sent in nominations of senators to serve on the Honors College Transition Committee (HCTC). He noted that the nominees identified by SC will be the SC’s nominees – the SC was not suggesting names to Provost Tim Tracy, but rather was identifying the two who will serve on the HCTC. [The Provost’s appointees must be appointed in consultation with the SC.] SC members reviewed a handout of nominees sent in by senators, which included a brief rationale for the nomination and a note about whether the individual was nominated by more than one senator. SC members evaluated the rationales, as well as an appropriate mix of college representation. During discussion, SC members emphasized that nominees should be faculty with experience teaching in Honors.

SC members discussed the 11 senator nominees at length, eventually deciding upon two senators from two different colleges. SC members offered a third nominee and the Chair said that if the first two individuals were unable or unwilling to serve, he would go to the third senators identified by SC as a good fit for the HCTC. There were no objections to this plan.

The Chair then said that Provost Tracy had shared the Provost’s proposed nominees, from three categories: Honors faculty of record nominees, department chair nominees, and Provost’s representative nominees. The Chair asked that SC members keep the names of the proposed nominees confidential, because they had not been contacted and were not official nominees. SC members had no comments or suggestions about the Provost’s representatives, although there was significant discussion regarding the Honors faculty of record nominees and department chair nominees. Multiple SC members commented that many of the Provost’s nominees were at the associate dean level, which did not reflect the sentiment of the SAOSC’s recommendation¹ that the HCTC be comprised primarily of faculty. There was extensive discussion regarding who the SC believed to be appropriate nominees for the HCTC; SC members were concerned with college diversity and racial diversity of the overall HCTC, as well as

¹ [SAOSC’s recommendation, approved by the University Senate on April 11, 2016: “The Honors Transition Committee should 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 (6 from the current Honors Faculty of Record, 4 Department Chairs, 1 Honors undergraduate student, 2 elected University Senators, and 2 representatives of the Provost). The committee 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”.]

ensuring that HCTC members were faculty who had taught in the Honors program, or who had current or previous experience as a department chair.

One SC member strongly advocated for a representative of a certain college who was an associate dean. Other SC members were wary of including an associate dean on a faculty-led committee, even though it would mean that college would not be directly represented on the HCTC. SC members ultimately agreed to recommend that Provost Tracy replace three of his six nominees from the Honors program faculty of record with other Honors program faculty of record. Regarding the Provost's suggestions for department chairs, the SC recommended that one of the two suggested department chairs be replaced by a current or former department chair from the College of Arts and Sciences (AS); SC members had no suggestion as to the specific AS department chair nominee.

6. Senate Meeting Roundtable

a. Provisional Approvals

SC members discussed the proposals that were on the Senate's May meeting agenda, but which were not reviewed or voted on due to lack of quorum. Brown opined that while the SC cannot change the *SRs* on its own, it can waive a rule(s) and then in the vacuum of policy the SC can fill it with something else. Wood likened it to things being provisionally approved by SC, until the Senate reviews and approves them in September.

Brown **moved** to waive *Senate Rules 5.4.3.1* ("Composition and Communication") and allow the proposed policies (as described in the Senate's agenda items) to be in effect provisionally until the Senate discusses it at the September Senate meeting. Porter **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Porter **moved** that the SC waive *Senate Rules 4.2.2.1* ("Admission to College of Nursing") and *Senate Rules 4.2.3.3* ("College of Medicine") and allow the proposed policies (as described in the Senate's agenda items) to be in effect provisionally until the Senate discusses it at the September Senate meeting. Wood **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

SC members agreed that the remaining two agenda items from the May meeting² could not be provisionally approved by SC and would have to wait until the September Senate meeting for any action.

7. SC Retreat Planning

SC members discussed possible agenda items for the retreat. Below is the list of topics that were mentioned.

- Senate's committee structure
- Academic and curricular functions of units in Undergraduate Education being reorganized
- Philanthropy-based name changes of educational units
- Status of the Graduate School and update on whether or not changes are being proposed
- Improving the curricular approval process and update on Curriculog
- Faculty trustee election process

² "Proposed Changes to *Administrative Regulations 2:10* ("Voluntary Series Faculty") and "Title IX Language - Proposed Addition to Syllabus Template/Guidelines"

Senate Council
May 9, 2016

8. Discussion on Senate's Role in Undergraduate Education's Curricular Functions

McCormick opined that the SC needed to discuss how Provost Tim Tracy's reorganization of Undergraduate Education will affect the roles, activities, and curricular and academic processes of the affected units. There were no objections to having a robust discussion at the retreat.

9. Other Business (Time Permitting)

The Chair asked Wood to give an update on the 2015-16 faculty evaluation of President Eli Capilouto. Wood said that she received 710 responses and went on to explain that she spent a significant amount of time ensuring that anyone can perform the faculty's evaluation in the future. She automated the survey so in the future someone can visit the Applied Statistics Lab and run an SAS program, after which the results will be readily available. Wood also said she had created a PowerPoint template into which the output graphs could be inserted. She said she included only the prior year with the current year's results and that some of her students were currently working on adding in details such as error bars.

Wood explained that in all questions in the survey, there was a slight shift to the positive. She said it was too much information to put all four years' worth of data into each graph. In response to a question from Bailey, Wood said that there was a steady trend to the positive for every year's responses; she was amazed at how constant the response rate was from last year to the present year and though the data was pretty clear. There were additional questions and comments from SC members.

Given the time, Wood **moved** to adjourn and Porter **seconded**. SC members voted with their feet and the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Hippisley,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Bailey, Blonder, Brown, Grossman, Hippisley, Kraemer, McCormick, Porter, Reid, Schroeder, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Deborah Castiglione, Debra Harley, and Jeff Reese.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, June 7, 2016.