

Senate Council
November 7, 2016

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm in 103 Main Building on Monday, November 7, 2016. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hand unless indicated otherwise.

Senate Council Chair Katherine M. McCormick called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

1. Minutes from October 24, 2016 and Announcements

The Chair reported that there were a few editorial changes to the minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from October 24 were **approved** as amended by **unanimous consent**.

The Chair offered a few announcements.

- Progress has been made on identifying individuals to serve as chairs of various University Senate (Senate) committees. Brad Lee has accepted the position of chair of the Senate's Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC). Joe Iocono has accepted the position of chair of the Senate's Institutional Finance and Resource Allocation Committee (SIFRAC). One Senate committee remains without a chair and will be addressed by the Chair in the near future.
- The ad hoc Committee on Administrative Regulations 6:2 has met twice and is off to a good start.
- The Chair attended a meeting of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) earlier in the day – the topic of discussion was how professional degrees and programs interplay with graduate offerings. The Chair indicated that SAPC would likely have a proposal for SC to review in the near future.

2. Old Business

a. Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC) – Scott Yost, Chair

i. Proposed Admissions Requirement Change for BHS in Clinical Leadership and Management
Guest Scott Yost, chair of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC), reminded SC members about the details of the proposal that caused concern when it was first presented to the SC. There was one query about where the proposal indicated suggestions for UK Core courses but the information was contained on a separate page.

There being no additional questions, the Chair announced that the **motion** from the SAASC was a recommendation that the Senate approve the proposed changes to the BHS in Clinical Leadership and Management. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

Schroeder **moved** to amend the agenda to move to Committee Reports and Mazur **seconded**. There being no discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

3. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) – Margaret Schroeder, Chair

i. Proposed Suspension of BS International Studies

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal. There was brief discussion about the home academic unit as listed on the form – the University does not have a department of international studies. Guest Bosch (AS/English, associate dean for undergraduate

programs) said she would send a revised form in within 24 hours. Grossman was reassured by Bosch that the International Studies program does have a functioning faculty of record.

The motion from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve the suspension of admission into the BS in International Studies, in the Department of International Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

b. Nominees for External Review Committees

The Chair explained that she had sent a query for more information about external review committee nominees and had not yet heard back. She suggested the SC move to the other nominees and there were no objections.

c. Academic Area Advisory Committees and other Committee Vacancies

i. Academic Computing Committee

ii. University Appeals Board

iii. Senate Hearing Panel (Privilege and Tenure)

iv. Academic Area Advisory Committee for the Physical and Engineering Sciences

v. Academic Area Advisory Committee Health Care Clinical Sciences

SC members discussed committee nominations and identified the requisite number of nominees for each committee.

(3. Committee Reports)

ii. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Engineering in Healthcare

Schroeder explained the proposal. Guest David Pienkowski (EN/Biomedical Engineering) was present but there were no questions from SC members. The **motion** from the SAPC was a recommendation to approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Engineering in Healthcare, in the Department of Biomedical Engineering within the College of Engineering. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was required. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed.

4. Tentative Senate Agenda for November 14, 2016

SC members discussed the tentative Senate agenda and removed a couple items and reordered the items under "Committee Reports." Although SC members did not vote on the agenda, there were no objections to the revisions discussed.

(2. Old Business)

d. Canvas and Retention Efforts – Associate Provost for Academic Excellence Operations Kirsten Turner

Guest Kirsten Turner, associate provost for academic excellence operations, discussed with SC members a desire on the part of leadership to improve retention efforts. Turner explained that there is technology available to pull grade- and other student-related data from Canvas so faculty do not have to manually send out academic alerts. If faculty volunteer to participate in the initiative, they can set up parameters in Canvas to automatically send academic alerts if X happens or if Y happens. Any faculty member can volunteer to participate, but Turner noted that it might be particularly helpful for faculty who teach large courses – instead of manually sending out 150 academic alerts, Canvas could do it automatically. Turner emphasized more than once that this would only take place if a faculty member wants to volunteer – a faculty member who wants to participate needs to opt in and ask to have the parameters set up. The alert would be generated and then the appropriate student advisor would be notified with subsequent feedback provided to the faculty. A full feedback loop would be facilitated by this process.

In response to Grossman, she clarified that there were standard criteria already established for academic alerts but she would have to check to see if faculty can set additional criteria. Lauersdorf asked if the faculty member would know if an alert was sent and Turner said she would check on that. Turner stated that one problem with the current academic alert system was that it did not offer a good feedback loop to faculty. She said she had taught classes and sent alerts and did not feel there was a strong feedback alert back to her.

There were additional questions and comments from SC members, but there did not appear to be any opposition to the initiative. Turner said that the initiative was in its early stages and small steps were being taken to determine if it was worthwhile to fully pursue. Blonder asked about how faculty would be informed about the opportunity and Turner explained that deans and associate deans were aware of it and it was expected that they would further share with faculty. Turner noted that the initiative would not be widely announced until the bugs were worked out.

Turner explained that there was an additional effort to integrate behavioral alerts and academic alerts to create more of a coherent case management system for students in need of assistance. Having a more integrated process would allow for a scenario in which an RA could receive an alert, knock on a student's door, and initiate a conversation about, for example, why the student had not been to any classes in the past week. She said the overall intent was to make the alerts less siloed and create a stronger profile of what was happening in a student's life. It is common for a student's behavioral issues to feed into academic issues and vice versa – the intent is to have a fuller picture to better help a student in need.

Moving to another topic, Turner said that a small group was looking at the final examination schedule, primarily due to a student having been robbed at night when walking on campus from a nighttime final exam. She said the intent was to decrease the number of night final exams for students, although it was well known that many large classes needed to hold exams at night. The intent was to check on classes with less than 100 students that had nighttime exams. One particular department on campus had a long-standing practice of offering their final exams at night for classes of 30 students, but there was no real reason for it other than habit and tradition. It was not feasible to make any changes for fall 2016, but the small group was looking at the possibility of changes for the spring 2017 semester.

SC members were mostly amenable to further discussions about final exam changes for smaller-sized classes, but emphasized the importance of consulting with departmental faculty before creating a standardized administrative rule that permits nighttime exams only for classes with very large enrollments. In response to a suggestion from Blonder, Turner said she was working with UK Police on the issue, too, as well as working to get a heat map on where the nighttime exams were located and try to have increased patrols in the corridors between exam sites and residence halls.

5. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

Grossman raised an issue that was brought to his and Blonder's attention. A faculty member gave an assignment about video and social media and one of the students who turned in their assignment included the student verbally abusing the faculty member. The issue the faculty member raised was that the UK employees responsible for addressing possible violations of the student code determined that because the assignment was submitted online, it did not constitute interrupting a class and that the verbally abusive speech was okay due to it being free speech. Grossman and Blonder offered additional

Senate Council
November 7, 2016

details about the situation. SC members discussed the issue and offered opinions about various aspects of the situation.

Mazur offered comments about her recent experience in preparing a syllabus for a course proposal. While Mazur thought Curriculog was far superior to eCATS, she said it took her far more time to figure out what she needed to have in her syllabus than it took to enter the course proposal into Curriculog. Mazur explained that she searched for syllabus requirements and came up with seven different templates/checklists/formats, even though all of them were primarily the same. Ms. Brothers commented that the Undergraduate Council (UC) was charged with evaluating a proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences to limit the extent to which syllabi were reviewed as a part of a course proposal and part of that charge included the possibility of the UC developing a single syllabus-related guide for faculty.

There being no further items for discussion, Grossman **moved** to adjourn and Lauersdorf **seconded**. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. McCormick,
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Blonder, Grossman, Lauersdorf, McCormick, Mazur, Mills, Porter, Reid, Schroeder, Stekardis, and Wood.

Invited guests present: Anna Bosch, Monica Diaz, Geza Bruckner, David Pienkowski, Kirsten Turner, and Scott Yost.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, November 16, 2016.