

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

APRIL 11, 2016

* * * *

* * * *

ANDREW HIPPI SLEY, CHAIR

KATHERINE MCCORMICK, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

* * * *

* * * *

HIPPI SLEY: Welcome everyone to today's meeting. Let's get started. Please make sure you have your clickers. Okay. Five second count down. Five, four, three, two, one. Good. Grace Dai is in the back. Grace, can you identify yourself? She's standing in as sergeant of arms today. She'll help with clickers and all sorts of other things.

So unless there are objections now, the minutes from March 21st, 2016 stand approved and distributed by unanimous consent.

I'd like to briefly mention the

UK4-11-16.txt

faculty evaluation of the President. Connie, would you like to say a few things about reminders for us about that?

WOOD: Everyone should have -- who has not responded to the survey should have gotten a reminder about an hour ago. It will -- the survey will close, probably will not technically be closed until very early a week from tomorrow morning. I will be sending out another reminder sometime a week from today. So far, I think there have only been 500 responses.

HI PPI SLEY: Thank you, Connie. There are currently some courses and program changes on the web transmittal. So please do your senator citizen duty and take a look at those, make sure you're okay with them.

At the end of second semester, after eight years courses are purged and that will be announced too which ones are going to go. Look at those too because you may think that should not be going. All right. If it's not used for eight years it goes automatically without anyone stopping it, unless you stop it.

Okay. There is an update on -- I'll hand it over to Connie again, who conducted this election. Connie.

WOOD: The first round of voting for faculty trustee election ended at noon today. The three top vote getters were Lee Blonder, Terry Connors, and Patrick McGrath. We plan to have the second round of voting starting a week from tomorrow and you will all, who are eligible to vote, will be getting a reminder then.

HI PPI SLEY: Thank you very much. Thank you for all the hard work on the SREC conducting this election.

Kate, our wonderful parliamentarian told us way in advance that she couldn't make the May 2nd meeting, so Kelly Vickery has stepped up and he will be parliamentarian for one day. Thank you, Kelly.

Thank you for all the people who responded to the email for nominees for these various area committees and other kinds of committees. This is really the way faculty can participate in shared governance by populating the committees, but first they have to be nominated.

So we've got over 60, I think. It must be something of a record. And a lot of you put down why that person should serve on the committee. So that was excellent to get that and Senate

Council on Monday likely will decide who they should be and we will announce that on May the 2nd.

About a month, a few weeks ago, we had the public art forum in here and as many people as are in the room right now is more or less the number of people that showed up at that, maybe a few, fewer. So it went extremely well as a good first step.

Okay. So I'd like to hand over to Katherine to tell us about something exciting.

McCORMICK: Yes, we have the opportunity to nominate the outstanding senator for this year. Lee Blonder and Roger Brown joined me in this work and here are the requirements. We would like someone who has contributed to the senate by showing active and dependable service, has made noble substantive contributions to communicate with the senate and while working with the faculty at large on important issues that impact the faculty as a whole. Has given strong voice to faculty issues in senate meetings, public events and/or local and regional news media and actively defended the principle of shared governance in university (inaudible). And finally, that person should be effective in generating and effecting the senate's larger agenda and goals.

So we need your nominations quickly because there are various activities that need to happen before May the 2nd, which is our next and last senate meeting this year. So please forward those to me quickly and I apologize for the short turnaround, but I would like those by 5:00 p.m. next week.

ROHR: Rohr, Pharmacy.
Can we do that now, the nomination, right now?

McCORMICK: I prefer to have it in writing so that I -- you can give me a sense of who it is. Let's wait. If you don't mind. All right.

HIPPISLEY: And let me clear it up. Eligibility constraint on senate council on council members. Senate council members are fantastic, but in this particular contest they're not allowed.

GROSSMAN: That's current senate council members.

TAGAVI: Just to be sure, senators.
It's not any faculty, it's senate, right?

BRIAN: Either have been a senator or currently a senator.

GROSSMAN: Yes.

TAGAVI: Which one?

GROSSMAN: Either.
HIPPI SLEY: Anything else, Katherine?
McCORMICK: No.
HIPPI SLEY: No. That's it?
GROSSMAN: It's for senators, but it may be a senator whose time has ended.
Okay?
HIPPI SLEY: Parliamentary report, Kate?
SEAGO: No report.
HIPPI SLEY: Trustees, anything?
WILSON: I don't think we have anything specific to report. As to the budget, we know what we read in the Herald-Leader. So it's not any different than (inaudible). I would want to encourage people to respond to the evaluation of the President.
Over the last four or five years, this has been something that's been added to the plate of the President's evaluation and it is actively discussed by the executive committee. So your words are heard at that point and they -- in many ways this is a particularly good opportunity for the trustees to hear the will of the larger faculty. So please do take the time, seriously.
JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.
To what extent, I guess maybe you've answered it here. To what extent does the administration keep the trustees briefed, even if it's brief, on -- on what's happening to the budget in real time?
WILSON: Actively speaking, we will get a notice, we will be sent the e-mail that is sent to all of you two or three hours before. That's pretty much the standard procedure right now.
GROSSMAN: Yeah, sometimes if there's -- if we're meeting anyway for another purpose, we'll get some information that hasn't been made public yet, but -- except for that. But we haven't had a meeting in awhile now, so...
WILSON: It's been a couple of months since we had a meeting. Yes?
WHITAKER: Mark Whitaker, A and S.
There was an article in the Herald-Leader that made it seem like the House had managed to get the Senate to agree to a 2 percent cut, but then the Presidents, with Governor Bevin, got together and agreed to a 4, 4 and a half percent cut. Is that right?
GROSSMAN: You know as well as we do.
WILSON: I found that article also puzzling. It's difficult to know what the reality is on that one. That's all I will say at this time.
WHITAKER: Okay. Just thought I would ask.

WILSON: At some point we will know.

Okay.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you, Trustees. Okay.

So this candidate for degrees list, this is not the degree list that's coming out up May, the May 2016. These are various students who for some reason or other didn't get onto a degree list, when they were meant to, through administrative error. I just want to say, we've seen this many times before and discussion is great, but we've got lots and lots of things to do today as well as talk about these things.

So I am going to ask two people from the two different colleges which represent the full list to come and talk to us about these students. And the first one will be from the graduate school. Is there a representative from the graduate school here perhaps or anybody from the graduate school? No one from the graduate school. All right. Well, we can't do this if no one's going to present.

Can we do it on behalf of graduate school for senate council, shall we do it? All right. So this first one, let me try and remember it. It was just basically a filing error as far as I'm concerned. I can see it was meant to happen in December 2015, but they filed it in the wrong box. I think it was as easy as that.

So this is the motion, you saw it on the agenda as well. Anyone want to discuss this motion? Hearing none.

GROSSMAN: And this is the elective faculty only.

HIPPISLEY: Elected faculty only, please. Thank you, Bob. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. 67, 4 and one abstention. Sheila, you do your magic now or we wait? Five people clicked when they shouldn't have.

All right. Another student, this is JB 86. It seems to be parallel. The degree is different. You can see (inaudible) studies, MA. Okay. Anyone want to discuss this? Questions? Hearing none. Let's vote. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay. That's good. All right. Motion carries. Okay.

Now, we do, I think, have a representative from Arts and Sciences, Ruth.

BEATTIE: The first of these is a student that originally applied for her degree in May of 2015. The student did not complete the degree requirements and was informed in June of '15 that she would need to reapply for an August degree.

There is no record that the student applied for her arts degree. We have neither a hard copy or an electronic copy of that application. This student maintains that she turned in a degree application and when she talked to her advisor and asked when her diploma would be available was told that diplomas are normally sent out about three months after the degree dates. When the student forwarded her transcript to them there was no evidence of the degree on it and when her diploma didn't arrive, she contacted us. So, the student is now requesting that we petition on her behalf for her degree to be a degree in fashion arts and international studies be awarded for August of 20.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. Discussion? Hearing none, let's vote. Five, four, three, two, one. 58 for, 2 against and 3 abstain. The motion carries.

BEATTIE: This next one is the student had been awarded one degree in December of 2013 and had applied for a second degree in May of 2014. The student missed the deadline for submitting the online application for the degree and so submitted an April application for degree.

This time period overlapped with the time when paper applications were being accepted for the next term and the May 2014 degree application got misfiled and so the student was not awarded the degree. So we're petitioning that the student be awarded the bachelor of science degree now for May of 2014.

HIPPISLEY: Any questions of Arts and Sciences? Hearing none. We'll vote. Five, four, three, two, one. 64, 1 against, and 0 abstain.

BEATTIE: In this case, the student was pursuing a BA in Psychology with a second major in German. The original degree application as filed for a December 2013 degree. The student did not complete requirements in time and so application was submitted for May of 2015 instead and the BA in Psychology with a double major in German was awarded. The student, after she got this degree, came back and said she actually thought she had applied for dual degree, not a double major and that she had, in fact, changed her program from a double major to a dual degree. We had no paperwork that shows that that program change took place. However, the student in the meantime has contacted the registrar's office and asked about the German degree, was told that the

German degree would be awarded, but that the diploma was damaged and would have to be reordered. The student never received her degree.

So the requirements for the second degree had been met, and based on this, we are petitioning the rescinding of the Bachelor of Arts Psychology with a double major in German degree dated May of 2015 and awarding of the Bachelor of Arts German May 2015 and the Bachelor of Arts Psychology May 2015.

HI PPI SLEY: Any questions? Five, four, three, two, one. 64, 2 against and zero abstention. Motion carries.

BEATTIE: In this case, the student was awarded a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology with a second degree in Sociology in December of 2009. The student re-enrolled at UK in January of 2014 as an engineering major and then -- and at that time, the student's readmission profile, which every student has when they're admitted to the University, did not show that the student had earned any college level course work, let alone a degree.

The student then changed the degree from an engineering degree to a BA in Psychology. The staff member entering that degree change into SAP went ahead and processed that change. The SAP program change did not indicate that the student had previously been awarded a degree in Psychology.

A couple of months later, the student then declared a BS in Sociology and changed the BA in Psychology to a BS in Psychology.

According to senate rules, a student cannot earn two degrees in the same major. The student was able to successfully submit an online degree application through myuk. In May of 2014, the Bachelor of Science Sociology Degree, which was then awarded in May of 2015, and this was approved and this student received the diploma and so on.

And then, in -- the student then submitted an online degree education for a Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology in December of 2015.

At that point in time, it was discovered that this student now has -- was looking for a second degree in Psychology and also had been awarded a degree in Sociology when they previously had a major in Sociology.

The student has completed all of the degree requirements for both degrees. So we are petitioning that the BA in Psychology and the double major in

Sociology dated December 20, 2009 be rescinded and that the student be awarded a BA in Psychology dated December 2009 and a BS in Sociology dated May 2015 be awarded.

HIPPISLEY: Any questions for Ruth? Five, four, three, two, one.

GROSSMAN: I have one question. Have these limitations in the software been addressed so that if a student has previously earned a degree and comes back and says I want to earn another degree, we'll know that they have a previous degree?

BEATTIE: We've made some inquiries about getting it fixed as to at least having it show up in things like Apex. I mean, Apex didn't show, you know, the student had already been awarded a degree. So, you know, with the new -- the new system we're...

WITT: Yeah, I'd be happy to address that. We're working right now to replace the very antiquated Apex degree audit system that will address a lot of the issues that were causing these erroneous errors.

So what will happen, we'll be rolling out -- and some of the college is already testing this. Apex will be replaced with myukgps and that stands for Graduating Planning System. It's much more robust. So it will be fully integrated with SAP. And so I think the difference will be that Apex really was for the third-party vendor solution. And I think this is going to take care of all the issues in a very nice manner.

GROSSMAN: Note that all of the issues are being taken care of, according to Don Witt.

HIPPISLEY: So 59 for, 3 against, and two abstentions. Katherine?

MCCORMICK: I do have -- do you have a policy in terms of how far back you would think to go? 2009 is a good while ago. So I mean, I'm just curious.

BEATTIE: I think this one is unusual. Normally, when we've got three petitions, it's normally within the last 12 months. But because the student had earned the BS in Sociology, we thought it was appropriate.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you very much, Ruth. Thank you. Okay. So we start with a few committee reports and we will begin as tradition has it with our SAPC Academic Program Committee, Margaret Schroeder.

SCHROEDER: All right. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate: Research

Methods in Education in the Department of Educational Policy and Evaluation within the College of Education.

The research methods in education graduate certificate is a product of an eLII grant. It provides students with a background in quantitative methods, evaluation, measurement and assessment in the field of education, developing knowledge in education research methods allows students from outside of the college to learn methods they can use in their academic and professional work.

Enrolled students will learn to apply a range of research methods, techniques, and conscripts to real world settings, issues, and data sets.

The graduate certificate is designed for students interested in education research methods, but who are not in the proposed MS research in methods. Research methods in education program is a 15 credit hour program, all online, asynchronous format. It has all the necessary components for a graduate certificate. Are there any questions?

HIPPISLEY: No questions. Move to vote.
No amendments. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay. Motion carries 67 for, zero abstentions, and zero objects. Second report.

SCHROEDER: This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Nutrition for Human Performance in the Department of Human Health Sciences within the College of Health Sciences.

This is a 14 credit hour undergraduate certificate. It is an interdisciplinary certificate with the College of Health Sciences, College of Education, and College of Agricultural, Food and Environment.

The practice area of Nutrition for Human Performance continues to grow and has sparked interest in students pursuing undergraduate degrees in not only Nutrition, but also Kinesiology and Health Promotion in Human Health Sciences.

The undergraduate certificate focuses on the integration of nutrition and exercise to properly support physical activity, fitness, and athletic performance at all levels from those just starting an exercise program to elite lead athletes and those recovering from injury.

It also provides students with a cross-disciplinary knowledge of the relationship between exercise

physiology, nutrition, and overall wellness.

The program is 14 total credit hours and it meets all the proper requirements for an undergraduate certificate at UK. Are there any questions?

HIPPISLEY: Hearing none, let's move to vote. There are no amendments. Five, four, three, two, one. It's 68 for, 1 against, one abstention. Number three.

SCHROEDER: All right. This one, we're going to consider collectively together. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve for the submission to the Board of Trustees, the deletion of six existing BA/BS degrees: Classics, Japanese Language and Literature, Russian, French, German, and Chinese Language and Literature in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages, Literature, and Cultures within the College of Arts and Sciences.

A year and a half ago, we already approved the new programs that replace these existing degree programs. This was the deletion of these. And the creation of the new ones was a product of an external review of that department and college. They responded to that. This is just a simple clean up procedure. There's no students to teach, (inaudible) has already been approved. Any questions?

HIPPISLEY: Five, four, three, two, one. 69 for, zero opposed, and 2 abstains. Thank you, Margaret. In case we don't see you on May the 2nd, thanks for all the work you've done.

SCHROEDER: Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Okay. I would like to invite Ernie Bailey, who is Chair for Academic Organization and Structure Committee to talk about his proposals.

BAILLEY: So we've had an Honors program since 1961 at the University of Kentucky. In October of last year, the Lewis Foundation donated \$23,000,000, big splash in the paper, and we've had lots of discussion on that since in order to convert that to a college.

And so there's a proposal that was constructed the faculty of record, by Ben Withers, by Diane Snow, by a committee selected to look at the proposal, and basically they made a recommendation that a college be formed, faculty be formed, a dean be selected, and they've also offered a wide range of options that the dean needs to establish the new college.

We went and I think we also had an open forum at one time and collected

UK4-11-16.txt

some comments. Following that, they responded to the comments by providing some amendments, not amendments, an addendum to basically clarify some issues.

Our committee, the Academic Organization and Structure Committee reviewed it. We met on March 23rd to discuss and talked about the proposal for about two hours. We were impressed that -- I mean this is somewhat obvious, a Honors College is very attractive to students who would like to have a small setting, small classes, contact with faculty members, and it's a recruitment tool that's attractive to both students and faculty.

One of the other aspects that we were particularly impressed with was its ability to enhance the recruitment and programs in other colleges. And so it was really both of that. So that's why I would emphasize that that was attractive to us and was expressed in the proposal.

The proposal really didn't come along with a lot of details and that has bothered a lot of us who've had discussions. Who are the faculty going to be, where's the class going to be, and that was, I think, largely deliberate.

The people who were framing this wanted us, the faculty, to have a lot of say in what we constructed. It was very frustrating for us reviewing this because we couldn't pin down any particular facts. But in looking at it, it comes down -- if you look at the memo that is attached, appended to the agenda, it came down to a couple of points. Two points really. One is, they're asking us to recommend the creation of the Lewis Honors College, approve the leadership by a dean and governance by the faculty of the college. Who is the dean? Who's the faculty?

The second part of the proposal is to create an Honors Transition Committee that will design a class structure which will subsequently be reviewed by the Senate. So we were actually quite happy when we realized this because we could not pin down what is the structure in it.

So the proposal before us really is do we want to have an Honors College? And two, what is the Transition Committee going to be (inaudible). So we asked also for responses from all of the deans and from all of the faculty councils and

UK4-11-16.txt

overwhelmingly, people were in support. There was no one who said we don't want to do this.

There were lots of comments about, however, if you do it has to be like this. You have to pay attention to sustainability. Lots of questions about sustainability. Lots of questions about who the faculty would be, but there was -- it just was not controversial to have an Honors College; it was how do we do it.

So what we did is we made a recommendation to the Senate, then to the Senate Council. The Senate Council passed it on to you. And I'll just read through this to the second item. This is the thing where I think that we need to put our fingerprints on.

Create an Honors Transition Committee to design precise structure for subsequent review by the Senate in the fall of 2016. So we want this committee to come back with details.

And what we recommended was that the Honors Transition Committee be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the University Senate Council, college deans, and it should be broadly representative of the University of Kentucky's community.

That was another big concern was that this not be an isolated program, but that it involve the entire campus. The recommended composition, our committee went back and forth to the Senate Council is fifteen members and what we suggested is six from the current Honors faculty of record, four department chairs, and we wanted department chairs there because department chairs have a sense of structure which perhaps the faculty don't appreciate always. At least they don't think they do. And one Honors undergraduate student should be on the committee, two elected University senators and two representatives from the Provost, since it's his committee, he should have some input into (inaudible).

We want the committee to consult with the entire Honors faculty, with the chairs on the senate committees academic organization and structure, academic programs, academic (inaudible) and priorities in order to put together a good proposal.

And the charge that we want to make to the committee is one, to assist in the recruitment of the a new dean for the Honors College, Lewis Honors College and they are constrained by (inaudible).

They have a contract and the contract stipulates that a dean will be hired by 2017, January 2017.

The committee would also determine the overall composition for the faculty of the Honors College and a regulatory structure to govern the faculty eligibility and involvement, consider staffing for the college, determine criteria for participating and governance of the college, determine the -- how to ensure diversity.

And this was another big issue that came up. How are we going to ensure that we have ethnic diversity? How are we going to ensure that this is not a program that is just for the economically well off? What programs should be in place so that students who perhaps are the first ones in their family to participate in education be included.

So Dr. Withers and Dr. Snow actually came back with a strong recommendation of a number of things we could do to address that and we'd like to see that in the proposal. Recommend on how to ensure effective consultation of the Honors College dean and the faculty with the deans of other colleges and the faculty participating in the program.

This was a big deal because we were concerned that -- that basically the students that are in the Honors College, it is not a degree producing program. They were all getting degrees in other colleges and we'd like the other colleges to see this as a resource to benefit their programs. And so there needs to be a lot of (inaudible). Assess the plans for economic sustainability of the Honors College. And the provost provided, I think, a layout about how the funds would be spent. A large part of that also depends on support from the other colleges. So we'd like to see that (inaudible). Recommend an initial Honors faculty of record. We would like to have that by the fall of 2016 because we'd like the program to start quickly and we would also like the transition committee to transition off, not be involved. And the sooner we can have a faculty of record that is involved in making these decisions the better.

And finally, identify how to ensure success for the college, as well as provide a unique educational opportunity to students. So those are the charges. That is what we would like the committee to come back with.

HIPPISLEY: So you can see the motion tries to capture the fact that there are the most high recommendations from Ernie so you can see that the motion is the creation of a new, a new Lewis Honors College incorporated the foundation outlined in the memo that Ernie just read out.

And as Ernie said, making it very explicit that part of the recommendation is getting from where we go now to getting to that point through transition committee. So the motion is also agreeing to the charge and composition of that transition committee.

The motion is on the floor. Will there be any second before I take your questions.

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. I want to clarify. The faculty that are on the transition committee will not be the faculty of record for the college, that if you serve on that committee, do you transition off? Is that --

BAILEY: That's not part of the recommendation and frankly, I don't -- I don't know that it needs to be. Do you think it should?

BRION: I thought one the -- one of the things that I read was that the transition committee will disband and when I saw disband, that's what I read in that. So I wanted to have that clarified.

And as you spoke here, you said that they would transition out. Do we have a time period for that transition?

BAILEY:

No.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, Trustee. Two things to your point, Gail. First of all, the transition committee will dissolve itself, but that doesn't mean that there are no members of the transition committee who will become part of the faculty of record.

BRION: That's what I wanted to clarify.

GROSSMAN: Right. So some members of the transition committee may become members of the faculty of record, but not all of them.

BRION: That's what I wanted to clarify.

GROSSMAN: And then the second thing, the transition committee is supposed to report back to us in the fall. And hopefully, at that point, they will have a plan for extinguishing themselves.

BAILEY: We talked about having a date saying as of this date, it will not exist, but -- but it seems to be --

considering how open it is, we might in the fall say, we would like you to do this over the next couple of months.

We'd like to see the faculty of record assume responsibilities, but we're leaving it open so that we can have the discussion in the fall.

BRI ON: I had just wondered if -- if we had put a date in for, you know, three years from now and if it -- what I would suggest is that if it goes beyond three years with the transition team that they have to come back to the Senate for re-approval. That's what I would be suggesting. I -- I don't think -- I don't think it's fair to ask for this task to be done within a certain period.

HIPPI SLEY: Dianne Snow is the (inaudible).
SNOW: At the Senate Council meeting, one of the suggestions made was that we might want to have that transition committee still in operation when it indeed comes in to work together with the (inaudible).

So no one has envisioned that transition going much beyond that time. There might be just a little bit of overlap (inaudible), but certainly not three years. Nobody is looking at that long term.

BAILEY: I guess that's what I'm uncomfortable with that, is I do see it dissolving in six months perhaps, and hopefully, it's a result of the new faculty of record coming in and taking over some of the activities.

BRI ON: I just -- I just thought it was unclear in the recommendation.

HIPPI SLEY: Connie and then Ben.

WOOD: Just a point of clarification, Ernie. The motion says including, including transition committee charge and composition, I believe. That's including, but not limited to, I assume the other recommendations that are in your April 4th memo; is that correct?

BAILEY: You know, we had -- when the Senate talked about this, the Senate said that we would embrace everything that was in the memo.

WOOD: Right. Senate Council?

BAILEY: Pardon? Senate Council did.

And that was the motion that had come forward. When we had looked at it, we were basically saying we're trying to say here is concisely what we're looking at. I don't know that -- are there significant differences between other text in there?

WOOD: Well, the only thing that is -- I just wanted to make sure that we made it perfectly clear that this committee

was supposed to report back to the Senate in fall of 2016. So I -- I wanted to clarify the wording, including, but not limited to.

BAILLEY: It says create -- I mean, what we have in the -- I mean, that is very definitely the sense, that they're going to come back to us.

WOOD: Right. I just wanted to make sure that --

BAILLEY: There was no -- there was no proposal for a specific structure for us to talk about it. And so we really have to have the committee come back with it. And that was by design. I think if you look at the proposal, there were three or four different options for how the faculty would exist. And that -- that -- we can't -- we just can't pass on it.

WOOD: I agree. I just wanted to make sure that it was clear in this proposal that's before us.

HIPPISLEY: Ben, do you have something?

WITHERS: I just wanted to point out that the donor's agreement says that the Honors faculty needs to be in place by the fall of 2017 so they could provide terminus for the time for these decisions. So by no means is the intention for this to continue for three years with the transition committee.

HIPPISLEY: Any other questions? Okay. So this is the motion. All members of the body can vote. So count down is five, four, three, two, one. Vote is 69 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

Marcie Deaton, we invite you to talk about this, how this is related.

DEATON: Hello. Now that it's been approved, to get it to the Board and get our GRs changed, it has to go twice. We have a first reading at the May Board meeting. Second reading, June Board meeting, which would put us in line with the donor agreement to have the Board approve this by June 3rd.

So what we -- the proposal to the GR, GR VII, is to add the Honors College as a major educational unit. At this time, it certainly says the colleges, the Graduate School and the Library. So it would be added in with that. Change the reference from honors program to Honors College.

Then we've mirrored it almost precisely with the Graduate School for the faculty functions, faculty council, describing the dean's role, establishing a dean, regular faculty and all of that. The full text is in the packet. I don't know if you have it here today or not.

But we wanted to take that to the Board with your endorsement on May

the 3rd or do you need to make that May -- the next Board meeting for first reading.

Yeah. I think I was just like jumping all around. Yeah. So I -- this bullet point is just the various places where we would add faculty function, dean's role, the dean can be head of an interdisciplinary program, but it does point out, it says director or chair.

And then we did some updating to the Regulation template and formatting to make it consistent with our newer template. Any questions specifically about the GR itself or that process?

HIPPISLEY: This is what the motion looks like. The University Senate endorse the Provost's proposed revisions of Government Regulation VII (University Organization) which codifies the new Lewis Honors College. Questions? We will vote on the modifications (inaudible).

BIRD-POLLAN: Andrew?

HIPPISLEY: Sorry, I'm sorry. Yes?

BIRD-POLLAN: I have a question. I can see (inaudible), but I'm having a hard time following it. I'm Jennifer Bird-Pollan from the College of Law.

I'm just wondering, the faculty in the Honors College, will it only be faculty from colleges with undergraduates or is it faculty colleges across the University?

DEATON: That would be a question for Ben.

WITHERS: I see no reason why colleges or faculty promoted colleges, not undergraduate colleges, can serve as faculty of record if the dean of the college and the dean of that other college and the Provost agree.

TRACY: And the Provost agrees.

HIPPISLEY: Any questions? All right. Okay. We will vote on the proposed endorsing GR VII revisions. Five, four, three, two, one. 74, 0 opposed, 1 abstention. Motion carries. Thank you Ernie and his committee and Ben and Diane.

Okay. I'd like to invite Katherine McCormick. She's the Chair of the Admissions Advisory Committee and she has a report.

MCCORMICK: Thank you. This is actually one of -- the Admissions Committee hasn't spoken with you in quite a while and so we are appreciative of the opportunity to chat.

So our principle charge is to share with the Provost our

UK4-11-16.txt

recommendations for admission objectives and policy. Primarily, we want to have an opportunity to discuss and -- the challenges, as well as some of the celebrations that we've had regarding admissions.

And so primarily we've been asked to share with the Provost or recommend to the Provost the size, the desired size of the freshman class. We would like to recommend 5150, I think is our number, and then the average, average ACT, which for next year would be 25.5.

The members of our committee are -- hopefully, some of them are here, is Scott Yost, Mike Lacki, Kim Woodrum, and Ben Withers, the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, as well as Roger Sugarman, who represents Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness.

And so we would also like to share with you some of the data regarding our admissions, the work of our admissions and our University enrollment management team. And so we have invited Don Witt, who is a member of our committee, who is also the Associate Provost for Enrollment Management, and so he's going to share some of the priorities and data that we have to date.

And then we'd also like to use this opportunity to have a chance to listen to your comments and this may help us as we plan our agenda for next year. And so again, that communication today will influence the work going forth next year.

So please join me in welcoming Don Witt, as well as Todd Brann, who is the Senior Director for Planning and Forecasting in the Office of Enrollment Management. Thank you.

WITT:

Katherine, thank you very much. My presentation may be a little bit shorter because when I put on registrar's hat, I just promised everyone that my UK GPS would solve all degree problems. I better run quickly. But I think it will address many of our problems.

It really is an honor to spend a few minutes with you to talk a little bit about what goes into enrollment management. Enrollment management can be many different things, but basically what I wanted to focus on today, what happened in the committee and what it focused on over this year, really what feeds into the freshman class.

And it's really been great

UK4-11-16.txt

working with Kathy and faculty members to really help guide some of those discussions and help us to go forward. And it's really sort of kind of interesting for me to be here because for many, many, many years, I actually served as secretary to the Senate and so I would sit down there in the front and I'm really impressed with all the great voting capabilities because when we were here, it was the "let's count all the hands" and the sergeant at arms would be here so it's really nice to be here in this capacity.

So moving on, though, let's look a little bit at just kind of what happened in the fall of 2015. And we've decided to take kind of a look back so you can see where we are right now and then we're going to compare kind of things from 2010, all the way through last year, the fall class of 2015.

And you can see with this presentation that we've grown from 13,000, from 13,000 applications to a record of over 22,000 applications, and this is for our freshman class alone, just for fall 2015.

In terms of admissions, this is pretty interesting too, but this is not unique to the University of Kentucky, but it is a trend across all universities where we're having to admit more students to yield a class that is our goal. Part of it I think is the times are changing quickly.

Students are more well traveled. They have more information at hand. They're trying to make better decisions about where to attend college, and so we're having to admit more to yield the class. And you can see that in 2010 we admitted just over 9200 and then you can see then a record number of just over 16,000 for last year.

One thing I do want to point out, you can see the admit rates over here. That's something that we do want to work on. We want to try to improve. We want to try to become more selective in terms of the students we do admit to the University of Kentucky. That's an important thing in terms of us recruiting and retaining the best students for UK.

Now, looking at kind of enrollment. Where did we end up? You can see that last year was a record size freshman class of just over 5200, then you can see the full-time and part-time. We broke that down. So most of the students coming in freshman level were full-time.

UK4-11-16.txt

And then breaking down some of this information in a little bit more detail in terms of just what makes up the class, you can see that last year, we had a 25.5 average ACT. The mid-50 percentile of the ACT was 22 to 28. You can see the average freshman GPA was a 3.68.

I will point out too that we worked very closely with Roger Sugarman, who was a member of the committee, also with advanced analytics, also with Todd Brann, and also even partnering with some of the colleges. We've worked with the Gatton College of Business. We've worked with the Statistics Department, Arts and Sciences, just trying to feed into all this information.

We know that one of the best predictors for our freshman success here at UK really is the high school GPA. So we're really proud that our GPA has been remaining very strong.

The weighted high school GPA with the 50 percentile, you can see is a 3.30 up to a 4.03. That was up a little bit over last year. One thing too, we're pleased that we had a record number that are in class for fall 2015 of national merit finalists and that's inclusive of national achievement and national Hispanic finalists too.

It's kind of amazing that that number of 117 national merit finalists in the freshman class. When you look at just public research institutions, the number of 117 put UK in the top 10 of public research institutions with the number of national merit finalists. So that's pretty nice that we're attracting some incredible gifted students.

The other point too here, we had a record number of students in the freshman class who scored a 31 or above on the ACT, 704 students. And so part of the challenge with this, we want to try to increase the quality. We want to try to make sure we have the best prepared students for the faculty for all the colleges, but obviously as sort of a part of our mission as a state land grant institution, we also need to balance that out with sometimes some equally important, but often, maybe competing goals. So we're also trying to make sure that we have first generation students represented.

We're making sure that we have a great inclusive diverse environment and so I'll talk about that in just a few minutes.

We included a little bit of the SAT information. It too kind of mirrors

UK4-11-16.txt

the ACT. Kind of getting into some things in terms of what makes up our freshman class. Diversity is something that is extremely important to enrollment management and I'm really proud to say that for last year our freshman class was the most diverse in UK's history if we're looking at the number of enrolled African American students.

But definitely we're not satisfied with this number. We want to continue to build on this. It did make up 11 percent of the freshman class. And if you're looking at how that compares sort of with the overall African American population in the state, this is actually a few percentage points ahead of that. So we're really pleased that we're moving in that direction.

We did have a record number of African American applications and then a record number of admitted students too. You can kind of see the percentage of the trends there.

And one of our goals, the committee will be working with this, we want to make sure that we continue attracting a more diverse, but also not just attracting, enrolling and graduating a more diverse student population. So we look forward really to working with each of the colleges, working with the different units to see how can we make this the most inclusive freshman class possible.

I think this is an interesting slide too. One of our fastest growing segments of our freshman class and I think you're already aware of this, because it's happening nationally, it's happening locally would be our Hispanic/Latino enrollment. You can see the dramatic increase in the number. The number overall is relatively small, but it's definitely something that we, as an institution, really want to watch carefully because we want to make sure that we have the right support structures in place. Making sure that we can continue watching this trend, very, very important.

And I've included this slide too because as a part of an inclusive environment, we want to have the most international undergraduate population. And this is an area we, quite frankly, need to work on. You can see that, by the graph, you can see that we had a dip in the number of international undergraduates coming to UK and we've been working closely with the Provost's

office. We've been working with Susan Carvalho, in terms of the International Center.

And actually what I think we're going to be doing now is working more with each of the academic deans because I know that certain colleges like Arts and Sciences, the Gatton College of Business and Economics, the College of Agriculture, all those different areas, they have a very vested interest in international efforts and we want to partner more with those colleges to help move this along in the right direction.

Now, a couple of things I wanted to share with you. That's just sort of the data. We can share a lot more details, but I did want to talk to you quickly about what makes up a freshman class.

And so each year we do look at all of it. We kind of review all the trends, the goals. We look at what's happening in other institutions. Then, after we review all the data, we also kind of look at the enrollment funnel.

And what that means is, we look at all of our prospects that we have. Prospects to these inquiries, students that have actually reached out and they want to learn more about the University of Kentucky. And we also, then as a part of our prospects, we purchase names. We purchase all the ACT names, every single test taker across the State of Kentucky.

So if someone says, I really don't think I'm being recruited or whatever, we've purchased every name and no matter the score, we are working with all those students. And then what we do too, we do heat maps with all the different areas across the country where we see -- where we've had a high conversion rate of prospects all the way through the enrollment funnel through the matriculas of students that enroll during the fall class. So there's certain areas in the country that are privy to be extremely advantageous for us to invest our resources.

I'll just highlight those quickly. One area is Chicago. It's pretty amazing. When I host what we call a UK Preview Night, and I'll talk about that in just a few minutes, we will literally have several thousand students show up for a UK Preview Night in Chicago.

And kind of pay attention to what's going -- I'm going to kind of paint a picture with this. So we have Chicago to the north. Then going kind

UK4-11-16.txt

of to the west, you see that we have another area in St. Louis. We will also have several thousand students show up in St. Louis. Going south, can you guess what the next city is where we have a record number of students, Atlanta.

And so what's happening, you can sort of see if you draw that diagram around the City of Lexington, where that travel distance is. It makes -- usually that five to six hour radius is what we're seeing. So we're paying very close attention to those areas.

We're also paying close attention to other areas that are very hot with the heat map. So the state that really supplies more students for our freshman class besides Kentucky is what state? It's Ohio. It's unbelievable. So everywhere from Cincinnati, all the way up to really Toledo and everywhere in between, it's unbelievable in terms of the number of students.

We will host events in each of the major cities and usually several thousand folks will show up to each of those events.

And then beyond that, other cities that are popular, Indianapolis, Nashville, and we're also seeing some other emerging areas, believe it or not, northeastern part of the United States. And why do you think that could be kind of interesting for us, the northeast?

Well, where are we? We're in the middle of what? We're known as horse what? The horse capital. We're seeing a lot of student interest from the northeast in terms of those individuals that have the means, but also maybe they're with a -- you know, they already have a horse or whatever. They're very interested in those programs here. So it's just really interesting watching those trends.

So we look at prospects, applicants, admits, confirmed students, which is what we're doing right now. How many students have confirmed their intent to enroll this fall and then, of course, the enrolled students.

Todd and I are watching this along with the Provost and each of the deans, really every single week. Watching the data and making sure that everything is on track to reach that goal of 5150.

Now, along with all of these different things with the enrollment funnel, we have a really robust communications office too. So what that

means is, as students go from a prospect all the way through as an enrolled student, they're receiving various emails, personal calls, letters.

What's really great too, we're really working hard to collaborate with each of the deans. So I know that just as over the past two weeks, some of the deans have actually recorded personal messages. Well, we're sending those out to all of our students that are admitted for fall saying, we'd really like to have you. Dean Kornbluh, did you do that?

KORNBLUH: Yes, I did.

WITT: Would you care to give your example?

KORNBLUH: I was given a script to read.

WITT: Yeah. Some deans need a script. Others do not. You did a very nice job. But what we're trying to do, and this is sort of my philosophy in enrollment management, while we all are very mindful of the growth of the University, you know, you see it literally and figuratively with all the new stuff happening, but we're really watching that carefully.

And I know as corny and as clichéd as this sounds, I'm a firm believer that we're trying to build this University really student by student. And every student, they kind of bring their own goals and their wishes and so, we really try to tailor all this communication on a personal level.

And so I really like this idea that we're working, not just enrollment management, but working with all the deans. So obviously, we use social media. We're on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, all those different areas.

Now, moving on, another thing that I think that some of you are aware of because some of you actually participate, and that's another reason why I'm here today. I'll be passing around assignment sheet for faculty to come to all the preview nights, but I -- we have incredible events for really each of the colleges and the support units to participate in.

We have 21 preview nights and these are literally -- how many people? Let me just see with a show of hands, have been to a preview night before? That's really great.

And the preview night really is taking the University of Kentucky off campus and to the students across the community. So we have these scattered across the entire Commonwealth of Kentucky. We also have them in those

UK4-11-16.txt

cities I just mentioned, such as Chicago, Atlanta, St. Louis. We have 21 of those.

And all the academic colleges will be represented. They'll have representatives from each college. The dean will be there, associate dean or student ambassadors. We'll have all the enrollment areas, like financial aid, scholarships, support units. We'll have all the -- the folks in terms of living and learning programs. Honors usually comes. So excited to see all the things happening today with Honors. It will be a game changer in terms of recruiting the best and brightest students to UK.

The other thing too in addition to the 21 preview nights. This is something I don't think that a lot of people are aware of, but I'm very proud of. We have a program. We have twelve of these each year, it's called "Come See Blue for Yourself." Many students don't have the means to come to campus, so what we do, we work with students and their guidance counselors across the State of Kentucky, again in those targeted areas and we actually bring those students to campus so that they can learn about the University of Kentucky. And so we have many under-represented populations and that could mean maybe geographic diversity, economic diversity, racial diversity, cultural diversity, first gen.

It's an amazing event because what happens, you see truly a mixture of all these students and it turns into something much more than just a recruitment tool. It turns into something I think that the University should be very proud of and I want to do more of these.

This year alone, out of those twelve events, they came as far away as Chicago. What's pretty amazing? They come down for the day. They do our event and they actually go back that same day. So that really shows a commitment for those guidance counselors, but this year out of those twelve events, we served just over 4,000 diverse students. And that's pretty amazing. And so I'm really proud for those efforts. We want to kind of continue those too.

High school visits. We visit every single high school in the State of Kentucky multiple times and then we also visit the high schools, of course, beyond our borders. Many of you are familiar, we have a great UK Visitor's Center that's in the main building.

For those folks that work in the main building, we try to (inaudible), but it ends up being a very, very active place. We will be moving the UK Visitor's

UK4-11-16.txt

Center to the brand new student center when it opens in 2018 because we need a much bigger space so that we can showcase all the great things happening at UK.

We also have other important events I'll just quickly go over. Governor's Scholars Program, Governor's School for the Arts Reunion. I'm happy to say that UK traditionally has enrolled more GSP, GSA students than any other school across the Commonwealth and so we have a reunion for all those students. So that's really pretty great.

Many of you participated this year in an event called Kentucky Collegiate. It's an event I started a number of years ago. Andrew, you were there, you were a speaker. And then we had Katherine, you were there, some other faculties. It's really a faculty driven event and I really like this because we invite top admitted students for the fall class to come and we actually - it's grown so much, we started this event, believe it or not, in the Boone Center. I've now had to move it to the Bluegrass Ballroom because we'll have over a thousand folks show up for this event. But the faculty end up hosting the prospective students.

We try to pair up the students that area interested in let's say physics with the physics faculty members. And it's one of the things that really sets UK apart and that's the one thing that I really want to work with the faculty senate even more because top students, or really for that matter, any student, they want to partner more and learn more about the academic enterprise. And I really want to showcase UK's strengths in terms of all of our academic programs to our prospective students. So Kentucky Collegiate was really successful.

We just finished our merit weekends. I know that many of you helped with that too. That's a pretty unique program. We have three merit weekends and it's a program where I invite the top admitted fall students to come to campus early. They go through orientation. They register for all their fall classes. And approximately 90 percent of those students who do come to merit weekend, do matriculate to the University of Kentucky. And these are the students that are, you know, being recruited by the Ivy leagues and many prestigious places, so it's a great tradition for us.

I'm happy to say too that we have served over 1100 students with the three merit weekends. It was our largest merit, combination of merit weekends in

UK4-11-16.txt

our history. And then the average ACT of those students who did attend merit weekend was right at 31. So that's pretty amazing. So a lot of great talent interested in UK.

We also partner with -- I think it can be one of our most difficult groups to recruit to UK. That's our local students. And they think well, I kind of know UK. I've been to a basketball game and I've been to a football game. And I love that question or I love that statement because I'm like well, that's really not getting on campus. You really don't know the University of Kentucky.

So we really work closely with all the local high schools and we've partnered even more with the local magnet. So you know like at Henry Clay, they have the academy. At Tates Creek, they have the international baccalaureate program. At Lafayette, they have SCAPA. At Bryan Station, they have the Spanish immersion program. At Dunbar, they have the MSEC program.

We're happy to say that we're getting more of those students and those top kids to come to UK and enroll in the fall. So we're really pleased with those local efforts.

Community partnerships, and I'm going to wrap this up quickly. But community partnerships, this is something I'm also growing in our area. We partner with the YMC Black Achievers of Lexington, the YMC Black Achievers of Louisville, the Carter G. Woodson Academy, is right here in Lexington. We also partner with the nationally recognized now, BMW program, as I'm sure if you're familiar with that, it's out the First Baptist Church of Bracktown with (inaudible). President Obama has actually recognized that program and so we've partnered with them.

The BMW program stands for Black Males Working, so it's a way for us to really partner with a great program to showcase the University of Kentucky. We're now sponsoring a speaker series with the BMW Academy.

We also now are working with the Cabbage Patch Settlement House out of Louisville. These are students that are gifted, very talented, but they come from broken homes. And oftentimes, they really don't know how to navigate the whole college going processes. So we've partnered with that organization.

We've also partnered with the Kentucky Haitian Partnership. And then we also do now a college prep workshop that's free for students. And this is for students to come to campus and we actually

UK4-11-16.txt

offer them a free sample ACT. And so they get to actually take a sample ACT. We score it for them, and that's a way for them to really get an early taste of what this whole test taking process is all about.

And then wrapping up, just more other collaborations that I'm proud of. I mentioned all the academic colleges, student affairs, the living/learning programs, Honors. Ben and Diane have been incredible to work with on those programs.

Also, things that set UK apart, and I sort of challenge all the colleges to think about this all the time, about what sets the University of Kentucky apart for any student interested in coming here. They have many choices now.

And so we really, you know, with UK being one of eight institutions in the country with the unique combination of undergraduate, graduate and professional programs on one contiguous campus, that's pretty powerful. You know, with the Medical Center and the health care enterprise and all of our undergraduate offerings and the graduate school, that's a powerful recruiting tool for all of us and so we want to think differently about how do we really shape that academic community.

We also really worked to promote education abroad and we also promote undergraduate research to our students too. So that's really everything I kind of wanted to kind of talk about. Just kind of give you a glimpse at what goes into making up a freshman class.

For those of you who have participated in our recruiting events, for those of you who have recorded wonderful messages, Dean Kornbluh, thank you all very much for your support. It's much appreciated.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you so much, Don. Does anyone have questions for either Katherine or Don?

Okay. Thank you. We'll make sure that their presentation stays on the website.

WITT: Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: So after all those wonderful exciting things, you are hopefully reading the motion for the next event. And I'd like to invite Jonathan Golding to tell us a little bit about what he has is proposing.

GOLDING: I'm here today to talk about the implementation plan for the teaching and course evaluation. And if you remember, the actual questions were approved in March of 2015. So this is now the actual plan. How are we going to implement it?

And the report was sent out and everybody saw it. I wanted to say a few things then and entertain any questions. Just to keep a few things in mind as you think about the recommendations of this final report, you have to remember we're trying to develop a solution to the problem of lower response rate that has occurred with all schools as we switch from paper TCE to an online TCE. And this, we're concerned about this specifically with the new TCE that we hope will be used.

The goal is always to try and come up with a more valid instrument that will be used in conjunction with other things, for example, for promotion and tenure. We felt the great release recommendation that's in there was a more viable solution than simply trying to change the campus culture regarding the importance of the teacher course evaluations.

And I must be clear that the report makes clear that the committee strongly supports working to change the campus culture, but we're simply not convinced that this solution alone, changing the culture, is enough to get what everybody wants, which is a great buy-in as students, as far as completing the teaching and course evaluations.

And part of the concern about just going for the culture change is appealing or was appealing as a committee, that resources, especially in today's financial climate may not be available for the type of activities that are really going to be necessary to change the culture.

Second point I want to make is our recommendations in the report follow that of other schools, both public and private, who have such a plan for the release of grades. And a number of these schools are considered elite or medallion universities like Harvard and Yale.

And the feeling of the committee was to have UK be doing things that put us on the same path with these other schools instead of this idea of chasing our benchmarks. There's not reason if we, with implementing the TCE, can't be doing the same thing that Harvard and Yale are doing. There's simply no reason.

Number three, we felt our plan was fair to students and did not put any undue burden on them. Students are going always get their grade. This will be very clear. They're going to get their grade. We're not holding their grades forever until they complete their evaluations. It's just that the release is going to be

after eight days.

Next, students are not denied due process in the sense that students do not have to do a TCE for any class. They are afforded the opportunity to opt out of the TCE on a question by question basis.

So if I want to do it for my Psych 100 class, if a student doesn't want to do it, they don't have to. They get in, they answer -- they opt out of every question.

Next point about students. Students are not being asked to complete a long and difficult task. Currently, when I ask students about this, my unscientific sample, almost all students agree that completing a TCE right now takes about five minutes.

The new TCE is actually shorter as far as the number of questions. So if you consider five minutes for five classes, it takes about 25 minutes over a two-week period that the TCE window is open. We simply do not think that this was an onerous task for students to have to complete and, of course, if you opt out, there's no need to even take 25 minutes.

Now, students, we do not feel are going to be disrupted in their attempt to graduate, register or get a job, we'll say (inaudible) and finishing up.

Completing the TCE during the two-week window or even immediately if I notify their TCE was not completed, well, they're allowed their grades to be immediately released prior to the end of this eight day period.

So if I don't do mine after day one and I'm reminded in this eight day period, I do it. My grade is released. In this sense, now this is more me talking with other -- it came up during the committee, in this sense, completion of the TCE in the future is really like an eight day hold.

And given that there are many indefinite holds right now for students I've heard, Don, you tell me, that there are up to 40 holds that students can receive that can delay things like registering, getting an official diploma, graduating. We just didn't think that our eight day period was too much.

You have to remember if you're a student and you have a library hold, you're going to be waiting for a lot of different things until that library fine, for example, is paid.

And finally, I want to say, it's very important to understand, and the committee report says this, that we believe that it's going to be critical in

the future to monitor in a way that has not been done since this last TCE was put into place in 1993. The TCE process must be monitored. All of our recommendations are part of really (inaudible) experiment.

We hope it works. We hope not just students, but, you, as faculty will buy into it. And in certain ways, this is like the CATS survey that I think you're all aware our students must complete. But we think the way the plan will be set up, students will buy into it and we hope in a very short time, but it's going to require some monitoring.

It's possible after even one semester or a full year, a committee that's set up or a unit that's going to be in charge of this will say, you know what, this just doesn't work. And that will be up, of course, to the Senate to decide. But we do view this as part of the process.

I can't stand up here now and say it will work, but my colleagues and I, as part of the committee, felt that this was the most reasonable plan. And in a sense that the compromised plan, that's consistent with what other schools are doing, and we think we should also do. Thanks. Any questions?

HIPPISLEY: I'll just say what the motion is before we get into questions. The motion is from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee, chaired by Jonathan Golding, is that the University Senate approve the plan to implement the Teacher Course Evaluation questions. The questions themselves having been approved at the Senate's March 9, 2015 meeting. The plan as outlined in Jonathan's report, the committee's final report. Are there any questions? Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
I have two questions. I'll ask one at a time and give you a chance to answer. It says that -- I forgot the first one, I'll ask the second one.

GOLDING: Now I feel like I'm in class.

TAGAVI: It's my understanding that the philosophy of these tens of years that I have already been here is that the evaluation was done before the final exam was given.

GOLDING: Not your final exam. The window is always open for before your final grade. Evaluations are done before final grades are given out.

TAGAVI: Before the final. Is that changing?

GOLDING: No.

TAGAVI: So you said during that eight days --

GOLDING: There's a two week period that students get today as it has been since

1993. There's two weeks. And it's all before final grades given out so the student is not influenced by their final grade. It doesn't mean students don't know what they think they're going to get.

TAGAVI: I remember my first question.

GOLDING: You're having a rough day.
It happens to me too.

TAGAVI: I'll write it down,

HIPPISLEY: While he's thinking, Connie,
Connie?

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.
I also have two and I think I can remember them. The first, I'm wearing the hat of chair of the Senate Rules and Elections Committee. I'm concerned about the way this motion is stated. It is not within the Senate's purview to approve the withholding of grades for any reason; that would be a Provost level decision. So that's not within our purview to actually be able to approve that policy.

Senate Rule 6.3 says that the faculties have got to submit it and there's -- this would be an administrative policy that we have no purview over.

My second concern, and I'll switch hats, is as a senator from Statistics. I am very concerned about the nature of the survey, that you have to complete it. And especially the part that you have to opt out on each question instead of having an opt out at the very beginning that just says (inaudible).

There's a real statistical reason for this. This turns this into a forced questionnaire. Forced questionnaires bring into it a bias which is called mischievous responders. This completely biases the evaluations that are given.

There are some techniques which have been proposed in the literature to try and identify mischievous responders, but my PhD student now has evidence that all of those methods are also biased. So what we have now is known as a voluntarily response survey.

If we implement actually having a forced response, we have introduced a second sets of biases. You have a first set of biases from the voluntarily response nature. We're now mixing it in and we will not be able to disentangle it.

So from a statistical point of view, I completely oppose having any kind of questionnaire which forces the student to go through and opt out of any question.

We also have input from University General Counsel that says that in his opinion, this is T. Lynn Williamson, that if, in fact, a student takes us to court because they need a

transcript to apply to graduate school or for a job, that, in fact, if the student takes this to court, then we'll lose.

So one thing, I'm very concerned about the nature. If you would put just an opt out version like Pharmacy does, T. Lynn said that that would go a great deal to decreasing our legal liability.

GOLDING: Which question - you want to deal with the Senate Rules since I don't have them (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: I believe that the Senate Rules has said instructors don't have a choice not to submit grades. Is that the one you're referring to?

WOOD: This is all clearly discussed in the minutes of the SREC meeting in February.

HIPPISLEY: But I think, correct me if I'm wrong, Jonathan, that there is no recommendation for students not to get grades.

WOOD: No, no, I'm not saying that. But I'm saying that it's not within the Senate's purview to approve a plan to withhold grades. We are an academic body, not an administrative body.

HIPPISLEY: Well -

GROSSMAN: I need the senator from Arts and Sciences to propose an amendment to change the word "approve" to "endorse."

WOOD: Second.

GROSSMAN: I invited you to make the motion.

WOOD: Oh, I thought you just did. If I make it, will you second it?

GROSSMAN: Sure.

GOLDING: Well, let me just ask one thing first, that my understanding about the teacher course evaluation from the past was that the Provost's office deals with the teacher evaluations. The Senate deals with the course evaluations. And that was an important distinction.

But that for this purpose of this, of the new TCE, that the two were working in concert. Now, if you want to have -- now, I'm not sure what the Senate wants to do. That was the understanding of the initial implement -- the initial committee that was set up and then working with this committee.

I'd also want to say one other thing on the opt out, on the opt out issue. With regard to being very transparent, the committee talked about the idea of opting out at the beginning and the committee felt that that wasn't a good strategy given the goal again of trying to get students to complete the TCE, it was felt, quite frankly, to make it harder. That they would have to go through the entire survey. Because there

were fewer questions, it wouldn't take them very long, and that they would respond.

And then finally on the issue of mischievous responding, as I've said before, in my review of the literature I found not (inaudible) call that. I found nothing with regard to teaching and course evaluations at all about this.

It's possible there will be bias. My argument is simply this is why you have this monitoring committee or entity who will try and determine if there is a problem, that this is what students are doing. If students are that pissed off. Do we (inaudible) it? Yes, there'll be some. This is hard for me personally. I think the committee agrees that there's going to be substantial or significant numbers of students who are going to go through and say Golding sucks, Golding sucks, Golding sucks. Even put more than that.

Although, I hope that's not, but it's possible. I'm not -- I don't want to sit here and say it is not possible, but this is something we knew that would have to be monitored.

HIPPISLEY: Before we take any questions on this, there is a motion on the floor which we'll do in a minute which is a motion coming from Connie Wood, and I think seconded by Bob Grossman, to amend this motion by replacing "approve" with "endorse." And I think the idea being that the Senate's charge is more endorsing when it comes to practical implementation.

WOOD: Administrative.

HIPPISLEY: Administrative type things. So it kind of cleans up the divide between the Senate's part in the matter with approve and endorse. Right?

So this is the motion, "approve" is changed to "endorse". That's the amendment and it was -- are there any further comments on this particular, not the statistics, but just on replacing "approve" with "endorse"? Any other questions about this? Okay. So we're just going to vote on, on the substituting "approve" for "endorse". Okay. Be clear, you're voting for "endorse" rather than "approve". That's what you're doing right now. Not the actual motion. Okay. Five, four, three, two one. So the motion carries. So now -- 63 for, 3 against, and 4 abstentions. So we will return to the motion as amended. Right? You all know how it was amended.

GOLDING: I just want to add one other thing. Can I move on?

HIPPISLEY: Before we move on, there was a question, yes, you at the back.

OSER: Carrie Oser, A and S.
Jonathan, what was the response from some of the other universities? I mean, was it eventually approved after they implemented these sorts of policies?

GOLDING: Well, I have a report, but it goes back, it's a number of years back, that talked about in the '90s. I would have to get you that report, somebody did a report, it was Harvard, Yale. And I can't remember it all the schools in it.
It did, it went up. It was very high. And some of those schools, some of those schools may have -- I can't remember. I'd have to get it, but it did go up. And at this point, Brett, what's the response right now for online?

McDANI EL: It's about 70 percent, between 65 and 70 percent.

GOLDING: And what was it when it was paper?

McDANI EL: Depending on how you looked at it, it was between 70 and 80 percent.

GOLDING: Right. And the problem that came up, kind of one thing on why this whole issue, people were concerned, those again might be the mean, but there were classes that were again very low, you know, the distribution has been quite large. And the concern was how we can get this so we're really going to get a buy-in throughout and get the numbers up throughout.

HIPPISLEY: Davy Jones, you had a question.

JONES: The amendment we did solved that.

HIPPISLEY: Kaveh's second question, I think he's remembered.

TAGAVI: I have remembered it now.
That -- when I read your proposal, the written comments are only released to the professor, correct?

GOLDING: The written ones, I think that's what it said because after we just followed the rules of --

TAGAVI: Not that I disagree with you. I just want to make sure my chair is not going to see all those nasty comments that students make about me.

GOLDING: Mr. Williamson, what was the --

WILLIAMSON: Now, I don't think that the way it's written is exactly correct. But it says that students will only be given the numerical, the numerical --

TAGAVI: Can you bring it up, please?

WILLIAMSON: The numerical numbers, and faculty will go numerical and comments. The questions that are addressed to the faculty member themselves would be performance evaluation. And performance evaluation would be protected information under the open records law.
But as far as any other

questions are concerned, maybe, maybe subject to anybody asking, anybody getting the information. So both the comments and the score, if the student wanted to know or the public, anybody in the world, your dean, but it would be about the course. So that both the -- both the written questions, the answers, written answers, as well as the score on the course (inaudible). I don't (inaudible) open records law. The performance evaluation rating of the faculty member, him or herself would not be subject to open records law.

HIPPISLEY: So we'll go to Davy, maybe give us a history lesson here.

TAGAVI: Can you bring it up on the screen? The part that says comments would not be released, only by the professor, only the professor.

HIPPISLEY: Davy, some history?

JONES: Yeah. If we go back to the early '93 or '94, I believe, we had the blue form that we used up until recently, the Senate specific (inaudible) should the ratings of the evals be posted on the web like they are now. And the Senate's wording at that time was that the numerical ratings will be posted, but the -- not posted, made available to students in some easy manner or something, posting is what we (inaudible). The Senate specifically said when there are comments, would not be posted.

I'm wondering now if we're parsing what was a global, a narrative of stuff will not be made available and now we're parsing it, what part of the narrative will be made available about the course, but part will not be made available if it's about the professor. I didn't realize that parsing was happening, if that's what's really intended.

HIPPISLEY: But this actually, this, in a sense, isn't the -- a new recommendation. This is just following history. So this is not a new thing that you've proposed. Right, Jonathan?

GOLDING: Yes.

HIPPISLEY: This is just following what we did when we looked at the 1993.

WILLIAMSON: The recommendation didn't change anything. I was making an observation that the present procedure may or may not be valid depending upon how you look at it. But it didn't -- the recommendation just simply affirmed what we're presently doing.

JONES: I guess that the open records law may have some affect externally, but as a matter of an internal process, we do not choose to post the narrative comments whether they're about the course or about

the professor.
HIPPI SLEY: And that's what -
GOLDING: And that's not going to change.
HIPPI SLEY: Bob?
GROSSMAN: Katherine hasn't spoken yet, so
I'll wait.
McCORMICK: I just want -- Katherine
McCormick, College of Education.
So, Jonathan, students have
three weeks basically to do this or two
depending on --
GOLDING: Well, they have two. Actual two
weeks that they're first notified. They
get an email, they're notified and then
they get another. Brett, remind me, it's
two emails now they get, two reminders to
do their TCEs?
McCORMICK: But the week prior to dead week?
McDANIEL: Right. It's the week before
dead week and the week of dead week is the
two week window that they have. They get
an invitation via email and then they get
two reminders via email.
McCORMICK: And do you remind them during
the week of finals?
GOLDING: Well, I would have to ask.
That's an idea. Are they reminded going
into finals?
McDANIEL: Right now, it closes before
finals. With our change that we're
looking at, we would give them a reminder
saying, You have not completed it, you've
got -- you have the opportunity to get it
done so that you can get your grades.
GOLDING: We didn't decide on how many
times to remind them. I mean, it could be
as many as you want to remind them.
McCORMICK: But they would currently have
three weeks?
GOLDING: Yeah, to get it done.
McCORMICK: And then we add another week
prior, or post the grades, initially?
McCORMICK: I think it's three weeks total.
They have a lot of time. I mean, it's a
lot of time.
HIPPI SLEY: Bob?
GROSSMAN: Yeah. I'd just like to make a
comment relative to Connie's second
concern which is about the -- the opt out,
some of the mischievous responders and the
legal liability.
Now that we are endorsing and
particular implementation of this policy,
it's up to the Provost to actually do the
implementation, and so some of these
matters can now be left to his judgment.
And Connie, I'm sure -- I would
encourage Connie to harangue the
Provost as much she likes --
WOOD: I'll sic my chair on him.
GROSSMAN: -- to address - and you know, I
would hope he would consult with
statisticians to -- to consider this and

consult with legal to see if there is a legal liability here.

And so, you know, some of these, some of these concerns are valid. I think we can -- we can just ask the administration to handle the concerns how they see fit.

I think we need to get this off our plate and give it to the administration.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you, sir.

HIPPISLEY: Question?

McGILLIS: Yeah. Joe McGillis, Medicine.

So I'm looking this over on item 5C on submitting questions. I'm a little concerned that it has to be done by the first day of the semester. And my concern is an advanced class, you're frequently getting new information you're introducing, you may decide to do something a little bit differently.

So I think to make it more useful to instructors, I'd like to see that date moved back for submitting the supplemental questions.

GOLDING: There is a problem and this came up, and it was an important point to talk about, is how the group in IT who has put the questions in, when they have to do it. And to have it -- some courses for example, I didn't know, this are very short courses that only last a short time. And so we couldn't say, well, let's wait until midway during the semester because some courses are done by midway during the semester.

We didn't want to overburden the IT people in trying to -- these have to be entered. Every potential question has to be entered. So the thinking was, based on how I and the committee understood, the best way to do it was to have a set date and to have it early.

I understand your concern. Again, perhaps there can be some flexibility. But as a University policy, we felt that we had to have it then just to be able, again, resource wise, if anybody wanted to add, had questions, to be able to add them in.

I'm not taking away from the problem. I understand what you're saying, but this was the thinking of the committee to have that early date.

HIPPISLEY: John?

WILSON: John Wilson, Medicine.

Just a question about the opt out situation. It's really a nuisance factor for students as opposed to opt out. I know many colleges have opt out now that is just a single item. Have you gotten feedback from students about this change in this policy?

GOLDING: Well, the one thing I heard students thought it was really a -- it would take a long time to do, which I don't -- I don't buy. So on the opt out, I've not heard.

WILSON: Have you sought out input from students. Are there students here in the Senate? Or from the staff, from the student center?

HIPPISLEY: Any students?

ROARK: Becca Roark, College of Education.
I'm actually surprisingly in favor of this. I think I would like -- I want my professors to know what I have to say. In terms of the opt out situation, so I'm kind of confused that you, for each question, you say I wish not to answer, I'll opt out.

GOLDING: Chose not to answer, yes.

INAUDIBLE: Okay. I don't -- I mean, for me, I don't think that's a big deal, for (inaudible) dramatic. I don't think that's a problem. I do -- I do have a question though. I'm a student teacher right now, so I haven't been in class for a whole semester, but I know we used to have paper evaluations and the we had some that were online. Are they all online now?

GOLDING: They are. The one thing I would say, John, about the opt out each question. You know, we can't anticipate exactly how a student is thinking. One thing is there's 20 questions. Perhaps, you go through and you don't want to answer a lot of them, but there's some that you say, hey, this is one that I really want to give my opinion on.
Now, of course, you have someone at the beginning that says, well screw this, I don't want to do this at all. But we were again trying to get whatever valid data we could get. So I understand. It's standing here again saying I understand what you're saying. It would be easier for the student to opt out of the whole thing, but that may not be the best way. But there may be discussion later that doing every question just may not be a valid way to do this.

HIPPISLEY: Are there any other students?

WILSON: I have one other question.

HIPPISLEY: Let's first see if we have any students about that opt out. Are there any students here who want to talk about the opt out. Yes, please.

SHELTON: Amy Shelton, College of Communication and Information. I guess just thinking about how I've taken previous evaluations, but an opt out, I guess, would make it more comfortable for students who didn't feel like sharing a

specific opinion about something. But I also don't know how relevant it is, the kind of double purpose of an evaluation is to get your opinion about an issue or problem. So I'm kind of torn on this issue. And I don't know, I feel like when I take an evaluation, I like -- I give my opinion on every single question because that's how I view the point of the evaluation.

GOLDING: The only thing, you just have to remember, you have to give students the opportunity to just not do it. That's their choice and really their right to not do it if they don't want to. And that's -- that's why it's in there.

We wish all students were like you. I mean it is. That's what you hope for. That's not going to happen. If a student for whatever reason doesn't want to do it, they then have the opportunity.

HIPPI SLEY: You had your hand up.

DICKES: Rob Dickes, College of Fine Arts.

I want to go back to the submitting questions in 5C here. Can it -- would it be possible to instead of saying the first day of each semester to six weeks or eight weeks before classes end? That way, shorter semester classes would still have that option.

GOLDING: Brett, what's your view?

Because this came up, I mean -- I mean, it could be. I'll just stay out. I don't know. Brett, you speak first because you know this, the length of classes and everything.

McDANIEL: The problem really is we're trying to implement one process of doing it and if we have to change stuff as it goes through the semester, the chances of somebody messing up in getting those questions in is going to be greater. If we do it all at one time, it's going be less of a risk.

GOLDING: And again, it's whatever committee can say, hey, that's a good idea to give more flexibility to faculty and say screw IT, but that's, you know -- well, because that's -- you got to -- it's one or the other. It's a cost factor.

HIPPI SLEY: Roger, Kaveh, Davy and Gail.

BROWN: Roger Brown, College of Ag.

And so I'm not sure the students, maybe they don't want to respond because (inaudible). Right now your grades are available as soon as the instructor, the instant the instructor submits them. Even if it's in the middle of final exam week, you get your grade.

And now this proposal, which may not affect (inaudible) because you're so diligent. But there will be many students

who therefore don't receive their grades for eight days until the middle of May.

I'm just wondering, you know, if you have anything -- is that a -- that's what this proposal aims to do.

HIPPI SLEY: Is that a question, Roger?

BROWN: No.

HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Davy.

JONES: There's just -- he answered my question. I wondered how quickly students have access to their grades and apparently, it's instantaneous.

GROSSAN: Unless they have a hold for another reason.

HIPPI SLEY: Kaveh and then Gail.

TAGAVI: Can you show 1B, please? You had it earlier. If you read under A, it says, only numerical ratings shall be made available to anyone other than the faculty evaluated. No need to comment. Am I mistaken, that it says reader comments are only available to the faculty evaluated?

UNIDENTIFIED: Surely not.

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

GOLDING: Shall not be made available.

This is in a class that has less than 5 because of (inaudible).

KAVEH: No, 1A. Only numerical grades shall be available to anyone other than the (inaudible).

GROSSMAN: It's current policy.

HIPPI SLEY: John.

WILSON: John Wilson, Medicine.

So, as part of my performance evaluation, only numeric ratings would go to my chair, not the comments?

GROSSMAN: You can send the comments that you receive to your chair.

WILSON: Okay. So I guess I'm just -- I'm just trying to understand. I don't quite understand. It's not the practice. But say somebody says something particularly obnoxious that Wilson's not fair. He has cheated me. He has required me to pay money for a grade. I can delete that?

I mean, I don't think that's appropriate. I mean, I don't see why -- that's not the way it's done. The way it's done, written comments go to my performance evaluation. They go to the curriculum committee in my department. I

just --

HIPPI SLEY: I would say that this may -- whether this is worded wrongly or not, 1A is just saying it's what we're doing right now. Nothing is changing.

WILSON: The comments are a very important part of the evaluation. For good and ill, I mean, and for the protection of students.

HIPPI SLEY: Davy, a little history?

JONES: The Senate action in 1993-94 was

(inaudible) jurisdiction, to student access. We don't have any authority to say managerially, you know, the chair doesn't have access.

I think I remember the discussion from the Senate minutes at the time. It was envisioned the narrative comments are something that the chair and the faculty would discuss together with the performance evaluation, say come into my office and discuss how can we improve your performance.

That -- so -- the Senate didn't intend to assert that it has the purview to block the chair from having access to narrative comments.

HIPPISLEY: Davy, I know this on the fly, but could you suggest how, if we wanted to say no change, how that -- how we should have said that in our report.

JONES: Made available to students.

HIPPISLEY: Say again?

JONES: Only numerical ratings shall be made available to the students.

HIPPISLEY: But that's -- I think that was the intention. Gail.

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering.

I dislike being put in the position where I'm grading the student and then having their grade withheld from them. And I don't want to be evaluated by someone who is no longer freely offering their comments, but is being coerced in some manner by having their grades held.

So I would like to suggest that we number one, don't put faculty in the position again as was suggested before where they are the ones withholding the grade. If the administration wants to do this, that's their responsibility.

But if it is an online assessment, it's very easy to add one extra button at the beginning that says, I wish to opt out of all or I will opt out individually. I mean, it's --

GOLDING: I'm not going to stand here and say that it's not a good idea. It's a reasonable idea. I'm just saying the committee decided, we felt it should be a question by question opt out. Except, I guess, to amend or something --

BRION: I dislike -- I dislike tying students' response to this to their performance in my class. And I would speak against it.

HIPPISLEY: You had your hand up?

LEHMAN: Christina Lehman, Business and Economics.

My, I guess -- I'm sorry, I'm a student. So my concern is I am someone who hates these evaluations and I know -- I don't know, personally, I have a hard

UK4-11-16.txt

time saying that we should restrict people seeing their grades just because like -- while it seems like it's a lot of time, or you're given a lot of time for a short survey, I think it would be better for teachers to offer like five or ten minutes like they used to do with the hard copy.

I think we'd have much more volunteered responses with people in class if the teacher said, okay, I'm going to give like five to ten minutes right now to take this, like evaluation, (inaudible) the room. I'll be back in then.

I think that's better because, honestly, like it's 25 minutes for this, but then it's another 45 minutes for the CATS survey. Then it's another 15 minutes for this.

Like I work 25 hours a week. I'm involved in the student government and a bunch of other things, like, 25 minutes seems a lot. Especially at the close of the semester when I'm doing my for semester long group projects, coming to a close, all at the same time. And then, like, here's 25 minutes. I, like, I'd honestly rather eat or sleep.

GOLDING: Well, with all due respect, there's two problems with your argument. One argument is, of course, students are not all coming to class, so you have that problem. The second argument, probably even bigger, is that constraining time during class is seen as a problem.

So if I'm an instructor and I give my class five minutes, I'm not going to get any written responses, which for me, personally, are the most important aspect of the evaluation. I'm constraining time.

By giving it, letting students do it outside of class, you're just -- you're allowing them to answer as they want. I understand you're very busy. Some of you work during school.

I would still, with all due respect, argue that the amount of time that it would require you to do the evaluation is not a significant amount of time given everything else. And not wanting to interfere with your eating and sleeping schedule. I can understand.

But we got to, you know, look it's like every -- it's like the CAT survey. The university thinks that's important and thinks you should do it. And that takes much longer.

This is a pretty short thing to be -- be complaining, and it has a lot of importance for faculty, professional development, and for curriculum.

HIPPISLEY: And so just to also talk about that. We -- the committee decided that if

UK4-11-16.txt

an instructor wants to do it -- it's up to the instructor. Does that answer your questions more or less, the instructor decides to have you stay on 10 minutes in the last class and -- okay. Katherine.

McCORMICK: This is Katherine McCormick, College of Education.

I'd like to go on record as endorsing or supporting this work. My faculty, my junior faculty and my department have gone for a couple of years without any data because of the unintended consequence that they teach a number of sections of a course, that if the response rate is low, then they may have ten students in Pikeville, but the response rate puts them less than five and so they don't get any course evaluation.

And that -- that is a significant issue for faculty in terms of their promotion and tenure, as well as their performance evaluation, to have no data. And so I think that's -- that's a real concern.

SANDMEYER: Bob Sandmeyer, Arts and Sciences.

My question is the grade release policy. And it follows up this question nicely, or this issue nicely.

I used to teach large classes with a lecture component and sections, and there was an evaluation for the lecture component and then an evaluation for each individual section. I don't see any clarification here as to the distinction between those.

So here's my question. It just simply says, students who complete a TCE for a course. So as I read it, that just means one per course. So it conceivably could be the case that a student completes an evaluation for a TA, but not the lecturer, and still their grade is released?

GOLDING: It's an excellent point for somebody who teaches lectures and labs. It would have to -- that would have to be changed. The language would have to be changed because you want to get it for both. Excellent point.

SANDMEYER: As it stands now, that's --

GOLDING: Yeah. No, you're right. That's an excellent point. And I missed it and again, I teach these classes.

McDANIEL: The way the current system works is we evaluate both the lecture and the lab at the same time.

GOLDING: But you wouldn't want a student to think if they did one they should be getting their grade. It has to be made clear that if it's a combined class, they have to do both. Yeah. They have to do both.

PAYNE: Christina Payne, Engineering. I just -- is it -- a little clarification. Does this mean the eight day extension, they can during finals week then?

GOLDING: Yes.

PAYNE: So, I mean, I guess I'm concerned about bias at that point. If I give a really hard final, then are they going to give punitive reviews.

GOLDING: That's a good point. I'm just trying to think if we've talked about that. Any committee members remember? Terry or Roger?

BROWN: Yes. Roger Brown, College of Ag.

I don't -- I don't remember changing that point. I remember that we talked it about two weeks. The week before dead week and dead week and that there wouldn't be any change in the ability for students to complete their TCE say during class. That wasn't going to be an option and that's just the way I remember it.

JONES: We've provided a mechanism now. They can be failing to opt out and then get in after their grade.

GOLDING: Well, they couldn't see their grade. They still can't see their grade. I'm sorry. Again, I'll defer to other committee members if you remember. Roger doesn't remember. I honestly don't remember.

HIPPISLEY: Connie then Mi rek.

WOOD: I'd like to speak to Katherine's point. It solves the identity or lack of anonymous quantum if you force everyone to respond. But it still does not give you valid information if you're ignoring the people who are responding or opting out. You still don't have a valid evaluation.

GOLDING: Right. It would be poor. It was be poor if they all opt out, right. This is where I would argue that this is where you bring in a campus culture issue. You got to get students -- students don't really understand and we've talked to students. They don't really understand why they're doing this. What the -- what these ratings are for. They don't get it and this is where in the report we talk about the various ways that we have to communicate to students. Why they're important and why their responses are so critical to us as faculty to the institution.

So that would have to go hand and hand. Because I agree, if they opt out, it's not going to be good. You could argue right now they're opting out because they're not doing it.

TRUSZCYNski: Mi rek Truscynski, Engineering. I just want to be on record that I'm

opposed to using grade withholding as a mechanism to improve the response rate to this question.

HULSE: David Hulse, College of Business and Economics.

Did I understand correctly that the window for students to complete these will now, as it's proposed, would include finals week?

GOLDING: Right. That's the question. That's where I'm looking and trying to check my notes, how we talked about that. Because if you didn't do it, you would be told that now you have to do it in order to get your grade, but that's where I'm -- I'm --

HULSE: So for those of us that post scores on final exams, we would -- the students have to complete it --

GOLDING: This is where I'm trying to remember, and again, I'm going to poke my committee members because the question just sort of threw me there.

Because you would be able to do the evaluation during final weeks because your grade is not officially released until the end of finals week anyway. I mean, an instructor -- I can release my grades early, but officially, I don't have to give my grades out until after finals week is over.

HULSE: Well, I'm just saying, if I'm giving a final on Monday, University rules require you to submit the grade by Wednesday. And students that have completed the evaluation would want to know, well, okay, I got a B, I was expecting an A. What did I get on the final exam?

Many of us post on canvas or elsewhere, the scores on final -- on final exams.

HIPPISLEY: Jonathan, I do you remember this coming up, and it's a subtle difference, but there was a difference between what you post on canvas and the official results the registrar gives the students. For some instructors, they see an 89.5 on canvas and decide it's a B, rather than A.

HULSE: I guess my concern is that we're put in a difficult situation of do we post grades for -- and students that have not yet completed the TCE will have the opportunity to go in and still complete it. Yet we want to make them available for students that have already done the right thing and completed the TCE.

HIPPISLEY: Liz.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S. Yeah, I think this has been totally muddled actually. And so going even back to not even to final grades, but going

back to the question that I think Connie asked right at the beginning, was this an extension and you said no.

And now it is an extension. And so, basically, we go back to the students have to have them finished in the previous system before finals were given. Now, they don't. Now, it's an extension during finals week.

And so, I think the question of whether or not, you know, what kind of a final you give the students, whether or not they have actually computed the final grade for them is going to act -- greatly bias the student in evaluating the course and the instructor.

It's a moment that they take to do this and I personally cannot vote for this at all, nor would my department like this at all, the way this is. And so I understand that you may have a problem in figuring out, you know, a way to restrict it now. But I think it has to be restricted in order to be fair to the instructors.

HIPPISLEY: So Liz, let me just ask if -- if -- could you entertain how you would make a restriction in amongst the recommendation of (inaudible), if this is a real sticking point, would your restriction be that the window must close before finals week?

DEBSKI: For me, it would have to close before finals week, correct, as it does now. Exactly.

HIPPISLEY: Brett, do you see how -- if that's practical or not for the window to close before finals.

McDANIEL: It can be done, but then what you're saying is that you're going to penalize the student because they're going to have sit there and wait for two weeks to get their grade.

HIPPISLEY: Kaveh.

TAGAVI: There's one other aspect of this. Professors, as a service to students put their final grade in, in canvas. Now, they're going to say, well, some of these people have not rated me so I'm not going to put it.

The other thing is when I receive an email from a student, what was my final grade? As a courtesy, I tell them, or if they come to my office. After I have received -- released the information to the registrar.

Now, you are telling me, I should say, well, maybe this person did not do my evaluation, I'm not going to give them the final if they come to my office. This just puts the professor in a very bad situation.

HIPPISLEY: Any other comments? It's

getting late. Yes.
STRATTON: Terry Stratton, College of
Medicine. Actually, I was on this
committee, and it seems to me, correct me
if I'm wrong, Jonathan, we were talking
about this. It doesn't restrict at all
the instructor's release of any grades in
any capacity, right? It's simply the
official, when a student can go into the
registrar.
GOLDING: Right.
STRATTON: So if you choose to tell the
students or post on canvas, I think we --
we agreed you still could do that, right?
GOLDING: Right. It's just not the
official grades. Your grade in canvas is
not your official grade, was the
discussion we had on it.
HIPPI SLEY: I think Mary had a question, way
in the back.
ARTHUR: Mary Arthur, College of Ag.
I've long wondered why we didn't move to
this system. But one thing I'll say about
universities like Yale and Harvard is that
-- is that there's a benefit to the
students for filling out the evaluation
which is that they can then view the
course comments and they use it as part of
this intellectual community. So that the
students are choosing which classes to
take based on reading what it says about
the course.
And, you know, oftentimes those
course comments are things like, well,
there was too much reading or I loved this
course because there was so much reading.
And they're actually using it as a
valuable weight.
I think when we listen to what
the students are saying, we're hearing
their comments in part because they're not
seeing what it does for them.
GOLDING: Right. And that's a problem.
And there's no -- there's no mechanism now
so that they really understand. I mean,
some instructors, some of you may talk to
your classes about it, but what we're
hearing is that this doesn't go on very
often.
HIPPI SLEY: Scott.
YOST: Scott Yost, Engineering.
I just want to make a comment
on the other, I guess, aspect, you know,
the delay or whatever, the voluntary
aspect. But when it comes to students
evaluating a course, I can say under the
old system, one thing I found very dis --
I disliked the old system because we had
to turn them in before the class was
actually finished. Which means the
students, if you want the students to
evaluate your class, I'm sorry, the final,

the final exam should be part of the information the student can use to evaluate the class.

And if you -- as I see this, faculty will try to get stuff done early under the old system. Then they have three weeks to do what they want and the students have no formal mechanism to -- to factor that into their assessment of the class.

So I personally have no problem doing it after the final exam so you get a complete picture. The students get a complete picture of how the faculty administer the class.

GOLDING: It's a valid point, but dates would have to all be changed again by whoever decides. No, it's a valid point you're making.

HIPPISLEY: Do any students have a response to that particular issue of the evaluation happening during or after final week? Scott's point, Liz's point. Any students?

ROARK: Becca Roark, College of Education. I definitely agree that the final is part of the class. I mean, I think if it was an unfair final, then I should be able to say that in my evaluation. If I thought the final was fair, I should be able to say that in my evaluation.

I also want to go back to the part of bias that I know, you know, students could be, you know, evil and try to make the evaluation as mean as possible, but also right now the students who complete the evaluations are the students who care, like they love the class, love the professor all the way or students that hate the professor and hate the class. So you're getting that bias too.

So I think this system kind of eliminates that and somewhat it does offer that window where students can be kind of mischievous and do whatever they want. But I think the final is definitely part of the class, and as a student, I would like to evaluate my professor on their final.

HIPPISLEY: Any senators? You. Yes, you.

SANDMEYER: Bob Sandmeyer, A and S.

This is a follow up to the earlier question I asked regarding instructors and sections, and this one has to do with 5A. And specifically distance learning classes, this might be tangential, so if it is, you just tell me.

I, for instance, I taught a distance learning class and I -- but we had instructors. I designed it, but we had instructors who actually taught the class. So my question is about these

University units. Are there specific distance learning institutional evaluations for this kind of situation where you have the class designer and then the class instructor? That's the kind of problem that I alluded to earlier would be an issue with the student --

GOLDING: Not that I know because I'm in the same situation as you're talking about too with distance learning. That would have to be, again, the committee would have to decide how to designate who is really being evaluated for that class.

To me that's something the committee would have to decide. You see there wasn't much mention of distance learning. There are other issues with evaluation of distance learning classes that are going to have to be dealt with.

SANDMEYER: Okay. Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Connie?

WOOD: I'd just like to respond to the student regarding the bias that is there due to the fact that it is voluntary response. It is true that the probability that the student chooses to fill -- voluntarily fill out the evaluation, the probabilities are not the same.

The probabilities are higher for those students who really love the course than those students who really hate the course.

Unfortunately, if you turn this into a forced questionnaire, that bias is still there because that will be the students who will choose to opt out, but you're also introducing a second bias, which is the mischievous responder bias, which is those students who say, I'm so ticked off, I won't just opt out, I'll go through and wreak havoc with the survey.

So, you -- it doesn't fix the voluntary response bias and it -- what it does is it introduces a second area of bias.

HIPPISLEY: Unless there are any final comments or questions, I'll just remind you, I can see the clock and you can't. It's ten minutes of five. Bob and then John.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

I would just like to make a point. Some of the concerns that have been expressed are related to how we interpret the results from these TCEs. You know, an issue about if I give a hard exam, will that show up in an angry student. I would say if you give a hard exam, it's going to show up as professor writes exams that are really hard. That's not a positive or a negative comment.

You have to look at the whole collection of comments and interpret what

the students are saying relative to the course. So I view these concerns as more things that we can address on our side when we use these for evaluation and for improving our courses.

HIPPISLEY: John?

NASH: John Nash, College of Education. Mischievous responders is a vexing problem for in adolescent research who serve a self-administered survey for adolescent research.

I'd recommend doing the matter related to shifting the culture, that the committee consider a human centered design approach and perhaps look for a body of mischievous responders and try to understand their needs and views of why they do so.

And possibly also on the other extreme, some of those bias on the other side who appreciate taking these surveys. While we feel it's important to get information to advise on tenure and course improvements, I get the sense that 18 year olds and 19 year olds aren't so concerned about my tenure, but other aspects may drive them to do well on these, or do well to perform on these things and fill them out. So --

GOLDING: Again, you hope the committee would be able to take, go further when the research aspect is (inaudible).

NASH: Yes. So a user-centered design, a UX sort of approach, this could be very useful. Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: John.

WILSON: Before we vote, did we fix the thing about the comments?

DEBSKI: No. That's what I was still complaining about. You haven't - there's so many things we haven't fixed here. We've just gone from one subject to another without changing anything.

WILSON: The thing which releases numerical information, only numerical information to anyone other than the faculty. Did we change that word?

DEBSKI: No.

HIPPISLEY: No, but we can certainly go back to where the wording is. It was a very simple fix suggested by Davy.

WOOD: Point of order. Will the committee accept that as a friendly amendment?

GOLDING: Sure. We just -- what we were trying to do, it may my error totally that I just messed up when I wrote it because I was taking it from some other document about the what was available, what was going to be available now.

HIPPISLEY: So if the committee takes that as a friendly amendment that there be a period after numerical rating. Right?

WOOD: We're inserting to students.
HIPPI SLEY: So would be available to students and faculty with two exceptions only.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.
HIPPI SLEY: Numerical ratings will be made available to students --

WOOD: Instead of anyone.
GOLDING: Yeah, instead of anyone.
GROSSMAN: Instead of anyone other than the faculty evaluation -- be only numerical ratings shall be made available to students.

GOLDING: To students. Period.
HIPPI SLEY: To students. It's accepted as a friendly amendment.

DEBSKI: And what is the next sentence?
Can I speak to that?

SEAGO: Well, wait a second here and I'll see if I can get this. Okay.

HIPPI SLEY: Liz.
DEBSKI: I just think it needs a little more thought, so basically that if you just say it can go to -- to the students or something like that, that's basically saying that you can get comments to the public and large. The parents, you know, all of these other people.
So that's why you actually always state it the opposite way, so that you're limited in this. And so this way, you could release, right? You could release those personal comments to lots of other people besides the students.

GOLDING: This, again, is what I thought is the whole open records. That if somebody wanted that information, they can go in there and get it whether we like it or not. So this is -- that's the law.
So I -- I mean, you may not like it, but somebody could go in and get it. So we're just trying to be consistent with how we understood the law.

HIPPI SLEY: Can I just ask J. S. ?
BUTLER: We're over the stated meeting time. There have been many complicated issues raised. We are losing members rapidly. I'm move to postpone this item to old business at next meeting.

FI REY: Second.
HIPPI SLEY: Is it majority, two-thirds majority to postpone? Let's vote. Okay. So --

BROTHERS: Who was the second?
HIPPI SLEY: J. S., you're the first. Who was the second?

SEAGO: I did hear a second.
HIPPI SLEY: Abigail Fi rey, Art and Sciences. Can we create a motion to postpone? J. S., do you mean postpone specifically to May the 2nd?

BUTLER: I moved to postpone specifically to the next meeting.

HIPPI SLEY: May 2nd. Okay.
 BUTLER: Where it will be old business.
 HIPPI SLEY: Okay. This does not require
 discussion. Right, J. S.? We don't need a
 discussion on this motion?
 BUTLER: No.
 HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Postpone it.
 REAL: So Andrew, then by extension,
 ours would also be postponed?
 HIPPI SLEY: Yes, this will postpone the last
 item too, by extension. Right, J. S.?
 You're postponing the next item too?
 BUTLER: Yes.
 HIPPI SLEY: All right. The chair's
 postponing the next item, too, correct?
 BUTLER: Correct.
 HIPPI SLEY: Okay. Count down. Five, four,
 three, two, one. Who wants to stay, who
 wants to go.
 BROTHERS: I say just take a vote by hand.
 HIPPI SLEY: We'll do a vote by hand, all
 right? So we need a sergeant of arms.
 Now, all of those in favor of postponing
 the next two items.
 BROTHERS: That's right. And then do
 opposed.
 HIPPI SLEY: All those opposed? Two opposed.

(THEREUPON, the aforementioned meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E O F S E R V I C E

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
 COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

I, LISA GRANT CRUMP, the undersigned Notary
 Public in and for the State of Kentucky at Large,
 certify that the facts stated in the caption hereto are
 true; that I was not present at said proceedings; that
 said proceedings were transcribed from the digital
 file(s) in this matter by me or under my direction; and
 that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings
 to the best of our ability to hear and transcribe same

UK4-11-16.txt

from the digital file(s).

My commission expires: April 6, 2019.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal of office on this the 15th day of May,
2016.

LISA GRANT CRUMP
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE-AT-LARGE
K E N T U C K Y