

SENATE MEETING

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

FEBRUARY 9, 2014

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

ANDREW HIPPI SLEY, CHAIR

ALICE CHRIST, VICE-CHAIR

KATE SEAGO, PARLIAMENTARIAN

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

LISA GRANT CRUMP, COURT REPORTER

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

HIPPI SLEY: I'd like to call the meeting to order, please. You've got your clickers and start using them any second now. So the first one is we just decide that we're here. All right.

All right. Let's get going with the real business. Minutes first, I didn't receive any corrections to the December 8 minutes, so unless there are objections now, the minutes pass by unanimous consent.

Just a few announcements. The Convocation for the 150 years is going to be on the 23rd. You've seen this email. I've managed to get the deadline for RSVPs extended to tomorrow. I think it would great if there was a strong senate showing. Senators, Senate Council, the whole body, as many of us can go to that as possible, that would be great. I know also that the gown and the hat is free. The hood isn't. By tomorrow, if you can give Nancy an email.

You remember we introduced this new item called other business, I want to do it

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt  
again today time permitting. The idea is that members of the body can be more interactive and bring up an issue (inaudible). And in fact, it was used in that way. We are able to report on some progress on one of the issues that was raised in that item.

I emailed everybody to say it's great to have big debates with amendments on the floor, but if people could send me ideas before the meeting, that I could at least just check ARs and GRs.

We decide whether there are things that (inaudible) have a conversation. That's what really -- this time I had a lot of emails, and I'm hoping it will make business much more efficient.

When you send an amendment to me, it's a suggested amendment that you will move or might not move on the floor, so it's not an amendment yet until it's on the floor and it's been voted. It just makes life easier, I hope.

Very soon I will be soliciting names for area and advisory committee compositions. Please note also that we just had a web transmittal posted, so please check those.

Due to popular requests, I asked Joey Payne to put on a forum to have at least an hour and a half to two hours, to talk about the proposed retirement changes. He did that. It was pretty well-attended. And I haven't received any perplexed concerns from senators since that time. So the assumption I had was, by and large, senators are okay with the proposed changes.

More reports, Ben Withers, Associate Provost, updated us on the foreign language requirement. And Senate Council asked him to do a pilot implementation which will report on that (inaudible).

The Ad Hoc Committee on faculty disciplinary policy, continues to meet but there's nothing to report today.

Some of my actions: we announced this already, but Ernie Bailey, Joan Mazur, Phil Kraemer, who all now are Senate Council. And it's good bye to David Pienkowski, Liz Debski, and Debra Anderson, and thank you for serving.

Katherine McCormick from Education has been elected the new Vice Chair of Senate Council and that means she is also the University Senate secretary. That starts on June 1st.

President Capilouto, and this is all part of the Provost search, according to GRs, he consults Senate Council on a new Provost. He met with us, Senate Council, on December 15th, and explicitly asked us our opinions, which were based on what Senate Council asked their colleges to ask.

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

So it represents to the colleges, worries and concerns, what the priorities and attributes of a new Provost would be. And any opinion on process. So that was about an hour and a half meeting.

The Student Government Association announced to Senate Council it has now endorsed Senate's proposed revision to GR XI. This is the University Appeals Board revision. And that means it can go before the Board and it will go before the February Board, meets on the 20th. So hopefully, it will be endorsed.

If you remember when we were looking at honorary degrees back in September, I think it was, one of the senators worried a little bit about aligning the type of honorary degree to the type of person who was (inaudible) getting that degree. And some of it didn't make sense like a car salesman having an honorary degree of letters, for example, it doesn't necessarily make sense.

So Senate Council asked and charged Susan Carvalho's committee, the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees, to just explore expanding the list. There are about six different honorary degree titles. There could be twelve, there could be fifteen. So she will look at that and she will report back to Senate Council. And if it's viable, we'll report back to Senate for a vote on that.

This is exactly what any other business should lead to. So we had a senator from Communication who said, my faculty and other faculty believe that there is administrative bloat in the system, so Senate Council, think about that and say what should we do next. And they all said to me, go tell the President.

So I did tell the President that there is a faculty perception of administrative bloat. And he said, are you sure that's not just the healthcare side of the campus and I said, no, this senator came from this side of campus.

So he is going to look into it and tell me what he finds and then I will report back to you.

The other thing was the same senator said I have a second point, and that is if we're going into the business of doing online teaching course evaluations, what we find is that the percentage of students who actually cooperate in that goes way down from 90 to 27, could we please raise this as an issue.

Jonathan Golding already was the chair of the TCE Ad Hoc Committee, so Senate Council was able to say to him, while you were discussing what your official charge is, did you come up with any other ideas about

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

how to incentivize students to actually fill out these online forms.

He gave us three or four. And he's going to talk later today, so I won't tell you what those three or four are.

Earlier in the year I was invited to attend a University-wide workshop on advising. This had all professional advisors, this had an advising network, it had deans, it had various faculty there.

And the idea was to look at current policies and come up with even better policies to make us a better advising outfit and help for student success.

I thought to myself at the time, as soon as the University wants to start creating new policies that touch directly on educational policy, or investigate and explore what we (inaudible) educational policy, Senate needs to be involved.

So I asked Phil Kraemer, Senate Council charged Phil Kraemer's Senate subcommittee on advising to be part of this conversation. So he has -- so Senate is formally involved in this whole discussion of revamping and advising (inaudible) subcommittee and they will report to the whole body.

But I'd like to say right now, if any of you are aware of some kind of University policy that's going on and you think it's educational policy, then Senate needs to know about it and Senate needs to get its arms around it.

We have about twelve subcommittees of Senate, which means there are at least twelve points where we touch on educational policy.

Senate Council just recently, last Monday, approved deviations from the standard calendar for a range of MAP courses. These are all courses which will be part of a new MS in Digital Mapping and a new graduate certificate which we'll discuss later today as a recommendation.

I'd like to hand over to secretary, Alice.

CHRIST: Nothing to report, thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you, Alice. And now I'd like to hand over to Katie, our parliamentarian.

SEAGO: In response to some requests, we now have on the University website, Parliamentarian Help. And Sheila, if you want to click on the link there.

Just what I've done is create a outline of what happens during the meeting, how a motion is brought forward, what might happen during a motion. And there is also a quick link to table, so if you want to know when somebody says (inaudible) what are they talking about, stuff like that. When they might be brought up, they need a second. Some quick information when you're dealing

with Robert's Rules for that. So that's a new addition to the website to help people.

HIPPI SLEY: So we could all be parliamentarians now.

SEAGO: That's right.

HIPPI SLEY: I'd like to ask Bob and John to give us any report.

WILSON: As is our custom, Bob and I will take questions that folks have.

I did want to comment, make a comment about the forum on the benefits. We had two parking forums as well. There was some spirited questioning, and those videos are available. Actually, I think it's interesting, both the presentations and comments.

There are two things I would highlight for folks that I was certainly unaware of in my earlier interactions with the parking people, is that the consultant from Sasaki gives a very nice presentation and it's very responsive to questions, noted that our supply issue here is much worse than most of the state universities he deals with.

So our problem is difficult and it actually is worse than many places. So issues of the supply are something that is really critical.

The other thing he raised, which I think became very evident after the Med Center Forum, was how important not just mean travel times are for employees, but predictability.

There's an awful lot of hourly employees who are on time clocks, who, if they have a deviation of 30 minutes every once in three weeks, which is a reasonable percentage, they're on probation. So it's not just the mean travel time, it's how predictable is it that you can get to your work in a given time, because you can't.

The advice to simply leave, get to work earlier, doesn't work when you have a system where it's unpredictable. And so that's part of it.

There is at least a commitment now to do a more meaningful process, I think, and we shall see. I think the notion that it's going to get any better soon, is I think not correct. I think the range of things happening is largely to increase supply on increased demand, and has really limitations on what can happen to the supply side of the equation.

So we're going to have to have creative solutions to try to give us some ways of dealing with this. I think at least with this consultant, there's an understanding of how severe the problem is. I am partially encouraged by that. I'll open this up to questions from folks.

GROSSMAN: Not just yet. I want to add a little on that. First, the consultant is

Looking more to the medium range and the long term.

WILSON:  
GROSSMAN:

Yes.

In the short term, things are likely to get worse before they get better, seriously worse, because there's one very telling map that showed the percent occupancy of all the parking lots across campus, bright red being the highest occupancy, and except for a few lots that we reserve for medical doctors who come in at any hour for emergencies, all the lots except the one on the far side of the stadium were red. And the one on the far side of the stadium is going to be partly taken for a football training facility soon.

So the lot of last resort is already at least 60 percent full and is probably going to move up to greater than 80 percent, greater than 90 percent, I'll say.

So now would be a good time to explore alternative ways of getting to work. That's really -- you can get to work earlier and earlier and earlier, that's another option.

People who need to leave campus during the day and come back, you're screwed. There's just no other way of explaining it, in the short term.

I would also say the administration is very well aware of the problems and they are trying as hard -- they're trying very hard to develop short term solutions as well.

But we are hemmed in and so there's only so much that can be done.

Hopefully, they'll pull something out a hat soon. The President did point out to me that last year he went to legislature with three building -- three self-funded building proposals which required no state money. One of those was a parking garage. And the state declined to allow it to be built.

DEBSKI :

Liz Debski, A and S.

I was wondering if you could elaborate on what short term solutions are being discussed?

GROSSMAN:

Finding parking on other properties that don't belong to the University.

DEBSKI :

That's it?

GROSSMAN:

I don't think anyone is looking at taking over the Arboretum right now.

They've gone to the state and asked for a parking garage, they're going to go back to the state and ask for a parking garage. Probably next year, I doubt they'll do it this year because it's a short session.

But, you know, if the state says you can have one project and the choice is a parking garage or a new Fine Arts Building, for example, that's probably an easy decision to make. (Inaudible).

So, you know, we are constrained in

some respects. I wish I could give you a happier answer, but...

- ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane, A and S.  
Are they exploring the notion of public transportation (inaudible) University, and the bus system is usually (inaudible) city bus system (inaudible).
- WILSON: They're trying. Lextran has functioned at varying degrees of effectiveness.  
There's a lot of concern about employees who are not -- cannot afford a car, and have to get here because we're a 24-hour operation. Many poorly paid employees are making less than \$25,000 a year, who have been able to get here at 3:30 in the morning by a special Lextran. That is going away relatively quickly.
- GROSSMAN: It's a Lextran decision.
- WILSON: It's a Lextran decision. And so the facilities people are trying to reach out to everybody who used that system to try to find out alternative ways.  
So they're making efforts to try to deal with -- exactly that inadequacy but we're not (inaudible). But they're very concerned about making the transit system more effective.
- GROSSMAN: That's something that the consultants should be able to help with. It's especially the University bus system you mentioned. We already have some inefficiencies in the campus bus system (inaudible) fix.
- WILSON: The issue was certainly raised, too, that this is -- since this is really a work issue, parking shouldn't be limited by only having their own resources to use on this.  
And resources may well be needed to be put into the system by the University in order to deal with the current crisis. So whether that's actually going to be the issue and we certainly are going to follow up on that.
- BRIAN: Gail Brian, Engineering.  
Have they thought about increasing the space for motorcycles and scooters? Because I've been hearing every year there have been fewer and fewer spaces and that is a viable option for people.
- WILSON: I don't know the answer to that. There are a lot of spaces they're trying to reconfigure to seek out a few more spaces. Like they will end up getting sixty more spaces in the orange lot by simply restructuring things differently.  
So they're trying to look at that, and that's something that we can certainly --
- BRIAN: There's much more scooter traffic now and that actually serves as a way that you can go from building to building and get off campus and come back.
- HIPPISLEY: Last question.

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

KELLUM:

Becky Kellum, A and S.

One thing that I have noticed happening, maybe after this (inaudible) they've started leaving the gates up at parking structure (inaudible). I hope that's not one of the short term measures.

They told me, I emailed them and asked them why they were doing that, they said they were doing that because -- to lighten the traffic and getting in and out of the structure with the construction going on. It's basically just opening it up to anybody to park in.

GROSSMAN:

As John Stewart would say, if you have any complaints, send them to Brian Williams.

No, seriously, if you have observations, Lance Broeking, is the person who is charge of parking.

WILSON:

Feel free to copy us in on any complaints. It helps us to know what's going on. A word of advice, it's easier to get the Vice President's page.

You can get to the parking, but it's a little difficult to find.

HIPPI SLEY:

Thank you. Okay, we now begin our committee reports and we have a slew of program proposals.

So let's invite Margaret Schroeder to the floor. This is a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Digital Mapping in the Department of Geography within the College of Arts and Sciences. And Margaret is going to -- it comes from committee, it doesn't need a second -- that Margaret will give us some background on.

SCHROEDER:

Okay. This is an online graduate certificate, 11 credit hours within three courses in Digital Mapping that trains students in a range of web-based systems for producing online geovisualizations and applications.

The Graduate Certificate is part of a larger initiative within the department to provide a curriculum rich with technical training in Geographic Information Systems and online mapping, including the creation and use of geodata, cutting edge techniques for scraping geodata from social media and other web-based sources, as well as online spatial visualization tools.

It has proper graduate faculty of record, student learning outcomes, assessment plan, and no additional resources are needed to implement the certificate.

The committee wanted to note and applaud this group of people who put this together because this is from the -- a result of the E-Learning innovation initiative that the group received last January.

HIPPI SLEY:

Thank you. Any questions for the committee? Any discussion for or against?



UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

Hearing none, let's move to vote. We didn't need this slide because no amendments were passed. So we're going to go straight to the vote. Five seconds, four, three, two, one. And the motion passes, one abstention.

SCHROEDER: Okay. So this next one is a recommendation that the Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new MS in Digital Mapping in the Department of Geography within the College of Arts and Sciences.

So again, this is part of a larger initiative. This is the other part of that. It's to create an online graduate -- sorry, excuse me -- to create the master's degree in digital mapping degree to train students in a range of web-based systems for producing online geovisualizations and applications. I'm not going to repeat everything I said for the certificate because that all applies.

UK is well positioned with instructional assets in critical GIS and online mapping as well as strong ties to academic and industrial networks enabling this initiative to serve a largely (inaudible) market in online degrees in GIS and mapping amid an unfolding location-aware future.

Again, this is part of the E-Learning innovation initiative and it has proper graduate faculty of record, student learning outcomes, assessment plans, and no additional resources are needed to implement the program.

HIPPISLEY: Any points of information, questions for Margaret, or anyone who wants to speak for or against the motion? Hearing none, we move to vote on this recommendation. No amendment, so we don't need that. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. Thank you.

SCHROEDER: Okay. This one is a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new University Scholars Program of a BS in Agricultural Biotechnology and MS Medical Sciences within the College of Agriculture, Food, and the Environment, and the College of Medicine.

So in this University Scholars Program students in the undergraduate program in Agriculture Biotechnology program are able to seek a Master of Science in the Medical Sciences program.

There is currently no direct undergraduate degree associated with the Medical Sciences MS program. The MS is a broad interdisciplinary degree housed in the College of Medicine which allows for individualized and flexible curriculum that enhances the academic credentials of the students they serve.

The interdisciplinary undergraduate

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

Agriculture Biotechnology program in the College of Agriculture, Food, and Environment is one of the most well-known and successful undergraduate programs at UK.

Both programs would benefit from this relationship, providing the best undergraduate opportunity to strengthen their academic position by obtaining an advanced second degree, making them more competitive and also increasing enrollment in the MS program.

There is no additional resources needed and the program is fully vetted and supported by a multitude of departments. And I should note that this is -- we note in our committee that this was one of the first interdisciplinary University Scholars Programs and we wanted to commend the departments and colleges for doing that.

HIPPI SLEY: Any questions for committee?  
BROWN: Roger Brown, College of Agriculture, Food, and Environment. I don't know if it matters, but you might want to take the word "the" out.

HIPPI SLEY: Would you accept a friendly amendment to get the word from the recommendation?

SCHROEDER: Absolutely.

HIPPI SLEY: Any other questions?

KELLUM: I'm just confused about exactly what this is.

BROTHERS: Your name, please?

KELLUM: Becky Kellum, A and S.

SCHROEDER: So the University Scholars Program in general, are you familiar with that?

KELLUM: Yes.

SCHROEDER: It's the same premise, it's just that this is a degree in a different college, there are two different colleges, where it's usually in the past it's been within the same college and sometimes even the same department.

So it enables the students, undergraduate students, to share credits between their undergraduate degree and their graduate degree, encouraging them to stay at UK and obtain that second advanced degree.

Does that answer your question?

KELLUM: The last sentence did.

SCHROEDER: Okay. I'll give you shorter next time.

HIPPI SLEY: Any other questions? Okay.

Hearing no further questions or discussion, we move to vote. Five, four, three, two, one. The poll is closed and the motion passes.

SCHROEDER: Okay. This is a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Research in Human Health Sciences within the College of Health Sciences.

The purpose of this certificate is to provide students with an interest in

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt  
research with the opportunity to obtain significant knowledge and experience in health-related research that will benefit their pursuit of a career in health.

The HHS Certificate appropriately draws on faculty and instructional staff from all departments in the College of Health Sciences, thus ensuring its interdisciplinary focus.

The curriculum provides an excellent model of an interdisciplinary undergraduate research certificate incorporating (inaudible) credits in research experience, and an outside class, area class, to be approved by the student's faculty mentor.

All the necessary components are there. No additional resources are needed and the program has been fully vetted.

HIPPISLEY: Questions for the committee?  
Anyone want to speak for against? Hearing no discussion, move to vote. Five, four, three, two, one. The poll has been closed and the motion carries.

SCHROEDER: Almost done. This is a recommendation that the Senate approve for submission to the Board of Trustees the establishment of a new MS in Applied Behavior Analysis in the Department of Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling within the College of Education.

The MS in Applied Behavior Analysis is a 36-credit hour program that will provide a depth of understanding in Applied Behavior Analysis, managing challenging behavior, working in schools and working with parents and care givers.

Students from this program will be marketable in a variety of private and public entities. Currently, BCBAs are highly sought after by this entity.

This field has grown exponentially nationwide over the past ten years as the number of individuals with autism spectrum disorders in children with challenging behavior have increased. There has been a need for professionals uniquely trained to support them and their families.

The Special Education Department within the College of Education has been approved by the Behavior Analyst Certification Board as an approved university to offer the course list you see included in this master's degree.

Proper graduate faculty of record, student learning outcomes, assessment plan, and no additional resources are needed to implement the program.

HIPPISLEY: Any questions for the committee?  
Anyone want to speak for or against? Hearing nothing from the floor, move to vote. I'll give you a five second countdown, five, four,

three, two, one. Motion passes. This is the last one.

SCHROEDER: Okay. This is a recommendation that the Senate approve for the submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new dual degree program, PhD in Plant Pathology with University Federal de Viçosa, and I apologize, I'm sure I mispronounced that, and the Department of Plant Pathology within the College of Agriculture, Food, and Environment.

So this proposal is for a dual degree program. Students in the dual degree program will earn doctoral degrees in plant pathology from both institutions by simultaneously completing the requirements of both programs.

The advantages to the students include the unique ability to obtain advanced practical training and to develop cultural and language fluency in both the United States and Brazil, while the advantages to the respected departments include the ability to recruit academic and superior students from both countries and facilitate the research collaboration to focus on plant disease problems of mutual interest.

The proposal emphasized that the departmental strengths were complimentary and that this builds on a relationship that is currently occurring between the two departments.

HIPPISLEY: Any questions for the committee? Katherine?

MCCORMICK: Katherine McCormick, College of Ed. So can you explain the difference between a joint degree and a dual degree?

SCHROEDER: Absolutely. In a dual degree program the student will receive a degree from the Brazilian university and a degree from the university of UK.

It does only require one dissertation but it's clearly spelled out within the proposal the requirements for a joint committee, so that both the requirements from the Brazilian university, and from our University, are met with that joint committee.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

Would it be possible for a student to fulfill the criteria for this program by staying at just one of the institutions or do they have to travel to both?

SCHROEDER: They have to travel to both universities. There's a residency requirement for both universities that's met and laid out in the proposal.

HIPPISLEY: Anyone have questions? Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

So your comment about satisfying the requirements of both universities reminded me that we have some fairly arcane requirements for formatting those PhD theses,

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt  
or at least we used to. And it's possible that some of these may conflict with some of the requirements that the Brazilian university has.

Is there a mechanism for resolving these kinds of things if they're going to write a single dissertation for both?

SCHROEDER: I defer to Susan on that one.

CARVALHO: The arcaneness of the dissertations has been modified with electronic submission.

We do require that we submit it electronically, so if Vicosá required a paper submission, they would have to submit both ways. We won't be measuring margins.

GROSSMAN: Good. Thank you.

PRATS: Armando Prats, A and S.

So what is the composition of the dissertation committee? What language is the dissertation written in and can everybody in the committee read the other person's language?

SCHROEDER: I will go ahead and defer for the composition of the committee while I look for the page.

VAI LLANCOURT: I'm Lisa Vaillancourt, in the Department of Plant Pathology.

The dissertation will actually be written in English, with English and Portuguese summaries. And the business of the committee would be done primarily in English. All of the faculty at Vicosá speak English fluently.

Our faculty, some of us speak some Portuguese, we're learning more. For the US students everything basically would be English, we have some (inaudible). For the Brazilian students, one of their goals for this dual degree is for the students to develop fluency in English. (Inaudible).

MCCORMICK: Can I ask just one more question? So what is the advantage of a dual? Why did your committee choose a dual rather than a joint?

VAI LLANCOURT: Dual degrees logistically are easier to do. Basically we're not changing our degree requirements in any way, basically we've got the same requirements that we've always had.

And a joint degree -- I don't know if we're ever done a joint degree. It's much less common, it's a lot more difficult to develop.

A single degree would be awarded by both universities as just one degree. So basically the student gets a degree from UK and from Vicosá. (Inaudible).

MCCORMICK: So we give credit in two degrees for the same course?

VAI LLANCOURT: It's not exactly the same course. There's extra requirements for the dual degree. Because Vicosá has some requirements that we don't have and we have some requirements that Vicosá doesn't have. So

really the students do end up doing extra work, extra courses, over the normal student.

CARVALHO: Susan Carvalho, Dean of the Graduate School.

I can add that we talked to SACS about the differences between joint and dual and the degree of interdependence required for joint degree means that we have to accredit all the facilities, classrooms, keep track of everything, and it would be a much more complex plan as if it were an extension on campus. And that's why most universities with international degrees out in dual (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Name and college?

ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane, A and S.

It's something that I've seen in Morocco universities with American universities, so and it worked.

HIPPISLEY: Having no further questions, move to vote on the dual degree. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion passes. Thank you to our committee for doing all that hard work. Six proposals for one meeting is tremendous. It moves us along.

All right. So this next item, number 4, let me give you some background here.

You'll remember at the end of the last session Senate voted to approve a new kind of degree type, the degree type is honorary degree type, in fact. It was called an In Memoriam Posthumous Degree.

The idea with this, that just like the other kind of an honorary degree type that we do, this is a degree given for someone who hasn't earned it.

So a student would declare a major, let's say, English, for example, and during getting credits for that major they die and they don't get the full credits for the major, but we give something, we give an honorary degree, in fact, what we call an In Memoriam Posthumous Degree.

There was a little bit of confusion about this last time we all met. And Senate Council was incentivized to tidy up the language a little bit in the SR. Specifically, the steps that are taken to go from a chair thinking they've got a parent who wants this to happen, to University Senate actually voting on it.

The proposed changes, we have a slide that's been done.

BROTHERS: Which version did you want?

HIPPISLEY: Okay. So this is the SR and if you scroll down a bit you can see some of the things that have happened here. If you go down a little bit further, it gets more serious later on.

Okay. So what we wanted to happen was this. And this is the first main -- I'll talk about the other changes in a minute, but

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

the first one is procedures.

We wanted a conversation to take place between the dean of the college and the chair of the program, and the program itself, and the Dean of Students, and the Registrar, and Senate Council Office. All would be on the same page with what they think is a condition for an In Memoriam Posthumous Degree.

Senate Council is as important in here because they can say we have the SR (inaudible) actually, this person died but they earned the degree so it's not in memoriam, it's actually just a posthumous degree. So Senate Council would be (inaudible).

The Registrar and the Dean of Students, they're involved because they need to check on two things: the student was a UK degree student seeking status and the student was in good academic standard. Those two things are (inaudible).

And the program and the chair of the program is checked just to make sure that they have declared a major and (inaudible). So that's one thing that we wanted to tidy up.

If you scroll down a little bit more, we then for part 2 and all the way down, we then suddenly start to treat this like a caveat for any other degree.

So what happens is a college will say I've got a list of people who need a degree. And the dean of that college will submit that to the Registrar's Office and the Registrar's Office can then give it to Senate Council Office, to sort of process, and then Senate Council Office will get it on the floor for us to vote on.

So this is the procedure that makes it exactly what happens with regular degrees and -- yeah, with regular degrees, earned regular degrees. So that's what we've done with that language right now.

The other little edits that you'll see is just as a shorthand, instead on keep repeating In Memoriam Posthumous Degree, we say at the very beginning -- if you go back to the very top, Sheila, I think is where we first define our shorthand -- here, if you look at C1, second line from the bottom, we define In Memoriam Posthumous Degree, we're going to use the shorthand, in memoriam degree, (inaudible).

So that's the substance of the change that Senate Council recommends for this body to approve. You'll see a little yellow in there. Yellow is minor editorial comments that the subcommittee (inaudible) which on behalf of Senate Council, I accepted as a friendly amendment. People look at those yellow things and say, how could you possibly think that crossing out two after

provide is anything less than substantive. And we can have that discussion, but I think we provide family, you don't provide two

families.

The other thing is that the Board of Trustees had actually established this already. It's not going to (inaudible).

So this is basically the gist of the conceptual reasons for making these changes and this is how it's reflected in the edits.

So this comes from Senate Council, it doesn't need a second. I'm putting it on the floor right now. So anybody who would like to ask about it or speak for or against it, now is the chance to do that. Yes?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

I was struck when you were presenting this with several times you said things like when we think there's been a petition to give this student a degree. When I look at this, who exactly requests that the student be given a degree?

HIPPISLEY: Right. So the steps are typically this way: either the family contacts the college, most likely the chair of the department or the director of the program of the major that was declared.

Most likely the family contacts that person or the family contacts the director or the dean and says, my child has died and I would like -- I'd like to have him or her considered for the In Memoriam Posthumous Degree. So that activates or triggers the process.

DEBSKI: Can't that be put in the rule?

GROSSMAN: It is.

HIPPISLEY: It is.

DEBSKI: Where?

GROSSMAN: Roman numeral I.

HIPPISLEY: Upon being made aware of the deceased student by either the family or chair of the student's own department, now the dean is activated.

DEBSKI: But that doesn't say that they've asked for a degree, a specific one. It says they died, but it doesn't say about them asking for a degree. Perhaps I'm -- I read this, I don't actually see anyone say that they're the ones that need to ask that the student be given a degree.

HIPPISLEY: Davy, I'm sure you have an answer.

JONES: Liz, this whole thing was brought to us originally by the President, who gave us the request. And what he wanted, he wanted an automaticness to it, that death is all it takes to be triggered, not a request.

DEBSKI: Yeah. So anyone who dies will automatically get a degree?

JONES: Who also was degree-seeking and in good academic status.

DEBSKI: Without anyone asking for it?

JONES: Yes.



UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

KELLUM: At any stage of their degree?  
 BROTHERS: Name, please?  
 KELLUM: Becky Kellum, A and S.  
 I'm wondering how far along in their degree process they need to be in order to be eligible.

HI PPI SLEY: As soon as they are degree-seeking, as soon as they are seeking a degree in X, Y, Z. That's enough. Gail?

BRI ON: Gail Bri on, College of Engineering. I'm a little bit concerned with the strikeout of the University Senate recommends, and that the Board of Trustees is establishing this. Don't we recommend that the Board of Trustees do establish this? I mean, are we giving over our authority directly to the Board of Trustees to establish this without us?

HI PPI SLEY: No. What we're doing is we're reflecting in reality that the Board of Trustees has established this.

BRI ON: But I would say, upon the recommendation of the University Senate, the Board of Trustees have established this. Because it was upon our recommendation.

HI PPI SLEY: Actually, I think originally the President --

BRI ON: The President asked us, but we had to vote to recommend to do this.

HI PPI SLEY: Okay, that's a good question. Before I go to the last one, does anyone have an answer for that? Bob?

GROSSMAN: It's up to the Board of Trustees to establish the degrees that the University offers. Now, they took our advice in establishing this, but it's simply up to them to do it.  
 The original language that was there makes it sound like -- made it sound like the Board of Trustees had not yet established it. That's why it's crossed out. They have established it.  
 Yes, they did it on our recommendation, but that's not relevant. Any degree that is awarded will have to be upon our recommendation. But the establishment is entirely up to the Board.

HI PPI SLEY: Davy?  
 JONES: Gail, the language that's there actually reflects a year or so ago when we were first asking the Board at that time to newly establish that, that's the language in the prospective. They've now established it so the prospective tense shouldn't be there.

BRI ON: But they didn't do so without us.  
 JONES: Right. Do you want the first paragraph to have a little historical insight to it or is it just the policy and historical insight in the Senate Minutes, (inaudible).

HI PPI SLEY: Kaveh?  
 TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.  
 I have a comment and I use that word carefully. I'm not amending anything.

Just what the other senator think, there is no time requirement on this, meaning that if somebody dies today, twelve years from now the parents could say we want a degree. And then twelve years from now we are going to give somebody who died twelve years ago a degree? Just want to see what others think.

HIPPISLEY: To answer Kaveh's question, I think is the answer to Liz's question where it's not triggered by the dean -- it's not triggered by the family asking (inaudible).

So if someone dies in your college, you go out and start the process.

TAGAVI: But it's possible that we don't know somebody has died. People drop out. Everyone who drops out, you don't assume they are dead. So somebody, to our knowledge, they drop out or they are no longer enrolled, twelve years from now, then the parents call and say I didn't know about this, my child died twelve years ago, I want the degree. This could happen.

GIANCARLO: Matthew Giancarlo, A and S.

So to answer that question, first of all, would that fall under the stipulation that the student is in good standing and they are respective for an In Memoriam Degree?

And second, if I understand your question correctly, I don't believe there's any provision in here for ex-post-facto degree, we're not permitting something that will allow people from the past, prior to the establishment of the policy to now come forward, but that this would be the policy going forward?

HIPPISLEY: Yes, that second one is right. I think the first one (inaudible). Any other questions? Discussion? Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

A couple of points I wanted to make. First of all, you said repeatedly that the student has to be in a degree program, and, in fact, that's not the case. They don't have to have declared a major, they have to be in good academic standing and in a degree-seeking status.

But a freshman who passes away after three weeks here, who has not declared any major, who has not entered a program, is still eligible for this kind of degree. In that case, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who is also the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies, will act as the dean of the student's program.

The other thing is, if you can scroll down a little bit, there is -- so roman numeral III says that we have to recommend each In Memoriam Degree. We vote on it.

If there is a question in any case, in any particular case, about whether a student deserves a degree, we can choose not

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

to have that student awarded a degree.

So if someone comes down and says, you know, my child died in World War II, I think they deserve an honorary degree, you know, we can choose to say sorry, that happens a lot and we don't think that's appropriate.

HIPPISLEY: All right. So ultimately, the Body makes the decision, but these steps are to get it to the floor for us to take up. So it is case by case, like any degree that we (inaudible).

Any other questions, information, or people who want to speak for or against this? If not, let's move to vote. Close in five seconds, five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. Thank you.

Okay. So a little bit of background on this one and then I will hand over to the dean of the business school or his associate dean.

I think it was about a year ago, maybe the end of last session, this Body approved an MBA between University of Kentucky and University of Louisville.

What we want to do now is approve the expression of that degree in terms of what the information on the diploma looks like.

So according to the SRs, we approve diplomas in terms of their informational content. And there may be lots of comments on styles and fonts and colors. Strictly speaking, that's not what we do. We do informational content only.

And in your handout you'll see the proposed, can you bring it up, Sheila? The Associate Dean of the Business School is here if anybody has any questions.

So I believe we need someone to move this, the motion to approve the informational content of the diploma that a student studying for the MBA University of Kentucky, University of Louisville.

CHRIST: So moved.

HIPPISLEY: Do we have a second? Your name and college?

FOLMAR: Chelsea Folmar, College of Ag.

HIPPISLEY: Thank you. Any questions? Anyone want to speak for or against? Yes.

TAGAVI: Did you say just content?

HIPPISLEY: Informational content only.

TAGAVI: Is University of Louisville going to be higher?

GROSSMAN: Their president is lower than ours.

HIPPISLEY: Any questions for Professor Skinner?

DEBSKI: Can we just ask if someone is going to design a better layout?

HIPPISLEY: You can ask that question.

DEBSKI: I just want to ask that question.

SKINNER: I assume everything will be -- this was designed by the Senate's Rules and

Elections Committee. I tried to move a few things because of some comments. I can see they are not perfectly aligned. But I would assume it's going to be done by a professional.

HIPPISLEY: There's a member of the Rules Committee just over there.

JONES: The Registrar's Office has a whole subsection that deals with style and layout and it would go to them for perfecting.

HIPPISLEY: Happily not our call. Hearing no further questions or discussion, move to vote. Okay. Close the polls, five, four, three, two, one. The motion carries by a long way. Thank you.

Okay. So we have legal counsel here, Marcy Deaton. I will hand over to Marcy Deaton to explain this proposed GR for us to endorse for Marcy.

DEATON: If you were here the last I was here to do this, we initially updated this because we needed to add gender identity, gender expression, marital status. We included our veteran discrimination, we make that part of our anti-discrimination clause consistent throughout the University.

There was some discussion about the introduction to that, not particularly in the list of those characterizations, but rather these are from (inaudible) where in the old version that we were striking out, it listed appointment, promotion, employment, some education.

The last time I was here with it, we had reduced that to -- and I don't remember what it was -- but it was something like employment. It was very basic. And there was a little bit of concern about that.

So I went back and met with General Counsel, and we came up with another one to say even more generally, in all aspects of University employment. So that would be in the GR X. In the GR XIV, where it applies to education and employment, it says, it's a different one, all aspects of University operations. That way we think everything is covered.

So this group asked me to take it back to Senate Council with some revisions, and they could act on behalf. So Senate Council liked this. I'm a little confused with the process of it coming back here, but I think they're just looking for discussion.

But that's the history of it. It's been kind of being developed over a few months.

HIPPISLEY: To deal with the confusion, it never actually made it to the floor last time. It was shot down before it even got there, as it were. So it's now on the floor. It's not on the floor yet, I haven't put it on the floor.

SEAGO: You need a motion.

HI PPI SLEY: So I need a motion to endorse the revised changes to GR --

DEATON: X. This one is XIV. The other one is X.

HI PPI SLEY: -- X and XIV.

KENNEDY: So moved. Michael Kennedy, Emeritus.

HI PPI SLEY: Second?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman.

HI PPI SLEY: A and S.

GROSSMAN: A and S.

HI PPI SLEY: It's now on the floor. Any discussion for it or against or points of information? Yes?

NASH: John Nash, College of Education. The University policy regarding tobacco use, not smoking, I wonder if that should be clarified?

DEATON: The reason it says smoker, not tobacco, is that the state law only requires us to not discriminate against smoking. So what we've tried to list are only things as they are stated by federal or state law.

NASH: So I can discriminate for dip?

DEATON: Kind of.

HI PPI SLEY: Any other questions for legal?

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

DEBSKI: In that vein, is it only political beliefs or is sort of free speech guaranteed?

DEATON: Free speech is guaranteed.

DEBSKI: Can you say something like that, include that?

DEATON: We really want to leave it if we can as just the terms the federal laws and federal rules and state rules use without having to explain all that in detail. Yes, you have free speech. In your free speech, you can say, I'm a republican, you cannot be discriminated because your beliefs are republican or democrat.

DEBSKI: Well, what if you say, I disagree?

DEATON: That's okay. That's free speech. You can't be discriminated because of your political belief, whatever it may be.

HI PPI SLEY: Davy?

JONES: Liz, there's another place in GR X that is expressly about the free speech and that's not being touched by any of these.

ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane, A and S.

ILAHIANE: I was just wondering about the gender identity, gender expression.

DEATON: Yes.

ILAHIANE: Is there a place there for transgender, could that be interpreted?

DEATON: As far as I know, transgender and these are all considered sex discrimination. In fact, we don't actually have to list anything after sex, even sexual orientation as defined by the federal government is part of sex discrimination.

DEATON: The federal law doesn't actually say those terms after sex. But the federal rule that came out last year about Title IX

only referred to gender identity and gender expression. So then we're trying to stick to, at this point, only the exact terms that are in federal rules or guidance or letters or laws. They would all be covered.

We could actually stop this thing after the first sentence. We don't even need to list them all. They're all covered. No matter what we do, we can't discriminate. But we wouldn't expect people to have to go look up all the federal and state laws and all of that. So we chose to do the laundry list. But we also want to keep the laundry list exactly to what it is at this point in time.

HIPPISLEY: Armando?

PRATS: Armando Prats, A and S.

Marcy, last year the Benefits

Committee voted to deny transgender surgery. And I'm wondering if the actual inclusion of transgender status in that document does not essentially obligate the University to start paying for gender change operations?

DEATON: Well, we haven't added the term transgender, we've only added gender identity and gender expression. And that would also be a healthcare, insurance, benefit rule.

PRATS: But not a form of discrimination?

DEATON: Right. It's a little tricky.

HIPPISLEY: Mary? No. Any other questions?

Discussion for or against? Hearing none, let's move to vote to endorse these two revisions. Okay. Five second countdown, five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. And I believe this will be on the Board of Trustees agenda for (inaudible). For a first reading?

DEATON: First reading, yes. And then May 8th is the next Board meeting that it can go to for its final read.

HIPPISLEY: Thanks.

DEATON: Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Item number 7, I'd like to invite Dr. Jonathan Golding, who is the chair of our Ad Hoc Teaching Teacher Course Evaluations Committee. I would like to remind senators that we are taking no action today. This is a report or proposal for discussion only.

What will happen here is we'll have a civil discussion and people raise suggestions and amendments, we'll collect those in the minutes and Senate Council will look at those amendments and then at a future time, hopefully next time we meet, we will start bringing the amendments to the floor. All right? So that's what's happening today. It's a full and free discussion only.

GOLDING: A civil discussion. You can tell me what you want me to discuss. The report's been distributed, I can go through the history.

HIPPISLEY: A little bit of history would be very nice.

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt  
GOLDING: Okay. Very briefly, for those of you that don't know, the teaching evaluations that are used on main campus have been around since 1992/93 academic year. They're quite old.

Many colleges and departments and programs have adopted the teaching evaluation forms, however, over the years, a significant number of units have decided not use the form. And these include Honors, the Statistics Department, the College of Medicine, Dentistry, Law, Fine Arts and Architecture. So a sizable chunk of the University.

And there's a number of reasons for why the departments have opted out. These include the questions on the form are not pertinent to any units, some units feel there are questions that are absent that should be included.

There's been some dissatisfaction with the grading scale. It's a four point scale now, it used to be a five point scale. So it slipped over time.

And then also, there's language in the questions, if you read them, that can lead to what are called double barrel questions. They basically are asking two questions, so you don't really know what students are answering, nor as we look at it do we know how to evaluate that particular question.

Given the continued lack of University support for the form, and following, there was a report by the College of A and S, the Provost and others felt that there should be an attempt to try and come up with a common form so that the committee that I chair was charged with reviewing it and proposing a revised evaluation form that would give the opportunity to be used throughout the University.

The initial committee included 18 members from throughout the University that included members of my own college, A and S, it included people from -- there was somebody from the Medical School and there were members from the College of Education and Fine Arts, from other units, I have all that information if you need it.

We met, we started last spring. And what the committee did is that it decided the meetings last spring were basically set up to come up with a model for what kind of form could be used that would be University-wide.

And in the end, after looking at several meetings and looking at what's done around the University, we came up with a plan and model wherein there would be a limited number of common rating and open-ended questions that could be answered by students throughout the University at all levels. In

addition -- so that's the common sort of core questions.

It was also agreed that the model we were adopting would allow individual units to ask their own specific questions. And then finally, it would allow individual instructors to ask their own questions.

The critical idea behind the model was to gain again some acceptance of this common form, understanding that each unit has their own needs, their own pedagogies that they want to evaluate.

So this was, we felt, allowing the needs of everybody and the Provost need of having a universally accepted common core for allowing each unit to assess the pedagogies as they saw fit.

Now with this in mind, what we did this past semester, or last semester, full semester, was to try and come up with the common core questions.

Of the 18 people we started on the committee, 13 agreed to continue meeting, but because of conflicts only 8 people at a maximum of could attend meetings, although members agreed, the 13 members, minutes were distributed and they were encouraged to give whatever comments that they would like.

So we have, and I think you were given them as part of the report, but also they have the revisions? It's a much shorter form, you'll see.

So these are the common core questions, they've been discussed at Senate Council. This has been revised a little.

Two quick points, three quick points I'll raise, just bring up. The committee, if you read the report, the issue of the scale that's been used, five or four, you can have a great argument about it, great discussion, in the end, the committee decided that we would recommend a five point scale to allow for greater variability, and it's a way to give students a choice of having a (inaudible) grade for a course and instructor.

And again, there is also ways that we get the output from the evaluations. The committee recommended that the form should include a number of pieces of information that are not currently there. Some are, some are not.

This includes the response cap for any particular course, not just the enrollment numbers. The response cap, the median score, (inaudible) showing the distribution of grades across the scale.

On the present form you do get a distribution measure, but I'm not sure all faculty really know what that really means.

The third point I would want to bring up, the committee was charged with coming up with this evaluation form. We did



not deal directly with dealing with online course evaluation, but we believe at least for the common questions, this form could easily be revised to allow for evaluation of online courses and instructors.

And the issue about how the evaluation is going to proceed, it says for (inaudible) students to complete this form. It was not something the committee explicitly dealt with, just very brief discussion on it.

So with that in mind, I was a little longer than I thought, but just to give you some background. I'll be glad to answer whatever questions you have about what we proposed in our recommendation.

HIPPISLEY: I'll open it up for discussion, discussion only, but for people to say if they've got any substantial worries about it and make suggestions as to possible amendments that would make the worry go away.

We'll just use this time to collect such suggestions and concerns and collect such amendments and then bring them back next time. So Liz and then Kaveh.

DEBSKI: Liz Debski, A and S.

I can't see all the way down but there's something about the instructors stimulating critical thinking of students or --

GOLDING: It was decided questions like that, specific issues, critical thinking would be questions that colleges, departments, individual faculty, (inaudible).

We could sit here and argue, yes, everybody is supposed to teach that in their classes. It was decided a specific question asked about critical thinking was best left to individual units.

KELLUM: Becky Kellum, A and S.

Questions like the pace of the course was appropriate, (inaudible) of the instructor. I get a low grade on that. I don't know whether (inaudible). I literally do not know. And so sometimes -- I mean, I understand you're just trying to evaluate the teaching but the teacher also likes to get some feedback that can help.

GOLDING: Valid point.

HIPPISLEY: Can you suggest a way to fix that?

GOLDING: That's a tough one.

GROSSMAN: I have a suggestion. You made the scale much too fast, a little too fast, the right pace, going too slow, much too slow.

HIPPISLEY: Label the points on the scale, basically.

KELLUM: You get a total score. I do understand why the precedent is where it is. But (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Thank you.

BRION: Gail Brion.

HIPPISLEY: I think it was Kaveh.

TAGAVI: Engineering, Kaveh Tagavi.

I recommend a comment regarding

instructors, this big question. Conceptually wonderful. But can you tell me a little bit what the logistics of this? Let's say we have 5,000 courses, every semester you are going to have the logistics and (inaudible) of a new faculty who is going to put their own questions in there, who is going to do that and who is going to check it?

GOLDING: The standards I guess throughout this (inaudible). That's their job. And we have a member -- we have two people involved with that (inaudible) on our committee. The issue of implementation is not the charge of committee. You bring up a good point. That's going to be somebody on campus. They want this. The new Provost wants this, we're going to figure it out. (Inaudible) that doesn't have a lot of support right now.

HIPPISLEY: Gail?  
BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. To follow-up on the pace of the course, could that question be worded as assignments were distributed equally across the semester? Or -- I mean, I'm not sure what that question is trying to get at.

GOLDING: Well, here's the problem. The problem with saying assignments, not every course has assignments. So you've got to deal with that issue. You have to knock that out first.

The point about pace, I understand what's being raised. Again, it's coming up with another question. It's a valid point, not a furthest point. I understand. It's that coming up with a question that can be used by all units. As you happen to sit there and say, what's going to happen...

So your point, yes, assignment would be fine, but something would have to change there.

BRION: I have a problem with the instructor communicated effectively. That number 3 up there. Clearly, with the multi-cultural campus that we are, in sort of a mid west area, one of the common complaints that I hear from students are that faculty had an accent.

And that to me would just open up faculty to be considered that they weren't communicating clearly because they had an accent.

HIPPISLEY: Do you have a question?  
ELLIS: Yes. Sam Ellis, College of Medicine.

The question about the quality, I think it's rather ambiguous to me. Quality to everybody means something different. I thought it was vague and open to too much subjective interpretation, 11 and 12.

GOLDING: Can I ask what you feel the student would think either way? So I'm trying to understand what you think.

ELLI S:

Well, I think that quality to me may be different to what is quality for somebody else. What is objective that you should (inaudible).

GOLDI NG:

I'm standing here trying to think of the best way. This is a question that you can go to evaluation forms throughout the country and this is a similar question.

I'm not sure other than giving specific examples. But then again, that would have to be down to the units and instructors on how they want to define quality. For example, I'll give you an example that came up a great deal: it was raised that we should be putting down instructor fulfilled all the teaching objectives in the course.

Now, that's a way potentially you could define the quality work, that they fulfilled all that. The committee went against that because they felt that was getting too specific.

Students (inaudible). It's in the syllabus, but whether they know that. So it was felt to put a more general question.

I understand, I think, what you're saying. But to me that would be something departments, units would have to decide if they want to more specifically define that.

HIPPISLEY:

A question over there?

LEE:

Chad Lee, College of Ag.

Thank you for bringing this forward. It's an immensely difficult task.

GOLDI NG:

Thank you very much. Yes, it was.

LEE:

And throwing this out to a room full of PhDs is like tossing a fresh gazelle in front of a bunch of jackals for all of them to pick it apart in different areas.

As I look at your open-ended questions at the bottom, if there is something that a student reads in the previous questions and really has concerns, I'm hoping that student for taking this seriously, there's ways to identify those in the bottom.

So if they thought the pace was off, hopefully there they will identify what it was about the pace they didn't like. Or what it was about the quality they didn't like.

And so frankly, for the handful of students that do take this seriously, those would be the nuggets that would be worthwhile. I think you have a very good framework here.

GOLDI NG:

If I could give one anecdote, I teach large classes on campus. And when I would do the handout, the regular evaluation, I get very few comments. So last semester, this is my class of 500, I got more comments on the online form than probably, maybe in all the years I've taught.

So I think they'll do it. And

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

there is a value to having it online because they feel they have the time to do it. And it is very beneficial (inaudible) teaching (inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, College of Engineering.

To follow-up on my earlier point, I don't think you can leave this to just implementers. For example, would there be anything, would there be a censorship? Could the faculty put a derogatory comment in there?

Who is going to do the censorship? Does the faculty question have to be approved by the department or do you directly go to the people who are implementing?

I think we need more -- I think this is a policy we have to decide, whether you're freedom can be edited by somebody else, and if it is, we should put it in the rule, in my opinion.

GOLDING: Again I would say it's not the charge. And the way, I guess, I'll say my own opinion, is that it's going to have to be colleges and departments are going to have to decide how they want to add questions, how they're going to be able to add questions.

TAGAVI: But you have college questions separated. That implies college decide.

GOLDING: Yeah.

TAGAVI: The one with instructor implies instructor decides.

GOLDING: Right. But with some process you would think that a department will have final say.

HIPPISLEY: Hsain, then John?

ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane, A and S.

I'm going to go back to the 11 C, name of course, was a quality course, and I'm speaking with an accent obviously. I would suggest perhaps, friendly suggestions because we hope that our courses will be transformative. So I think that's key for me, what I try to achieve in my courses. Because again, the word quality means many things, it means many things to different people.

GOLDING: Again, offer a suggestion. Because if not, you can't say it was a good course because you argue the bias there. So quality is a word (inaudible). I have an accent, too, according to the people in this state, too.

HIPPISLEY: John?

WILSON: John Wilson, College of Medicine.

I need to underscore the -- my compliments to the committee that was previously expressed. Developing a universal form would be almost universally impossible.

I do have some concerns just logistically. And this may not be appropriate (inaudible). Many courses are,

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt  
particularly in my college, may have 20, 25  
instructors. I'm just trying to understand  
what is a student supposed to do when faced  
with question 2? Is it 16 out of 20 that  
you're (inaudible).

In other words, I'm just saying  
logistically it becomes a real problem in  
these courses.

GOLDING: Courses that are team-taught,  
especially in the College of Medicine, again  
this is me thinking that you, the college,  
would have to decide how you want to  
implement this.

This form to me, as I understand  
how the college, some of your classes work,  
so every individual instructor that came in,  
would have to rate the instructors on some,  
whether it's a subset or all, some decision  
will have to be made.

Because if I come into your class  
and I speak, there's certain questions here,  
that (inaudible) was I prepared, (inaudible)  
my lecture, and so that's a decision that to  
me that has to come later on for individual  
colleges, how they want to implement that  
(inaudible) unique course in your college  
(inaudible).

WILSON: So my second question: is it the  
role of Senate to somehow to decide how this  
is implemented bureaucratically? Because I  
can see, for example, an independent study  
course with one student, you really -- you  
identify the student if we have this type of  
evaluation. So how do courses get exempted  
from this specific wording that's here?

GOLDING: That's an interesting question. In  
my own department, independent study courses,  
I'm not evaluated for my teaching there. So  
that somehow is something (inaudible). So,  
however it's going to be implemented, either  
institutional, research or some entity, is  
going to have to decide (inaudible). And I  
think that's fair because not every course  
(inaudible).

WILSON: I guess I'm concerned about what  
happens to the data.

GOLDING: Well, we'll have to ask the  
Provost. She's leaving, but maybe if she's  
still around, ask what her intent was.

WILSON: Functionally, I'm thinking of  
reporting requirements that are (inaudible)  
placed on instructors, colleges, et cetera,  
to go into a database, which God only knows  
what happens.

GOLDING: Well, we think about the students,  
we try to think about if you're a student in  
my college in A and S and you wanted to see  
what professors you wanted to take and how  
they rated, right now you couldn't do that  
because there isn't data for every faculty  
member. You're screwed.

So you can go and look, you see my  
name, but then you might want to go to

statistics and see (inaudible) and you can't do it.

I don't even know if you can actually -- if that data is available to students. So this is a way you could argue it would have some value to students. Just speaking one group. And now they can look. Whatever data, wherever it's going to be held, it would be available to everybody.

HIPPISLEY: Lisa Conn?

CONN: Lisa Conn, College of Communication and Information.

I virtually think the charge of this committee was far too narrow. I think it leaves out some of the most important issues. In my unit, we teach exclusively online and not addressing how students are incentivized to complete these, is a huge issue. Because if we have five people complete them out of forty, it's an irrelevant measure.

I also think that we need to deal at a university level with how the data are analyzed and reported. If -- I saw the paragraph about the outliers. And other institutions deal with them differently. Some of them excluded them, the standard deviation is too high.

We want really meaningful numbers. And without that kind of treatment, the numbers really don't equal. I think we need a University policy about how we analyze the data that's better than what we have.

And finally, I think that we need to do something on a university level to educate students about what these do and what they can do because I've been (inaudible) consistently (inaudible) in classes in my school.

I am so angry and tired of seeing she's got a nice ass. And, you know, appearance, have gone way up, students commenting on women appearance. I think students really have to be educated about the purpose and what's appropriate and inappropriate for these (inaudible). And without these things, (inaudible).

GOLDING: All valid points. And I think that can be taken up (inaudible). You're making very good points.

HIPPISLEY: There is not a quick answer, but Ben Withers is working on exactly answering that question. He's proposing before this body where part of your course, the teaching over the 16 weeks, is educating the students on how to do this properly.

So you're telling them from the very beginning how -- the importance of it, the idea of evaluation and assessment, because it's all educational. And you even suggest (inaudible) midterm informal evaluations. Just so they realize what they're doing and (inaudible).

GROSSMAN: Yes? Oh, Bob and then...  
Bob Grossman, A and S.  
First of all, I would like to echo some of the others in complimenting you and your committee on coming up with these questions.  
I just want to remind everyone, the decision isn't to do this or not to do this. The decision is to keep what our current forms are or replace them with something like this. And to me, this is a huge improvement over the forms that we have currently.  
Some of the issues that have been raised are issues in -- with our current forms. For example, students writing inappropriate things and some of the questions not being appropriate for the course you're teaching.  
The concern about the word quality being subjective, this whole instrument is subjective. So, you know, it doesn't measure quality, the quality of the teacher, the quality of the course, it measures the impressions of the students.  
And so that's what you're trying to gather. So I'm not sure --  
GOLDING: One piece of the evaluation process, it tells you about student satisfaction. And we shouldn't, you're correct, we shouldn't say more about that. That's what it is. It's not an objective measure, it's not a measure of learning. Anyone who thinks it is, you're incorrect.  
GROSSMAN: Again, if we wanted to be really serious about measuring quality, there would have to be a huge amount of resources and time put into measuring what really mattered.  
For example, if course A is followed by course B and you want to measure the quality of course A, really the best measure is how they perform in course B.  
GOLDING: Right. The only thing I would add, the departments can be very savvy in getting some additional information by the questions they ask. There could be questions that gave you a lot more information than just this set of questions.  
HIPPI SLEY: Yes?  
KENNEDY: Michael Kennedy, Emeritus.  
The one on the question of educating the students, I got to the point where my first quiz for a course was what's in the syllabus. So they at least were obligated to read it through if they wanted a decent quiz grade.  
Secondly, what Bob said, I think instead of asking students to assess the quality, you might personalize the question to the student and ask was this worth my time and effort.  
HIPPI SLEY: Gail?  
BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering.  
I just have to say I appreciate

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt  
what's trying to be done, taking a form  
that's very long and bringing it down.

But you cannot forget that this  
form, while you're trying to measure student  
satisfaction, is also used to evaluate  
professor performance. And we do need it to  
be objective because administrators are using  
these to try to assess the quality of  
teaching.

GOLDING: The only thing I would say there is  
(inaudible) you have to view these for what  
they are. And any promotion or tenure  
committee has to understand the grand  
picture. Because what you're saying  
regarding (inaudible) we could argue  
administrators should be taking a more  
objective look at teaching and not  
(inaudible).

So, you know, this is well beyond  
what we tried to do here. Your point again  
is well taken. But you could argue with the  
University, whether ours or others, on how  
they think about these forms. The form  
should not have as much value as it has.

I would reiterate what Bob said,  
that we're just trying to come up with a  
model that we make better. The way that we  
at least have this tool to help us think  
about a solution.

STEWART: Sharon Stewart, College of Health  
Sciences.

One of my concerns is that we're  
trying to make one form fit so many different  
kinds of courses. In our college, and in a  
number of other colleges, there's a lot of  
clinical courses where students meet,  
perhaps, a professor one time at the  
beginning of the semester and then the rest  
of the time they're out working with  
preceptors for the entire length of that  
course.

So some of these questions even  
having to do with class meeting (inaudible) I  
think students would find really difficult to  
answer because that really isn't what's  
happening in that particular type of course.

So what I'm concerned about is in  
an attempt to come up with something that's  
better, we might actually end up with  
information that is not useful and I think  
some frustrated students and faculty members  
who feel like even with this small  
set of questions, there's several that do not  
apply to them.

GOLDING: What I would say, again a very good  
point. I wish we had somebody from your unit  
on our committee. The thing I would say  
there again I believe for me, personally,  
that I think (inaudible), would agree,  
there's going to have to be a way that some  
courses are exempt. The question is how  
many.

Right now they have multiple



evaluation instruments around. It doesn't seem the best, at least for the Provost, it was not.

So there will probably have to be some mechanism for that. And again, as for why the Provost wanted this common sort of set common across the University, that's a question that she and whoever, interim, will have to answer.

VASCONEZ: I think this --  
BROTHERS: I'm sorry. What was your name?  
VASCONEZ: Vasconez.

I think this is a very laudable attempt. In medicine, we have, obviously some (inaudible), we need to test and we need to evaluate students, (inaudible). And so I think by having another form, I think that's appropriate.

What I wanted to know is did you consider making this mandatory or is this an option?

GOLDING: That will be, again, the Provost -- the Provost says, look, everybody has to do this, you're not going to be able to opt out because, for example, someone said this is -- -- because it's late, and I don't know if any our my colleagues from Statistics are here, what we have heard is Statistics opted out because of the scale.

Now the argument would be the Provost says, no, you're not opting out because of that. Everybody has to do it. And that's one way to do it and everybody does it, but for a few exemptions.

The other way is to do what we have now which is everybody just decide we're going to do it or no, we don't like this, we're not going to do it.

So this will be -- that's why a decision -- Senate will have to decide on the instrument and see what (inaudible).

VASCONEZ: One more question, when you say my expected grade, what do you mean by that?

GOLDING: I'm not sure.  
VASCONEZ: Do they know the grade or do they think they know the grade? Because that could be putting --

GOLDING: That question has been on there and it's typically on forms for all universities.

VASCONEZ: What was the feeling of putting that in there?

GOLDING: It was felt like we wanted to see what students -- how they felt they were going to do.

Some people liked that question because it is to target potentially, are all the people filling out the form, these are your best students. So you get a gauge of where the distribution of grades may lie.

O'CONNOR: I'm sorry. I just wanted to reiterate again. I think doing interview about this form, approving it, is putting the cart before the horse until you go back and

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

settle some of these policy issues, and then the form, I think the actual form takes really a little different context.

HI PPI SLEY: Matt?

GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, A and S.

First thing again, thanks to your committee for their hard work. Last year I was on the committee for Arts and Sciences (inaudible) Arts and Sciences teacher evaluation form. I know how difficult it can be.

One general comment, if members of the Senate are really think about -- thinking about revising teacher-course evaluations, there's a massive body of research. It's all public. You can go online and find a lot of information about what works, what's effective. So the information is available.

Second, from what we determined in Arts and Sciences, is that the current form is a bit of a monstrosity. It's a legacy. And it's not a very good instrument for trying to find the things that we claim to be trying to find from it.

And reducing the size and focusing the questions can go a long way for may go a long way for rectifying some of the problems that people have identified here. That is, unless you guide students in what you're actually looking for, you really, in fact, get frivolous or not helpful responses. That is an artifact of the instrument. It isn't necessarily an artifact of our students.

The last point I'd like to make is that yes, it is suggestive and maybe even variable, but they are our students. We should be looking for ways to get better information from them because they're the ones who are paying to be here and they should have a very clear voice, in a very clear way, of evaluating what they think of our teaching.

So rather than objecting to it or burying it under a lot of complaints, I think it is our responsibility to back the committee in its efforts to provide a better instrument. I'd just like to put that out there in voice or in support of this instrument that is something that's going to help student response.

HI PPI SLEY: Someone in the very back there.

Did you have a question? No. Okay.

TRUSZCZYNSKI: So I would like to say that if is

this going to be used for -- Mi rek Truszczynski, Engineering -- if it is going to be used for evaluation of faculty members, if it is going to be used for promotion and tenure cases, and it's going to be used -- raises our set, I think we need to have a very clear specification of how this is going to affect the decisions and then it has to be tailored to what's supporting these types of decisions.

If, on the other hand, this is to provide a meaningful feedback to a faculty member who is teaching the course if it's really only for that faculty member, so that the faculty member can say, oh, here I didn't do things as I wanted to and here I did something right, then I think the Council is good and this form is good.

And comments that students provide, in my opinion, in most cases are quite good. One can always disregard the (inaudible) the ten percent of those that are in some way extreme and get very useful feedback from those comments.

So in my opinion, there's nothing wrong with the current form, there's nothing wrong with this form if these forms are to provide feedback to me.

If the forms are to provide feedback to administrators and this will affect me in some way, I really would like to understand how they will be using these forms.

HIPPISLEY: Any questions? Any more questions?

HERTOG: Jim Hertog.

Is there any way to add a question about whether they learn anything?

GOLDING: This issue came up. It's a --

HERTOG: Whether they feel they learn anything.

GOLDING: Yes. That's what you have to do, you have to ask whether they felt they learned something. The general view was, of the committee, that that wasn't a valuable question.

I mean it could be added, of course. I'm just saying we discussed this at length because the issue of learning, point well taken in literature, is enormous on the idea of what evaluations are showing you. So it wasn't passed by. But, of course, anything could be added.

HERTOG: This is all sort of administration rather than, you know, whether somebody learns something. It sort of assumes a traditional classroom structure, administration, tests, pacing and so on and so forth. If you break away from that, it could be very helpful or could actually harm the evaluation of the teacher that does it.

HIPPISLEY: I think we should end the discussion now. (Inaudible) we will discuss it in the Senate Council and bring back this discussion at the next meeting or at some meeting.

I just wanted to give you some news. News report, news flash. The two candidates for our new Provost at the University of Kentucky will come to give campus forums on Thursday and Friday, they are Dean Blackwell and Dean Tracy.

I encourage as many senators as possible to go to those forums Thursday and

Friday if you've got time. Senate Council will also be meeting with both candidates on Thursday and Friday. So that's some news. This Thursday and Friday. Susan, can you give us the times of the forums?

CARVALHO: On Thursday in the Great Hall at (inaudible) Library, Dean Blackwell, from three to four, and Dean Tracy, from four to five.

And on Friday, it's the Hospital Pavilion A, Dean Tracy from eight to nine in the morning, Dean Blackwell, nine to ten.

HIPPISLEY: We do have a little time for any other business. I would like to ask members of the Body to start with any other business. Yes?

McGILLIS: Just a quick question. Joseph McGillis, College of Medicine.

Are you going to publicize those times, send out (inaudible)?

HIPPISLEY: I think the President is sending an email to everybody. Any other business? We'll start with you.

HERTOG: Jim Hertog, CI.

I had mentioned earlier about the President's sort of initiative with regard to student retention and the -- his work in essentially charging deans with coming up with ways to improve on student retention, but also improving (inaudible) the possibility that faculty who will be evaluated according to the number of Ds, Es and Ws that are assigned to the students in the classes, which I consider an academic policy issue, I feel like should be part of what we discuss in here and not mandated through the deans to special -- specially organized ad hoc groups within their colleges.

And certainly, if we want to improve on retention, there's a lot of ways to go without trying to make it easier, essentially, for students to get passing grades or a grade.

And punishing those who are essentially upper graders or who have student populations that are not as well-equipped for the classes that they're teaching, to me, that seems like something that we should certainly be part of the discussion, not essentially a set of predetermined policies sent down to be implemented rather than question a student what should be done about this problem.

HIPPISLEY: So your basic point is this initiative from the deans is directly touching on educational policy, that's our purview, that's Senate purview, we should be involved in it?

HERTOG: Absolutely.

HIPPISLEY: Any comments on that before we do any other business item?

O'CONNOR: Amen.

- HI PPI SLEY: Amen. So Senate Council will discuss that point directly. There are a number of senate committees, I can just think offhand where (inaudible) involve Senate on any policy development that touches on student success, including advising and including looking at DEWs.
- Is there any other business or is this directly related?
- SACHS: It's not related. Leon Sachs, Arts and Sciences.
- I'm not sure this is appropriate to the Senate, but a colleague asked me if there are mechanisms for evaluating assistant or associate deans. And that seems appropriate in light of recent conversations about student evaluations plus administrative bloat. I don't know if that's a college specific question or a University specific question.
- The colleague said he pointed out that we can evaluate deans and perhaps via that mechanism indirectly assistant or associate deans, but there was no way to comment explicitly on the performance of deanlets, as they're affectionately called.
- HI PPI SLEY: So I don't know if anyone here is a member of the R3 Committee. Is anyone here a member of that committee?
- BRI ON: I was.
- HI PPI SLEY: Okay. All right. So Gail was. And this was a committee that was chaired by Hollie Swanson and I read it. I read it over the summer. I remember an explicit recommendation was to review deanlets.
- BRI ON: Yes.
- HI PPI SLEY: And it was there in black and white. And I drew this attention to Provost Riordan about this report and I mean exactly the report then and she said she was thinking about it.
- Now, in this formal review of the Provost candidates, this is a valid question that you could ask, as well as the DEW question. Both questions could be asked of the new Provost, what are they going to do about this.
- BRI ON: Or what do they think about the report. It would be nice if there was some comments about it.
- HI PPI SLEY: I could give to those who are present. Is this a comment on this? Yes?
- REAL: Kevin Real, CI.
- You could ask these people that are coming into new positions. But I agree with what has been said on both issues, these are Senate issues that I believe need to be addressed in this Body.
- HI PPI SLEY: Yes, I agree. I think we have five minutes remaining so we have time for one more any other business item. And it's going to be you, Hsain.

UKSenateMeeting-2-9-15.txt

I LAHI ANE:

Okay. Hsain Ilahi ane, A and S.

I want to ask you just -- this is a suggestion about the Thanksgiving break. You know, if we could probably explore the possibility of having one week instead of the teaching on Monday then Tuesday then Wednesday and maybe take those two days or three days and attaching them to the beginning of the semester or the end of the semester.

HIPPI SLEY:

So this is something also that Jake Ingram, President of the Student Government Association was meeting me about. We have an Ad Hoc Calendar Committee from Senate Council can discuss whether we want to add that to their charge to think about. I think it comes up every two or three years (inaudible). I can't remember why we say no every time. We are now ready for adjournment?

GROSSMAN:

So moved.

HIPPI SLEY:

Second for adjournment?

I LAHI ANE:

Second.

HIPPI SLEY:

All those in favor? Approved.

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 HARRISON )

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 from the digital file(s).

My commission expires: April 6, 2015.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 4th day of April, 2015.

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

NOTARY ID 440572