

SENATE MEETING

* * * *

* * * *

MARCH 9, 2015

* * * *

* * * *

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. Welcome to 9th of March Senate meeting. Please make sure you have your clickers and we'll see who is here. It looks like about 58, that's fine.

I received no corrections for the February minutes so unless there are objections now, these minutes are approved by unanimous consent.

A few announcements. We had the University call an Advising Retreat on the 2nd of March. This was a mix of Central advising, (inaudible) advising, and a few faculty advisors. It was a very interesting meeting. Phil Kraemer was explicitly invited as chair of the Senate Academic Advising Committee. He received a special invitation to it.

The idea was for there to be more faculty advisors or faculty people there and there were. So the hope is there will be another retreat and a better job asking faculty who advise to attend so that faculty

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt
can get input on how to re-imagine advising.

One of the things that came up was the idea of faculty advising being called a faculty mentor.

The First Scholars Program, this has been going around. I just wanted to announce that it's set to - this is a program, it's faculty advisors, the faculty members to take on first generation as students and be their mentors. And there's the details of the program on the website and the addresses to contact.

We are drafting in Senate Council, a new GR. The scope is to re-imagine faculty disciplinary procedures. We had a very extensive and detailed and honest discussion about a draft on Monday.

Senate Council is going to meet in a special session on Wednesday, 103 Main Building, to carry on discussing this. The idea is we will make a recommendation on the version of this GR draft to Senate in April for first reading, discussion only.

I'm hoping for a very open and honest discussion there. And then we will take it to Senate in May for a vote. I would encourage you to look at what we've come up with so far on this website. I encourage you to send comments, if you have any, to Senate Council Office, which is Sheila Brothers, and we can use that as part of our discussion.

We just put some web transmittals up, so please make sure you look at them, represent your college in that way. That would be great.

We've also solicited nominations for academic area and other advisory committees. I think we need about a hundred, of course this is where Senate plays a very important role in faculty governance. I think we have about 14 or 16, or something like that. So please think of people who would be suitable for these committees and in one sentence write them out, send your idea, or it could be yourself, to Sheila Brothers, please.

Senate Council discussed the reinstatement of Michael Healey, and the Provost -- we have reinstalled him as an Ombud for the second term.

Senate Council approved the deviation of a course MCL 510 from the regular calendar schedule. There were three petitions for adding degrees to past degree lists, two from A and S, BA Spanish, BS Biology, for December 2014 list, and MS Math for Graduate School for August 2014, and all three were approved and they were omitted due to administrative error.

I'd like to hand over to the secretary of Senate, Alice Christ, for her report.

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

CHRIST: Thank you all. Nothing to report.
HIPPI SLEY: Do we have a parliamentarian --
SEAGO: Not today.
HIPPI SLEY: Do we have trustee reports?
WILSON: No.
HIPPI SLEY: Great. We do have a new Provost

and he is here. And I am very honored to introduce Tim Tracy, the new Provost of the University of Kentucky, who would love to tell us all about the strategic plan and how it's going.

TRACY: No booing quite yet. I heard that on the last slide he's added one that the clicker is should we fire the Provost.

I'll try not to do death by PowerPoint today. I wanted to take just a few moments. Andrew and I had a great meeting last week and really started developing a relationship in how we were going to work together over the next year or so.

One of the topics that came up was the strategic plan, so I want to go through what we're planning to do with that and let you know what our plans are.

So one of the things that President Capilouto charged me with, one of the first things was to finish the strategic plan. And then he said, I want to have it done by June 1. So I will be getting on that very quickly and working and I'll show you that time (inaudible).

I want to tell you about how we're going to take this plan forward. There is a lot of great work that was done by those committees and so we're going to build upon that work and use that work to now develop some strategic objectives and some action items or action steps from that.

So please, we're not reinventing the wheel, we're not starting over again. We're simply taking the great work that was there and beginning to build forward.

The one thing that we've done that is pretty significant is that we reduced the number of strategic objectives from eight to five. Some of those like infrastructure and financial plan, for instance, we saw more as strategies or tactics that you would use to accomplish the plan. And so we've reduced the number to five.

And so what you see up there, and I hope it's not too small, are the five areas. And that is undergraduate student success, diversity and inclusivity, community engagement and impact, graduate education.

Let me take a pause for a minute and say that what we did was pull apart graduate education, professional education, and said we're going to put professional education in a parking lot for about six months. All professional schools have accreditation they go through though, some

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

very extensive assessment, and so we said, okay, they're really two parallel to different processes of graduate education and professional education, so we're going to pull those apart and come back to professional education later in the Fall.

And then the last one is research. A couple things then we decided to do was to one, I said I need some help, and so Dr. Kim Anderson from the College of Engineering was gracious enough to accept and be my assistant, or be the working with me on this and in fact, she'll be the direct contact for the different groups. And so I'm very appreciative for Kim in taking time out to do this with me now in June.

We will be staying with the co-chairs of those groups, Kim Anderson, Jane Jensen, for undergraduate student success, but in every case we paired a responsible administrator with those groups. In other words, the administrator who was basically going to be held accountable for this, we said we'll bring them into the process of developing these objectives. So for undergraduate student success is the Associate Provost Ben Withers.

The second committee is diversity and inclusivity with Randa Remer and Jeff Clymer, who were co-chairs originally. They'll be working on the plan. And Terry Allen, from the Office of Diversity and Equity, will be leading that. As you know, JJ Jackson is stepping down, retiring in May. And so Terry is going to fill that role for us.

The third is community engagement and impact and Lisa Higgins-Hord is co-chairing, but the other co-chair had to step away and so we'll be naming a second co-chair for that particular committee. And I've been working with Andrew and others on some names for that. I'll come back to that in just a moment. And Tom Harris, who is the vice president for University-related (inaudible) will be the administrative representative.

For graduate education, again because we've pulled out professional education, Dr. Lock is not going to serve as co-chair until we get back to professional education. So we've asked David Puleo, from Engineering, to work with David Blackwell on Graduate Education. And so Susan Carvalho, the Interim Dean of the Graduate School will work with that committee.

And then finally in Research, because Lisa Cassis is now Interim Vice President for Research, she would be the responsible administrator, but we've got Rodney Andrews.

And then I've asked Andrew to work with me to find some people to represent the more humanities side of research, the

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt
creative scholarships, so we'll pair that person with Rodney Andrews to complete that particular section. So we've already got two sort of part of the science people. I want somebody to representative the creative scholarship portion for that. And so we'll be naming another co-chair.

Andrew was kind enough to designate a direct Senate Council rep to this and will be assigning Ernie Bailey to one of these committees. But Andrew gave me some other names, a couple other names, and we'll be placing them as well, people of Senate recommendations to serve on the committees.

So that's our method for madness, so to speak, of how we're going to staff this. And they're going to be developing the plan itself.

If we can go to the next slide, I want to show you what we're going to do. One of the biggest changes is that each of the groups only gets three pages. So this will be a 15-page plan if it kills me. They may kill me, but we're going to work very, very hard. In fact, the first draft of one of them that we've done came in at three pages. So we're on track here.

GROSSMAN:
TRACY:

What font size?

Well, they don't get to play games or change the line spacing like we all do on grants. None of that stuff.

We want to start with this executive overview. Really, it's a summary of the context, where we want to be, our aspirations. A clear vision statement. And then some strategic objectives for the goal area, a little overall objective. And an overview of the strategic initiatives. I'm going to give them about a page, probably about half, or three quarters of a page, for what I call the why, the why question. Why do this?

And so the situation summary will be three to five bullet points to summarize our current situation at UK, summarizes the profile, our profile relative to our history and our peers. And then that's some data backing that up, the reason for doing what we're doing.

Then they only get three to four strategic initiatives. Want to keep it again, very focused. So that's the means to which they'll achieve the overall strategic objective when we translate it into practice. So if it's Research, and we have an objective for Research, how will we translate that, three to four things that we will do.

If it's undergraduate student success, how we accomplish that at a high level, and then they get two to four action steps for each initiative.

I think you should be able to read a plan in ten to fifteen minutes and

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

understand where an organization is going, why they're going there and how they're going to get there. So again, trying to keep it very focused.

Then they're only going to get one to two key metrics for each initiative. So I'm envisioning something like four to five metrics for each major area, things that are meaningful, things that we can say yes, we made a difference. They're easy to report. We can measure them and we can report to the Board of Trustees on a very regular basis, things of how we're accomplishing what we're trying to accomplish.

And then they can have some appendices where they can have some charts and graphs to back it up, if a plan itself is going to be 15 pages. So it's really trying to keep it very focused.

The next slide. So the time line. It's a very impressive time line. And maybe we'll work backwards. So you see June 1st is the deadline to submit it to the Board of Trustees. So Dr. Grossman, hopefully will get an email or something in his directors desk on June 1st that says here is the draft for the strategic plan for consideration at the Board meeting on June 19. So want to give him about three weeks to see the plan.

So working backwards, we want to make sure that the faculty and staff, and others at the University have the chance to see this, so we'll have some Town Halls in early May. We want to make sure they happen before the end of the school year, particularly for the nine month appointees, so they do have a chance to see those drafts that are out there.

But working up to that point then, we've already met as a leadership group, so those individuals who are leading the different initiatives and began the project. And I've asked them by April 1st to have, essentially, those parts that I have in there, the context, the issues, the goals and the strategies minus the metrics, by April 1st.

One of those is already close to being done, it's very far along. The graduate student success is also very far along. So I think we can accomplish this. It is going to take some significant efforts on the parts of these individuals, but I think we can get there.

Then by April 15th we'll synthesize all that work together and have a draft of the metrics. If it's undergraduate student success, I'm guessing that first or second year retention is going to be one of those metrics. If it isn't, I'll probably ask them to go back and think about it again because that probably is going to be a metric for student success. That leads us into the Town

Halls, then submission to the Board of Trustees.

So again, it's an aggressive timeline. But I think it respects the work that was done by the committees and takes that work and builds upon it and tries to develop a plan that again we can stand behind. And then we can come back, and obviously, there will be some things that we do to flush some of those out. But it really needs to be that high level where we can explain to someone what we're trying to be and how we're going to get there.

I promised you no death by PowerPoint, so I only have three slides. So I will open it up for any questions you might have. Yes, Lee?

BLONDER:

Lee Blonder, Medicine.

First these committees that you've named there, we, Senate Council had nominated several faculty members that were on these committees a year and a half ago. So are the committees going to be the same, the staffing of the committees?

TRACY:

So the committees, themselves, we will simply use that work. These will be -- the individuals on the list will be the people drafting those together. And I've gone to Andrew to repopulate those two to three people with additional people from the Senate and Senate Council to carry that forward.

BLONDER:

So the people that were on the original committees are not on --

TRACY:

We're respecting their work, but we're not bringing them back into the process.

BRI ON:

Is there any --

BROTHERS:

Name, please?

BRI ON:

Gail Bri on, College of Engineering.

Is there any time between the Town Halls and submission to BOT for revisions if good ideas come from the Town Halls?

TRACY:

We will take those ideas that come out at Town Halls and try to synthesize. That's the purpose, is to have them early in May so that we can bring that in by June 1st. Yes, that's the intention.

I wish I could tell you I had a longer time frame.

BRI ON:

Well, no, I just -- if it was the end of May...

TRACY:

The idea is the first two weeks in May to have those Town Halls so that we have a little bit of time to put that feedback back into the plan.

DEBSKI :

Liz Debski, A and S.

Will you be coming back to the Senate to talk to us about it?

TRACY:

I hope so, if Andrew invites me.

HIPPI SLEY:

April 13th.

TRACY:

Yeah. The idea, we're getting ready, either this afternoon or tomorrow

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

there will be an all campus email coming out talking about this process. And we hope to have regular communications out to the campus.

But again, we talked about how I can come back and present again and walk you through this process. I want to do everything I can to make sure that folks are informed, including the Senate and Senate Council.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

Just the May Town Halls, please remember that the first week in May is finals, and nine month faculty will be off duty as of May 15th. So it's really important that it be done earlier in May before people leave after finals.

TRACY: And that's our intention, is to make sure that everybody has a good chance to participate. Thank you. Anybody else? Yes, sir.

ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane, A and S.

I think in the previous slide you talked about the formation of the committees and you mentioned that you were in conversation with Andrew about including somebody else from the Humanities. I was wondering if you would be including somebody the Social Sciences.

TRACY: Some of the names that we got sort of represent that.

HIPPISLEY: It's pretty restricted to Humanities, I think.

TRACY: I mean, it's -- if there's one person or something, again I don't want to keep waiting, but I'm willing to accept other people who can get involved in the process very quickly.

Again, I don't want to grow these committees to a point where we then have trouble scheduling and that type of thing. So three to four people working on it. And hopefully, we have communications to the campus so that we get (inaudible).

VASCONEZ: Vasconez, College of Medicine.

With this strategic plan, you set up the immediate and more immediate objectives to the plan and things like that. Obviously, that is that is what you're thinking about here, I mean, June 1st is sort of a cutthroat deadline. But it's not going to be implemented right away, is it?

TRACY: No. Well, as soon as the Board approves it then we can begin developing and flushing out even the action steps and how we accomplish those, and the time lines.

I mean, obviously, we can't start everything on June 1, and so this is going to be phased in. And some of it will be multi-year. So it's going to take time to carry that out. Am I answering your question?

VASCONEZ: Pretty much. I mean, how far down the road do you see some of these

implementation deadlines?

TRACY: It will be a five year plan. So some of these will probably take a year or two to get fully implemented. Some of them, hopefully, will be very strategic and very significant, and so it's going to take an allocation of resources and some financial planning around that.

BRI ON: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. Just wondering, has the vision for the University changed? Do you have like a sneak peak at the vision that the strategic plan is leaning towards?

TRACY: We are working on that. I don't have a sneak peak for you. Has it changed significantly, I don't think so. But maybe kind of work with it a little bit.

Thank you all for your time and I look forward to seeing you again on April 13th.

HIPPISLEY: We have our committee reports. Ernie Bailey from the Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee.

BAILLEY: Hello. Our committee had a proposal to change the name of the School of Library and Information Science to the School of Information Science.

This is a proposal that had come before this committee last year and it was sent back with a request for some editorial changes and some consultation with people in other programs, so the proposal came back.

It was reviewed by the members of the committee and they chose not to meet, basically thought that it was very straight forward and we could have our discussion and vote on it. There was unanimous approval for the proposal.

The explanation for the changes, the term library detracts from the understanding of the scope and nature of the program. There are similar programs at other institutions and they have made these changes as well. And the term information science is widely (inaudible) to any library science as well.

The proposal was discussed at a faculty meeting and a vote held. There were 27 faculty members that were present at the meeting out of 37, and all 27 voted in favor of the proposal.

Dr. Huber is -- the school is in the College of Communication and Information. Dr. Huber -- is Dr. Huber here? Dr. Huber is the director of the school. But he did contact the deans of the Library, the College of Engineering, Arts and Sciences, Fine Arts, Business and Economics. The proposal was also discussed at the faculty meeting in the Department of Computer Science and there were no objections (inaudible).

So the committee voted unanimously to recommend this or to endorse this.

HI PPI SLEY: The recommendation from the committee, we don't need a second, is that Senate endorse changing the name of the School of Library and Information Science to the School of Information Science within the College of Communication and Information. It's on the floor as a motion. Any questions or points of information? Anyone want to speak for or against the motion? All right, we'll vote. We didn't need that. The polls are open. Give you a five second countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. The polls are going to close. Motion carries. Okay.

WOOD: Next report, reports from chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, from Dr. and senator, Connie Wood. During the certification process of last spring's election to the Senate, a few issues arose. One of which was the fact that SR 1.2.2.1A, a mouthful, which is the senate rule which is specifying the general rules under which elections, colleges actually hold elections for faculty to serve in the Senate, did not actually guarantee faculty who are eligible to vote to have the ability to either self-nominate or to be nominated. So the change that we are recommending here correct that omission.

HI PPI SLEY: So what we are proposing is to insert the following sentence into the section: This election process will ensure that all faculty eligible to serve have the opportunity to be nominated or self-nominated. So we have a recommendation from SREC that Senate approve the revision of SR 1.2.2.1.A. The motion is on the floor. Questions for the Rules and Elections Committee?

WOOD: Hearing no further discussion or questions we will move to vote on this. Five second countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. And the motion carries. So the next recommendation from the committee is that the Senate approve the revisions to Section 6.

WOOD: Last fall the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, which is the student committee out of student government, sent a report to the Senate Council which asked the University Senate to consider making specific changes to those Senate Rules which deal with the definition of plagiarism, student notifications, procedures when an allegation has been made, (inaudible).

The Rules and Election Committee considered all of the recommended changes. The changes that have come to the floor are three of which are actually substantive, and several which are basically clarifying the wording of the document.

The very first one, I don't know

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

how some of these things got into the rules, wording: or anything else. The students correctly suggested that we correct this to content. We agreed.

The next one is just basically -- the next one basically just rewording what plagiarism actually entails. We put the examples here into a parenthetical, that went into a parenthetical statement.

The next one is a -- little too far. I know, this one is messy with the track changes. This one actually is substantive. What the students had suggested, this is a section that actually specified how notices are supposed to be given to students when an allegation of plagiarism has been made.

The students wanted us to change the or to the and, and the reason for that was that they wanted two methods of communication. So what we are suggesting here is that, in fact, we eliminate the in person with the witness or signed receipt and replace that with having two modes of communication, one being email and the other being by regular mail, and that this be done with the University email and address that's maintained in the system. So this one is a substantive change. I hope it won't be controversial.

The next one, here we're doing two things. We're clarifying who the -- the situation that says if the instructor is not a faculty employee, for example, a teaching assistant. In the faculty employee, it was not clear, we changed that as it should be, to the instructor of record, which is a well-defined term. So that is a substantive change in two places.

And then we incorporated the change that the students wanted because the students said that the actual instructor, or they wanted the actual instructor to be able to participate in the appeals process for this.

And what we did to accommodate that, we thought it was a reasonable request, is that in any case the actual instructor should retain the important (inaudible) role and shall participate in all UAB meetings as far as possible. And obviously, if the teaching assistant is no longer at the University or if the faculty member is not longer at the University, it's not possible. So we did include the as far as possible.

The next is substantive, the students were concerned about the timeline in which the notification would be given, or the meeting would happen, for giving the student an opportunity to respond. And so we have inserted within ten days after the evidence is received the instructor and chair must make a reasonable effort to schedule the meeting. We did check and reasonable effort

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt
 is a legally well-defined term.
 So these are the changes we are proposing to make.

HI PPI SLEY: Any questions? Are there any points of information for Connie?

SWANSON: Mark Swanson, Public Health.
 In this point A here at the top, the original language says if the instructor is not a faculty employee, I read that as an employee of the faculty, shouldn't it just be a faculty member?

WOOD: No. Faculty employee is a well-defined term that appears in the ARs, GRs, HRs, et cetera and so forth, it's a well-defined term.

SWANSON: Thank you.

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.
 I have to do a mea culpa because I am on that committee and I should have noticed earlier and I did not.
 On your A, tenth line, signing the grade report, I have not signed a grade report for 25 years.

WOOD: Yes, you have. You have electronic to sign the grade report.

TAGAVI: But my suggestion -- because it might create some ambiguity. Can we change that to we are ultimately responsible for assigning the grade? We used to have a grade report and I'm sure you --

WOOD: I think that you're actually correct in that, Kaveh, but also it can come under (inaudible).

GROSSMAN: Just to support what Kaveh said, now that you're using the term instructor of record there, you don't need to include the who is ultimately responsible for signing the grade reports for the course. I am also on that committee but I missed that meeting (inaudible).
 So I think it's actually superfluous now to include who is ultimately responsible for signing the grade reports for the courses.

WOOD: Yeah, we can make that an editorial change. But thank you for bringing that up. Yes?

GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, Arts and Sciences.
 Going back to the prior changes regarding notification.

WOOD: Yes, sir.

GIANCARLO: Is this change in notification now in addition that we are required to send a surface, physical letter along with the regular email? And I'm wondering what kind of burden that puts on faculty or administration to do that and what expectations we have for student response?

WOOD: I can give you -- your interpretation is correct that the students requested two methods of notification, one of which would be regular mail. I will say I don't consider this to be, or personally, I

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

don't consider this to be an undue burden on the administrator. I was senior associate dean for many years and back then we had to send it certified mail or registered mail. So this is something that is very common.

We are requiring that they use the University maintained snail mail and email address.

HIPPISLEY: Hsain?

ILAHIANE: Hsain Ilahiane.

Actually, I would want to go to the first thing in writing to change or to amend. And, by the way, I am not on this committee. So where you say plagiarism includes the reproducing, blah, blah, blah, including, but not limited to, a published article, book, I would also maybe suggest adding in performance, performance in the fine arts.

It doesn't have to take this tangible artifact for something to be copied, there are other forms that students can copy in terms of theater or in the fine arts or something like that.

WOOD: We're certainly open to amendments from the floor. I don't think that that is excluded here because it says including, but not limited to.

HIPPISLEY: Is there anyone from Fine Arts that wants to speak up to that amendment. No senators from Fine Arts today?

BAKER: I'm from Fine Arts.

BROTHERS: Name, please?

BAKER: My name is Michael Baker, Fine Arts.

I agree with Hsain and also I agree that it is including, but not limited to. I don't know that we necessarily need to spell it out.

WOOD: Thank you.

HERTOG: Jim Hertog, Communication and Information.

One of the issues that comes up, and I guess I never faced it directly, is that plagiarism includes reproducing someone else's or one's own work that has already been handed in for a grade or published for or et cetera. And if you don't make clear that you're directly quoting yourself or something like that, that's actually a form of plagiarism.

I'm wondering if that needs to be addressed at some point here in the code if we're going to rewrite it. It looks like if you were to hand in two pages from a previously graded and handed back assignment from another class in a new class, this sort of says that's not plagiarism, but, in fact, (inaudible), cheated.

WOOD: I'd like to yield the floor to Bob Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

Your statement is controversial and not universally agreed upon. I would, in

fact, disagree with it, myself, because I don't consider that plagiarism. Plagiarism is stealing someone else's ideas, you can't steal your own ideas.

So you might want to prohibit such activity for your class and call it cheating if a student does it. That's your own business. But it's by no means a universally accepted definition of plagiarism.

The definition of plagiarism has unfortunately kept expanding over the years. A lot more things today are considered plagiarism by some people that weren't considered 50 years ago.

So I think we need to stick here to a very agreed upon definition, widely agreed upon.

HIPPISLEY: Davy Jones, do you have anything to add to that?

JONES: Yeah. Just adding to what Bob said. This actually came to the Senate Rules Committee to interpret this previously. And the Rules Committee interpreted that this scenario would be a cheating and a failure to follow the requirements of the course and punishable in that way rather than as a plagiarism situation.

GIANCARLO: Is that in the rules somewhere?

HIPPISLEY: Davy?

JONES: If you don't have that as an asterisk interpretation in the Senate Rules, we can put it there. It's in the minutes of the Rules Committee somewhere, but we can put it as an asterisk into the rule itself.

GROSSMAN: But it's up to the instructor of the course. It's not cheating. It's not considered universally as cheating.

DIETZ: Hank Dietz, Engineering.
Both (inaudible) and ACM, the two major societies in my area, make it very explicit that self-plagiarism is plagiarism. So I don't think this is really as fuzzy a case as is being made out here.

However, that said, I personally have never had any such restriction on any course that I've taught in the past 30-some odd years. So I think that it is reasonable to have this be a separate thing.

And you're defining plagiarism here in a very specific way as being someone else's work and I have no problem with that being the definition that's here even though (inaudible) and ACM, as I say, are pretty specific about self-plagiarism being a serious issue.

WOOD: We'll have to be very careful in the asterisk interpretation to bring that distinction out in the Senate Rules.

GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, Arts and Sciences.

I just wanted to add as well, I respectfully disagree with Bob's assessment because at least in our field, and in Humanities fields, double-submission is

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt
called plagiarism and it is specifically
called plagiarism and has been punishable by
sanctions.

And I've run into it myself where
students double-submit papers or double-
submit portions of written work and I've
never had a student argue with me when I had
brought that up and imposed a sanction for
it.

But I have always treated it as a
form of plagiarism. And technically saying,
well, it's a form of cheating, not
plagiarism, that to me, is six of one, half
dozen of the other. You could say, well, how
is it cheating, I say, it's plagiarism. It
is the illegitimate reproduction of work that
is not produced by yourself in the context of
this class. So however we can disambiguate
that but still keep it that self-plagiarism
or double-submission is a sanctionable
offense, I hope that we would do so.

HIPPISLEY: Same point?

UNIDENTIFIED: No, I have another one.

HIPPISLEY: Gail, is this the same point?

BRION: It's on the same point. Gail
Bri on, College of Engineering.

Connie, just refresh my memory.
These were things that students wanted
clarified? This came --

WOOD: Almost all. They had other
suggestions which we felt were not in their
best interests and therefore we did not
include them. But --

BRION: Is self-plagiarism one of the
things the students were concerned with
defining?

WOOD: I don't want to -- they had some
suggestions on how this should be rewritten
and they were -- oh, I almost cut off the
PowerPoint. They had some suggestions as to
how to rewrite this part of it that we felt
was not in their best interest. It made --
it opened up the door too widely, you know,
in that they were at risk for issues that
should not be handled under plagiarism.

So but, no, we took most of their
suggestions, the ones we did not were the
ones that we felt were not in their best
interests. And they agreed, they agreed when
we went back to them.

BRION: I just wondered if they had asked
the committee to define self-plagiarism.

WOOD: No. That issue did not come up.

BRION: Thank you.

HIPPISLEY: Did you have a point?

LACKI: Yeah, I just have a correction --

BROTHERS: Name, please?

LACKI: Mike Lacki, Ag.

You have basically ten days, I
think you said?

WOOD: Yeah.

LACKI: Shouldn't that read ten working
days?

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

WOOD: Yes, it should. Thank you.
GROSSMAN: I've just been scrolling through a Wikipedia article on plagiarism, and I would just point out that there is a separate section in the plagiarism article on self-plagiarism and just to read the first paragraph: The concept of self-plagiarism has been challenged as being self-contradictory, oxymoron, and on other grounds. So there is such a thing out there that people believe in, but it is not a universally accepted concept.

UNIDENTIFIED: But it is (inaudible).
GROSSMAN: Again, it's -- read the article.

VAI LLANCOURT: Lisa Vaillancourt, (inaudible).
I'm a little confused about this part and then the part above about having sent a snail mail notification. I'm wondering if they're quite compatible because I mean, mail takes awhile, I wonder when they say make an effort to schedule, does that have anything to do with this notification through the mail.

WOOD: No, it does not.
VAI LLANCOURT: So those are separate things?
WOOD: Those are two separate.
VAI LLANCOURT: Okay.
WOOD: Those are two separate issues.
VAI LLANCOURT: Okay.
WOOD: Email is a little quicker, yeah.

HIPPI SLEY: Yes?
HERTOG: Jim Hertog, Communication and Information.
My point is more that typing down a definition makes clear that it excludes the possibility that an individual's second submission of a piece should be considered plagiarism, as I have in the past within the context of the class and it will require either that we look at it in terms of cheating or that it be explicitly stated on the syllabus in the future that too is cheating because under the rules it's far more clear. There was this sort of vague notion that I was going under in the past and the new wording makes it clear that it's not.

So if someone does resubmit a paper, it no longer falls under plagiarism under this more clear and specific definition, and I would not have any recourse if I had not stated specifically in the syllabus do not double-submit, or something like that. That's my point.

And so either if we feel that it's cheating, we may want to address it later under that part of the code or it must be in the syllabus going forward or else I'll have no recourse when I get a resubmitted paper.

WOOD: Let me respond. This is really discipline specific. Those of us in the mathematical sciences certainly would not agree. There are theory and problem which you can -- students can encounter in a number

of classes, and to say that they cannot submit the same solution to that problem is not reasonable or that would be considered to be plagiarism because there's one correct proof or one correct solution.

So that's -- I would prefer to deal with it, and I'm speaking now as a senator, and also from the Rules Committee point of view, I would prefer to deal with it as a separate issue because I don't think you can make a universal, you know, statement across all disciplines that it should be considered as plagiarism, therefore, it should be discipline-related and it should be relegated to the syllabus.

SWANSON: Mark Swanson, Public Health.
Could we resolve this by adding a sentence that many faculty consider reproducing their own work self-plagiarism, it is the responsibility of the student to clarify this with the instructor?

Because if we don't put something like that in and a student does this and a faculty member who has not sat through this meeting considers it plagiarism (inaudible) they are left with no recourse.

GROSSMAN: That first part of that sentence, plagiarism includes reproducing someone else's work has been in there since at least the early 1980s. So any such burden that you've been operating -- that you may operate under the future is the same burden that you've been operating under in the past.

SWANSON: Yes, but we're correcting language.

GROSSMAN: Not that part. We're (inaudible) the whatever.

SWANSON: That's exactly right.

HIPPISLEY: Gail, then Matt.

BRIAN: I again have to agree with this is discipline-specific because as the way several of the science disciplines do PhD dissertations right now, where the PhD dissertation is actually stitched together from multiple papers that have been published, the student would be self-plagiarizing themselves.

HERTOG: Wouldn't it be clear that that was previously published by that student?

UNIDENTIFIED: Not exactly, no.

BRIAN: But I'm just saying that it is discipline-specific and I don't think -- I think that self-plagiarism is something that if it's important to that discipline, that it be in that discipline's syllabi as recommended language that self-plagiarism is not encouraged and this includes resubmitting a paper that you gave to another class on a similar topic.

HIPPISLEY: Matt?

GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, A and S.

Without devolving further into a division between, perhaps the sciences and humanities, or numerical for students and

non-numerical for students, could we split the difference by adding language to this paragraph which recognizes that plagiarism may include double-submission, self-plagiarism, in quotation, for unauthorized re-submission of prior work?

That would -- it would make it a conditional and, therefore, those disciplines that do not recognize that as a potential pedagogical problem do not have to do anything, while at the same time, it would provide those of us who do very much see it as a potential pedagogical problem, would have recourse (inaudible) the rules, and something we could point to with students and say that in our discipline, this is not acceptable.

UNIDENTIFIED: Is that a motion?

HIPPISLEY: Are you proposing an amendment?

GIANCARLO: Is this the time?

HIPPISLEY: You can do this whenever you like.

GIANCARLO: I would move to add the language after plagiarism includes reproducing somebody else's work, plus the parenthetical citation. I would add the language, it may also include -- what did I say?

BRIAN: May also include self-plagiarism.

GIANCARLO: It may also include double-submission, self-plagiarism, or unauthorized re-submission of work.

WOOD: That's applied by the instructor?

BROTHERS: Hold on. May also include submission, double -- double-submission, self-plagiarism --

GIANCARLO: It may also include.

BROTHERS: Okay. And what was the rest of your list? I got double-submission, self-plagiarism --

GIANCARLO: I'll repeat it. Are you going to type it?

BROTHERS: Well, I'm typing it in the minutes first and then I'll put it there.

GIANCARLO: It may also include double-submission, self-plagiarism, or unauthorized re-submission of prior work.

CHRIST: Second.

What I'm trying to do by this is actually make it so that an instructor can appeal this without having, every single time, to add more verbiage to their syllabi, where it is disciplinary, very disciplinarily clear that that's a problematic thing to do for students. Otherwise, I fear that in some of our classes, we will get people resubmitting the same papers again and again, and then saying it's not in the rules, therefore, it's okay for me to do it.

HIPPISLEY: So this is the amendment and you will see in blue it's being proposed, moved by Matt Giancarlo, Arts and Sciences, and it's been seconded by Alice Christ, Fine Arts.

GIANCARLO: Of prior work. Thank you.

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

HI PPI SLEY: And it's now on the floor. So what we're going to vote on -- discuss and then vote on are those blue words.

DI ETZ: Can I make a friendly suggestion on that?

HI PPI SLEY: Matt, will you accept a request for a friendly amendment?

GI ANCARLO: Yes.

BROTHERS: Name, please?

DI ETZ: Oh, Hank Di etz, Engi neeri ng. I think the phrase double-submission and self-plagi arism and unauthorized re-submission is just kind of complicated. I think what you're really talking about is plagi arism may also include submission of your own work which was not originated for the purpose of this course or something like that.

So it's really coming down to was this created for that specific setting.

HI PPI SLEY: If we can work that out, Matt, do you accept?

GI ANCARLO: Well, I would just say that by the use of the term double-submission because I've heard that term used in this context and (inaudi ble) context. So I'm kind of using it as a way of clari fyi ng the possible terminology referring to this.

Second, the double-submission can mean the simultaneous submission of work in two different classes under two different instructors, which is an incident that I've run into.

So it wasn't necessarily prior that it was submitted and graded and then resubmitted, it was a student who was essentially tried to kill two birds with one stone. So I would prefer it to be double-submission up there along with unauthorized re-submission of prior work.

HI PPI SLEY: So he's not accepting the friendly amendment. The motion is on the floor for discussion if people want to speak for or against it. Bob and then --

GROSSMAN: First, I'd like to make a friendly amendment even though I oppose the whole amendment. I'd like to improve it to replace a prior work, it's not clear, prior work by who, replace prior work with one's own work because we're talking about self-plagi arism here. So resubmit of one's own work.

HI PPI SLEY: Matt, (inaudi ble).

GI ANCARLO: Yeah, okay.

GROSSMAN: Second, by may also include, you're confusing the whole issue. Does it include it or does it not include it? This makes it -- makes the matters even muddier, and so how is a student supposed to figure out whether this is allowed or not. Really what they need to do is ask the instructor, but there's nothing here about the instructor decides whether this counts as plagi arism which is really --

HI PPI SLEY: Do you have a suggestion for another friendly amendment?

GROSSMAN: No. I'm speaking against the amendment.

HI PPI SLEY: Is this a friendly amendment?

CROSS: It's a clarifying. Al Cross, Communication and Information.

I really think we need to say that this is course specific and say unauthorized re-submission of one's own work as defined in the course syllabus.

I would also suggest moving this sentence to the end of the paragraph because it's defining a maybe situation and the other two are certain situations.

HI PPI SLEY: Matt, are either of those suggestions friendly to you?

GIANCARLO: Well, moving it to wherever in the paragraph I think would be fine. But saying that as defined in the syllabus just kicks the can back to the instructor, which is what I would like to avoid.

HI PPI SLEY: So you're accepting it to go to the very end, that's okay --

GIANCARLO: I'm sorry. I wouldn't accept the rider that it has to be in the instructor's syllabus every single time for it to be a principle that could be enforced in a disciplinary conduct.

HI PPI SLEY: Yes?

PEFFER: Sean Pfeffer, Business.

This is in Business, too, same thing. We can't redo it and our journals all say that you cannot resubmit, so this isn't just in some (inaudible), Business has the same problem.

And the attitude of the well, let's write it this way and you guys just change it if you want to change it in your syllabus, the problem with that is that one, the syllabus is already 14 pages and has everything in the back of it, two, that argument flips right on around and says, why don't we write this as plagiarism includes self-work and then everybody who is arguing that it doesn't ought to be able to write it in their syllabus if it doesn't.

See, it doesn't work to say this is what is and you guys can change it because if you don't put it in this amendment then you can just turn around and say it the other way. You can write this as plagiarism does include somebody else's work period, unless you guys put it in your syllabus the other way.

So it's kind of (inaudible) attitude that I hear about writing this as plagiarism doesn't have anything to do with this because it doesn't because Wikipedia says so. But you guys can change it if you want. I'm not sure that's productive. I'm not sure that's productive. So I think this makes a whole of sense so we can at least get

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

a foothold, otherwise, I'm going to argue that to the Ombud and (inaudible).

WOOD: From an interpretation of the rules respecting, I don't think you are on firm ground by saying that if you accept this as academic policy that it does include that the instructor is going -- has the right to overturn the academic policy as approved by the University Senate. So, one, I don't think your applicable argument is correct.

Secondly, in terms of looking at a possible challenge or interpretation to the rule, as it stands, where is the burden and how is the student to know. It's very important if it is a possibility that it is very clear as to where the burden of explanation is.

Is it on the faculty member or is the burden on the student to inquire from the faculty member, both of which are usual language when it comes to plagiarism. But you have to have something that is going to specify how a student is to know what the situation is in an individual course. If it -- if -- you could say, it is the burden of the student to, in this, to clarify this issue, that is acceptable, or you have to say it's in the syllabus or something. You cannot leave it hanging.

HI PPI SLEY: Mi rek?

TRUSZCZYNSKI: Mi rek Truszczynski, Engineering.

So I am not sure this is the right place, but I want to speak against this blue text. Is it the right place?

HI PPI SLEY: Is it the right place?

SEAGO: Uh-huh.

TRUSZCZYNSKI: I don't think things like unauthorized for, re-submission, who would authorize the student to submit, I don't know. But more importantly, I think that we want our students to learn and show that they understand. I personally don't care that the student submitted some solution, proving that she knows, but (inaudible) in my class, I ask the student to do exactly the same thing she was supposed to do for some other class, (inaudible).

But if I did and the student shows me that she knows, she did do it, why do I care? I don't.

So I think this whole issue of self-plagiarism is absolutely blown out of proportion right now here. We are focusing on one-millionth of plagiarism cases that (inaudible). I think it's a waste of time.

HI PPI SLEY: AI?

CROSS: AI Cross, Communication and Information.

This really is discipline specific, course specific but these rules apply to every student at the University and they're in a place people go for guidance. And we've got a real problem with this language because

the word may. Who is going to figure it out?
If you don't want to say as defined
by the syllabus, how about saying as defined
by the instructor? And I would inquire if it
would be in order to make such an amendment
at this point, an amendment to the amendment.

HI PPI SLEY: This was suggested as a friendly
amendment and it was declined.

CROSS: That's okay. I'm asking if it's in
order for me to make a motion for a second
order amendment on which we would vote.

HI PPI SLEY: So we have a second order
amendment.

SEAGO: Are you making --

CROSS: I am making that motion --

SEAGO: Do we have a second?

CROSS: -- to add the words as defined by
the instructor.

KENNEDY: Second. Michael Kennedy, Emeritus.

HI PPI SLEY: Is there a way of putting that in,
in color or something?

BROTHERS: Yes. Where?

HI PPI SLEY: So the motion on the floor now is
the second order amendment, which is this
(inaudible), that's the amendment we're doing
right now. Anyone want to speak for or
against the amendment?

FIREY: Abigail Firey, Arts and Sciences.
I would like to (inaudible)
amendment because the very first paragraph of
6.3.1 has the concluding sentence: In cases
where students feel unsure about a question
of plagiarism involving their work, they are
obliged to consult their instructors on the
matter before submission. It seems to me
that that sentence covers all of the
contingencies that have been discussed here
and that we don't need to complicate this
further with this addition.

HI PPI SLEY: Thank you. She's speaking against.
Anyone else speaking for or against this
amendment to the amendment?

KENNEDY: Michael Kennedy, Emeritus.
I'm in favor of the amendment. I'm
pretty much opposed to redefining a word
which for years, centuries, has had a certain
meaning. I think if we're going to start to
redefine it here we at least ought to be as
clear about it as we can.

HI PPI SLEY: So you're speaking for the
amendment to the amendment?

KENNEDY: I am.

HI PPI SLEY: All right. I think the discussion
on that motion at least has wound down.
So (inaudible) vote on the amendment to
the amendment, but we have a means of doing
this.

UNIDENTIFIED: Just define the last five words.
Highlight the last five words.

HI PPI SLEY: So everybody knows what they're
voting on, just those last five words being
added. You're not necessarily voting on the
first.

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

So that's the motion on the floor and we're about to vote on it as soon as we get the slide. This is just on those last five words. Okay. Give you a quick countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. The amendment to the amendment passes, narrowly by five.

So we'll now go to an amended amendment which is in the previous slide. So this is now the motion on the floor, there can be more discussion if we want some, we can move to vote. Move to vote then. This is the vote, adding this right here. Five second countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries.

So now we have the slide which is SR 6 revision as amended. We do need this. So this is a recommendation to revise SR 6 as just amended. This is a motion on the floor. Is there any further discussion? Countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. Motion carries. Thank you very much.

And we are now onto our last committee report. I'll just give you a little bit of background to this. Last time we met we had our first meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee's report on a general universal set of questions for TCEs with the possibility and encouraged possibility of adding any other questions the college wants to add.

We had a thorough discussion on this. There were a lot of different issues that came up and most of those issues were implementation issues, and you charged me to talk to the Provost about this, and TCE had to leave, I wish he had stayed for a little bit longer, but he did have to go.

So one of the questions that came up is does the Provost really want this to be a universally accepted set of questions, these seven or eight.

Now, Jonathan Golding's committee created some questions on the assumption that that were going to be mandated. I asked the Provost and he said yes, of course they're going to be mandated, of course he wants them to be mandated. So that's number one.

Another question was on some of these courses that we teach aren't a natural fit for those kinds of questions and we had asked the Provost, he said what course are the exceptions as you define them. So this will be universal but with exceptions as will be defined.

The other question that came up was what if we have extra questions that we want to add, who is going to help with that, are we going to get penalized for adding them. The Provost will (inaudible) all resources that are required to help you add the extra questions.

One point was could there be some

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

kind of joint committee, University Provost Office committee to help with implementing the questions and putting anything online and so on. And the answer of the Provost was yes, there can be.

Another question was how will these be used, are they going to be used in tenure and promotion cases. Well, they're going to do exactly what current TCE does, which is part of ARs, to help guide positions of tenure and promotion. So the AR isn't going to go away. So that use of the TCE won't go away either.

Another question was will the results be used to compare colleges to colleges because now you have a common set, you could maybe just say these are apples and apples, not apples and oranges anymore. I asked the Provost explicitly to absolutely not -- they will not be used to compare Arts and Sciences with Agriculture. They'll be used to compare colleges with themselves.

This is what this college is in 2005 and now this is what the college is doing in 2010. Or inside the college itself, this is what this particular department did in 2005 and now this is what they're doing in 2007. So it's a well-devised analysis that's going to be done.

So these are all the questions that I've got. The other big question was how this is going to be implemented and the Provost Office will supply the resource for that.

So Senate Council discussed this, we asked those questions, and this is the recommendation. The recommendation from Senate Council is that Senate accept the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Course Evaluations and Jonathan Golding is here to answer to questions.

Number two, endorse the Provost's mandate that these questions will be the common questions that all programs will use on their TCE with the exceptions for those courses which have certain characteristics to make them not fit.

And the third part of the recommendation is that we request that the implementation of the new questions be effective as soon as practically possible.

So this is the motion on the floor. It comes from Senate Council so it doesn't need a second. So it's on the floor if people would like to speak for or against it or have any points of interest. I'd like to invite Jonathan here just in case he can help at this point.

Yes?

BONDADA: Subbarao Bondada, College of Medicine.

The certain characteristics, are they going to be defined by you or

(inaudible)?

GOLDING: Well, my assumption was the committee would have to make some set of guidelines to what kind of courses would not be evaluated using this method.

BRIAN: May we have the questions up, the recommended questions?

HIPPISLEY: Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.
So a question, there were a number of suggestions made during Senate Council or at the last Senate meeting about possible improvements to some of the questions. If the Senate approves this language, is it the case that every time the Provost's committee decides it wants to change a word here or there it has to come back to the Senate, or will there be -- will the Provost Office be able to say this questions isn't working very well, let's tweak it this way.

GOLDING: We may have to come back (inaudible) because I guess I would say we have to come back and get it approved.

HIPPISLEY: The questions originate in the Senate.

GOLDING: So one would think that we'd have to come back.

REAL: Kevin Real, Communication and Information.
The feedback I got from my faculty in my department was more concern with something that you may not have even been charged with, but it's the online course evaluations which are generating a very small percentage of response rates.

GOLDING: Was that part of your charge?
No. We discussed it. There are issues with it, which everyone knows, low numbers without incentives.
So what I can do is give an example, myself, I teach a class of 500 in the Fall. And I gave a class-wide incentive that the class as a whole, if they reach 80 percent, I would give a small amount of extra credit, if they reach 90 percent, I'd give a little more. So we reached I think it was 89.7, so I gave them the extra.
And the interesting thing for me, that's with a class of mostly freshman and sophomore. My senior class, a small class, everybody did it and I give them the extra credit. So in a certain way you could argue you got to get the freshman and sophomores and move them along. So it worked for me. Whether it would work for everyone, I don't know.
But there has to be something. To me, the implementation committee would have to offer suggestions because that may not be an approach, incentive approach that every doctrine would want to use.

BRIAN: Gail Brian, College of Engineering.
I really appreciate what the

committee was charged to do and how difficult this is.

I, after looking at these questions and they are so subjective, I find it difficult to support these questions.

GOLDING: Well, they're no more subjective than the old ones. The argument is you get out of a lot of double-barreled questions, questions that it was unclear what the student was answering.

No one ever said the evaluations, and there's a big literature, (inaudible) decide one thing. It is very subjective. Students are basically giving you a satisfaction. You're not measuring learning. This is a big issue that's come up.

But the committee discussed this at length. And again, if you look at the literature, it's not what we're able to do with this type of university-wide or other large university, what we would be doing here is be doing what other major universities did, other research institutions.

I can appreciate you not feeling great about this. These have to be used by departments, by the colleges, by the Provost in a certain way, and I'm not sure of the alternative way.

BRIAN: So let me make sure I understood what you just said. So this is about customer satisfaction.

GOLDING: I think that's (inaudible). There is no doubt students are giving their opinion. Let's say they may evaluate me. Your opinion of me in front of that classroom. Does that mean you think I'm a bad instructor? You might think that I'm horrible. I'm just saying --

BRIAN: -- that instructor?

GOLDING: No, it doesn't. That's right. That's why when people get concerned that oh, these are the only thing that are going to be used for promotion and tenure, well, to me, I would say, look, I've been here a long time, that's ridiculous.

It's one piece of the puzzle. And that's why if you went to the departments, you could argue chairs and others should be visiting the classroom to see what really goes on. But since that never happened for me, I don't see it happening.

BRIAN: It never happened to me.

GOLDING: That's the issue, is how units want to think about evaluation. This is a piece that can be used. The advantage you get, I'll say it again, the advantage of this approach that other schools take, you have a common core and every unit is able to go out and decide what they want to assess. What pedagogical issues they think are important and go and address those issues.

WOOD: Connie Wood, Arts and Sciences.
As I understand it, this will

be totally an electronic voluntary response, am I correct there?

GOLDING: Well, the only caveat there is, say, the implementation committee. Some schools require this of students. That's why the issue of how we're going to get students to do this is very tough. For example, some schools do not allow students to get grades until they do this.

Now, that's another issue for another Senate meeting. Because -- well, I'll just leave it there. It's a big issue, what is the incentive for students.

WOOD: Have you all addressed that issue and also the possibility of bias corrections for non-response in a voluntary response survey, or is that being left to the implementation committee?

GOLDING: That's their committee. Again, our charge was to come up with the questions. These are big issues, (inaudible) but that committee is going to be a critical committee wherever it's formed.

WOOD: The reason why I bring this up is that a large part of my willingness to support this is based on how these issues are actually handled because the bias due to non-response is much bigger than the fuzziness or the generalness of the questions. And I am terribly concerned about moving to a system that does not have built into it the influence, the ability to either to adjust, such as the Census Bureau does for non-response, or have some other incentive (inaudible).

GOLDING: I wish I had an answer for you because these things keeps coming up. It's, of course, an excellent point, but again, our committee was charged with coming up with this, these issues.

I'll say this: Personally, I hate to see you not vote for this because of that, that point because I think if this is decided upon to go with this model, the next step is (inaudible) decisions that are very difficult decisions and very complex issues. We just didn't have the time. We also had the charge to get this done pretty quickly.

HIPPISLEY: Davy?

JONES: Davy Jones, Toxicology.

As fast as practically implementable, does that exclude the present semester?

HIPPISLEY: Yes.

WILSON: John Wilson, Medicine.

Andrew, is it your understanding that the implementation committee would be coming back to the Senate?

HIPPISLEY: Yes. (Inaudible) which is going to (inaudible) and report back to Senate. Ben Withers is just there in the back, and he's been thinking about these kinds of questions. I don't know if you have a contribution on

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

that issue, Ben, of sort of a minimal number of responses for it to be meaningful?

WITHERS: I can give you some statistics from the Fall semester. Historically, the paper evaluations we've done historically has a response rate of between 66 and 69 percent. In the Fall, the response rate for the paper TCEs was 66.7 percent. There were about 1100, 1,181 courses with 38,000 students in those with paper.

In the Fall, the eXplorance online system, the one that we're going to here, the response rate was 56.2 percent and that was with 65,000 distributed TCEs, the completed responses were 36,571. So you can see we're not that far off.

There has historically been an issue with the online TCEs, but as students get more interested and more used to giving online surveys, the response rate is better. So I think that with proper implementation, we can push this up to where the paper needs to be. That's what Louisville, they're in the mid-60s, they use eXplorance. As far as the implementation, I think the joint committee that the Provost appointed, incentive appointed would be the best way to go about it.

As far as implementation, I think a joint committee that's Provost appointed, incentive-appointed, would be the best way to go about this.

HIPPI SLEY: Are there any student senators here at this point? What do you think about an online form and what incentives you would need to fill it in?

WOLCON: Well, I know --

BROTHERS: I'm sorry, name please?

WOLCON: I'm sorry. Natalie Wolcon, College of Nursing.

We take our surveys, I think around the time when we take exams. I think that's good because it kind of holds you accountable to stay in the room, complete the survey and then leave. And also if you just had a final, I know (inaudible) classmates, they have something to say after that, and it's a good way to wrap up the course.

Paper evaluations, also you're staying in the room for, but I have thought that the online version is easy and quick and I haven't heard any complaints about it.

HIPPI SLEY: Do you have a comment?

PROFIT: Seth Profit, Pharmacy.

We do online as well and I think we do -- I think they're pretty good. I think they're a little bit lengthy sometimes, but we also have an option to opt out of doing on the rankings or we can just write out our own. (Inaudible) submission. So I don't know how it turns out, but the length is a little bit long sometimes. But other than that, I think everybody likes the online

basically.

HI PPI SLEY: Lisa?

O' CONNOR: I would just urge you to vote against this because I believe the quality of assessment is a combination of the content, the data gathered from the data analysis and I think we should approve this only after we have an implementation plan. Those should be approved as a package deal. Not what we are going ask, but how are we going to gather it, how are we (inaudible). I think that's what we should be voting on.

HI PPI SLEY: Thank you. Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S.

Let me just remind everyone, both to Lisa's comment and to Connie's comment, this is not a brand new program you created out of nothing. These are questions to replace the system that we currently have. I have no idea whether it counts for omission bias, Connie, whether the current system does, I doubt it does. So this, even if it doesn't in the end account for that, it's still not worse than the current system we have.

The -- in terms of the implementation of it, again, I understand the implementation committee, how it's implemented is important, but we already have an implemented survey that has like 40 questions, most of which are awful and not relevant to most of the courses that have to use this thing.

So we are replacing an instrument that was developed around 1980 or so, 1990.

GOLDING: Early '90s.

GROSSMAN: Early '90s, with one, that, you know, it's more than 20 years later and not creating something brand new.

O' CONNOR: Can I just respond to that?

HI PPI SLEY: Sure.

O' CONNOR: I understand that this is our chance to fix that's broke, . So we should take chance now while we have it. That's my respectful opinion.

HI PPI SLEY: Connie?

WOOD: I'd also like to respond. It is the language that says mandatory that makes my fellow senator's comment so important that you have to have the implementation as part of the package.

Currently, my department does not use that form where, you know, or that process where this is enforcing that this be mandated, I think is very important that these issues of non-response, bias, data analysis and implementation comes into play.

HI PPI SLEY: Kaveh?

TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering.

I also want to remind you this subject came up last time. This proposal says there could be instructor specific questions, so whether they're instructor or

course specific, there is absolutely no guidelines.

Who is going to decide on these questions? Could the chair of the department edit it for you? Could they tell you no, we don't like this? Could a dean impose her or his own questions?

These are also academic freedom, and I'd like to thank the committee for doing this and I think this is better than what we have. But I really want to (inaudible) here that this is our chance to fix it.

If we don't fix it now and somebody makes a suggestion next year, we're going to be told we just changed this last year.

GOLDING: I want to make one thing, right now you can add any questions you want to the evaluation form. Now how your department deals with it, I don't know. I can put any questions in that I want up to a certain limit. So just so you know, it's nothing new (inaudible).

TAGAVI: It's new to me.

GOLDING: Well, I spoke to (inaudible) this morning about an issue related to this. I can put in whatever I want. The colleges could put in whatever they want right now. So that would not change.

Your issues about implementation, I, you know, I can revert that and stand here and agree and just say, well, this is what the Provost wanted. So to me, personally, I, personally, without my committee members here, I am of the opinion to move forward rather than stay way back, 20 years back, and where we are when you look at other research institutions. I think we move forward.

I would just say where it said, you know, whatever that line was about implementing, you know, I don't see this, personally, as a bad statement. It's going to take a lot of time and effort. I don't see it as something happening in the Fall because there's not enough time. It's going to take coordination between the various units to get this all set. It could be a year.

But my point is having been here, like many of you, a long time, to hold back, to me, would be a mistake. I think it's time to move forward and we're going to deal with the issues of your concern.

BRION: Gail Brion, College of Engineering. Again, I must -- I use the old form and I actually have found it useful for improving my class. That's how I use the current student evaluations.

When I look at these questions, I'm not sure how I can use these responses to improve my instruction because a lot of them appear to be very subjective and open to prejudices. I'd hate to see Obama teach a course and have a bunch of the Tea Party

people answer these questions about him. I think it's terribly open to bias.

GOLDING: The two critical things here: first of all, the charge of the committee, the model we chose was to have a set of questions that could be used throughout the University. That we feel we accomplished. Your view about subjectivity, I can understand your view. But to me, the most important thing, if you -- I try to use mine like you do, but now, you have the freedom to come up with whatever questions you want, to ask whatever you personally want.

BRIAN: I still haven't gotten from you what other than - what other research institutes are doing, what the purpose of this is and how it's to be used.

GOLDING: You mean evaluations in general or just ours?

BRIAN: Like I said, I suggested --

GOLDING: Here is one thing I'll say. Of course we know for promotion and tenure, of course for faculty development.

There's other important issues for the students, I don't know how they think about it, but it's supposed to be there for information for the students to get information. Because any one of us can get in now if you use paper one. You can get in now in the Institutional Research site and see evaluations for anybody. So you can get in there and see it.

Now my understanding, is that's supposed to be there. It's an information source for the students. So there's more to it than (information).

BRIAN: I just wanted to -- I'm hearing customer satisfaction. Is that why these were designed? What was the intent?

GOLDING: No. I'm saying, my point was simply there is an aspect where it is the student telling you their satisfaction with an instructor in the course. But, of course, they're used, if you want say it right now, they're most important for promotion and tenure. That's always there. That's part of the regulations.

GIANCARLO: Matt Giancarlo, Arts and Sciences.

One, our University is decades behind other university in instituting updated and rational student response evaluations and it's time we caught up.

Two, what I'm hearing is a certain level, it has to be said, of timorousness and comfort with the status quo that is not reflected in keeping up to date with what the students want and what would be good for this institution relative to our peers.

Three, in terms of its subjectivity or its non-capture of important data, it is certainly no worse, and to my mind, it is a lot better than this form we're using now. Therefore, it's a question of the devil you

know versus the devil you don't know.
I'm thinking that moving forward
with form is actually a positive step
forward.

And four, I would like to apologize
to the members of the committee. The
verbiage of the Senate, it's such that we're
accusing you of hoisting on us a Tea Party-
like push/pull or bias instruments or
customer service satisfaction surveys when
really what we know you were doing was trying
to make an instrument that would get student
feedback on their satisfaction of an
educational experience they have paid good
money for and I support that.

GOLDING: Well, thanks. I'm getting
(inaudible) here. We tried our best and that
is what we're doing. I agree totally about
being behind. We don't want to be behind on
something like this.

HIPPISLEY: Davy?

JONES: I'll just add an historical aspect
to the posting of the ratings. In 1992 or
'93, it was when the Senate endorsed the
posting of the ratings on the bubble form.
It was only for undergraduate classes and it
was specifically that the comments are not
going to be posted. What's the intended use
now in terms of posting? What parts will be
posted? Graduate courses, too? Will
comments be posted? I'm not quite clear.

GOLDING: Well, again, a very good question.
I assumed it would be similar to what it is
now where comments are not posted. But I
don't know. The plan was and again is
something we (inaudible). It's a good
question for something we never discussed at
all in the committee.

O'CONNOR: So I have a question, can we find a
middle ground here? Quite the contrary to
being satisfied with the current environment,
I am very dissatisfied and we need to fix it.
Could we somehow approve this to move forward
tentatively but only with final approval when
we have an implementation plan to go with it?

Can we do something sort of
(inaudible).

HIPPISLEY: Are you proposing an amendment to
the motion with some sort of proviso language
there, some sort of qualifying language?

O'CONNOR: So we could approve the content,
preliminary approval of this content
contingent on an implementation plan that is
approved by the Senate.

HIPPISLEY: This is a motion, it needs no
(inaudible).

GROSSMAN: Can I make a suggestion?

HIPPISLEY: Suggestion.

GROSSMAN: The part 3 discusses the
implementation of the new questions. Perhaps
after implementation of the new questions,
comma, which shall be brought to the Senate
for approval, comma, the effective is

practically impossible.
O'CONNOR: Well, I don't want this to be mandatory until we approve the implementation.
GROSSMAN: Well, that's why which must be approved by the Senate would...
HIPPI SLEY: So part of the clause 3, which talks about implementation, we say implementation must be approved by the Senate or endorsed -- probably endorsed by the Senate.
GROSSMAN: Endorsed.
HIPPI SLEY: Right.
GROSSMAN: So I guess I will make that formal motion. Implementation of new questions, comma --
BROTHERS: All right.
GROSSMAN: -- implementation of the new questions, comma, which must be approved by the Senate, or endorsed by the Senate.
HIPPI SLEY: I think you said implementation or -- we've got Davy up there. I think it's endorse. Because it's not an education policy, it's an implementation.
JONES: Most of these are on faculty performance rather than educational content of the course, so this seems more of an endorsing rather than approving.
GROSSMAN: Then put a comma after Senate.
CHRIST: There we go. Does that get what you want?
CHRIST: Can I make an editorial suggestion?
HIPPI SLEY: Alice Christ.
HIPPI SLEY: This is the amendment to be moved by Bob. Is there a second to the amendment?
MAZUR: I second.
HIPPI SLEY: By Joan.
CHRIST: I have an editorial suggestion which is that the comma and the new clause go after implementation instead of the questions.
GROSSMAN: That's fine.
HIPPI SLEY: That's a friendly amendment and it's been accepted. Joan, do you accept that?
MAZUR: Yes.
HIPPI SLEY: So this is a motion, you can see it in red, into the proposal. Would anyone like to speak for or against it? Roger?
BROWN: Roger Brown, College of Ag.
So does this mean that the questions don't become mandated until there's a second review by the Senate or they become mandated and it's just the implementation that we come to review by the Senate?
UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.
HIPPI SLEY: We're going to get the implementation to happen to our satisfaction.
BROWN: So the questions then become mandated and use mandated, can that portion be implemented? You can't make them mandated without some implementation, right? I just want to clarify.

At some place, it has to come back

to the Senate in order for the implementation to occur, so the endorsement doesn't matter if we're just going to delay the implementation with another review by the Senate?

HIPPI SLEY: Does anyone have an answer to that question? Bob?

GROSSMAN: The current TCE will be used until the new questions are implemented. They're not implemented until they are endorsed, that implementation plan is endorsed by the Senate.

So, in other words, until the implementation is decided, we will continue using our current TCEs. But it was going to be that way anyway.

HIPPI SLEY: So if we vote on the amendment and if we vote on the motion, the next thing that happens at Senate is we will maybe have charges, maybe not, maybe have someone else say this is the implementation and no one is allowed to start talking about the questions at that point. This is just implementation time. Mark?

LAUERSDORF: Mark Lauersdorf, A and S.

That was my -- I'm echoing the same question you are. I believe that the spirit of the original intent was that we be allowed to go back and revisit the questions at the time the implementation is unveiled.

In the case that the implementation crosses the (inaudible) causes us to want to marry that more strictly or more loosely (inaudible). I believe that was the spirit and I believe this does not capture that spirit because as Andrew has interpreted, I interpreted it the same way, that this only allows us to delay implementation but not allow us to go back and revisit questions once we've submitted the implementation plan.

HIPPI SLEY: So 95 percent of the comments that came out last time we met were not about the questions, they were about implementation. Most of the discussion in Senate Council was about implementation. Most of the discussion today has been about the implementation.

So I think the interpretation, I'm hoping we will accept this. The interpretation is that you're okay with the questions and you're okay with the general principle of universal acceptance provided that there is a better fit.

What we're not okay about is we don't know how this is going to be implemented so maybe (inaudible) start to correct it. That's what I think we're doing now with the amendment.

O'CONNOR: I'm afraid I don't agree with you. The implementation is could (inaudible) some change to the questions. I think it's scary. You've done a good job and I don't have any particular problems, but I would personally want the liberty to if I needed it.

HI PPI SLEY: Parliamentarian?
SEAGO: This is not your last opportunity to add questions. So I would not let that hold everything up.
REAL: I'm sorry. What do you mean? Could you say that again? I did not understand you.
SEAGO: Per parliamentary procedure, there are methods in place for going back if we needed to revisit the questions. So I just wanted to make a statement, you know, to not let that completely stop everything about it.
GROSSMAN: We can through parliamentary procedure reopen the questions.
SEAGO: The questions, uh-huh.
HI PPI SLEY: So they're not frozen.
SEAGO: They're not frozen completely.
HI PPI SLEY: Mark?
LAUERSDORF: I just have a question for clarification. It was addressed in the preamble to the question set that there was a discussion in the committee of the question of the four point versus five point scale. Will that be something that is addressed in implementation or is that something that should be addressed now in crafting the questions?
GOLDING: That's up to you. I mean, we had long discussions about it and we chose the five point with greater variability in the scale. That's, again, that seems that that's a question Senate has to decide because accepting the questions, it seems to me if we're accepting the five point scale.
LAUERSDORF: And the question is because it's in the preamble but not actually included anywhere other than a recommendation from the committee, is that part of our vote now on the question set?
HI PPI SLEY: I think it is. I think that's what we want is we're accepting the report as in its preamble. The committee deliberated long and hard, (inaudible) the five point scale. Anyone else want to speak for or against the amendment?
MAZUR: Maybe the language could be endorse the mandate that these questions will substitute for the currently used common questions that programs use on their TCEs with exception. And that gets out the all and, you know, because those really are the mandate is really the implementation.
SEAGO: That's a separate --
HI PPI SLEY: We're just talking about this particular amendment.
MAZUR: Oh, the red type, sorry.
HI PPI SLEY: Yes, the red one.
MAZUR: Sorry.
HI PPI SLEY: So we vote on this amendment, this in the red. Okay. All right. The polls will close in five seconds. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay. So the motion to put that amendment in has passed and now we have

- the proposal back on the floor again. Okay, so this is on the floor now. Anyone want to speak for or against the proposal? Kaveh?
- TAGAVI: I appreciate the comment that this is not our last chance. But when this comes in six months or two months or nine months, as an implementation plan, and somebody raises their hand and says I think the question one should be changed this way, then a reasonable response could be this amendment is out of order because we are now talking about the implementation, we are not talking about the question. I just want to put that out so we know.
- GOLDING: We know it's possible to adjust the question.
- GROSSMAN: The questions can be revisited.
- SEAGO: Sure. If this is accepted and go back anything that a body passes, there is a process in place for going back and revisiting sections of it on it. So that we would just have to go through the formal process of putting it back out there for --
- HIPPISLEY: So in this cause for discussion about implementation, we may very well want to revisit the questions and can do so via parliamentary procedure. Yes?
- HERTOG: Jim Hertog, Communication and Information.
- Is there any sort of expected review of effectiveness of this two years later so we could then have numbers and so on saying the implementation worked, it didn't work, and so on, and have sort of a focus of discussion at that time to determine whether it should remain in place or be revised at that point?
- GOLDING: Excellent question. This issue came out in the committee and that's going to be the Provost having to get somebody to get some analysis. And you could argue that has been the problem for 23, 24 years. There's never been a very clear use of the old form. People would just opt out and say it's not working for us. So hopefully, the Provost, you know, hopefully he'll be here, will agree. He's committed to it now, that he'll commit to trying to make that the implementation form be something worthy of review.
- HIPPISLEY: Thank you. I think I'm right in saying everyone has discussed this and there's no further questions. So we will now vote. We've got an amended version, we will now vote on that. I'll give you the countdown. Five, four, three, two, one. It does not get more exciting than this. All right. Thank you. Motion carries. Thank you committee.
- All right. So I think we are done except for any other business. We have this slot for any other business, we have time, we don't need to use it. But if anybody has an

UKSenateMeeting-3-9-15.txt

issue they want to bring up, we had a few issues last time. We did discuss by Senate Council (inaudible). We did go back over them. Would anybody like to bring in any other business? Gail?

BRI ON: I would just like to suggest to this Body that it would timorous not to bring up objections.

HI PPI SLEY: Hearing no other suggestions for any other business. Anyone move to adjourn? Joan Mazur. Second?

BONDADA: Second.

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, 2019.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office on this the 29th day of April, 2015.

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

NOTARY ID 530912