

University Senate
February 9, 2015

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, February 9, 2015 in the Auditorium of W. T. Young Library. Below is the record of what transpired. All votes were taken via electronic voting devices unless indicated otherwise; specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council.

Senate Council Chair Andrew Hippisley called the University Senate (Senate) meeting to order at 3:02 pm. He reminded senators to pick up their clickers.

The Chair called for an attendance vote and 60 senators registered their presence.

1. Minutes from December 8, 2014 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no corrections to the minutes were received by 9 am Friday. Because there were no corrections, the minutes from December 8, 2014 were **approved** by **unanimous consent**. There were a few announcements.

- The Convocation in celebration of UK's 150th anniversary celebration will take place on February 23 at 10 am in the Singletary Center for the Arts. The Chair offered senators RSVP information and encouraged senators to attend; regalia will be available for one-day use.
- If a senator has a topic or issue potentially for discussion by the Senate Council (SC) or Senate, the senator can bring it up during the "Other Business" agenda item. One such topic will be brought up later in the meeting.
- While it is good to have debate on the floor, the meeting will move more smoothly if senators send potential amendments in advance. Some amendments were sent in in advance for this meeting, and while the amendments may still need to be moved from the floor, having them on paper in advance could make the proceedings more efficient.
- Solicitations for area advisory committee nominees will be sent out in the near future.
- There is a web transmittal currently posted.
- The forum put on for senators to explain proposed changes to the retirement plan was well attended. The Chair said he had not received any concerns from senators so his assumption was that senators were mostly satisfied with the proposed changes.
- The SC received an update from Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ben Withers on UK's foreign language requirement. The SC asked for a pilot and implementation report in fall 2015.
- The ad hoc Committee on the Faculty Disciplinary Policy continues to meet. Their report is scheduled to come to the Senate for a first reading in March or April.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

The Chair reported the previously announced results from the SC election. The new SC members are Ernie Bailey (AG/Veterinary Science); Joan Mazur (ED/Curriculum and Instruction); and Phil Kraemer (AS/Psychology). The Chair offered his thanks to those SC members whose term ended in December: David Pienkowski (EN/Biomedical Engineering); Liz Debski (AS/Biology); and Debra Anderson (NU).

The SC elected Katherine McCormick (Education) as the next Vice Chair of SC and Secretary of Senate, with a term beginning June 1.

The SC met with President Eli Capilouto on December 15 to consult on a new provost, specifically their priorities and attributes, as well as the process by which to identify a new provost.

The Student Government Association (SGA) formally informed the SC that it had endorsed Senate's proposed revisions to *Governing Regulations XI* ("University Appeals Board"). The item will be on the agenda for the Board of Trustees' February meeting.

The SC charged the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees with exploring an expansion of the range of available titles for honorary degree recipients (*Senate Rules 5.4.2.3 D*).

The SC chair met with President Capilouto on January 27. During their discussion, the Chair brought up the faculty perception of administrative 'bloat.' That issue was raised by a senator at a previous meeting during the "Other Business" agenda item. The Chair reported that the President said he would look into it and report back to the Chair. The same senator asked about digital submissions of teacher-course evaluations (TCE). The SC asked the associated committee to look into the matter and it will be part of their report later in the meeting.

The Chair attended a University-wide workshop on advising, to reflect on current policies and think of ways to improve academic advising. The Senate's Academic Advising Committee is formally involved in the advising initiative. There are areas in which the Senate must be involved when it comes to educational policy.

The Chair reported that the SC approved deviations from the standard calendar for MAP 671; MAP 672; MAP 673; MAP 674; MAP 675; MAP 695; MAP 698; MAP 699; MAP 701; and MAP 719.

b. Vice Chair

Vice Chair Alice Christ said that she had nothing to report.

c. Parliamentarian

Parliamentarian Catherine Seago explained that in response to some requests, the Senate web page now includes some parliamentary help. By clicking on "Parliamentary Help," a senator (or anyone) can see a short outline of what happens during a meeting. Also available from that web page is a link to a table with quick information when dealing with Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

d. Trustees

Trustee Wilson gave senators information on recent parking forums he attended. He also offered an overview of some of the parking issues that faculty were reporting. Trustee Grossman also offered comments on the parking situation and short-term and long-term solutions. There were a few questions from senators.

3. Committee Reports

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

i. Proposed New Graduate Certificate in Digital Mapping

The Chair explained that the SC recommended approval of the **motion** from the SAPC that the Senate move to approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate in Digital Mapping, in the Department of Geography within the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Schroeder, chair of the Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC), explained the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Digital Mapping. There were no questions from senators. The Chair called for a **vote** and the motion **passed** with 76 in favor and one abstaining.

ii. Proposed New Masters of Science in Digital Mapping

The Chair explained that the SC recommended approval of the **motion** from the SAPC that the Senate move to 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. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Schroeder explained the proposal for a new MS in Digital Mapping. There were no questions from senators. The Chair called for a **vote** and the motion **passed** with 73 in favor and two abstaining.

iii. Proposed New University Scholars Program: BS Agricultural Biotechnology and MS Medical Sciences

The Chair explained that the SC recommended approval of the **motion** from the SAPC that the Senate move to 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. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Schroeder explained the proposal for the new University Scholars Program: BS Agricultural Biotechnology and MS Medical Sciences. Brown noted that the correct name was “College of Agriculture, Food and Environment” [no “the” prior to “Environment”]. On behalf of the SAPC, Schroeder **accepted** Brown’s **friendly amendment** to remove “the” from the college’s name in the motion. She added that she accepted the same friendly amendment for the other agenda item with the unnecessary “the” in the college’s name. In response to Kellum, Schroeder explained the basic premise of the University Scholars Program.

There being no further questions from senators, the Chair called for a **vote** and the motion for establishment of a new University Scholars Program of a BS in Agricultural Biotechnology and MS Medical Sciences within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment and the College of Medicine **passed** with 72 in favor, one opposed and three abstaining.

iv. Proposed New Undergraduate Certificate in Research in Human Health Sciences

The Chair explained that the SC recommended the Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate in Research in Human Health Sciences within the College of Health Sciences. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary.

Schroeder explained the proposal for the new Undergraduate Certificate in Research in Human Health Sciences. There were no questions from senators. The Chair called for a **vote** and the motion **passed** with 68 in favor, three opposed and three abstaining.

v. Proposed New MS in Applied Behavior Analysis

The Chair explained that the SC recommended the Senate approve the establishment of a new Master’s of Science in Applied Behavior Analysis, in the Department of Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling within the College of Education. Because the motion came from committee, no second was necessary.

Schroeder explained the proposal for the new Master’s of Science in Applied Behavior Analysis. There were no questions from senators. The Chair called for a vote and the motion passed with 72 in favor.

vi. Proposed New PhD in Plant Pathology dual degree with Brazil's Universidade Federal de Vicosa

The Chair explained that the SC recommended the Senate approve, for submission to the Board of Trustees, the establishment of a new Dual Degree Program: PhD Plant Pathology with Universidade Federal de Vicosa, and the Department of Plant Pathology within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. Because the motion came from committee, no second was necessary.

Schroeder explained the proposal for the new Dual Degree Program of a PhD in Plant Pathology with Universidade Federal de Vicosa. McCormick asked for an explanation of the difference between a dual degree and a joint degree. Schroeder said that dual degree means a student will earn a PhD from UK and a PhD from Universidade Federal de Vicosa (UFV). Debski asked if a student would be able to earn both degrees by staying at one institution. Schroeder responded that a student must travel to both universities – there is a residency requirement for each university laid out in the proposal. Associate Provost for Internationalization and interim Dean of the Graduate School Susan Carvalho explained that electronic

dissertation requirements could easily be met by students of both universities. Guest Lisa Vaillancourt (AG/Plant Pathology) responded to a question from Prats and said that dissertations for all students will be written in English with English and Portuguese summaries. All faculty at UFV speak English fluently and while some UK faculty speak some Portuguese, part of the goal of UFV faculty is for their students to develop English fluency. Brazilian students' dissertations will be given in English, too.

McCormick asked for additional information about the differences between dual degrees and joint degrees. Vaillancourt said that dual degrees were logistically easier to put together, in large part because dual degree arrangements did not require any change to UK's degree requirements. It is more difficult to create a joint degree program by which students receive one diploma given jointly by two institutions. The dual degree program in Plant Pathology with UFV includes additional requirements for students, over the normal work usually required for the PhD. Carvalho added that a joint degree would require UK to be involved in accreditation of another institution's facilities, which was a complex process. Illahaine commented that he had seen similar, though unrelated, programs at universities in Morocco. There were no further questions or comments from senators. The Chair called for a vote and the motion passed with 72 in favor, one opposed and two abstaining.

4. Proposed Revision to Senate Rules 5.4.5.C.b.i ("Diplomas," "In Memoriam Posthumous Degrees")

The Chair explained that at the end of the last session, the Senate approved a new type of honorary degree. The idea was that like other honorary degrees, this type would be given to someone who had not earned it. In this case, it would be a student who died prior to completing coursework. There was a little confusion about In Memoriam degrees the last time the Senate met, which incentivized the SC to clean up the language a bit. The Chair explained that in the first part of the process, there was a clear difference between how a student is added to an In Memoriam degree list and how a student is added to a regular (earned) degree list. In the second section, however, the student and process is treated largely like any other candidate for degree. Finally, throughout the section, the term "In Memoriam Posthumous Degree" is abbreviated.

The Chair noted that a few editorial changes were sent in prior to the meeting, which could be seen in yellow on the screen. The Chair said that he accepted those minor changes on behalf of SC. The Chair said that the recommendation from the SC was that the Senate **move** to approve the proposed revisions to SR 5.4.5.C.b.i. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was needed. The Chair added that the Board of Trustees had already established the type of honorary degree, so the last edit was changing that to the past tense.

There were a number of questions and comments from senators. Debski expressed concern that the proposed language did not make it clear who made a request for an In Memoriam degree. Tagavi expressed concern that there was no time limit within which an In Memoriam degree must be requested. When there were no further questions or comments from senators, the Chair called for a **vote**. The motion **passed** with 68 in favor, four opposed, and two abstaining.

5. Diploma Content for Joint University of Kentucky-University of Louisville Executive MBA

The Chair explained that the Senate approved the joint UK-University of Louisville (UofL) Executive MBA a year or so ago; the day's agenda item was to approve the informational content of the diploma. The Chair solicited a motion for approval of the informational content of the joint UK-UofL EMBA diploma. Christ **moved** thusly and Folmar **seconded**.

Recommendation from SC: that Senate approve the informational content of the Joint University of Kentucky-University of Louisville Executive MBA. There were a couple comments about the style and format of the diploma. When there were no further questions, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 70 in favor and one opposed.

6. Proposed Revision to Governing Regulations X ("Employment") and Governing Regulations XIV ("Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct") - Marcy Deaton, Associate General Counsel

The Chair invited Guest Marcy Deaton, associate general counsel, to explain the proposed changes, which she did. The Chair commented that while the Senate discussed similar changes in December, he

did not put the motion to approve on the Senate floor. Kennedy **moved** that the Senate endorse the proposed revisions to *GR X* and *GR XIV* and Grossman **seconded**. There were a few questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 63 in favor, four opposed, and two abstaining.

7. Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations - Jonathan Golding, Chair (first reading – discussion only)

The Chair reminded senators that the agenda item was for discussion only. If senators have suggestions, the suggestions will be recorded in the meeting minutes and Senate Council (SC) will review them. The Chair asked Jonathan Golding (AS/Psychology), chair of the ad hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations (Committee) to deliver the report to Senate.

Guest Golding explained that UK began using the current teacher-course evaluations (TCE) in the 1992-93 academic year. While some units adopted the form, other units opted out and created their own versions. Some of the concerns are based on dislike of the current four-point rating scale and a few questions that asked more than one question, making response difficult to interpret. Given the continued lack of University-wide support for the form, as well as a report out of the College of Arts and Sciences about TCE, then-provost Christine Riordan and others felt there should be an attempt to come up with a common form. The Committee originally included 18 members from various colleges, including Medicine, Education, and Fine Arts, as well as other colleges. The Committee first met in spring 2014 and reviewed what other institutions use as an evaluative instrument, after which they developed a form that could be used university-wide. The draft TCE has a limited number of common and open-ended questions that could be answered by any student, regardless of program or level. Golding emphasized that the Committee's report allows individual units and instructors to ask other questions that are of interest to that particular entity¹; the intent was to develop a common core of questions to be added to as desired.

While the Committee began with 18, about 13 agreed to continue working on the issue when queried this past fall, but due to schedule conflicts about eight members regularly met. The meeting minutes were regularly distributed to all 13 members so those who could not attend were able to contribute if desired. Golding said that the Committee recommended a five-point scale; he acknowledged that an argument could be made for a four-point scale, but the Committee chose five points to allow for greater variability and to allow students an option to give an average rating. The Committee also recommended additional information be gleaned from respondents, such as mean, median, and distribution measures. The Committee did not directly address distance learning courses, but Golding opined that a few edits would allow it to be used for online courses. The Committee did informally discuss incentives for submission for students of instructors who use digital TCE, but did not see incentives as a focus.

The Chair opened up the floor for discussion among senators. There was a lengthy and lively discussion among senators. Below are the comments and questions from senators. Golding responded to many of the senators by explaining the Committee's rationale for various decisions. Throughout the discussion, senators thanked Golding and the Committee for their work.

- Why is there no question about critical thinking? Response from Golding: The Committee expects individual units and instructors to create such as questions as those entities deem appropriate.
- Why is there no question about assignments being distributed evenly across the semester? Response from Golding: Not all courses have assignments that can be evenly distributed across the semester.
- There should be a common question regarding critical thinking. Response from Golding: The Committee expects individual units and instructors to create such questions as those entities deem appropriate.

¹ ["Entity" refers to a department, school, college, program, instructor, or group of instructors.]

- If a student scores a professor low on course pace, it is impossible to tell if the course pace was too slow or too fast. One recommendation for a fix was to have the scale for that question be “Much too fast,” “Too fast,” “Just right,” “Too slow,” and “Much too slow.”
- Who will be responsible for ensuring entity-specific questions are added to the TCE?
- Who will be responsible for ensuring entity-specific questions are appropriate?
- It is possible that the question about “instructor communicated effectively” could open up faculty to negative comments about verbal accents because UK is a Midwestern university with a multicultural campus.
- The question about the course being a “quality course” is too subjective. Response from Golding: the Committee tried various ways to get at the inherent question. One option was to ask if the instructor fulfilled all the teaching objectives of the course, which could define quality, but the Committee thought that was too specific a question for the common core and expressed concern that some students may not know what the learning outcomes were. The Committee opted for a more general, common question with the assumption that individual entities will add questions that are more specific.
- The concerns about quality and pace can be addressed by the students writing out their specific concerns in the open-ended questions.
- Is there anyone on campus who will have the authority to censor what questions an entity adds to the TCE? Would entire colleges need to approve college-level questions? Response from Golding: The Committee assumed that a department [or school] or college would have final say.
- The question about quality in a course could be replaced by asking if a student found the course to be transformative. While “quality” means many things to many people, “transformative” has a limited definition.
- The form may not work for team-taught courses in the College of Medicine (ME). If a course has 20 or 25 instructors, which is routine in ME, how does a student answer questions about “the instructor.” Response from Golding: Individual colleges will need to add additional questions to address unique pedagogical activities, such as team teaching.
- What is the policy for exemptions based on class size? For example, an evaluation by one student in a class size of one could not be anonymous. Response from Golding: During implementation, there will need to be consideration of whether or not to require TCE in classes with very small enrollments.
- What happens to the data that is collected? Response from Golding: The Provost’s office will need to determine that, because the Provost’s office requested the TCE redesign effort.
- The Committee’s charge was far too narrow and left out important issues. For example, the Committee should have been asked to make a statement on the insignificance of five students turning in a TCE out of a class size of 40. The Committee should also have been asked to address how outlier information is evaluated. Finally, the Committee should have been able to look at how better to educate students about filling out TCE – too many comments about physical appearance are submitted but the TCE is used for promotion and tenure decisions. Response from Golding: These are very good points.
- The revised TCE is a huge improvement over what UK currently uses. The TCE does not measure the quality of the course, but rather measures student impressions of the course.

Response from Golding: The TCE is one piece of the evaluation process, that of student satisfaction. The TCE is not an objective measure.

- The question of quality could be replaced with asking if the student thought the course was worth their time and effort.
- The form needs to be more objective because administrators use it to address the quality of teaching. Response from Golding: Promotion and tenure committees must recognize the TCE is a small part of evaluating teaching. Administrators must take a more objective look at teaching; most faculty agree the TCE forms have too much power.
- It is somewhat concerning that UK is attempting to make one form fit so many types of courses. In some clinical courses, students meet with the instructor once at the beginning of the semester but then spend the remainder of their time with a preceptor. It would be very difficult for a student to answer the question that asks whether class meetings contributed to their learning in the course. The questions simply will not apply to many students and faculty, so the information that comes out the TCE in these situations will not offer useful information. Response from Golding: That is a good point. There will have to be a way to exempt some types of courses, but the question is how many? UK now has multiple TCE evaluation instruments and the provost specifically wanted a common set of questions.
- Did the Committee consider making the TCE optional, or is it mandatory? Response from Golding: The provost can say that everyone has to do it and there is no opting out, except for a few exemptions. The other options are to require that everyone use it, or not everyone use it. The Committee assumed the majority of entities would have to use it, but that a decision would be made after the Committee's work was completed.
- What is the purpose of asking a student to note their expected grade? Response from Golding: That type of question is on many universities' forms. The draft TCE presumes the student will have an idea of what their grade will be because the TCE is filled out towards the end of the semester. It may offer an insight into whether only high- performing students are filling out the forms.
- Creating a form prior to settling policy issues surrounding use of the form is akin to putting the cart before the horse.
- There is a massive published body of research on TCE, which any faculty member could locate. When the College of Arts and Sciences (AS) reviewed the current TCE, it was determined the TCE was a bit of a monstrosity and was not very good at getting to the information faculty want to see. AS recommended reducing the size and focusing the questions, which could go a long way towards rectifying the problems with TCE, because specific questions will be less likely to lead to inappropriate answers. Although the TCE are subjective comments from students, the TCE offer students a clear voice and way of evaluating their instruction. The draft TCE is a clear attempt to move towards a better instrument to improve student responses.
- If the TCE will be used by tenure and promotion committees, or for salary raises, faculty need to have a better understanding of how the TCE will be used in these decisions. If the TCE will be used in these situations, then it should be tailored to these situations. If, on the other hand, the TCE is used to provide meaningful feedback for a faculty member who is teaching and is only used by a professor to learn and improve their teaching, then the current TCE and draft TCE are quite good. If administrators plan to use these forms, faculty should have an understanding of how they will be used.
- The TCE could benefit from a question that asks if the student feels they learned anything. The draft TCE assumes a traditional classroom structure with lectures and a deviation from that could

be negatively reflected in the TCE. Response from Golding: That type of question did come up in Committee, but there was concern that it would not offer sufficient information. Any entity can add such a question to their TCE if they see fit, however.

The Chair thanked senators for the discussion. He said senators' comments will be documented in the meeting minutes and the issue of TCE will return to the Senate in the near future.

The Chair announced that the President had just sent an email with details about the two faculty candidates for the position of provost, Dean Tim Tracy and Dean David Blackwell. Open forums will be held later in the week and the SC will meet individually with each candidate.

8. Other Business (time permitting)

The Chair asked if any senators had a topic for discussion. Hertog commented that there is an ongoing student retention initiative on the President's orders and the Senate ought to be involved. The possibility that faculty will be evaluated based upon rates of student receipts of D grades and E grades and withdrawal (W) rates is an academic policy issue and should be discussed in the Senate. Such a move could simply punish faculty who are tougher graders or who have student populations that are not as well equipped for class as other student populations. The Chair said that the SC would discuss the matter at a future SC meeting.

On behalf of a colleague, Sachs asked if there was a mechanism by which faculty evaluate assistant or associate deans. He added that he knew of faculty input into dean evaluations. The Chair noted that this issue came up in a report submitted by the Faculty Committee on Review, Reward and Retention, chaired by former SC chair Hollie Swanson. The Chair mentioned the matter to then-provost Christine Riordan, who expressed interest in the issue. The Chair suggested Sachs raise the matter during the upcoming provost candidate forums.

The Chair said there was time for one further comment. Ilahaine asked if the Senate could explore the possibility of having a full-week break in the fall instead of the current one-day in which there are no classes. The Chair said that the issue has come up periodically; he will meet with Student Government Association President Jake Ingram on the issue in the near future.

There being no further business to attend to, Grossman **moved** to adjourn and Ilahaine **seconded**. Senators voted with their feet and the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Alice Christ,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Alan Allday, Marcy Deaton, Jonathan Golding, Robert Houtz, Gilson Capilouto, Richard Schein, Steven Skinner, and Matthew Zook

Absences: Adams, I., Adams, M., Anderson, Baker, Bird-Pollan, Blackwell, Blonder*, Bondada*, Botts, Brennen, Campbell*, Cassis, Clark, Cox, de Beer, Dietz*, Dunn*, Ferrier, Fiedler*, Fox, Graf, Hallam, Hazard*, Healy, Hulse, Ingram, Jackson, J., Kornbluh, Lee, C., Martin*, McManus, Mock, Murthy*, O'Hair, D.*, O'Hair, M.J.*, Osorio, Peffer*, Pienkowski, Prather*, Rabel, Richey, Royse, Sanderson, Sekulic*, Shen, Smyth*, Steiner*, Stratton*, Sudharshan, Sutphen*, Swanson*, Tick, Tracy, Turner, Vosevich, Walz, Watt, Williams, Wilson, M.*, Witt, and Wood.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, February 18, 2015.

* Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.