

University Senate
March 9, 2015

The University Senate met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, March 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. The Chair called for an attendance vote and 58 senators registered their presence.

1. Minutes from February 9, 2014 and Announcements

The Chair reported that no corrections to the minutes were received. There being no objections, the minutes from February 9, 2014 were approved by unanimous consent.

The Chair had a few announcements.

- An advising retreat was held on March 2 to discuss, amongst other things, faculty advising and mentoring. The chair of the Senate's Academic Advising Committee, Phil Kraemer, also attended and participated in discussions
- UK's First Scholars Program is currently seeking faculty and staff who are willing to serve as mentors for students in their sophomore and junior years. The Chair suggested that those interested email the contact person or review the website for more information.
- The ad hoc Committee on Faculty Disciplinary Action has created a draft *Governing Regulation (GR)*. The scope is to reimagine faculty disciplinary procedures. The Senate Council (SC) had an extensive, detailed, and honest discussion about the proposed new regulation at its most recent meeting. The SC will hold a special meeting on Wednesday, March 11 in 103 Main Building to continue the discussion. The plan is to have a first reading at the April Senate meeting for discussion only and a second reading in May. In the meantime, senators are welcome to visit the SC's agenda site to access a recent version of the proposed new *GR*; comments should be sent to Ms. Brothers.
- The Chair encouraged senators to review the recently posted web transmittal.
- Senators (and other faculty) with nominees for academic area and other advisory committees should email those nominees to Ms. Brothers.

2. Officer and Other Reports

a. Chair

Regarding a second term for the current academic ombud, the Chair reported that all parties (current ombud, Provost, and SC) concurred on the reinstatement. Therefore, Michael Healey will serve a second term as academic ombud, in 2015-16.

The SC approved a deviation from the calendar for course MCL 510.

The SC also approved three additions to degree lists due to administrative errors. The three requests were for: a BA Spanish (petitioned by College of Arts and Sciences, for December 2014); a BS Biology (petitioned by College of Arts and Sciences, for December 2014); and an MS Mathematics (petitioned by Grad School, for August 2014).

b. Vice Chair

Vice Chair Christ had nothing to report.

c. Parliamentarian

Parliamentarian Seago had nothing to report.

d. Trustee

Trustees Wilson and Grossman had nothing to report.

3. Update on UK's Strategic Plan - Provost Tim Tracy

The Chair invited Provost Tim Tracy to offer an update on UK's 2014-2020 Strategic Plan process. After his presentation, he solicited questions from senators. Blonder asked if the committees named a year ago, which included SC-nominees, would continue to be used. Provost Tracy said that the work from those committees would continue to be used, but the final drafting of the plan is up to the committee co-chairs. The Provost noted that he had already requested and received SC nominees for a few roles. Brion and Debski asked about input via town halls and a return visit to the Senate. The Provost replied that the intent was to hold town hall meetings early in May in order to get that feedback into the new Strategic Plan. He was also willing to return to the Senate for an update. The Chair noted that Provost Tracy was already scheduled to speak to Senate at the April meeting.

Ilahaine asked about adding a faculty member from the social sciences as a participant. Provost Tracy said he was unwilling to wait on additional individuals due to the aggressive time frame for completing the Strategic Plan by the end of May. He added that he was willing to accept faculty participation from someone who was ready to start working quickly. The Provost did comment that he did not want groups so large that scheduling meetings became difficult.

In response to Vasconez, the Provost said that not all Strategic Plan-related initiatives will be able to begin upon completion of the Strategic Plan in June. Some things may take a year or more to be resourced and implemented. Brion asked about UK's Vision and the Provost responded that it had not changed.

There were no further questions from senators. The Chair thanked Provost Tracy for the presentation.

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate's Academic Organization and Structure Committee (SAOSC) - Ernie Bailey, Chair

i. Proposed Name Change of the School of Library and Information Science to the School of Information Science

The Chair explained that the SC recommended approval of the motion from the SAPC that the Senate **move** to 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. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. Bailey explained the proposal to senators. Bailey explained the proposal and noted that it included letters of support from a number of University colleges, all supporting the proposed name change.

There being no questions from senators, the Chair called for a **vote** and the motion **passed** with 67 in favor, four opposed, and one abstaining.

b. Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) - Connie Wood, Chair

i. Proposed Revisions to Senate Rules 1.2.2.1.A ("Elected Faculty Membership," "Election")

Wood, chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee (SREC), explained the proposed revision to *Senate Rules 1.2.2.1.A*. The intent was to ensure that faculty who are eligible to serve have the ability to self-nominate or be nominated. The Chair explained that the SC recommended approval of the **motion** from the SREC that the Senate approve the revision to *SR 1.2.2.1.A*. Because the motion came from committee, no **second** was necessary. There were no questions from senators. A **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** with 71 in favor and none opposed.

ii. Proposed Revisions to Senate Rules Section 6 ("Academic Offenses and Procedures," "Plagiarism")

Wood explained that there were a few revisions to the *SR*, which were brought forward by the Student Government Association (SGA). There were a few editorial changes but there were three substantive changes: description of plagiarism; student notification procedures when an allegation is made; and jurisdiction.

The first change involved defining and describing plagiarism – the SREC removed the terms “anything else” and “or whatever” and inserted a better description. The second change was to require two methods of communication with a student after a plagiarism allegation has been made and remove the option for in-person delivery with a witness. The third change was to clarify that the Instructor of Record is responsible in situations in which the instructor is not a faculty employee. Also, the SGA asked that language be added to clarify that the actual instructor should participate in the proceedings of the University Appeals Board (UAB) as much as possible.

Tagavi expressed concern that the language in *SR 6.4.1.A* still referred to “signing the grade reports.” He said he had not physically signed a grade report in 25 years. Grossman supported Tagavi’s comment. Wood said that the SREC could make that editorial change on behalf of the Senate and thanked Kaveh for the comment. In response to Giancarlo, Wood said that requiring an email and a letter sent through the U.S. Post Office would not be an undue burden on administrators. Ilahiane asked about adding a reference to performance to the list of items that could be plagiarized, as it would be possible to plagiarize something that was not a tangible artifact. Baker said that he agreed with Ilahiane’s comment, but that in his opinion, the language would encompass something intangible.

Hertog asked about situations in which a student reproduces their own work, which had already been turned in for a grade. He said that the language as currently written would not cover a situation in which a student submits for a grade something that the student had previously handed in and for which a grade was already received. This began a lengthy discussion among senators. Some senators, primarily those who did not see dual submission/self-plagiarism as a problem, stated that if the prohibition is stated in the syllabus, the faculty member could use that as the basis for penalizing a student to self-plagiarizes and there would be no need to add it to the *SR*. Other senators, primarily those who did see self-plagiarism as a problem, stated that not including the language in the *SR* was problematic. Senators who wanted the language about self-plagiarism added said that the suggestion from other senators to just add such a prohibition to a syllabus was unfair – syllabi are already very long, and if an instructor forgets to add it to the syllabus, the instructor will have no recourse.

Giancarlo **moved** to amend the motion to add a sentence immediately after the sentence ending with “without clear attribution”: “Plagiarism may also include double submission, self-plagiarism, or unauthorized resubmission of prior work.” Christ **seconded**. Grossman offered a **friendly amendment** to substitute “one’s own work” for “prior work” and Giancarlo **accepted**. Cross offered a **friendly amendment** to move the sentence to the end of the paragraph and Giancarlo **accepted**.

Cross **moved** to add “, as defined by the instructor” to the end of Giancarlo’s sentence and Kennedy **seconded**. After brief discussion, a **vote** was taken on the amendment to add “as defined by the instructor” to the end of the sentence and the motion **passed** with 35 in favor, 30 opposed and two abstaining.

A **vote** was taken on the **motion** to add the following sentence to the end of the second paragraph in *SR 6.4.1*: “Plagiarism may also include double submission, self-plagiarism, or unauthorized resubmission of one’s own work, as defined by the instructor.” The motion **passed** with 40 in favor and 27 opposed.

A **vote** was taken on the motion to amend various parts of *SR Section 6*, including the added sentence, and the motion **passed** with 55 in favor, 13 opposed and two abstaining.

5. Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations - Jonathan Golding, Chair (second reading and vote)

The Chair recalled that the Senate held a first reading on the report from the ad hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations during the February 9, 2015 Senate meeting. The comments made by senators during that meeting were thoroughly discussed by the SC; the most common issue was concerns about implementation. The Chair said that he discussed implementation issues with Provost Tim Tracy, who affirmed his [the Provost’s] support for universal, mandated use of core teacher-course evaluation (TCE) questions. The Provost also let the Chair know that exceptions can be allowed if the Senate chooses to do so. Another concern was adding questions to the proposed new TCE core questions. The Chair related that the Provost said he would put forward all resources

necessary to aid faculty in adding questions to the TCE. Regarding questions about a joint Provost-Senate implementation committee, the Chair noted that Provost Tracy was also amenable to that. There were questions about use of the TCE; the Provost affirmed that the proposed new TCE will be used for promotion and tenure (P&T) exactly as the existing TCE is used for P&T. Another question from the Senate pertained to comparisons and whether or not the new core questions on the TCE will be used to compare one college to another college. The Chair explained that the Provost plans to use the TCE to compare a college to itself over a period of time, not to compare one college to another. Finally, Provost Tracy is prepared to offer whatever resources are necessary to implement the new TCE.

The Chair said that the **motion** from the SC was to recommend that the Senate: (1) accept the report by the ad hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations; (2) endorse the mandate that these questions will be the common questions that all programs will use on their TCE with exceptions made for courses with certain characteristics; and (3) request that the implementation of the new questions be effective as soon as practically possible. Because the motion came from the SC, no **second** was required. The Chair invited Jonathan Golding (AS/Psychology, chair of the ad hoc Committee on TCE) to come to the podium to help with the discussion.

There was lengthy discussion among senators. At one point, the Chair confirmed that the questions would need to return to the Senate if there is a desire to change the questions. The majority of comments by senators pertained to implementation concerns and improving response rates. Grossman **moved** that the phrase “which must be endorsed by the Senate” be added to the motion, immediately following “the implementation.” Mazur **seconded**. In response to Brown, the Chair clarified that the intent of the amendment is to not require use of the proposed new TCE until implementation concerns are appropriately addressed. He added that there were very few comments about the actual questions.

There were a few concerns from senators about the possibility that the motion language would prevent any additional consideration of the questions in the future. Parliamentarian Catherine Seago explained that the Senate could use parliamentary action to revisit the questions in the future without any trouble. When there was no further discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion to add “which must be endorsed by the Senate” to the motion and the motion **passed** with 53 in favor, 11 opposed and one abstaining. In response to a couple of questions about revisiting the questions, Seago reiterated that there is a parliamentary process the Senate can go through to reconsider any past action, which would merely require putting the proposed reconsideration on a Senate agenda.

After a few additional comments, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** that the Senate: (1) accept the report by the ad hoc Committee on Teacher-Course Evaluations; (2) endorse the mandate that these questions will be the common questions that all programs will use on their TCE with exceptions made for courses with certain characteristics; and (3) request that the implementation, which must be endorsed by the Senate, of the new questions be effective as soon as practically possible. The motion **passed** with 50 in favor, nine opposed, and three abstaining.

6. Other Business (Time Permitting)

The Chair asked if any senator wanted to bring up any issue for discussion but there were no such issues raised.

Mazur **moved** to adjourn and Bondada **seconded**. Senators voted with their feet and the meeting was adjourned at 4:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Alice Christ,
University Senate Secretary

Invited guests present: Jonathan Golding and Jeff Huber.

Absences: Adams, I., Anderson, Bailey, P., Bird-Pollan*, Birdwhistell, M., Blackwell, Brennen, Campbell, Carvalho, Cassis, Childs*, Clark, Closson, Cox, Cross, de Beer, Dickson, Doolen, Dunn, Ferrier, Folmar, Fox, Grace, Graf, Gross,

* Denotes an explained absence.

Hallam, Healy*, Herrera*, Ingram, Jackson, J., Jackson, N.*, Karan, Kellum, Knutson*, Lee, C., Martin, A., McCormick*, McGillis*, McManus, Mock, Murthy, Nash, Oberst, O'Hair, D, Osorio, Pienkowski, Prather, Prats, Rabel, Richey, Royse, Sachs, Sanderson, Schoenberg*, Sekulic*, Shen, Steiner, Stewart, Stratton*, Sudharshan*, Tick, Tracy, Turner, Vasconez, Vosevich, Walz, Williams, Wilson, M., Witt, and Zepeda.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Tuesday, March 17, 2015.