

# Senate Council

Monday, September 26, 2022

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3:00 PM on Monday, September 26, 2022, in 103 Main Building, although a video conference link was also available for members. Below is a record of what transpired. The Chair informed SC members that there were not enough voting items on the agenda today to justify the use of Poll Everywhere.

Senate Council Chair DeShana Collett (HS) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:00 PM. The Chair welcomed those present. She informed everyone that the session was being recorded for notetaking purposes and noted that it was an open meeting. She asked that all attendees, online and in person, state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, to ensure everyone knew who was speaking. The Chair commented that there were no votes scheduled. The Chair reminded SC members that regarding the ability to speak, members must raise their hand to be called upon. The Chair also reminded everyone that SC members would have priority speaking, noting that others may be called upon as needed and given a chance to speak only if there were no additional comments from SC members.

## 1. Minutes from September 19 and Announcements

The Chair reported the minutes from September 19 were not yet ready and would be distributed when available.

The Chair acknowledged the observance of Rosh Hashanah, noting many colleagues across campus were observing the holiday.

The Chair informed SC members that there were some challenges associated with finalizing the composition of the Undergraduate Council (UC). The Chair noted that three open seats remained from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Design. The Chair informed SC members that Olivia Davis (BE) was willing to serve on the UC as a voting member, noting that while there would be two members from the College of Business and Economics on the Council, each would come from different departments (Davis from Accounting, and the other from Management). The Chair noted that the UC Chair and SC Office staff were actively seeking faculty to serve in the vacant seats. The Chair explained that once open seats were filled, the UC would have one additional voting member for the remainder of 2022-2023. The Chair asked if there were any objections to Davis serving as a voting member of UC for 2022-2023 and there were none. There being no **objections, Davis was appointed to the UC as a voting member by unanimous consent.**

The Chair commented that Alberto Corso (AS) had been contacted about serving as the SC liaison to the Graduate Council (GC) and he was willing to serve in that role.

The Chair informed SC members that the SC Office was working diligently with Senate Calendar Committee Chair Richard Charnigo (PbH) to standardize the structure of the requests received by the office for changes to academic calendars. The Chair noted that once the committee discussed the information they desired from proposers, it would be trialed to determine procedural effectiveness. The Chair commented that once the committee identified the best process, the SC would be asked for approval to use the proposed form.

## 2. Appointment of Senate Parliamentarian for 2022-2023

The Chair expressed her gratitude for Clayton Thyne's (AS) service as parliamentarian over the last year. The Chair also expressed her appreciation for Gregg Rentfrow's (AG) willingness to serve as parliamentarian in the 2022-2023 year. The Chair noted that Rentfrow had graciously offered to attend SC meetings as well as Senate meetings. There being no objections, Rentfrow was appointed Senate parliamentarian for the 2022-23 year.

### 3. Interim Administrative Regulations 3:16 (“Review of Chief Administrative Officers of the University)

- a. Track Changes Version of Draft Presented to Regulation Review Committee
- b. Clean Version of Draft Presented to Regulation Review Committee
- c. Currently Posted (Interim) AR 3:16
- d. Informal Description of Issues

The Chair reminded SC members that at last week’s SC meeting, she explained the normal vetting process for *Administrative Regulations (AR)* and *Governing Regulations (GR)*. The Chair noted the current process was supposed to include input from SC or Senate but explained that the process had become rushed as the University’s reaccreditation site visit grew closer. The Chair informed SC members that she raised concerns about the proposed changes and that she was informed SC could offer feedback after the interim AR was posted. The Chair explained she was soliciting feedback from SC members that she would share with Associate Legal Counsel Marcy Deaton and Associate Vice President for Student Excellence and Engagement and Acting Associate Provost for Planning and Assessment Katherine McCormick.

SC members provided a variety of feedback, including the following:

- Whether the intent of the interim AR was to be established as a permanent AR
- The implications that the AR have for faculty
- The impact of the political cost for Legal Counsel and the responsible official neglecting their responsibilities related to shared governance by ignoring the concerns raised by the SC Chair
- Accountability across University constituents by participating fairly in shared governance
- Whether the interim had to be approved by the Board of Trustees (the Chair clarified because this was an AR, it could be approved by the President on recommendation of the Provost)

The Chair noted that SC members were being asked to weigh in on the AR to uphold shared governance and transparency. She commented that the interim AR had been expedited because of the upcoming SACSCOC reaffirmation, noting that she did not necessarily believe there was any ill-intent. The Chair informed SC members that many AR changes were happening due to the reaffirmation without SC input and she was soliciting SC input now while the interim AR was fresh on everyone’s mind.

Richard Charnigo (PbH) expressed concerns about striking the language about the annual report describing the status of summative reviews and asked if there was a way to preserve the intent of the language.

Marilyn Duncan (ME) noted that she agreed with concerns raised by the Chair in that not consulting SC first was in violation of existing regulations and policy. Senate Council Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) asked where the formal mechanism existed for University Legal to solicit feedback from SC. Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) explained that he and Davy Jones (emeritus faculty) served on the Regulation Review Committee for two years, it was explained to them that the mechanism to trigger discussion was initiated when SC representatives on the committee suggested the need for presentation to SC for feedback. Cramer noted that when the Chair raised such concerns to the committee, the mechanism to trigger SC feedback should have been activated. Cramer explained that a year passed where the committee did not meet and noted that the changes in the interim AR which were rushed were bad changes. Provost Robert DiPaola suggested that while there was not a requirement for AR changes to go to the SC, the SC was represented on the committee by the SC Chair.

The Chair informed SC members that she believed the most pressing issue currently was for SC members to provide feedback on the proposed changes. She suggested the feedback needed to be provided to Legal

Counsel before the interim regulation became permanent, whenever that might be. The Chair welcomed SC members to provide other feedback via email and noted her appreciation for their input while the SC awaited revised regulations from Legal Counsel.

Faculty Trustee Hollie Swanson (ME) asked about the process by which an interim *AR* became permanent. Guest Jones suggested that an interim should last no longer than six months, although he had seen interim regulations that were more than six months old. He noted that if the interim continued to be reenacted, the SC would never have an opportunity to weigh in.

Duncan expressed concerns about extended periods where department chairs were not reviewed, noting instances of such. The Chair asked that SC member consider the position that unit and college faculty would be put in due to Legal Counsel having removed language on summative reviews. She explained that by removing the summary review, faculty who desired such a review could end up in a confrontational position whereas under the previous version, requesting a review was a normalized activity. Senior Associate Provost for Administration and Academic Affairs Kathryn Cardarelli noted that the Office of the Provost was still moving forward with formative and summative reviews and was continuing to execute that process even though it was not included in the interim *AR*.

Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) commented that he was concerned about the spirit of promulgating the interim *AR* (the process described by *AR 1:6*). Cramer noted that the responsible official (UK's provost) had responsibilities to determine the extent to which comments from the Chair are taken into consideration. He said that there was space within the spirit of the rule where UK could do better. He opined that SC would like to see Provost DiPaola take such concerns seriously when raised by the Chair.

Provost DiPaola explained that expediting the interim *AR* was due to time limitations and that no ill-intent was intended. The Provost noted that the Office of the Provost would continue to communicate results of reviews back to relevant units within colleges, especially if it is the review of a dean. The Provost informed SC members that the Office of the Provost would continue to provide summative reviews and key points (with respect to privacy) regardless of what was stated in the *AR*. The Provost commented that there were numerous internal processes related to shared governance, beyond the *ARs*, that the Office of the Provost would continue to practice.

The Chair thanked SC members for their input and welcomed SC members to share additional feedback with her.

#### 4. Update on QEP Process – Co-Chair Susan Cantrell

The Chair invited Susan Cantrell (ED) to provide an update regarding the process of the University's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP).

Cantrell provided an update to SC members about the QEP process, which included the following:

- The topic for the QEP: Transdisciplinary Educational approaches to advance Kentucky (TEK)
- The purpose of an institution's QEP, which was to reflect and affirm a commitment to enhance overall institutional quality and effectiveness focusing on an issue that the institution considers important to improving student learning outcomes and/or student success
- The SACSCOC standard for an institution's QEP
- An overview of topic exploration activities, which led to the selection of the QEP topic
- The purpose of a transdisciplinary approach to ensure students graduate with skills needed to thrive in the workforce and operate across traditional boundaries to lead lives of meaning and purpose

- The goals associated with the QEP, including acquiring essential workforce skills through real-world learning and active engagement in transdisciplinary environments, and engaging in team-based transdisciplinary activities that produced innovative and relevant solutions toward addressing critical societal issues locally and globally
- The QEP development committee composition and process
- Objectives and outcomes associated with the QEP
- Strategies associated with the QEP
- The importance of engaging first-year students at earliest opportunities such as K-Week and orientation
- Next steps for the QEP development committee

The Chair thanked Cantrell for her update and work on the committee. Provost DiPaola thanked Cantrell for her work and commented that he believed the QEP was moving in the right direction. The Provost informed SC members that there would be another opportunity for feedback during the week of Thanksgiving and noted there was great consideration for how to utilize the University's existing infrastructure to leverage and advance the QEP.

SC members asked a variety of questions and discussed the following:

- Whether a team experience was always necessary for a transdisciplinary element to occur and if so, how that would work
- The importance of how individual components contribute to a transdisciplinary approach and the challenges associated with team assessment
- The difference between transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary (Cantrell noted that transdisciplinary efforts produced a collaborative result that could not be defined by individual disciplines)
- How UK Core courses would help students engage in transdisciplinary work
- Whether the QEP was focused on student learning outcomes or student success outcomes (Cantrell noted that they were focused on student learning outcomes)
- Operationalizing the QEP and the process associated with development and implementation
- If every department in every degree program needed to make changes associated with the QEP (Cantrell answered no, and commented that this approach may not be appropriate for all first-year students)

## 5. Provost Committee on Advising – Vice President for Student Success Kirsten Turner

The Chair welcomed Vice President for Student Success Kirsten Turner and Assistant Dean for Academic Advising Sarah Ellison (student success).

The Chair explained to SC members that the SC was asked in March of 2020 to approve the inclusion of a member of the Provost Committee on Advising (PCA) on the Senate Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee (SRWAC) and the Senate Academic Advising Committee (SacAC), noting that this proposal was approved by the Senate the following month. The Chair described the justification provided at the time, which was provided in a memo from the Assistant Provost for Student and Academic Support Marianne Young:

*“The Provost gave direct oversight for university academic and career advising to the office of Student and Academic Support. By way of this new alignment, the Provost Committee on Advising was established. The Provost Committee on Advising is charged with creating a highly coordinated and integrated professional advising system with shared outcomes using strategic assessment to standardize processes and procedures which support student success.*

*The committee includes representation from each college academic advising office, each program advising area, and each career advising office. The Associate Deans of each College designated an*

*advising leader to be on this committee. This group also serves as a resource to the campus community regarding advising-related issues and concerns and may make policy suggestions to the University Senate or other administrative bodies. Therefore to align with the Provost's direction regarding oversight of advising, the Provost Committee on Advising should be listed as one of the official representatives for the two Senate committees listed on the attachment."*

The Chair informed SC members that for the past few years, the SC had not seated a member of the PCA on either committee for the following reasons:

- The area within the Provost's office that oversaw the PCA moved over to the President's office, meaning it literally was no longer the Provost's committee
- The URL provided to the SC back in March 2020 that described the PCA now redirected to VP for Student Success
- It would be very useful to know who serves on the PCA, what their meeting schedule is, their chair, and their current charge
- For the *Senate Rules*, ex officio roles are intended to provide expertise from the area named
  - When Senate approved the inclusion of the PCA, it was done so in consultation with the knowledge that the role would provide guidance from the Provost's area

The Chair invited Vice President for Student Success Kirsten Turner to provide information to SC members.

Turner noted it was good to see everyone and introduced the Assistant Dean of Academic Advising for the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment Sarah Ellison (within the Office of Student Success). Turner explained the creation of the PCA to SC members and the structure of the PCA and the Advising Network, noting the PCA was intended to represent advising at the administrative leadership level. Turner noted that former Senate member Rebecca Freeman (AS), whose Senate term had ended in August of 2022, represented the University Senate on the PCA. Turner commented that she wanted to converse with SC members first about clarification for PCA representation on Senate committees before asking who the Senate representative for the PCA should be. Turner noted that PCA administratively reported through Student Success, and not through the Office of the Provost. She explained that advisors were jointly supervised by the associate deans and Student Success. Turner noted that she wanted to talk through whether issues existed and commented that she saw a utility in having representatives from the PCA on Senate committees.

The Chair asked how the PCA representatives to Senate committees were chosen. Turner noted that the PCA itself made recommendations. SC members discussed the following:

- Whether the word "Provost" was authentically attached to the committee and if a renaming of the committee might be better received
- The SC should ask the current chairs of the SacAC and SRWAC how important the roles of the nonvoting members from the Advising Network were
- Unaddressed issues in shared governance and shared goals between Student Success and University Senate
- The University's organizational restructure
- How the PCA representatives were selected and what expertise was needed by the committee, and what processes the Advising Network currently used for selection of Senate committee representatives
- Ensuring that ex officio committee members identified by the Advising Network were employees of the University.

The Chair noted a formal proposal (for the name change and proposed Senate committee representatives) was preferred and could be submitted to Sheila Brothers (SC Office). Turner thanked the Chair and SC members for their time and expressed her appreciation.

## 6. Items from the Floor (Time Permitting)

The Chair asked if there were any items from the floor.

Akiko Takenaka (AS) expressed concerns about University acceptance rates increasing to 94% and asked how a 94% acceptance equated to a reasonable academic standard. Takenaka asked if raising acceptance rates meant lowering the standard, and inquired about the further support needed, the impact on overall standards, and appropriate faculty training. She asked what kind of additional support faculty could expect to ensure the success of students who were now at the University. Takenaka noted that colleague sent her data from the US News and World Report which showed higher education acceptance rates ranging from 7% to 90% with a median of approximately 70% across institutions observed by the University for benchmarking activities. Takenaka expressed concerns that faculty were already experiencing an increase in inadequately prepared students who were in high school during the pandemic. Takenaka commented that many faculty would appreciate President Capilouto attending the next Senate meeting to address these issues.

Vice President for Student Success Kirsten Turner offered some feedback to Takenaka's concerns, noting University acceptance rates had been 90% or above since prior to the pandemic. Turner noted that she would retrieve specific data. Turner explained that applicants who fell below University admission standards were sent to the colleges and that colleges could make a decision to accept the student. Turner commented that the Associate Deans had been thoughtful and creative about scaffolding around opportunity students, those who would need more support to succeed. Turner agreed with Takenaka, that this academic year's incoming freshman class had experienced a loss in academic preparedness due to the pandemic.

Faculty Trustee Hollie Swanson (ME) asked how metrics such as standardized test scores, class rank, and GPA were weighed among applicants. Turner noted they were currently piloting a test optional program that was recently approved for extension by the Senate for an additional three years. Turner provided some metrics to SC members, noting a relatively stable academic profile, but explained there were still students on the high and low end.

Turner noted there was still work to be done. She explained to SC members that though other institutions in the Southeastern Conference had higher admissions requirements, the University would not do so as such limitations did not align with the University's mission and values and responsibilities to citizens of Kentucky. Takenaka commented that it would be helpful for these sentiments to be shared with Senate members. Turner said she welcomed an opportunity to give a presentation on this subject to the Senate.

The SC Chair asked if there were any further items from the floor.

Faculty Trustee Aaron Cramer (EN) noted that concerns had been expressed regarding units that were not handling curricular issues properly. Cramer explained that concerns had been raised about programs being shut down or experiencing significant reduction without going through the Senate's formal process. If there were programs with low numbers of students, there was an appropriate way to address those programs, through the Senate. Cramer noted while someone new to the University may not be familiar with University process, the results of such actions would have negative implications, perhaps even in the reaffirmation process. Cramer asked Provost DiPaola to look into the matter and the Provost agreed to do so.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 PM with **no objections**.

Respectfully submitted by,  
DeShana Collett

Prepared by Katie Silver on Thursday, September 29, 2022

SC Members Present: Bastin, Cantrell, Collett, Charnigo, Cramer, Davis, Duncan, Laws, Raglin, Swanson, Takenaka, Tagavi, Vincent, York

Invited Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Robert DiPaola, Sarah Ellison, Gregg Rentfrow, Kirsten Turner