

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

JANUARY 23, 2023

* * * * *

1 MS. COLLETT: All right. It's 3:00 o'clock.
2 I'm going to go ahead and call
3 this meeting to order. If you
4 haven't--if you're here in person
5 please make sure you use the
6 sign-in sheet. Please make sure
7 you do that either now or before
8 you leave. Next, I'm going to
9 ask that Senators check and make
10 sure that you're logged into Poll
11 Everywhere. This is our normal
12 housekeeping here. So, you would
13 have received an email as you do
14 every single month with
15 instructions from Sheila about
16 Poll Everywhere. Hopefully, all
17 members have checked their
18 account and there won't be any
19 issues that come up at the time
20 of voting. The office recommends
21 that you use a web browser
22 because it tends to stay up to
23 date fairly quickly and readily
24 available more than the App, but
25 let's make sure that it is
26 working. So, hopefully,

1 everybody is logged in. You see
2 the instructions there as well.
3 Okay. Because I'm having some
4 funny stuff going on with this I
5 am going to bring up another
6 screen here. So, this is January
7 23, 2023, University Senate
8 Meeting. You can ensure your
9 voting is working correctly by
10 indicating the following, you are
11 here, you are not here and you
12 are not obligated to tell us that
13 you are here. So, it looks like
14 I have people coming in. I have
15 67 on my end. Perfect. All
16 righty. So, we've got some
17 housekeeping items before we get
18 into our first agenda item today.
19 Just remember that meetings are
20 subject to Open Records Laws and
21 it's being recorded for note
22 taking purposes. As always we
23 follow Robert's Rules of Orders
24 Newly Revised. This is a hybrid
25 meeting, so in person and Zoom.
26 So, we want this to be an

1 inclusive, interactive
2 experience. There's no voting by
3 proxy and if you are not a member
4 you cannot vote. State your name
5 and affiliation prior to speaking
6 any time you are called upon.
7 Saying your name helps to
8 identify the individual and makes
9 it easier to remember your names
10 as far as for me to know who you
11 are, additionally the Court
12 Reporter needs the names as she
13 does the transcription. So, make
14 sure you speak loudly so that you
15 can be heard and try to speak
16 clearly as well. All righty.
17 Individuals called upon at the
18 Chair's discretion, just remember
19 that Senators who are members
20 have the first priority.
21 Senators who have not spoken yet
22 about an issue will be next.
23 Those who can offer information
24 to assist the Senate's discussion
25 such as proposers or guests will

1 come after and then non-members
2 if time or circumstances permit,
3 but Senators have first priority.
4 Civility. Debate is about
5 expressing your opinion. We just
6 like to be respectful. Make sure
7 that you are participating and
8 reporting back to those who
9 elected you. Keeping your
10 constituents informed by
11 communicating is a big deal.
12 This may be done through your
13 college meetings, as I've said
14 before, but if those meetings do
15 not occur with some frequency you
16 need to find ways to communicate
17 monthly, such as department
18 meetings or through college
19 Listservs. Because this has
20 worked the last few meetings I'm
21 recommending that--I'm
22 recommending to you that the
23 Senate Council Office has
24 Listservs, as I've told you
25 before, that Senators can use to

1 facilitate communication and
2 improve transparency. We've had
3 several Senators from at least
4 three or four colleges take
5 advantage of this Listserv
6 resource and some of you may have
7 access already to your college
8 based Listservs that you can use
9 through your college, but we
10 appreciate the Deans and the
11 other members of college
12 leadership who have encouraged
13 their Faculty Senators to
14 communicate freely with their
15 colleagues. All right.
16 Attendance is captured via the
17 Zoom report and in-person sign-in
18 sheets. Chat function is
19 disabled. Not everyone is on
20 Zoom so those in person may not
21 be able to see the chat. So, we
22 just ask that, you know, instead
23 you raise your hand to be called
24 upon and whatever you have to say
25 we hear it as a group and as the

1 Senate meeting. If you're
2 attending by Zoom keep your
3 cameras on as much as possible
4 just due to Open Records Laws.
5 The KRS statute requires that all
6 members shall remain visible on
7 camera while business is being
8 discussed. And, again, use a
9 good quality headset. This is
10 stuff I've repeated each and
11 every time. You know, Senate
12 members if you are disconnected
13 and cannot reconnect at all
14 please send Sheila an email so
15 that we are aware but we will
16 continue to conduct business as
17 usual. Mute yourself when you're
18 not speaking. And if you're
19 on--so remember that the red
20 light--if you're in person the
21 red light means the mic is off
22 and no light means the mic is on.
23 When your mic is on the light is
24 off and the room camera will
25 focus on you during your time of

1 talking. If you are unmuted and
2 we hear a distraction I will
3 either call you out at that point
4 or Katie will mute you on Zoom.
5 All right. To ask to speak for
6 any reason via Zoom use the raise
7 hand button at the bottom of the
8 screen, in person just raise your
9 hand and we will acknowledge you.
10 You must seek permission from the
11 Chair to speak. So, in instances
12 where you--or reasons why a
13 Senator would like to speak
14 include the following point of
15 order information, so something
16 is not clear that's being
17 discussed or make or second a
18 motion, questions of fact and/or
19 debate or to call a question. We
20 will try to call on people in
21 order in which hands are raised
22 regardless of the modality being
23 used. All right. Senate Agenda
24 for today. Announcements. So,
25 the Senate Office plans to send

1 forward a proposed change to the
2 Senate Rules regarding
3 nomenclature for program changes.
4 You can see currently that we
5 have minor change, major change,
6 significant change, it's really
7 difficult to understand what's
8 the difference between a minor
9 and a significant, that word
10 minor versus significant. So,
11 we're proposing minor change
12 versus change versus significant
13 change. Not a lot has happened
14 since the last Senate meeting as
15 far as announcements, so this
16 will be a little shorter period.
17 The Senate Council has noticed
18 that one constant source of
19 confusion that relates to the
20 terms describing program changes
21 in the SR is this minor, major,
22 significant program changes. The
23 term significant refers to
24 proposals that require review by
25 a Senate Committee, such as

1 adding online delivery or
2 creating a new program. So, it
3 would be best to leave that
4 terminology alone. The minor
5 program changes is analogous to
6 the minor course change, so that
7 should be left alone. And then
8 that just leaves major, which is
9 the descriptor that needs to be
10 adjusted. If we delete the word
11 major it relates to programs. We
12 will have a minor program change,
13 program change, significant
14 program change, which is a far
15 more logical taxonomy. But a
16 proposal will be coming forward
17 in the next few weeks about that.
18 Followup regarding the process
19 for badges. So, the Senate
20 Council Office Staff worked on
21 updating the SRS over the break
22 and ran into some areas in the
23 proposal which were a little
24 difficult to codify related to
25 the approval process steps for

1 the badges honed outside of a
2 college. So, after a discussion
3 with the committee chairs all
4 badges will require Academic
5 Council approval. So, I had
6 discussions with Leslie Vincent
7 and Chairs of the Program
8 Committee, Admissions and
9 Academic Standards Committee and
10 the Rules and Election Committee,
11 we agreed that the Academic
12 Council oversight is necessary
13 for every badge proposal, credit
14 bearing and non-credit bearing.
15 So, there will be broad universal
16 vetting and you'll see the
17 process as it goes, it starts at
18 the department or Senate approved
19 faculty body level and move up
20 through the college level
21 faculty. It's a little bit
22 different when it goes to--if
23 they're honed outside of the
24 college, but we'll have a little
25 kind of process sheet that you

1 can see, it will go actually to
2 the Senate Council Office and
3 Senate Council Office will
4 determine which Academic Council
5 it goes through, but everybody
6 will hit that Senate Council
7 Office, Academic Council and back
8 to the Senate Council Office and
9 then 10-day post for broad
10 vetting. So, they'll be a 10-day
11 posting. We're (Inaudible) some
12 forms for creating badges and
13 also for creating a faculty body
14 for curriculum items honed
15 outside of the college. As you
16 all can remember last year around
17 this time, April or May, when we
18 had the faculty bodies come
19 through for courses honed outside
20 of a college. So, the same exact
21 template that we used there we're
22 turning it into a form that can
23 be used for anyone who is
24 proposing faculty bodies and also
25 creating badges. So, we'll

1 announce when those forms have
2 gone through final vetting and
3 final approval through Senate
4 Council. And also, if you're
5 interested in creating badges go
6 ahead and start contacting the
7 Senate Council Office so we can
8 help you through that process.
9 Yes? Who are you?

10 MS. VINCENT: Leslie Vincent, Gatton College.
11 I had someone reach out and ask
12 if the badges that were approved
13 as part of the pilot, do they
14 remain approved or do they need
15 to go through the process? And I
16 didn't know the answer.

17 MS. COLLETT: Sandra, do you want to talk about
18 that?

19 MS. BASTIN: Sure. We kind of feel like it
20 would be nice if everything were
21 on the same--the same shelf so to
22 speak and they did go back
23 through, but if there have been
24 no problems with them it really
25 would be a redundant issue. So,

1 I think that will end up a
2 discussion when we decide who
3 will be ultimately responsible
4 for the badges or the USPs,
5 sorry.

6 MS. COLLETT: Okay. All right. And there is a
7 proposal coming forward on how to
8 change the University Scholar's
9 Program that have already been
10 approved. So, in the near future
11 a proposal will come that
12 modifies the SR slightly to
13 indicate that if the requirements
14 for the USPs and the SRs are met
15 a representative of the Graduate
16 School Program just needs to
17 request that the Graduate School
18 create their USP. Senate already
19 has a framework for USPs in the
20 SRs. If you have thoughts about
21 this issue please share them with
22 Sandra, she's the SAPC Chair, as
23 soon as possible. And they've
24 already kind of discussed this
25 and the guidelines are already

1 well established in the SR and
2 Graduate Council is actually
3 supportive of these changes as
4 well. All right. SC Office is
5 meeting with OSPI about changes
6 to the SRs related to suspension
7 and closure of a program. The
8 current language in the SR is
9 outdated, it still permits a unit
10 to suspend admissions for up to
11 one year without going through
12 the Senate, which was dissolved a
13 couple of years ago due to
14 SACSCOC requirements. So, to
15 update and be in compliance with
16 SACSCOC we need to make some
17 changes. The SR language needs
18 to differentiate between
19 suspension and closure.
20 Suspension is when no students
21 may enter, but can still graduate
22 and require Senate approval and
23 closure is when no student may
24 graduate or enter the program and
25 require Senate approval and Board

1 of Trustee approval. So, the
2 office will propose a shortened
3 approval process for programs
4 previously suspended that the
5 faculty body wish to permanently
6 close. After the Department of
7 College reviews the proposal to
8 close a previously suspended
9 program will be reviewed by an
10 Academic Council and after review
11 by the Senate Council Office it
12 will be closed via placement on
13 the 10-day web transmittal.
14 Proposals to suspend will still
15 require committee review and
16 vetting in a Senate meeting and
17 as will proposals that seek to
18 suspend and close at the same
19 time. These proposed SR changes
20 will also be given to the Rules
21 and Election Committee for
22 review. So, Roger is aware, he
23 is the chair of the Rules and
24 Election Committee. We have
25 several items on the Consent

1 Agenda that consists of the
2 Senate minutes from December,
3 seven proposals for the new USPs,
4 a proposal to suspend admission,
5 a proposal to suspend admission
6 and close a program and activity
7 reports and minutes from the
8 Academic Councils and the
9 Committees. Remember the items
10 on the Consent Agenda are
11 considered adopted unless a
12 member asks to remove an item and
13 discussion later in the meeting.
14 Items can be removed well before
15 the meeting or just before the
16 Consent Agenda is adopted.
17 Senate Council was amendable to
18 adding these items to the Consent
19 Agenda because they were not
20 controversial. If a Senator
21 would like to remove something
22 from the Consent Agenda please
23 speak up now. Okay. So, if
24 there are no objections these
25 items will be adopted and as you

1 can see we have the USP courses
2 listed and the suspension and
3 closure of the Graduate
4 Certificate in Environmental
5 Systems and suspension of the
6 Ph.D. in Gerontology. So,
7 hearing no objections the Consent
8 Agenda of January 23rd is
9 adopted. Okay. Officer reports.
10 So, SRs give the Senate Council
11 and the Senate Council Chair the
12 authority to take some action on
13 behalf of the Senate as long as
14 they are reported to Senate
15 Council. On behalf of Senate
16 Council and Senate I approve the
17 distance learning delivery for
18 the College of Engineering and an
19 engineering course. Basically,
20 there was some issues with the
21 instructor that came up,
22 unavoidable. They tried to get a
23 TA to teach the course. The TA
24 was onboard, but then something
25 changed and the TA was no longer

1 able to teach the course, and so,
2 there were going to be about
3 eight students who were without a
4 course that some of them need to
5 graduate. So, there was an
6 emergency waiver that was put in
7 place for this. The SC approved
8 a non-standard calendar for the
9 Natural Resources and
10 Environmental Sciences courses
11 and this course typically occurs
12 twice in the summer session.
13 What they wanted to do is kind of
14 move this course a little bit
15 earlier to ensure the course ends
16 before the Memorial Day Holiday
17 at the end of May. Having it
18 late really caused a lot of
19 problems with having the number
20 of faculty and staff who were
21 available to actually teach and
22 help in this course. It received
23 approval by the--it went through
24 the Calendar Committee and then
25 through SC, SC received approval

1 to run annually from May the 9th
2 through the 23rd up through 2026.
3 And as you can remember, when we
4 talked about the Calender
5 Committee we are not giving all
6 these calendar approvals in
7 perpetuity because it falls on
8 who to look at it and review and
9 make sure that it's up to date.
10 And so, each calendar that comes
11 through will still have a date of
12 review at some point. All right.
13 The SACSCOC requires, as part of
14 the tenure reaffirmation process,
15 a Quality Enhancement Plan from
16 the University. The QEP for the
17 accreditation activities
18 occurring this year is entitled
19 Transdisciplinary Educational
20 Approaches to Advance Kentucky or
21 TEK. The QEP Co-Chairs are Susan
22 Cantrell as well as Provost
23 DiPaola, she's given the Senate
24 Council members an update and
25 coming soon once everything is in

1 place she will come to Senate and
2 actually give a full overview of
3 the TEK and how faculty can
4 actually get involved, but you
5 should start seeing some
6 information come through, trickle
7 through your Deans and your
8 Associate Deans to kind of make
9 you aware of what we're doing.
10 All right. Reports from Vice
11 Chair Vincent.

12 MS. VINCENT: No report today.

13 MS. COLLETT: Parliamentary Report.

14 MR. RENTFROW: No report.

15 MS. COLLETT: Board of Trustees.

16 MR. KRAMER: Thank you, Chair Collett. The
17 Board of Trustees met December
18 12th and 13th. That December
19 meeting ordinarily includes a
20 healthcare retreat, but this
21 canceled by the President. The
22 board approved previously Senate
23 approved items including degrees
24 and suspension and closure of two
25 programs, it considered

1 investment performance, set
2 investment policy and reviewed
3 various reports. The research
4 report from the VPR focused on
5 research in non-STEM fields and
6 was well received by the board.
7 The board approved several
8 financial items including what
9 the EVPFA described as the
10 largest budget revision ever.
11 This was necessary due to the
12 completion of the acquisition of
13 the King's Daughters Health
14 System mid-year, so the budget
15 had to be revised. These
16 financial items also included
17 acceptance of a pledge from John
18 May Stewart. This was
19 accompanied by the board's
20 approval which followed the
21 Senate's endorsement in December
22 of the naming of the Department
23 of Finance and Quantitative
24 Methods as the John May Stewart
25 Department of Finance and

1 Quantitative Methods. The board
2 also evaluated the President's
3 performance. The board found the
4 President has had major
5 accomplishments, including
6 recruiting a record high incoming
7 first-year class, increases in
8 graduation rates, improving
9 diversity, investing in employee
10 compensation and completing the
11 King's Daughters transaction.
12 The board found the president to
13 have major strengths which
14 include his relationship
15 fostering, commitment to
16 students, responsiveness to
17 students and focus on the
18 strategic plan. The board found
19 opportunities for improvement
20 related to improving
21 transparency, DEI, faculty
22 relationships through shared
23 governance and morale. A
24 resolution was introduced on the
25 floor to commend the President's

1 performance and accomplishments.
2 The Faculty Trustees noted that
3 the resolution was not a balanced
4 summary of the board's evaluation
5 of the President. While the
6 board noted opportunities for the
7 president to improve the
8 resolution did not direct the
9 President or encourage the
10 President to improve in those
11 areas. That resolution passed 17
12 to 2. That concludes my report.
13 If there are questions.

14 MS. COLLET: Are there any questions for your
15 trustees. Roger?

16 MR. BROWN Yeah, I have a question about the
17 evaluation of the President,
18 specifically about the comments
19 that faculty make on surveys
20 regarding the President's
21 evaluation. I think most people
22 on this call are familiar with
23 the Senate Council's survey that
24 goes to all faculty. I'm talking
25 about a different survey, this is

1 one that's part of the
2 President's contract requirements
3 that constituent groups be
4 surveyed, I think for instance
5 the Senate Council's Office or
6 the Senate Council rather
7 recommends like five faculty
8 members every year and then those
9 go to the President's Office and
10 those get surveyed with a
11 different survey. And when I've
12 seen that survey completed before
13 and the comments are created in
14 that survey I was surprised to
15 learn that the President's Office
16 summarizes those comments and
17 only gives the full amount of
18 information directly to the chair
19 of the board, but all the other
20 members of the board only get the
21 President's Office summary of
22 those comments and I'm wondering,
23 is that--that didn't strike me as
24 very objective then. I wonder if
25 the process has been improved to

1 make it so all board members get
2 those--that survey information.

3 MR. KRAMER: Thank you, Roger Brown,
4 Agriculture Food and Environment.
5 So, the question that Roger is
6 asking has to do with how the
7 board performs its evaluation of
8 the President and he's referring
9 specifically to one of the early
10 steps, which is that the board
11 administers a survey to various
12 constituent groups, a few of each
13 maybe three faculty members,
14 three students, three staff,
15 three alumni, a fairly small
16 sampling and then there's some
17 sort of numerical scale questions
18 and some open-ended responses.
19 And, Roger, if I understand your
20 question, specifically what
21 happens with those open-ended
22 responses--the numerical
23 questions just get averaged
24 together and presented in
25 aggregate. The way I've heard

1 this described and Trustee
2 Swanson will correct me if
3 I'm--if she remembers it
4 otherwise, is that when those are
5 reviewed, I think Roger is
6 correct, by someone in the--or
7 someones in the President's
8 Office, if a comment is repeated
9 two or more times then it somehow
10 gets included in the summary
11 that's presented to the board.
12 If the comment is only reported
13 or noticed once then it doesn't
14 get reported. Obviously, that's
15 a little bit of a fuzzy standard
16 and I think that's the question.
17 Some of the responses clearly are
18 not provided to the board
19 members. Does that answer your
20 question, Roger?

21 MR. BROWN: Yes, thank you.

22 MR. KRAMER I mean that said, of course the
23 board's responsibility for
24 performing an objective and
25 independent evaluation of the

1 President is probably its most
2 important job as a board,
3 governing board of the
4 institution.

5 MS. SWANSON: So, we did bring that issue up
6 with the chair of the board, and
7 so, we are talking through some
8 ways to improve that. And of
9 course one thing Trustee Kramer
10 and I try to do is make sure we
11 team up, and so, then we've got
12 two comments.

13 MS. COLLETT: Herman.

14 MR. FARRELL: Yes. Herman Farrell, College of
15 Fine Arts. So, on the other
16 issue that was raised by Trustee
17 Kramer, you said that it was
18 reported that this new
19 acquisition has caused the
20 largest budget revision ever.
21 I'm just wondering if you're
22 allowed to, either of you, can
23 share with us how that will
24 impact our educational mission on
25 both our health side as well as

1 the other side, the educational
2 side of campus.

3 MS. SWANSON: That's a great question and
4 that's something that we're
5 watching carefully. One of the
6 questions that I posed as it went
7 through was how that impacts
8 faculty and whether or not all of
9 the physicians with King's
10 Daughters would automatically
11 become clinical titled faculty
12 and the answer I was told was no.
13 That there would be a process by
14 which physicians at that time
15 become faculty, either adjunct or
16 clinical titles and that was why
17 we approved a Special Practice
18 Plan, a Community Based Physician
19 Practice Plan to cover that area.
20 And as far as programming goes,
21 things will be developed--will be
22 in developing, for example,
23 clerkships and residencies would
24 be where we would expect things
25 to develop.

1 MR. KRAMER: Herman, just to add one more note
2 about the specific budget
3 revision. My understanding is
4 that it doesn't really have an
5 affect it's just that what was
6 under their umbrella became under
7 our umbrella so we had to like
8 add in the revenues and add in
9 their expenses into the
10 University's budget because they
11 we're now part of the University.
12 But I think the intention, at
13 least for the near future, is to
14 kind of leave everything alone
15 and have things go how they were
16 going. So, yes, it was a large
17 budget revision, but it was
18 simply to like pull in what was
19 already a budget that King's
20 Daughters had on its own.

21 MR. FARRELL: Thank you.

22 MS. COLLETT: All right. Next up we have
23 committee reports. I'm sorry.
24 We have old business first. So,
25 subcommittee on programs without

1 faculty oversight, update on
2 activities, Leslie Vincent.

3 MS. VINCENT: All right. Thanks. So, last
4 semester at Senate Council a
5 subcommittee was formed to
6 evaluate and take inventory of
7 educational activities that are
8 occurring both inside and outside
9 of colleges that aren't currently
10 tracked by a Senate course prefix
11 or Senate approved credential.
12 So, our committee was formed. We
13 had a few meetings in the fall.
14 The first meeting was to figure
15 out, you know, how we wanted to
16 approach this task to evaluate
17 what educational activities are
18 occurring. And then we met to
19 discuss definitions of what
20 education means, what a course
21 means, what a credential means,
22 so that we could have some
23 parameters around which we
24 identify these things that are
25 occurring within the University.

1 From there, after that meeting
2 last week I went to the meeting
3 for the Academic Associate Deans
4 and gave a preview of the request
5 that I then made later in the
6 week to identify what activities
7 may be occurring within colleges
8 that would fit this non-credit
9 bearing educational activity, so
10 that we as a committee can
11 understand what's going on in the
12 University and then use that to
13 formulate recommendations to
14 present to Senate Council later
15 this semester. So, right now our
16 data collection is underway. If
17 you are aware of any activities
18 within your college that are non-
19 credit bearing but have, you
20 know, either a course or some
21 content that's delivered or may
22 offer a credential that's not
23 tied to a Senate approved course
24 or a Senate approved program if
25 you wouldn't mind sharing that

1 with me. You can email me
2 directly as we're working through
3 collecting this information.

4 MS. COLLETT: Bob.

5 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S. Does your
6 examination include what, at
7 least one time I don't know if
8 it's still called that, OLLI,
9 Lifelong Learning Courses that
10 are offered by community members
11 with the backing of UK?

12 MS. VINCENT: We are including everything in
13 our initial collection of
14 information and then a
15 recommendation where we're going
16 to look at everything we've
17 collected and then determine what
18 we would consider to fall within
19 these educational activities that
20 would warrant some oversight by
21 Senate.

22 MR. GROSSMAN: So, I encourage you to look at
23 OLLI, because although some of
24 those courses are really good, I
25 noticed for several years a

1 climate change denier was
2 teaching a course on climate
3 change and there was clearly no
4 faculty oversight of that course
5 and there are others that, you
6 know, could be similar.

7 MS. VINCENT: Thank you.

8 MS. COLLETT: And that--I can just add to that.
9 That office has changed as far as
10 the reporting structure. With
11 the reorganization it actually
12 reports up to the Office of
13 Institutional Diversity, so there
14 is no educational unit tied to
15 that office any more, it used to
16 be under the Provost Office. All
17 right. Committee reports. There
18 are six committees presenting
19 reports today on five proposals.
20 So, our first one is a proposed
21 new MS in Criminal Justice, it's
22 an online degree. Sandra Bastin
23 is the Chair of SAPC. Sandra,
24 you want to go ahead and tell us
25 about this proposal.

1 MS. BASTIN: Yeah. This is a recommendation
2 that the University Senate
3 approves for submission to the
4 Board of Trustees of an
5 establishment of a new MS Degree
6 in Criminal Justice in the
7 College of Social Work. The
8 Master of Science in Criminal
9 Justice provides a comprehensive
10 understanding of the integration
11 of theory, policy and research
12 within leadership and
13 administrative roles in criminal
14 justice systems. It cultivates
15 critical thinking and examining
16 the synthesis of social and legal
17 system structures and
18 institutions in implementing and
19 evaluating outcomes. The degree
20 prepares students for careers as
21 administrators in public and
22 private criminal justice
23 settings, including advocacy,
24 probation and parole, reentry,
25 prosecution and enforcement,

1 correctional facilities and court
2 systems.

3 MS. COLLETT: This proposal also involves
4 online delivery and was reviewed
5 by the Senate Distance and E-
6 Learning Committee. Sara Police
7 is the chair and she's here to
8 give the committee's report as
9 well.

10 MS. POLICE: Hi. This is a recommendation
11 that the University Senate
12 approve the new MS Criminal
13 Justice in the College of Social
14 Work for online delivery. This
15 is a new fully online MS Degree.
16 Our committee looks closely at
17 the rationale, the justification
18 and the support for offering a
19 complete degree program online
20 and all of these things were
21 identified very clearly in the
22 letters of support and the
23 proposal itself. The College of
24 Social Work is very well versed
25 in experience and delivering

1 online courses and programs, most
2 of its current students are fully
3 online students. One point of
4 discussion around this proposal
5 was faculty support, for example,
6 on the online delivery form Dr.
7 Kalea Benner, the proposer, makes
8 it clear that the College of
9 Social Work anticipates hiring
10 additional full-time faculty to
11 support instruction, and so, she
12 indicated that these roles cannot
13 be advertised until the program
14 is approved. So, it became like
15 a chicken or an egg issue. You
16 cannot have a program without the
17 faculty, faculty without the
18 program. So, we recommend,
19 unanimously, approval for online
20 delivery so they can hire the
21 faculty they need.

22 MS. COLLETT: So, this is a recommendation from
23 the SC that the University Senate
24 approve the establishment of a
25 new MS in Criminal Justice in the

1 College of Social Work and offer
2 it online, because the motion
3 comes from the committee no
4 second is required. The motion
5 is now on the floor and the floor
6 is open to members for question
7 of fact and/or debate. Seeing no
8 hands raised, it is time for a
9 vote. As a reminder, Senate is
10 voting on the recommendation that
11 the University Senate approve the
12 establishment of a new MS
13 Criminal Justice in the College
14 of Social Work and offer it
15 online. All right. It looks
16 like we have--a couple more
17 coming in. All right. Looks
18 like 80 approve, three oppose and
19 three abstentions. You got more?
20 Okay. So, two abstain. Thank
21 you. That motion passes. All
22 right. So, next we have the
23 proposed new Graduate Certificate
24 in Trauma Responsive Practice,
25 this is also online as well.

1 MS. BASTIN: So, this is a recommendation that
2 the University Senate approve the
3 establishment of a new Graduate
4 Certificate Trauma Responsive
5 Practice in the College of Social
6 Work. There's a growing need
7 both locally and nationally for
8 social workers and other helping
9 professionals to increase their
10 knowledge and skill sets related
11 to providing trauma informed care
12 within their professional careers
13 Additionally, this certification
14 provides value for those working
15 in direct service provision roles
16 as it increases marketability and
17 is a direct response to the call
18 from the substance use and mental
19 health services regarding the
20 need for additional specialized
21 training and trauma informed
22 care. This graduate certificate
23 would be housed within the
24 College of Social Work and will
25 provide students the opportunity

1 to earn non-credit hours for
2 course work that will
3 significantly prepare them to
4 work within a number of direct
5 practice roles.

6 MS. COLLETT: Okay. So, this proposal also
7 involves online delivery, was
8 reviewed by the Senate Distance
9 and E-Learning Committee. Sara
10 Police is the chair.

11 MS. POLICE: This is a recommendation that the
12 University Senate approve the
13 proposed new Graduate Certificate
14 in Trauma Responsive Practice in
15 the College of Social Work for
16 online delivery. The graduate
17 certificate is available to fully
18 online students pursuing the MS
19 in Social Work and the majority
20 of these students are completing
21 the MS fully online. Therefore,
22 for it to be accessible to both
23 hybrid and fully online students
24 this proposal brings it graduate
25 certificate to a fully online

1 format. The initial delivery
2 form accompanying the proposal
3 didn't fully describe information
4 regarding teaching faculty, but
5 our committee worked with a
6 proposer to learn more about
7 instructors and in doing so we
8 learned that the current faculty
9 teaching these courses will
10 continue to teach them in an
11 online mode. We also worked with
12 the proposer and Dean Jane Miller
13 around the letter of support for
14 the proposal and the letter of
15 support is very clear about
16 dedicated faculty numbers and
17 online resources to support the
18 program. So, after receiving
19 clarification around faculty and
20 resources for support our
21 Committee unanimously recommends
22 approval for online delivery.

23 MS. COLLETT: So, just to note the motion from
24 SAPC was originally contingent
25 upon approval of two courses, but

1 those courses have actually
2 received final Senate approval
3 and are at the Registrars Office.
4 So, if you read that in the
5 initial proposal. So, this
6 recommendation comes from SAPC
7 that the University Senate
8 approve a new Graduate
9 Certificate in Trauma Responsive
10 Practice in the College of Social
11 Work and offer it online, because
12 this motion comes from Committee
13 no second is required. So, the
14 motion is now on the floor and
15 the floor is open to members for
16 questions of fact and/or debate.
17 Okay. Seeing no hands, as a
18 reminder the Senate Council is
19 voting on the recommendation from
20 SAPC that the University Senate
21 approve a new Graduate
22 Certificate in Trauma Responsive
23 Practice in the College of Social
24 Work to be offered. I have even
25 more people voting this time. I

1 think we're at 88, 89. Eighty-
2 nine approved. Thank you. Hold
3 on one second. Let me get our
4 Zoom people back up here.
5 Perfect. Okay. So, next up we
6 have proposed changes to the BS
7 FOS, Food Science. Sandra.
8 MS. BASTIN: This is a recommendation that the
9 University Senate approve the
10 submission to the Board of
11 Trustees a change for the BS
12 Degree, Food Science in the
13 Department of Animal and Food
14 Sciences and the College of
15 Agriculture, Food and
16 Environment, which will include a
17 name change to Food Biosciences.
18 Although, the current program has
19 successfully prepared students
20 the department has struggled to
21 attract sufficient students since
22 it was a very researched oriented
23 program. Additionally, the
24 program will be able to better
25 serve additional sectors of the

1 food industry. The Food
2 Bioscience Program will provide
3 students with the skills to
4 contribute innovative solutions
5 to future food problems from the
6 laboratory to the boardroom.
7 Students will have a more focused
8 academic experience, specifically
9 they can choose to get more
10 experiences in distillation,
11 fermentation, beverage sciences
12 and food business management.
13 They have collaborated with the
14 faculty involved with the
15 Distillation, Wine and Brewing
16 Sciences Undergraduate
17 Certificate Program and the
18 Gatton College of Business and
19 Economics to address these
20 student's needs.

21 MS. COLLETT: All right. So, that was a
22 recommendation from SAPC that the
23 University Senate approve a
24 change to the BS FOS, Food
25 Sciences, because the motion

1 comes from committee no second is
2 required. The motion is now on
3 the floor and the floor is open
4 to members for questions of fact
5 and/or debate.

6 MR. KRAMER: Aaron Kramer Faculty Trustee. I
7 don't think this goes to the
8 Board of Trustees, is that
9 correct? Maybe Sandra said that,
10 but that might have been--this is
11 final action by the Senate in
12 this?

13 MS. COLLETT: Yes, it's final action by the
14 Senate.

15 MR. KRAMER: Thank you.

16 MS. BASTIN: It is final action, sorry.

17 MS. COLLETT: Richard.

18 MR. CHARNIGO: Richard Charnigo from Public
19 Health. The slide mentions a
20 report from the Senate Distance
21 and E-Learning Committee, is that
22 applicable here?

23 MS. COLLETT: It is not. That should not be up
24 there. Thank you for noticing
25 that. Any other questions of

1 fact and/or debate? All right.
2 So, as a reminder this is coming
3 from committee and it's a
4 recommendation from SAPC that the
5 University Senate approve a
6 change to the BS FOS, Food
7 Sciences Program. We got 88.
8 Alright. Eighty-five approve and
9 three abstain. Thank you. All
10 right. Next up we have the
11 Senate Academic Organizational
12 Structure Committee, Greg Hall is
13 the chair. This is the proposed
14 name change from the College of
15 Education to the College of
16 Education, Sport and Human
17 Sciences. You'll note this is
18 for discussion only. We have the
19 proposer here, Molly Fisher who
20 is the DGS in Department of
21 Science, Technology, Engineer and
22 Math Education. So, this
23 proposal has been a topic of
24 conversation across campus, since
25 long before it was submitted to

1 the Senate and before I was
2 elected as seat chair. So, I'm
3 just going to share some
4 background before Greg offers the
5 SAOSC report. So, upon receipt
6 of the proposal there was some
7 missing input from some affected
8 colleges, although proposal did
9 include letters of support from
10 public health, athletics and
11 human development institute. I
12 engaged with former Dean Hylick
13 as well as proposer Molly Fisher
14 to let them know that due to the
15 scope of the change documentation
16 and communication with all
17 affected colleges needed to be
18 included. So, there's some
19 things that kind of went around
20 and we didn't get all of the
21 solicited letters that we needed
22 from all the affected colleges,
23 so I communicated with the Deans
24 of the colleges that were
25 mentioned in the proposal to ask

1 them to submit the required
2 documentation of discussion among
3 faculty within their respective
4 colleges as well as to report the
5 consensus of the votes and any
6 comment or feedback that they
7 received. So, faculty and deans
8 from other colleges during this
9 time expressed concern about the
10 proposal or either wanted to
11 weigh in that the proposal could
12 potentially touch areas in their
13 colleges and a decision was made
14 at that time to allow additional
15 letters. At that time we also
16 set a deadline for these letters
17 to come in in order for the
18 committee to review the letters
19 prior to sending a full complete
20 proposal packet to Senate Council
21 for review. Requests from
22 colleges to add documentation of
23 consultation with their faculty
24 have continued to come in and
25 roll in, and so, in lieu of

1 adding additional letters I will
2 allow Senators, once we get to
3 this point, from those colleges
4 who have not had letters included
5 in the proposal or have not been
6 able to submit such documentation
7 to be among the first of those to
8 speak during the discussion time.
9 So, just noting here that SR
10 1.2.3.3 has specific requirements
11 for a first and second reading
12 for any document embodying a
13 major policy decision. So,
14 you'll notice that this is not
15 the first time that we've done a
16 first and a second reading on
17 items, we've done that with the
18 previous Senate Rule change and
19 we're going to do it with another
20 item today. Any time these items
21 seem like it may have more
22 discussion where Senators need to
23 go back to their constituents and
24 potentially have more discussions
25 before a final vote is taken we

1 will effectively use SR 1.2.3.3.
2 And so, remember the proposal is
3 within Senate's purview at this
4 point. During the discussion
5 Senators may also need to
6 consider, if anything, what about
7 the proposal needs to be changed
8 to help to facilitate this on to
9 a second reading. So, today is
10 going to be the first reading
11 with the second reading hopefully
12 scheduled in February and I think
13 it's February 13th maybe, is the
14 next Senate Meeting. Usually, at
15 the second Senate Meeting there
16 would be a motion to endorse and
17 based on--and that's going to be
18 based on the proposal's academic
19 merits. I will say the Senate
20 does not have final authority to
21 name--for the name changes
22 related to organizational
23 structure, but GR4, the
24 University Senate, you'll read
25 under that it requires the Senate

1 to make recommendations to the
2 President or Provost regarding
3 the establishment, alteration,
4 abolishment or reporting
5 relationships of educational
6 units, so this includes name
7 changes to educational units.
8 The Senate Council will suggest
9 motion language and it can be
10 suggested--it can also be amended
11 here, but we'll suggest motion
12 language for the February meeting
13 to either recommend to the
14 Provost and the President that
15 they move the proposal to the
16 board or Senate can vote and
17 Senate Council can recommend that
18 the motion is to vote--to report
19 as actions without asking that
20 the board be part of the review.
21 Okay. So, Greg, do you want to
22 do it from there? Do you want to
23 sit there? Okay. I just want to
24 say this, but due to the number
25 of items that we have on the

1 agenda today I will limit the
2 time for discussions, so that we
3 can get through all of these
4 items, we're going to limit it to
5 about 30/35 minutes and then move
6 to our next agenda item. So, as
7 Greg gives his report please
8 think about the entirety of the
9 proposal and how best to ensure
10 that Senator's have what they
11 need to be informed themselves
12 and also be comfortable with
13 informing their constituents
14 after this proposal is read.
15 Greg.

16 MR. RENTFROW: Okay. So, this is a
17 recommendation that the Senate
18 actually approve this proposed
19 name change from the College of
20 Education with the proposed name
21 of the College of Education,
22 Sport and Human Sciences. Two
23 issues emerged in our review of
24 this proposal, the committee's
25 review. One, the issue of the

1 labels and the terms and if those
2 terms are really sort of the
3 property of a particular college
4 or program and, secondly, the
5 process for basically
6 determining, you know, what--you
7 know, what those names should be
8 and what those terms should be in
9 that regard. So, obviously
10 there's tremendous opposition to
11 the proposal and the opposition
12 letters and statements continue
13 to come in. When our committee
14 reviewed the proposal in November
15 we identified three colleges,
16 business, TI communication and
17 information and the third
18 one--forgive me, A and S that we
19 needed to see evidence of
20 consultation and votes/statements
21 from those three colleges, again,
22 A and S, CI and business. And we
23 agreed and it was unanimous that
24 although there are issues
25 regarding, again, who owns these

1 terms such as sport and human
2 sciences. We
3 approved--recommended approval of
4 this proposal pending receipt of
5 evidence of votes/consultations
6 with those three colleges. We
7 did acknowledge though that there
8 may be a program that we--that we
9 missed, we didn't know of, and
10 what's to be done about that.
11 So, in early November our
12 decision was to approve the
13 proposal, recommend approval, but
14 pending receipt of letters from
15 those three colleges, no matter
16 what the positions of those
17 colleges were, the outcomes
18 there. About a month later, when
19 we had our next meeting, we still
20 hadn't received those (Inaudible)
21 from those three colleges, and
22 so, basically nothing--nothing
23 changed. Although, we had ample
24 discussion--and this was not a
25 formal recommendation, but that

1 there needs to be a process and
2 perhaps even a rule change, a
3 policy change, that proposals
4 along these lines should be
5 vetted and should be accompanied
6 by that consultation evidence of
7 that consultation before they
8 arrive to the Senate Council and
9 that can be done in a few ways,
10 perhaps they go through the
11 Provost Office in some formal way
12 or secondly that they're vetted
13 by the deans, but essentially
14 that that information needs to
15 come before it's submitted to the
16 Council. So, that's kind of
17 where we--where we were on this.
18 There were concerns that not
19 enough effort was made to do that
20 consultation across the different
21 colleges, colleges that clearly
22 would be stakeholders, before the
23 proposal arrived to our
24 committee. That's--that's kind
25 of where we are.

1 MS. COLLETT: So, I just want to remind
2 everyone that the (Inaudible) as
3 well as the Senate Rules, it's
4 the faculty consultation that we
5 are looking for, so it's not just
6 what the deans give, you know,
7 say that they want it or not, but
8 it's actually them polling their
9 faculty within the colleges to
10 get their feedback and the
11 consultative letter encompasses
12 that feedback from the faculty.
13 Generally, what happens is,
14 obviously like any other thing
15 that happens there are
16 conversations that occur well
17 before this proposal actually
18 gets to the committee to vet what
19 may need to be changed,
20 agree/disagree about something
21 that everybody usually can live
22 with. And so, you know, once it
23 gets to Senate Committee we hope
24 that that's done, however, the
25 Senate Committee has its own

1 charge and its due diligence that
2 it must do in order to make sure
3 that the proposal is brought
4 forth with all the completed
5 parts completed or other parts
6 completed. So, before we move
7 into discussion, I am now asking
8 to hear from Senators whose
9 colleges have not or did not have
10 the ability to put a letter that
11 was included in the proposal, so
12 we're going to give them some
13 first priority. Those colleges
14 include dentistry, design,
15 engineering, fine arts, graduate
16 school, law, libraries, medicine
17 and pharmacy. Reminder that
18 Senate Council voted to ask
19 Senate to discuss this issue, so
20 the floor is now going to be open
21 for discussion and questions of
22 fact and/or debate and again I'm
23 prioritizing comments from those
24 Senators first, if they want to
25 speak first. Okay. Eric.

1 MR. BLALOCK: Hi, Eric Blalock, College of
2 Medicine. I've been asked to
3 read our letter into the record
4 from the College of Medicine and
5 this is from the Office of the
6 Dean, dated January 18, 2023
7 regarding a proposed name change
8 for the College of Education.
9 "Dear University Senate, we as
10 the College of Medicine were
11 asked in December to provide any
12 concerns we might have over the
13 proposed name change of the
14 College of Education to College
15 of Education, Sport and Human
16 Sciences. The Faculty Council of
17 the College of Medicine met to
18 discuss this matter on January
19 17, 2023 with many of the
20 college's Senators present. The
21 documents that the Senate was
22 reviewing provided by the College
23 of Education to the Senate
24 Academic Organization and
25 Structure Committee were

1 distributed to the Faculty
2 Council and Senators prior to the
3 meeting. After a lengthy
4 discussion a motion was put
5 forward to endorse the College of
6 Education's proposed name change
7 to College of Education, Sport
8 and Human Sciences. The vote of
9 the College of Medicine Faculty
10 Council was two yes, nine no and
11 two abstain. As indicated by the
12 vote this name change is not
13 supported by the College of
14 Medicine Faculty Council. The
15 primary concern noted was the
16 wording Human Sciences within the
17 name, which is very broad.
18 Nearly everything the College of
19 Medicine does, including the
20 courses it offers, relates to
21 Human Sciences. Some of the name
22 changes that the College of
23 Education has considered, such as
24 College of Education Sport and
25 Kinesiology would not be

1 concerning to the College of
2 Medicine from the tenor of the
3 discussions. Please add the
4 College of Medicine's Faculty
5 Council deliberation results in
6 regards to the proposed name
7 change as outlined in this letter
8 to the materials that the
9 University Senate will be
10 reviewing as this name change is
11 being considered. Thank you for
12 noting the input of the College
13 of Medicine's Faculty Council.
14 Signed, Dr. Griffith the Acting
15 Dean, Dr. Tony the Faculty
16 Council Chair and Dr. Vanderford
17 the Chair Elect." Thanks.

18 MS. COLLETT: Anyone else from the colleges
19 that I mentioned first? Do I
20 need to name them again? Okay.
21 So, it's open for discussion.
22 Anyone? State your name and
23 affiliation.

24 MS. LANPHERE: Kathryn Rosie Lanphere, College
25 of Education, Department of

1 Kinesiology and Health Promotion.
2 Even if you are not a Bengals fan
3 or a sports fan you may have
4 heard of the recent collapse of
5 NFL player Damar Hamlin in front
6 of hundreds of thousands of
7 people. It was quite traumatic.
8 Our very own Sports Psychology
9 Dr. Marc Cormier was invited to
10 do interviews national and
11 regionally and even for the
12 Buffalo news on the impact of
13 witnessing Damar's cardiac
14 arrest. We offer 36 courses with
15 sport in the name itself and many
16 others that directly report to
17 the Study of Sports Science.
18 This is not a bonus class for us,
19 this is a concentration. We have
20 our Ph.D. in Sport and Exercise
21 Science, we dedicated our life to
22 the study and research of it and
23 it's what we do. We have a new
24 Acting Dean, Dr. Danelle Stevens-
25 Watkins Kentucky Psychological

1 Association Researcher of the
2 Year and in fact she just won a
3 \$2.5 million NIH Grant to support
4 under represented faculty in
5 Human Sciences. We offer 114
6 classes in Human Sciences, Health
7 Promotion and Health. I am
8 anticipating that you will hear
9 decent from other colleges that
10 will argue that we did not follow
11 policies and procedures. This is
12 not true. That these terms will
13 confuse students or they are too
14 vague or poor arguments for
15 trying to keep a smaller college
16 like us in our place. We have a
17 new, open, honest dean that's
18 willing to work with all other
19 deans. As for the process there
20 really isn't a process for a
21 college name change. The last
22 two colleges to change their name
23 were the Communication and
24 Information and CAFE. In those
25 cases, neither had an application

1 and both were simply letters from
2 those colleges with some
3 supporting paperwork. They were
4 not forced to consult every
5 single dean in the University of
6 Kentucky. This process isn't
7 clear. It's not fair to make us
8 go and beg for letters of support
9 when there is no precedent.
10 Exercise Science majors make up
11 52 percent of the undergraduate
12 enrollment in the College of
13 Education and to deny us the
14 attempt to change our name, to
15 say what we do, to have it
16 visible is discriminatory and
17 it's wrong. Our students and
18 faculty want to be included, we
19 want to be visible and have a
20 name that represents our
21 diversity of study. We are
22 marginalized by not being
23 recognized in the college name
24 and we are tired of being
25 invisible and not regarded as

1 having valid impacts in Sport and
2 Human Sciences. Please include
3 us.

4 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Bobi Ivanov.

5 MR. IVANOV: Thank you. Bobi Ivanov from the
6 College of Communication and
7 Information and also coming from
8 a unit that has a--coming from a
9 department that has not been
10 recognized for a number of years
11 before becoming an independent
12 department we can certainly
13 empathize and sympathize both
14 with the college and its faculty
15 and the College of Communication
16 and Information is certainly very
17 supportive of the faculty and
18 their need for identity and
19 recognition. At the same time,
20 from our standpoint the proposal
21 was not vetted at all with our
22 college during the two years it
23 was in the works. Only when the
24 Senate Committee reviewing it
25 asked the College of Education to

1 reach out to us after an
2 endorsement of the name change
3 was made at that level we were
4 aware that it was moving forward.
5 Other colleges found themselves
6 in the same position as they had
7 no idea it was moving to the
8 Senate for action. So, the
9 crucial step of gathering input
10 outside of the college among
11 similar UK academic programs, not
12 just their own students and
13 alumni, was missing. That's from
14 a process standpoint. Also, we
15 received information
16 that--suggesting that the
17 college's name was consistent
18 with--the proposed name was
19 consistent with its peers and
20 names that other peer
21 institutions shared. However,
22 when we reviewed the names of
23 peer Kentucky and SEC Colleges
24 and schools of education we could
25 not find an example of sport in

1 those names. So, based on the
2 vote of the--not just the
3 leadership but also the faculty,
4 all of the faculty in the College
5 of Communication Information
6 there was an overwhelming non-
7 support for this proposal of the
8 name change. Again, we empathize
9 and sympathize with the College
10 of Education, but our college
11 faculty did not provide support.
12 Thank you for your time.

13 MS. COLLETT:

Thank you. Zixue Tai.

14 MR. TAI:

15 Okay. Zixue Tai. I'm also from
16 the College of Communication and
17 Information and more specifically
18 I'm from the School of Journalism
19 and Media. The faculty at the
20 School of Journalism and Media
21 got the document, got the
22 proposal, from the College of
23 Education in December and we had
24 a few rounds of discussion among
25 the full faculty. Here are some
of our concerns from the faculty.

1 In the School of Journalism and
2 Media we have had a lot of
3 history of teaching sports in our
4 curriculum. As a matter of fact,
5 Tom Leach, the voice of the
6 Wildcats is one of our graduates.
7 He graduated from the
8 Telecommunications Program, which
9 is now the Media Arts and Studies
10 Program we have. At the school
11 we currently have eight, plus one
12 courses teaching diverse aspects
13 of sports, we have Journalism
14 208, Issues in 21st Century
15 Sports Journalism, Journalism 308
16 Sports Reporting and Editing,
17 Journalism 408 Sports
18 Broadcasting and Production,
19 Journalism 499 Advanced Writing
20 for Sports, Journalism 1538 Law,
21 Media and Sports, we have MS 330
22 Psychology of Video Games and E-
23 sports, MS 435 History of Video
24 Games and E-sports and MS 445
25 Industry of Video Games and E-

1 sports and we have the internship
2 program, GAM 399, which covers
3 diverse positions that the school
4 has approved for sports related
5 positions. Now, every semester
6 we have a number of our students
7 that are involved in the SEC
8 Network doing production, doing
9 field production and field
10 reporting for UK games. Every
11 year we have students who
12 graduate from the program who get
13 placed in jobs like ESPN, the
14 major television networks and
15 other media organizations doing
16 sports. So, the faculty concerns
17 remain that to put sports to one
18 college is going to create a
19 confusion for the students, for
20 the current students, for future
21 students and it's going to
22 confuse parents as well for
23 students who are specifically
24 interested in doing sports
25 journalism and sports production.

1 The faculty have no issue with
2 what kinesiology is doing. We
3 are fully supportive of what the
4 College of Education is doing in
5 their curriculum. Our main
6 issue, again, is the name to put
7 sports, which is an
8 interdisciplinary field, it is in
9 fact a super interdisciplinary,
10 it does not belong to one
11 discipline. To put sport to the
12 name of one college that's going
13 to be detrimental to the students
14 and it's going to cause
15 unnecessary confusion. Thank you
16 very much.

17 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Okay. Everyone after
18 this, can you please try to
19 summarize your discussion, maybe
20 limit it to about two minutes so
21 I can get to everybody, please.
22 Richard Charnigo and then Herman
23 Farrell.

24 MR. CHARNIGO: Hi. This is Richard Charnigo
25 from Public Health. I would like

1 to speak briefly in favor of the
2 proposal from the College of
3 Education and I'm speaking only
4 for myself here. Okay. This is
5 just my view. It seems to me
6 that some of the objections to
7 this proposal are because
8 elements of the new name are not
9 exclusive to courses or programs
10 that are in the College of
11 Education, but we're in a large
12 University and the trend is
13 toward multi-disciplinary and
14 transdisciplinary research. We
15 can even see that with the name
16 of our Quality Enhancement
17 Program for re-accreditation.
18 So, there's going to be overlap
19 in the missions of colleges.
20 There's going to be overlap in
21 the activities. This is
22 inevitable, I would even say that
23 it's desirable. So, I think it's
24 too much to expect that a college
25 name is not going to somehow

1 overlap the educational
2 activities of another college.
3 The name that's proposed by the
4 College of Education I think does
5 reflect what is going on there
6 and I do support this proposal.
7 Thank you.

8 MS. COLLETT: Thank you, Richard. Herman.

9 MR. FARRELL: Yeah, hi. Herman Farrell,
10 College of Fine Arts. I just
11 want to preface my comments by
12 noting that I've served on the
13 Academic Organization and
14 Structure Committee since I think
15 2008 when I first went on the
16 Senate, I served as the chair of
17 it one term for about four years
18 and then another term, I think,
19 about two years and now I'm just
20 a member of the committee. So,
21 when the comment was made with
22 regard to our procedures and
23 whether or not we're allowed to,
24 not dictate, but just suggest
25 strongly to any applicant or any

1 proponent that they seek out
2 approvals from other colleges,
3 it's done in the manner--and I
4 just want to make it clear that
5 there's been multiple precedents
6 where this plea or request has
7 been made and the reason why it's
8 made is to avoid what's going on
9 right now. Senate Committees are
10 meant to kind of deal with issues
11 in order to avoid floor fights,
12 in order to avoid taxing the
13 Senate membership with
14 discussions like this when things
15 can be worked out in committee or
16 worked out among the varying
17 folks who have a dispute. And
18 so, that's why we made the
19 reference to other colleges and
20 we did kindly as my Chair Greg
21 Hall has noted we did kindly then
22 go ahead and approve this
23 conditionally whether or not
24 there was acceptance by the other
25 colleges. Subsequently, we found

1 out that there was not acceptance
2 by it and there was real serious
3 issues raised. I think in the
4 future if I'm on the committee or
5 other members on the committee I
6 think we will probably make sure
7 that we don't do something like
8 that and we just make sure that
9 we get those approvals or we get
10 that kind of commentary from all
11 that would be impacted. I said
12 this very clearly to the dean at
13 the time, that dean at the time
14 when he came into the meeting I
15 said, "The issue of whether or
16 not the College of Education
17 faculty is in favor of it is
18 crucial," and I'm glad to know
19 that there is very strong support
20 within the college, but the other
21 question that does come before us
22 when we're dealing with name
23 changes is this very particular
24 question, whether there's
25 confusion, whether there is

1 competition with regard to a
2 name, whether there is any kind
3 of red flag that could
4 potentially be raised. I think
5 Mr. Charnigo makes a--Senator
6 Charnigo makes a good point about
7 varying names. I had a comment
8 made as a Senator about the
9 notion of film being used in A
10 and S and I raised it on the
11 Senate floor and there was a nice
12 conversation about it and there
13 was no competition between the
14 film work that the communications
15 folks were doing, the A and S
16 folks were doing as well as the
17 College of Fine Arts, and so, we
18 found a happy medium. It seems
19 like we're not in that place
20 right now and it feels to me that
21 we should probably either
22 discharge this so that it can be
23 reconsidered or at this point
24 based on all of the emails that
25 I've seen that have come in from

1 a variety of different colleges
2 in opposition to this I would
3 have a serious problem with
4 voting in favor of this now.
5 Thank you.

6 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Kaveh.

7 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. For
8 full disclosure, if I was faculty
9 in College of Education I would
10 vote against this, because I
11 think the name education is so
12 classy, so traditional and I
13 don't want to mess with it, but
14 I'm not part of the College of
15 Education. So, then what I would
16 like to see is clear and
17 convincing argument that the
18 college is not offering a program
19 in sport or the college is not
20 already offering program in human
21 sciences. And to be honest, I'm
22 not convinced and I mostly agree
23 with my colleague Senator
24 Charnigo's comments and I agree
25 with that.

1 MS. COLLETT:

Thank you. Roger.

2 MR. BROWN:

3 Roger Brown, College of
4 Agriculture, Food and
5 Environment. I was prepared to
6 read four letters into the record
7 on behalf of my many colleagues
8 in the College of Agriculture,
9 Food and Environment, given time
10 constraints, I'm going to just
11 try to convey the highlights.
12 So, this is from a letter from
13 Professor Teets who's the Chair
14 of the AG Faculty Council and he,
15 in my summary here says that,
16 "Eleven faculty elected
17 representatives on that council
18 unanimously disagree with this
19 proposal." I have another letter
20 here from Professor Hans, who is
21 the Chair of the Department of
22 Family Sciences in the College of
23 Agriculture, Food and Enviroment,
24 he writes, "I'm writing to convey
25 the unanimous opposition of the
faculty in the department." I

1 have a third letter here from
2 Professor Hunter, she is the, I
3 think, Interim Director for the
4 School of Human and Environmental
5 Sciences, she also writes in her
6 letter in bold that the faculty
7 members in that school are in
8 strong opposition and unanimously
9 oppose the proposed name change.
10 And I have one more letter, this
11 one is from Professor Stevenson
12 in the--she's the Chair of the
13 Department of Dietetics and Human
14 Nutrition in the College of
15 Agriculture, Food and Environment
16 and she writes in bold, "The
17 faculty in the department
18 unanimously voted in support of
19 this letter which is in
20 opposition of the currently
21 proposed name change in the
22 College of Education." Thank
23 you.

24 MS. COLLETT: Bob.

25 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman with A and S. I

1 come for the College of Arts and
2 Sciences, which I think covers
3 pretty much everything that's
4 done on campus, so we own all of
5 you. But I don't--but I don't
6 think that that means that
7 students who are interested in a
8 science or a particular form of
9 art feel that this is the only
10 college they can go to because
11 they're the only ones who have
12 art and science in their name. I
13 think it's kind of silly to think
14 that. The opposition from folks
15 in CAFE is a little bit ironic,
16 considering they went through
17 this entire process maybe 10
18 years ago when they wanted to add
19 the word environment to their
20 name and there was this big
21 brouhaha. They're not the only
22 ones who do enviroment, we do
23 environment too and, yes, as
24 Richard Charnigo pointed out
25 before me, yes, lots of people on

1 campus do environment,
2 environmental work, and again,
3 the students don't get confused
4 about, "Oh, if I'm in this
5 college does it mean I can do
6 environment or not." So, I think
7 for one thing this is making a
8 mountain out of a mole hill and
9 for another I think a lot of the
10 criticism of the particular name
11 that the College of Education has
12 chosen to describe themselves is
13 somehow a plan to take over the
14 whole University. And so, I do
15 support the proposal. I agree
16 that the consultation should have
17 been done more up front, but
18 nevertheless I think we should
19 support them in what they want to
20 be called.

21 MS. DUNCAN: Marilyn Duncan, College of
22 Medicine. So, I tired to imagine
23 if I were a student in one of
24 these programs that you say make
25 up 50 or 52 percent of your

1 undergraduates and, you know,
2 when I think of College of
3 Education I think of, I don't
4 know the olden days when students
5 were trained to be a teacher in a
6 classroom and go to a grade
7 school or a middle school, they
8 were called junior highs in my
9 day and high schools, and it
10 seems like a lot of students now
11 are taking programs that put them
12 in a position to apply for a job
13 in a--like a sports center or a
14 health club or a facility--I
15 don't even know what you call
16 these places, or the health and
17 wellness programs that are
18 becoming more and more abundant.
19 And so, I wondered if I were a
20 student in one of these programs
21 and I wanted to get a job, sort
22 of a non-traditional job for an
23 education major if it would be
24 much more helpful for me if the
25 title of my degree implied that I

1 had had classes in preparation in
2 sports and human sciences and I
3 thought that would probably be
4 beneficial. And since this
5 represents at least 50 percent or
6 the majority of your students
7 then it would be nice for your
8 college to have a name that
9 included that. So, for that
10 reason, I support this. And I
11 don't really see that it detracts
12 from students in other programs
13 or other colleges. I think
14 there's a much greater benefit to
15 the College of Education than
16 there would be detriments to the
17 other colleges. There may be a
18 little bit of confusion, but I
19 think this is true anyway. As
20 Bob Grossman points out, you
21 know, not all the arts and
22 sciences is done in the College
23 of Arts and Sciences, not all of
24 the health is done in the College
25 of Health Sciences or the College

1 of Public Health, so I think
2 nobody owns these names and they
3 overlap in different programs.

4 MS. COLLETT: Thank you, Marilyn. Karen
5 Clancy.

6 MS. CLANCY: Yes. Karen Clancy in the College
7 of Health Sciences. As a faculty
8 member in the College of Health
9 Sciences our dean asked us what
10 our opinion was and put it to a
11 vote. Forty-five of our
12 faculty--64 percent responded, 45
13 of our faculty opposed and only
14 one supported it. The reason
15 being, our specific programs
16 include Human Health Science,
17 which is one of the largest
18 programs, undergraduate programs,
19 on campus. Also, the Department
20 of Health and Clinical Sciences
21 and the Ph.D. in Rehab and Health
22 Sciences, our faculty council
23 also reviewed and voted on this
24 measure. But also, I'm an alum
25 of the College of Education and

1 I'm also an alum of the College
2 of Health Sciences. My Ph.D. is
3 in Education and Policy Studies
4 Evaluation. My concern is that
5 this might not be a great thing
6 for the College of Education.
7 I'm concerned about the diluting
8 of resources in the future. If
9 you look at the mission of the
10 College of Education it's a very
11 broad mission. Kinesiology and
12 all of the programs in the
13 College of Education have been
14 able to grow so far. My concern
15 is for future students and also
16 for the faculty and for
17 administrators and for the
18 University that duplication of
19 resources and future programing
20 will elevate the expense to
21 students and students already
22 struggle with the expense of
23 higher education. Thank you.

24 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. I have time for one
25 more, someone who hasn't spoke,

1 for the University broadly and
2 for the college specifically, I
3 think that's--we have to balance
4 that. That's--the role of the
5 Senate here is to think about how
6 those things line up. It's not
7 an internal matter, it
8 is--obviously, it matters to
9 education and I think it's very
10 important specifically for the
11 faculty members and the students
12 that don't see their name
13 reflected in the name of the
14 college, but I think it matters
15 to the whole University as well.
16 And we've heard, no one owns
17 specific words, you know, that it
18 is a local matter. We have a
19 university that's sometimes
20 organized in a way that colleges
21 are not always encouraged to work
22 together, sometimes we're
23 competing for resources, trying
24 to win a reasonable sized slice
25 of a pie that the pie itself is

1 not always big enough and I think
2 that that creates incentives for
3 us to act in ways against each
4 other. But this is beneath us,
5 this is not how we should be
6 behaving as a university, it's
7 not how we should behave as the
8 Senate. The best approach is,
9 and I think it's been noted by
10 some of my colleagues as well,
11 collaboration to develop a
12 consensus. There's little space
13 for this at this point. I mean
14 we're running out of space to
15 reach that solution. We need
16 faculty and administrators from
17 the colleges impacted most by
18 this decision to come together
19 and reach a solution that
20 everyone can live with, we're
21 clearly not there now, but that's
22 what I would have advised then
23 and I'm certain that that's what
24 the Chair would advise now and
25 it's what I speak in favor of

1 Sport Leadership and Counseling
2 Psychology. I don't think anyone
3 wants that to be our name, we
4 certainly don't. So, I
5 understand there's some concern
6 about the overlap and that it
7 kind of encroaches into other
8 colleges, but because of the
9 breadth of the programs that we
10 offer in our college we need
11 something that broadly captures
12 all of them. And so, we've been
13 very respectful of the word
14 health along the way, because we
15 know there's some obvious overlap
16 there despite many people in our
17 college actually wanting the word
18 health in our college we have
19 been very respectful of that
20 word. We actually see the
21 overlap in other areas as a
22 potential to collaborate with
23 faculty and other colleges. The
24 KHP Department alone has over one
25 and a half million dollars in

1 research funds ranging from
2 things like physical activity to
3 sexual health, community engaged
4 research and in the past grant
5 reviewers have actually
6 questioned, "Why is this research
7 coming out of the College of
8 Education?" and also, this name
9 change will allow us more
10 opportunities for expansion and
11 research, increase federal grants
12 and collaboration with other
13 colleges. We want to work with
14 the other colleges. I'm actually
15 a professor in the STEM Education
16 Department, my programs, my
17 expertise, it is reflected in the
18 name College of Education, but I
19 care deeply about my friends and
20 my colleagues in other areas in
21 our college, I want them to feel
22 like our college is as inclusive
23 as possible. I was the Faculty
24 Council Chair at the time of the
25 initial request, I was happy to

1 help sphere head this initiative
2 with our college just to support
3 our colleagues. I have since
4 actually rotated off that
5 position, so that's why like a
6 random faculty member in the
7 college is actually the proposer
8 here, but this work wasn't
9 complete. So, what's why I'm
10 here today because we were still
11 in this process. I speak for
12 many people in the College of
13 Education who feel the same way.
14 This is not an initiative created
15 by the members of the KHP
16 Department, it's truly a college-
17 wide request even from faculty
18 who are already represented in
19 our name, the College of
20 Education. And I just--I'll just
21 say that we had a former dean who
22 maybe didn't make the best
23 relationships, maybe didn't
24 follow the process, that dean is
25 no longer with us, so we have a

1 new acting dean who is very open,
2 very honest, very willing to
3 communicate and talk to other
4 deans. We can't be punished for
5 anything that happened before
6 that point, but please, please I
7 hope you consider that in this
8 discussion.

9 MS. COLLETT: Thank you, Molly. So, just
10 remember that the Senators can
11 suggest any amendments to modify
12 the proposal, they can reach out
13 to the proposer. There can be
14 conversations that occur between
15 now, the Senate Council Meeting
16 and the next Senate Meeting which
17 is February the 10th, I believe.
18 And so, remember to go back to
19 your constituents, discuss what
20 you've heard here, think about
21 this, both sides of opposition
22 and in support, in favor and talk
23 it over with your constituents to
24 see how you need to come back and
25 vote when we're back in February.

1 We will also send out, obviously,
2 information like we always do on
3 any of the proposals. If there's
4 any updates that will come
5 through and you will see those
6 prior to the Senate meeting. All
7 right. Next item up is proposed
8 changes to Senate Rule Four, how
9 it's related to admissions to the
10 University, you have this in a
11 cover letter (Inaudible). So,
12 today is the first reading on
13 this item, it's discussion only.
14 Again, going back to SR 1.2.3.3
15 saying that we can do two
16 discussions. When making
17 comments on this SR today if you
18 will give us a specific passage
19 or use or refer to the track
20 change version to point to where
21 you may have some issues. Many
22 of the changes involve removing
23 administrative text and name
24 positions, which makes it harder
25 for the language to become out

1 dated. I will note here that
2 there is language in SR 4.2.1
3 that is stricken out, that has to
4 be restored on standardized
5 tests, because the Senate has not
6 discussed this issue, therefore
7 that cannot be put into this SR
8 right now. So, Christine Harper,
9 the Associate Vice President of
10 Enrollment Management and Chief
11 Enrollment Officer is the
12 proposer. Note that the entirety
13 of the section is not being
14 changed, just the sections
15 related to undergraduate
16 enrollment. Due to the scope of
17 the changes, as I said, this is
18 going to go through two readings
19 when we come back to the February
20 Senate meeting. Finally, the
21 Chair of the Rules and Election
22 Committee Roger Brown is aware of
23 these changes. The SR is already
24 scheduled to review the proposed
25 changes and provide guidance to

1 us on what other SRs may need to
2 be changed or updated. Leslie.
3 MS. VINCENT: Okay. So, this proposal for
4 changes to SR 4 is basically
5 providing an updated version to
6 reflect current practices
7 regarding undergraduate
8 admissions at UK. The rules have
9 not been updated in over two
10 decades and the nature of college
11 admissions has changed
12 drastically over this time. Of
13 highest concern are mentions of
14 standards and processes which are
15 not currently in practice and for
16 some are not in accordance with
17 current law. So, this is a major
18 renovation, an update of SR 4.
19 Just to give you some history in
20 terms of the work that occurred
21 with the SAASC Committee, there
22 were multiple meetings between
23 Christine Harper in Enrollment
24 Management along with Senate
25 Council Office and myself as the

1 chair of the committee to work
2 through these changes together to
3 reflect what's occurring in
4 practice but also will allow for
5 the Senate Rules to not become
6 outdated and have to continuously
7 update as different standards and
8 practices change. And so, SAASC
9 reviewed the proposed changes to
10 SR 4 and voted to approve them
11 unanimously to move forward.

12 MS. COLLETT: Remember that the floor is open
13 for discussion. This is
14 discussion only. So, open for
15 discussion, questions of fact
16 and/or debate. This will come to
17 the Senate for a second reading
18 and vote on February the 13th.
19 Questions? Kaveh.

20 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I
21 have many, many comments on this,
22 you are not going to--there's not
23 enough time, so in lieu of that I
24 will send Council a slide with my
25 comments. But just a sample, one

1 or two cases I'd like to mention
2 right now. I am working from the
3 track version pdf. At the bottom
4 of page 4, 4.2.1.3 the title is,
5 Academic Preparedness and
6 Placement. Four lines below
7 that, I'm going to read it to
8 you, "Students who do not meet
9 the established CPE related
10 threshold in the area of reading,
11 writing or math are placed in the
12 Academic Preparedness and
13 Placement Program." So, I
14 Googled that. What is that
15 program? Not much change except
16 for a Senate Rule, which is this
17 rule, so it's referring to
18 itself. I have no idea what that
19 program is. Maybe everybody else
20 knows. I don't know it. That's
21 one thing. A few lines below
22 that and this is--I'm using a
23 second one just because it's next
24 to it, I'm going to read this to
25 you it says, "If the student is

1 denied to their applied major the
2 office responsible for
3 undergraduate admission will
4 facilitate the holistic review in
5 collaboration with one of the
6 non-selected colleges," as I read
7 this I'm asking myself, "Which
8 one?" and I also brought this up
9 at the Senate Council. I think
10 it's improper to give the
11 information of an undergraduate
12 student to other colleges which
13 they have not asked to do. Maybe
14 it's against FERPA, I'm not a
15 lawyer, I don't know, but it's
16 just improper. And here is one
17 of the consequences of an
18 improper policy, which one? Are
19 we going to choose for the
20 student which one we're going to
21 force them to be selected to?
22 That's the deficiency and there
23 are several other ones and I will
24 send it to you as a file.

25 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. I would ask that you

1 also copy Leslie as the SAASC
2 Chair--
3 MS. TAGAVI: I will do that.
4 MS. COLLETT: --on that information as well.
5 Herman.
6 MR. FARRELL: Yeah, I also have multiple
7 questions with regard to this
8 proposal and I'm so glad that
9 there's going to be a second
10 reading. So, I'll have questions
11 and a comment, but briefly I'm
12 glad to hear that the
13 standardized test is taken out of
14 this whole conversation because I
15 think we need to have a long
16 conversation about that and all
17 the colleges need to engage in
18 that conversation. First
19 question, and I'll just continue
20 on with all the questions before
21 I get a response from Professor
22 Vincent, one is, are we also--it
23 looked to me like there was a
24 removal or a slicing through, a
25 strike through, of the GPA

1 requirement, which was like 2.0
2 or 2.5 varying on how they weigh
3 the GPA, so is that included in
4 this proposal? Second of all
5 going to what Kaveh just alluded
6 to and talked about, the notion
7 of the Admissions Office
8 consulting with non-selective
9 colleges and allowing them to
10 make decision making with regard
11 to admission is an interesting
12 notion, for one the non-selective
13 colleges might--I'm not sure what
14 that means in my case. I come
15 from the College of Fine Arts.
16 We have several programs and
17 schools within our unit, college
18 unit, that are selective notably
19 the School of Music as well as
20 Arts Administration and then
21 there's other units like my own
22 unit Department of Theater and
23 Dance that is not, so I'm curious
24 to know if there are other
25 examples of that across the

1 university. How is that handled
2 in terms of if it's considered to
3 be non-selective or selective and
4 then who would handle this kind
5 of process of vetting admissions
6 if the college has a majority of
7 students that are selective, but
8 then it has a couple units that
9 are non-selective? Has there
10 been a conversation with the
11 faculty of these colleges at
12 these non-selective colleges as
13 to the potential impact on them
14 in terms of this change of
15 standards, but also just with
16 regard to the resources, that's a
17 question for the deans? Do they
18 have the resources to do this
19 process that's now being--it
20 appears to be pushed out from the
21 admissions office and forwarded
22 onto the colleges? And then
23 ultimately I think the big
24 question we all have to ponder
25 with regard to any kind of change

1 like this is the impact on
2 faculty across the University.
3 If we're not vetting within our
4 college or we're not doing a
5 substantial job of vetting
6 students in terms of their
7 readiness for their way into our
8 college classrooms, in the long
9 term and short term the impact
10 will be on the faculty who are
11 dealing with students who may be
12 in need of remedial help and I'm
13 not opposed to our University
14 being open and giving
15 opportunities for that, but I
16 just do then question about
17 whether the resources are going
18 to be made available and whether
19 additional faculty will be hired
20 and then how long will that take
21 for something like that to occur.
22 So, it's a bunch of questions,
23 Leslie, and I'm sorry about all
24 of that, but if you could respond
25 to any of them at this point I'd

1 appreciate it. Thank you.

2 MS. VINCENT: Sure. I'll take--I'll try and
3 then I will probably defer to our
4 expert in Enrollment Management,
5 which I am not. So, the GPA
6 requirement change, I think the
7 one you're talking about is on
8 page 5 of the track change, is
9 that correct? When we took out
10 any specific reference to a GPA
11 or a standard or a score my
12 understanding is these are
13 typically outlined, like in this
14 case it's outlined by CPE
15 Standards and we stated that we
16 would align our practices with
17 the standards set forth by any of
18 these outside entities so that as
19 their standards change we
20 wouldn't have to update the
21 Senate Rules. So, my
22 understanding is we haven't
23 actually changed any of the GPA
24 requirements in the rule change.
25 We've simply changed how we refer

1 to those in the Senate Rules so
2 that they stay up to date. So,
3 that would be one response.
4 Regarding selective admissions,
5 again, my understanding in how I
6 think it's spelled out in this is
7 that colleges still
8 maintain--that have selective
9 admissions still set the
10 standards regarding admissions
11 utilizing Senate approved
12 processes. And then I may allow
13 Christine to speak to the other
14 part as to what happens from
15 there.

16 MS. HARPER: Christine Harper, Chief
17 Enrollment Officer. The APP
18 section, which was brought up
19 twice, we had listed colleges
20 that are what we would call APP
21 accepting colleges. However, two
22 years ago two new colleges said,
23 "We would like to be APP
24 accepting colleges." So, we have
25 a number of colleges that have

1 said--Arts and Sciences, Fine
2 Art, Education, Communication and
3 CAFE, are all the individual
4 colleges that have said, "We
5 would like to take students that
6 might not meet the readiness
7 indicators by CPE which are APP
8 accepting colleges." In the
9 nomenclature we changed the APP
10 accepting colleges, because in
11 fairness a student could apply to
12 a selective college like
13 engineering, not meet the math
14 requirements, and so, therefore
15 be taken by another college even
16 though they meet the APP
17 guidelines. So, we are--we
18 wanted to say they're open in
19 terms of who they're taking in
20 those colleges, non-selective,
21 because they could be taking
22 really, really strong students
23 that didn't meet the selective
24 criteria of another major. To
25 the point in the process itself,

1 of those non-selective colleges,
2 the five that we have currently,
3 we employ a holistic review and
4 would give the non-selective
5 colleges the review based on the
6 student's choices. So, a student
7 gets to choose two different
8 majors and if they choose let's
9 say business as their first
10 choice and then they put a
11 major--let's say history as their
12 second choice, if they don't get
13 into business through the
14 selective criteria or are an APP
15 student, so they are missing one
16 of those areas of readiness, they
17 will be reviewed by Arts and
18 Sciences. So, we do a holistic
19 review and then we give the
20 results of that review to the
21 colleges that are non-selective
22 for them to review and make those
23 decisions and tell us if they
24 would like to accept the student
25 or deny the student.

1 MR. FARRELL: If I could just have a quick
2 followup. I'm confused then. I
3 didn't get an answer to the
4 question about non-selective
5 colleges, if there are units
6 within it that are selective, how
7 do you--who do you--how do you
8 treat that, as a selective
9 college or a non-selective
10 college? Sorry.

11 MS. HARPER: If a student--if a student--for
12 example, if it's in Fine Arts and
13 the student has applied and they
14 don't meet the selectivity of a
15 specific area they would be in
16 the exploration programs. So,
17 you have exploration as a major
18 option throughout all of the
19 colleges, which is an outcome of
20 the previous structure where
21 there was undergraduate
22 education. When that disbanded
23 each of the colleges has an
24 exploration for students, one,
25 who are not sure which major

1 within a college they want to
2 pursue or, two, for a student who
3 may or may not meet the criteria
4 of a program in their first year,
5 but is admissible to that
6 college.

7 MS. COLLETT: Herman, do you want to make--

8 MR. FARRELL: I'm just--yeah. I guess, I'm
9 just confused about that, the
10 exploration program, but I'm also
11 just confused as to just on the
12 ground how a unit that doesn't
13 have, at the college level, an
14 understanding about this
15 admission process, how is that
16 handled in terms of the students
17 coming into the classroom?
18 You're saying that they come into
19 the classroom without a vetting
20 process? I'm sorry if I--I am
21 confused because--I am confused.
22 So, thank you.

23 MS. HARPER: Sure. I can't speak to that
24 specifically because we do a
25 holistic review and we provide

1 review process that Dr. Harper
2 has referenced here, so that as
3 college faculty we can ask the
4 key questions as to what could
5 potentially be the impact on our
6 classrooms. Thank you.

7 MS. COLLETT: Thank you, Herman. Jen Greer.

8 MS. GREER: Thank you. Jennifer Greer,
9 College of Communication and
10 Information. I was just going to
11 speak to Senator Farrell's
12 questions. We went through this
13 process two years ago when we
14 became a non-selective college
15 and we have worked
16 collaboratively with Enrollment
17 Management on these decisions.
18 So, the final decision on whether
19 a student is admitted, once they
20 have gone through this holistic
21 review, is always resting with
22 the college and we don't have a
23 non--we don't have a selective
24 program in the college at this
25 moment, but I could see if we had

1 something that was very
2 enrollment, you know, intense
3 that we wouldn't be able to have
4 big admissions in that program we
5 could be that way. And you're
6 correct, we would have to work
7 out the process through--you
8 know, it comes through our
9 Associate Dean for Undergraduate
10 Operations now, but we would have
11 to work that out internally
12 within the college. But the
13 decision, I just want to reaffirm
14 having gone through this change
15 two years ago the decision rests
16 solely with the college just as
17 it always has, it's just this
18 secondary kind of holistic review
19 that they send to us for the
20 final approval on whether we want
21 to admit a student or not. I
22 think Christine, does that
23 describe that pretty well from
24 your end?

25 MS. HARPER: Yes, it does. Thank you.

1 MS. COLLETT: So, what I would ask between now
2 and the next meeting is to please
3 make sure that if you have
4 questions or concerns to send
5 them to the Senate Council Office
6 as well as the Vice Chair Leslie
7 Vincent, so we can--go ahead.

8 MS. VINCENT: Could we get it before the next
9 meeting--

10 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

11 MS. VINCENT: --so that we have time to present
12 to Senate Council? So, I don't
13 know what that date should be,
14 but--

15 MS. COLLETT: Yeah. If you could, you know, by
16 the end of this week, you've got
17 this on the forefront, you see
18 the questions, it's something you
19 can, you know, put in an email to
20 your Associate Deans or whoever
21 is running your admissions and
22 probably get an answer back. So,
23 I would--

24 MS. VINCENT: I only ask because some of the
25 items that are in our current

1 rules are illegal and we have a
2 site visit coming, I believe, in
3 March and not that is--we want to
4 push something through that we
5 aren't comfortable with, but it
6 would be nice to have these
7 things cleaned up. Thanks.

8 MS. COLLETT: So, questions, concerns, updates
9 to Leslie by the end of business
10 day on Friday would be great and
11 then we can bring that--actually,
12 she'll have some time to work on
13 it and then bring those changes
14 to Senate Council before it comes
15 back to Senate. Okay. Next
16 thing up is test optional update.
17 So, Christine, you want to come
18 down. All righty. So, this is
19 an update on the waiver, which
20 will expire with the incoming
21 class of 2024/'25 unless the
22 Senate approves a permanent
23 change regarding standardized
24 test scores for admissions. So,
25 today we are receiving an update

1 on the Test Optional Pilot. Vice
2 President Harper is aware that
3 any formal change to SR 4.2.1
4 will need to be submitted as a
5 proposal which will require full
6 Senate review and vote prior to
7 changing the SR. So, you see the
8 current SR language as it sits
9 now. Just a reminder that Senate
10 approved the Test Optional Pilot
11 in March 2021, so it waived parts
12 of that SR 4.2.1 pertaining to
13 those expectations of the
14 standardized tests for admissions
15 and the minutes from that meeting
16 reflect general support for being
17 test optional, but concerns were
18 raised about ensuring faculty
19 oversight of admissions related
20 policies. All right. And then
21 moving--the proposal was
22 approved, like I said, by Senate
23 in March 2021, so if you want to
24 go back and look at those Senate
25 Minute transcript or just the pdf

1 of it referring to the
2 statistical evaluations that will
3 be considered, in that also the
4 proposal to have that waiver done
5 from VP Harper includes moving
6 forward an analysis will be
7 completed using the matriculated
8 students' current grades at UK
9 course work and the modality in
10 which they assess their course
11 work in their high school prior
12 to matriculation as national data
13 is demonstrating performances
14 differences based on the
15 modality. Okay.

16 MS. HARPER: Thank you very much. I am joined
17 by Todd Brann who is our Senior
18 Associate Provost and Executive
19 Director of Institutional
20 Research and Analytic and
21 Decision Support, IRADS, so I got
22 all of that out. We really
23 appreciate the opportunity to
24 come and present this
25 information. As was shared,

1 initially the Test Optional Pilot
2 was approved in March of 2020
3 when the ACT and SAT stopped
4 being administered because of the
5 pandemic and then the extension
6 was requested, one, because we
7 had really strong outcomes and
8 still some needs particularly as
9 we knew across the country areas
10 with the most challenges to
11 access were still having
12 challenges with the exam. To
13 date, ACT for example, in 2016
14 administered 2.7 million exams
15 and last year it was 1.2 million
16 exams, which is a factor from
17 test optional, but still the
18 number of students that are
19 accessing that is lower.
20 Nationally as well as our
21 internal data supported that GPA
22 is the best indicator of student
23 success over a test score.
24 Additionally, both ACT and
25 College Board who administers the

1 SAT have affirmed that there are
2 challenges in construct that
3 create bias which negatively
4 impacts student performance and
5 that the tie--the scores of the
6 students on ACT or SAT are tied
7 very closely to socioeconomic
8 status. The more students can
9 pay for tutoring, and access
10 tests, the schools that they're
11 in, the opportunities that they
12 have are very strongly tied to
13 that. So, from an access
14 perspective it's critically
15 important. We though wanted to
16 make sure that we did this in a
17 very robust manner and not only
18 in general but then also in
19 working with the College
20 Admissions processes as well as
21 setting the prerequisite scores
22 or prerequisite entry
23 requirements for each of the
24 different places, math, etcetera.
25 So, that work was done

1 collaboratively with the colleges
2 and units and department heads
3 that oversaw those areas with
4 IRADS and Enrollment Management.
5 Just to give you an idea of the
6 landscape right now. We have
7 over 1835 four-year institutions
8 that are currently test optional,
9 1450 of those have approved test
10 optional approach permanently
11 moving forward. And for us, I
12 think, it has been very critical
13 to supporting a number of
14 vulnerable populations and
15 increase diversity, particularly
16 for our low income students of
17 color and first generation, we've
18 seen increases not only in the
19 application process, but in
20 admissions and matriculation
21 because we did this with our
22 admissions requirements, but also
23 with our scholarshiping. So, we
24 not only want to make it able for
25 students to come, but then also

1 scores and you'll see that above
2 3.5 you'll see there's a weak
3 relationship, much less
4 pronounced below that threshold
5 and if you take this same
6 visualization, same data set,
7 change nothing and simply switch
8 the order of the bins and looked
9 at the high school GPA within the
10 test score bins you immediately
11 see the strong relationship
12 across those test score bins
13 indicating that high school GPA
14 good predictor regardless of
15 those test scores. And so, we
16 started working with Christine
17 and Enrollment Management and
18 colleges and departments on a
19 Transcript Pilot where we really
20 looked at potential replacements
21 or substitutions for the test
22 score based rule. So, this is
23 just an example of--this is an
24 actual example from the fall of
25 2020 when we were looking at a

1 few different rules. This
2 particular slide is for Math 111
3 and we were looking at three
4 different rules to potentially
5 use in lieu of an ACT Math
6 greater than or equal to 19. We
7 originally proposed a 3.0 high
8 school GPA or calculus. Working
9 with A and S they said, "How
10 about we look at high school GPA
11 of 2.85," working with the math
12 Department they said, "Hey, how
13 about a 3.0 or a 2.5 high school
14 GPA and you took pre-calculus."
15 And so, you see the--in generally
16 speaking, in the orange those are
17 students who did not meet each of
18 those rules. The students in
19 blue are the students who did
20 meet those parameters. And you
21 see that these different options
22 that do not include the test
23 score performed very similarly, a
24 little bit better than the actual
25 test score rule. So, for that

1 ACT Math greater than or equal to
2 19 amongst our pilot populations
3 the average class grade was a
4 2.78 for those 46 students with
5 the math department rule for
6 example it was 35 students, so
7 approximately a similar number of
8 students and a 2.14, whereas the
9 students who were meeting the
10 rules the average class grade was
11 3.25 with the test score rule and
12 with the transcript rule it was
13 actually a little bit higher 3.34
14 with about 190 students. So, we
15 were looking at, are we excluding
16 approximately the same number of
17 students and then how are they
18 performing in that class. And
19 so, these are just the rules that
20 we ended up using, the first
21 three actually pertain to the
22 Academic Preparation Program and
23 Math, Reading and Writing
24 Readiness and what we used for
25 the transcript rules in lieu of

1 those as well as some of our
2 college admissions for
3 engineering, health sciences and
4 nursing. So, you all
5 have--obviously have the slides
6 so we won't go through all of
7 these, but just as an example for
8 the College of Engineering that
9 had an ACT Math greater than or
10 equal to 25 and a high school GPA
11 greater than a 3.0, in lieu of
12 that we used a high school GPA
13 greater than 3.65 or a high
14 school GPA greater than a 3.3 and
15 you took pre-calc or a high
16 school GPA of 3.0 and you took
17 calc. And so, we saw a pretty
18 good results with those, for
19 example, in the College of
20 Engineering 1400 students in the
21 '21 and '22 cohorts and about 13
22 percent of those students were
23 test optional. Here's the list
24 of the actual class
25 prerequisites, and so, you'll see

1 that--that actual example that we
2 choose for Math 111 we ended up
3 using the high school GPA greater
4 than a 3 or the high school GPA
5 greater than a 2.5 and pre-calc
6 or that you took calculus again.
7 And so, for example in '21
8 through '23 about 2300 students,
9 45 percent of them meeting that
10 test optional rule. So, that's
11 just a bit of background on how
12 we got through that first fall
13 2020 and the rules that we
14 implemented for fall 2021. As we
15 have been and continue to look at
16 ways to assess the results we
17 looked at it both at more of a
18 micro level, at the class and
19 students as well as macro and
20 just grabbed a few slides.
21 Generally speaking, you can meet
22 the readiness standards, the
23 admission standards or
24 prerequisite standard either
25 through the ACT rule alone or the

1 transcript rule alone or you do
2 both. And so, for the micro
3 level affects we really looked at
4 those who met it through the
5 transcript alone versus the
6 students who met it through the
7 test score alone. Whenever we
8 start to do this work we really
9 want to lean into the
10 demographics and think about what
11 are the populations that we're
12 seeing, so I grabbed a quick
13 slide on that test optional
14 frequency by cohort. As you can
15 see in '21 we had about 23
16 percent of the cohort for test
17 optional, about 33 percent in '22
18 and then you see some breakdowns
19 for some of the specific at-risk
20 groups that we concentrate on
21 from a student success
22 perspective for those test
23 optional frequency for '21 and
24 '22, URM students, that CPE
25 definition about 38 percent

1 compared to all students at about
2 29 percent, 30 percent for first
3 generation and 30 percent low
4 income. And so, then also
5 traditionally this aggregate that
6 ethnicity CPE column by all of
7 the different values. And so,
8 that's the bottom chart, the test
9 optional frequency for the '21
10 and '22 cohorts, non-residential
11 alien is the CPE nomenclature for
12 intentional students, as you
13 would expect they are highly test
14 optional, 69 percent. Native
15 Hawaiian or other Pacific
16 Islander is at 60 percent,
17 there's only 10 of those
18 students, so a relatively small
19 number. Black non-Hispanic 47
20 percent. Students choosing not
21 to supply that information at 45
22 percent. Hispanic students 36.
23 American Indian or Alaskan Native
24 33. And then multi-racial, two
25 or more races 27 percent, 26

1 percent and 17 percent for Asian.
2 And so, here when we're talking
3 about those differences between
4 the transcript only students
5 meeting the rule versus the ACT
6 students meeting the rule we took
7 a quick look at the average
8 difference in those group GPAs,
9 and so what jumps out here is
10 generally speaking if the test
11 was able to be deemed conclusive
12 that the transcript rule is
13 performing better, for example,
14 the engineering admissions for
15 389 students who met it only via
16 the transcript rule their
17 cumulative GPA at the end of the
18 first year was 2.93, for 50
19 students who only met it through
20 the test score rule their GPA at
21 the end of the first year was a
22 2.53. And so, you can see
23 generally speaking that for the
24 test that are significant, the
25 transcript rule is performing

1 better across those 95 percent
2 (Inaudible). This is--those were
3 the admissions related tests.
4 This is those same group of
5 prerequisites, a similar outcome
6 here. Ten of the 15 tests were
7 deemed conclusive, all 10 we had
8 the transcript rule performing
9 better. For our example, Math
10 111, 1,026 students made it
11 through that transcript rule,
12 only they had a class GPA of 2.9,
13 87 students meeting it through
14 the test score only and their
15 class GPA was a 2.32. And so,
16 we're looking at the differences
17 between the two groups, excluding
18 those students who meet it via
19 both methods. In terms of the
20 macro impacts that fall 2021
21 cohort, as Christine mentioned,
22 faced unprecedented challenges
23 and we were really looking at
24 their GPA performance
25 particularly for those students

1 who experienced the highly online
2 learning environment in their
3 senior year, which we collected
4 on our first-year student
5 questionnaire. So, we were
6 closely monitoring the fall '22
7 cohort and I'm happy to report
8 that this is their fall GPA for
9 the last four cohorts and you'll
10 see that the fall '22 cohort
11 bounced back from the real
12 challenges that we saw with the
13 fall '21 cohort, 3.10, not quite
14 back to pre-pandemic levels, but
15 what is really interesting from a
16 data perspective until you just
17 aggregate and split by how many
18 credit hours they're bringing
19 into the institution which is
20 rapidly becoming our foremost
21 indicator for the students that
22 we think are going to need
23 additional support. So, the
24 students on the left in the blue
25 are students who did not bring in

1 any college level credit upon
2 their arrival at UK and you can
3 see that their performance is
4 significantly lower than their
5 peers, but when you do this for
6 those bins fall '22 performed
7 better, better than even pre-
8 pandemic levels with the
9 exception of one relatively small
10 bin that 45 to 49. So, overall
11 it looks like we're not quite
12 bouncing back, but we had more of
13 these students who didn't have
14 any college level credit because
15 of the challenges faced during
16 the pandemic. And then our
17 record first spring retention
18 back to 95 percent which is
19 unprecedented over the past two
20 plus decades and I'm happy to
21 report those high school GPA bins
22 bouncing back as well getting to
23 that 90 percent first spring
24 retention at that 3.0 level,
25 which we traditionally see.

1 MS. COLLETT: All right. Any questions that
2 you all may have right now?
3 Provost DiPaola?

4 MR. DIPAOLOA: No, I just wanted to add that as
5 you can see--I just heard
6 somebody say we should clap.
7 This is so data driven and so
8 important to our mission. I
9 really applaud them. They
10 actually shared with me the data
11 ahead of this. To talk about a
12 data driven approach for our
13 mission especially when it comes
14 to low income, under represented
15 group, first-gen, etcetera, in
16 terms of where we are. So, thank
17 you, Todd and thank you,
18 Christine.

19 MS. COLLETT: Any other questions? Okay.
20 Thank you all so much. Thank
21 you. So, items from the floor.
22 There's no further business to
23 conduct right now and this is an
24 opportunity for Senators to ask
25 and suggest a topic for

1 discussion, opportunity for
2 Senators to raise issues that are
3 not necessarily on the agenda.
4 Are there any items from the
5 floor? Yes. Loka and then
6 Herman.

7 MS. ASHWOOD: Hi, Chair Collett. I just wanted
8 to mention that a USA Today
9 article just published a little
10 over a month ago last year was
11 entitled, "What happens if the
12 school doesn't comply with Title
13 IX? Not a whole lot." And this
14 story features the University of
15 Kentucky as failing to comply
16 with Federal Title IX Law. Now,
17 one of the roles of the Senate is
18 to advise the President or the
19 President's Designated Officer on
20 the planning for physical
21 facilities, personnel and other
22 resources, but crucially when
23 these may affect the attainment
24 of education objectives at the
25 University, so as a Senator I am

1 concerned that what is going on
2 is impacting our ability to
3 attain our educational
4 objectives. So, relatedly in
5 2019 there was a joint working
6 group that was formed on Sexual
7 Assault and Harassment Policy on
8 campus. In February 2021 the
9 working group issued a report
10 with a series of recommendations
11 to President Capilouto, however,
12 the status of the policy related
13 to that Administrative Regulation
14 6.2 remains interim and it's been
15 that way since 2020 and we're now
16 in 2023. So, I'd like to ask,
17 could the Senate gather
18 information on the University's
19 status in regard to compliance
20 with the US Department of
21 Education's Title IX Law as well
22 as its impact on education?
23 Thank you.

24 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Loka, those are
25 definitely good points that you

1 bring up and I will absolutely,
2 actually, request that the
3 Provost provide us a written
4 update on those areas as well.
5 I'll get it from the transcript
6 and write out those questions
7 that you have just posed and
8 bring it back--bring it to Senate
9 Council and also bring it back to
10 Senate.

11 MS. ASHWOOD: Thank you.

12 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Dr. Farrell.

13 MR. FARRELL: Yes, I'd like to withdraw. I'm
14 lowering my hand. I do have
15 something, but I'll raise it at
16 another time after I've done a
17 little more research and
18 conversation with colleagues.
19 Thank you.

20 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Thank you very much.

21 Okay. So, now it's time to move
22 to adjournment. What? Do I have
23 a--oh, I am so sorry, Bob.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: I hardly ever talk, so I can
25 understand that. Bob Grossman, A

1 and S. The--and we're going to
2 war to keep our ampersand away
3 from anyone else. I want to
4 raise an issue that I'm not sure
5 is in the purview of the Senate,
6 but it certainly is in the
7 purview of advising and the
8 administration. At the end of
9 every athletic competition a song
10 is sung, the National--or the
11 Kentucky Anthem and, you know,
12 it's been recognized that the
13 song is an extremely--well, it
14 was written in a time of great
15 racism and un-understood racism
16 and people didn't realize they
17 were being racist when they were
18 doing that and we're continuing
19 to sing "My Old Kentucky Home" at
20 these venues where the University
21 is represented is really
22 something that I don't think a
23 lot of us are proud of because of
24 the racist implications of the
25 song. It basically says well

1 slavery in Mississippi was really
2 horrible, but here in Kentucky it
3 wasn't so bad. And so, I was
4 wondering if we could look at a
5 way or if we could ask the
6 administration to look at a way
7 of phasing out the use of the
8 song. I know it's got a long
9 history in Kentucky, but people
10 often don't think about the
11 racism inherited in the song, but
12 it's there nevertheless and I
13 think the State would be better
14 off if we didn't sing it at every
15 athletic competition. Thank you.

16 MS. COLLETT: Thank you, Bob. I will put that
17 as one of our things to look into
18 as well. Thank you. Anything
19 else? Items from the floor?
20 Okay. If there are no objections
21 for adjournment. The meeting
22 will now stand adjourned by a
23 unanimous consent. Thank you for
24 attending today. Please make
25 sure you report back to your

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

colleagues on all the Senate
related information from today
and don't forget that the Senate
Council Office provides a
Listserv that you can use to send
out to your colleagues in your
colleges. Next Senate Meeting
February 13th.