

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

FEBRUARY 14, 2022

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

AARON CRAMER, CHAIR

DESHANA COLLETT, VICE CHAIR

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

KATIE SILVER, STAFF ASSISTANT

\* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter  
An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

\* \* \* \* \*

1  
2 CRAMER: Welcome to the University Senate Meeting.  
3 Today is February 14th. Happy Valentine's  
4 Day, all.  
5 Attendance is captured for the meeting via  
6 Zoom report. Any chats that are sent will be  
7 received only by office personnel. When  
8 necessary, the office staff can help put a  
9 motion language into the chat when  
10 inappropriate or helpful to help us be on the  
11 same page there. Mute yourself when not  
12 speaking, although Katie has been empowered  
13 to mute others as needed if you forget for  
14 example. The meeting is being recorded for  
15 note-taking purposes. If any member of the  
16 Senate is disconnected and cannot reconnect  
17 at all, please send an email to Sheila  
18 Brothers - sbrothers@uky.edu, so we're aware  
19 of the situation. Senate meetings are open  
20 meetings, we follow Robert's Rules of Order.  
21 No voting by proxy. If you're not the member  
22 you cannot vote. I think our Poll Everywhere  
23 software should make that a little bit more  
24 straightforward to enforce. Be civil, be a  
25 good citizen. Make sure that your

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter  
An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1 departmental colleagues and college  
2 colleagues are aware of the activities of the  
3 Senate and are able to provide you feedback  
4 back to help you represent them, and that  
5 they know what's happening in the Senate  
6 themselves. And participate. If you have a  
7 question, ask the question, if you don't know  
8 what it is we're voting on, ask that. If you  
9 don't know how to vote, we'll try to talk you  
10 through it, but there'll be a little bit of a  
11 learning experience this time. So -- and  
12 this may be for the last time, I'm not sure,  
13 it depends on how the voting goes today. But  
14 recall that Zoom participants are divided  
15 into two categories. We have panelists and  
16 attendees, both of whom can participate in  
17 the meeting. Voting senators are panelists.  
18 They would have received a unique link via  
19 email from Katie Silver, it's on a scheduled  
20 thing, so it sends you an email 24 hours  
21 ahead, and one hour ahead with the Zoom  
22 information. And the panelists are eligible  
23 to vote on most items.  
24 The non-voting senators and guests or  
25 attendees, they would join the meeting from

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter  
An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1 the Zoom link on the Senate site and do not  
2 vote. To speak for any reason or otherwise  
3 be recognized, including making motions or  
4 seconds, use the "Raise-hand" button at the  
5 bottom of the screen. I think it's under  
6 "Reactions". If you cannot see this, click -  
7 there's three dots in ellipses with more  
8 beneath it. You might be able to find it  
9 there. Voting, like we said, it's going to  
10 be a little different this time, and so you  
11 would have received the emails from the Poll  
12 Everywhere system. Also, from Sheila. And I  
13 sent some emails too. If you don't already  
14 have a Poll Everywhere account - a free Poll  
15 Everywhere account - then the email from  
16 Sheila would have prompted you to sort of  
17 establish this account. Upon logging into  
18 this account, you could, for example, set up  
19 your mobile phone and certify it to use  
20 texting to vote. Or you could use the app,  
21 or the web to vote. If you're voting via  
22 text and you haven't yet, you would text  
23 yousenate789, to the phone number 22333 to  
24 join the session. Via texting, you won't see  
25 the motion language on your device, but the

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter  
An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1 text vote will automatically apply to the  
2 current question or vote. One, would be to  
3 approve two, would be to oppose. Three, to  
4 abstain. And that'll appear on the  
5 PowerPoint slide when you see the motion.  
6 If you're voting via the app, you would open  
7 it - if you've not already done so, log in -  
8 and by clicking on the house icon - the home  
9 icon - and join presentation, you would enter  
10 yousenate789, and then you would respond to  
11 questions or votes as they appear on your  
12 screen. If you're voting via the web, it is  
13 pretty similar. You would navigate to this  
14 URL pollev.com/yousenate789. And then again,  
15 if you're not already logged into your Poll  
16 Everywhere account, you would log in. You  
17 could click the house icon and join  
18 presentation by entering you7789 --  
19 yousenate789. Again, responding to questions  
20 or votes as they appear on your screen. So  
21 the first one I expect will be a little  
22 bumpy, but we'll get a good sense of whether  
23 people are able to do it. Because I can see  
24 how many people voted so forth at which will  
25 help me understand, "Hey, almost everyone's

1 voted" or, "Hey, almost no one's voted"  
2 that'll help everything go smoothly.  
3 So for details - and we have a couple of  
4 minutes before we get to the first vote - you  
5 could refer to the email from Sheila Brothers  
6 last week. I think I forwarded that to you  
7 again late last week and so you should have  
8 email with information about that. Recall  
9 before speaking, please remember to state  
10 your name and college affiliation to help us  
11 know who we're hearing from. The first item  
12 on our agenda are the minutes from the  
13 January 24th meeting and announcements. No  
14 edits were received in the Senate Council  
15 Office. So unless objections are heard now,  
16 the minutes from January 24th, 2022 will  
17 stand approved as distributed by unanimous  
18 consent.  
19 Those minutes are approved.  
20 Just a couple of announcements. Just a  
21 friendly reminder that Senate Council  
22 suggested asking senators to turn cameras on,  
23 if possible, especially while speaking.  
24 Although certainly no explanations are needed  
25 if you cannot. I'd also offer a reminder

1 about the date of the next Senate meeting.  
2 Initially, it would have been scheduled for  
3 the second Monday, which would be March 14th,  
4 but this is the Monday of spring break, so  
5 Senate Council rescheduled the March Senate  
6 meeting to be held on Monday, March 21st. Was  
7 there a question I thought maybe -- I don't  
8 see it anymore. There was a hand up. All  
9 right. If you have a question, you could  
10 raise your hand and I'll come back to you.  
11 A couple of other announcements. Senate  
12 Council sent nominees to serve on the Search  
13 Committee for the Director of the Chellgren  
14 Center. Senate Council also sent a  
15 representative for a Strategic Scheduling  
16 Committee, or workforce, or task force. This  
17 is a group that will be looking at classroom  
18 scheduling, mostly, and examining historical  
19 course scheduling and making some  
20 recommendations, and so forth. So we sent a  
21 representative who will act as the liaison to  
22 the Senate in this matter. This largely  
23 activity conducted by the Associate Deans for  
24 Undergraduate Education or the similar  
25 positions in the different colleges. Trustee

1 election activities will begin soon. So look  
2 for an email - I think from Roger - about  
3 nominations in the next week.

4 The university is running a promotion to  
5 support vaccine boosters. So employees  
6 who've received their COVID-19 boosts are  
7 eligible to enter. You don't have to get  
8 like a new booster, if you've already been  
9 boosted, I think you're eligible. If you've  
10 already been boosted don't get like a  
11 four-shot, just so you can be eligible here.  
12 You're already eligible if you've received a  
13 booster. 10 winners will be drawn each  
14 Friday between now and April 29th. So  
15 there's a website there if you want more  
16 information about this.

17 We're going to be initiating soon a  
18 semi-regular course purge. Under Senate Rule  
19 3.2.2.4, courses are to be purged from our  
20 course catalog, if they haven't been taught  
21 in a certain period of time. We like to  
22 check and make sure the list is good, that  
23 nobody's like, "Oh, I was just getting ready  
24 to teach that course" before these are gone,  
25 because once they're gone, they're gone. To

1           recreate it would mean to create a new  
2           course. And so we'll send an email out to  
3           senators and our college curricular contacts,  
4           these are typically staff and faculty  
5           administrators at the college level alerting  
6           them to this activity. If you see this list,  
7           feel free to share it with your department  
8           chair, colleagues. If there's a course on  
9           the purge list that should not be on that  
10          list, someone from the unit can email Sheila  
11          and ask her to remove the course from the  
12          purge list. So expect to see communication  
13          about that later this week.

14          Recall the curriculum proposal deadlines for  
15          this academic year. If you're seeking to  
16          have a proposal effective this coming Fall,  
17          note these deadlines. These are deadlines  
18          for a course to be received out of the  
19          Academic Council and in the Senate Council  
20          Office to have a reasonable chance of likely  
21          approval by the end of the semester so that  
22          they can go live in Fall 2022. So keep these  
23          dates in mind.

24          All right. The next item on the agenda is  
25          the Chair's report. The Senate Rules give

1 Senate Council the authority to take some  
2 actions on behalf of Senate, as long as  
3 they're reported to the Senate.

4 Specifically, the Senate Council approved two  
5 changes to the '21-'22 calendar - our current  
6 academic year calendar. One is to shorten  
7 the period of time when students are  
8 prohibited from changing majors on the  
9 calendar. Originally, that was a nine-week  
10 period where students could not change their  
11 major. It's reduced to about four weeks. I  
12 think the technical systems have gotten to  
13 the point where they don't need that much of  
14 a window, of sort of hands-off period for  
15 students changing majors, and so they were  
16 able to decrease the length of that window.  
17 Also corrected an entry where a date within  
18 the entry was incorrect. It wasn't actually  
19 the data itself, but the entry in the  
20 calendar specified some other date that  
21 wasn't correct. That was related to the last  
22 day to defend or to deposit your thesis or  
23 dissertation with the graduate school to  
24 graduate in the spring semester. I asked,  
25 probably last month, faculty to participate

1 in a one-click attendance survey, just say,  
2 "Hey, how's your attendance looking this  
3 semester?" There was some concerns that there  
4 was -- that we have a limited ability to  
5 understand what attendance was like in --  
6 looking like in our classes early in the  
7 semester, because of widespread COVID and  
8 people being out for different reasons. So  
9 just to let you know how that survey went.  
10 The mean attendance relative to the expected  
11 attendance was about 76 percent in the  
12 survey. Had a kind of wide standard  
13 deviation of about 20 percent. It had a  
14 distribution that was skewed to the right,  
15 with sort of a significant low attendance  
16 tail. The median attendance was about 81  
17 percent.

18 In that time period, there appeared to be  
19 about an order of magnitude of fuzziness  
20 between what we were seeing in like the  
21 official dashboard, and what we were actually  
22 seeing in our classrooms. You know that  
23 we've seen that in other situations, too.  
24 For example, the local public school system  
25 was showing a similar kind of almost order of

1 magnitude difference between what they were  
2 reporting officially, and what was actually  
3 happening in terms of classroom attendance.  
4 The numbers of cases are actually quickly  
5 falling. So even if there's this order of  
6 magnitude, if they're both decaying in sort  
7 of a rapid rate, they're kind of decaying  
8 together. And so, we are seeing that in the  
9 dashboard data for campus, but also, I think,  
10 anecdotally, in people's classroom  
11 attendance.

12 Last week, Senate Council held kind of a  
13 lengthy discussion on academic policies  
14 related to absences. Really specifically, it  
15 largely focused on snow days. This was  
16 brought about by recent campus closures.  
17 There's no explicit policy about what a  
18 closure for snow weather means as it relates  
19 to attendance. I expect that the next Senate  
20 Council meeting, Senate Council will  
21 establish a charge for an ad hoc committee to  
22 deliberate on the membership of this  
23 committee to try to resolve these questions  
24 or decide if there are resolutions that  
25 should be taken along these questions. If

1           you're interested in serving on such a  
2           committee, please email Sheila, it would be  
3           helpful for Senate Council to have a list of  
4           people that are willing to engage on this and  
5           try to add a little bit of clarity.

6           Senate Council also heard a presentation from  
7           the Undergraduate Council on the Graduation  
8           Composition and Communication Requirement,  
9           the GCCR. This is a requirement for our  
10          undergraduate students. Typically, there  
11          would be a GCCR Committee. This is a  
12          subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council  
13          that Senate Council's responsible for  
14          composing. Over the past several years,  
15          Senate Council has not done this leaving the  
16          responsibility with the Undergraduate Council  
17          at large. Undergraduate Council put forward,  
18          some recommendations, including simplifying  
19          the GCCR requirements somewhat, and also  
20          moving the GCCR-related approvals to the  
21          Undergraduate Council itself and not having  
22          the GCCR subcommittee. So we'd expect to see  
23          a more formal proposal on this coming from  
24          Undergraduate Council that would make its way  
25          towards Senate at some point

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter  
An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1 Senate Council tasked the Research and  
2 Graduate Education Committee to look at  
3 Wethington Awards. There were some questions  
4 related to how these were being considered  
5 for different types of funding in different  
6 colleges. So there was a report on the  
7 Wethington Awards that talked about some of  
8 the parameters and requirements established  
9 by each college. These are established at the  
10 college level and not centrally. If you're  
11 interested in this report, I would look at  
12 the Senate Council agenda for January 31st,  
13 and look for the report there. It's going to  
14 be linked under item 3CI in that -- or 3CI  
15 agenda and have a look at that if you're  
16 interested in that work. We certainly thank  
17 the committee for engaging in that study of  
18 that question for us.

19 Senate Council also heard a presentation on  
20 badges. This is an item that's come before  
21 the Senate. We've talked about it for a  
22 couple of years, since -- I think the first  
23 Senate discussions on the topic were in the  
24 neighborhood of summer 2020. A badge is  
25 described as a mini credential which would

1           comprise -- be comprised of a short -- a  
2           small number of courses - typically two  
3           courses - documenting a student's skills or  
4           skillset prior to receiving a diploma. And  
5           that should be something that helps narrate  
6           some aspect of a student's education when  
7           they're pursuing careers and so forth.  
8           And so, these would typically be unit-level  
9           decisions in terms of like what the structure  
10          content of these are, it was an interesting  
11          report. Senate Council is grateful for the  
12          work of the subgroup. Particularly it was a  
13          good model of shared governance. We've had  
14          multiple pilots through the Senate on how to  
15          actually run this. We've approved pilots for  
16          multiple years. We embedded a Senate Council  
17          member in the group that was discussing this.  
18          Leslie Vincent has been representing the  
19          Senate in these discussions. And so, in some  
20          sense, not talk about this as shared  
21          governance, like baked in from the beginning.  
22          And so, we're expecting a formal proposal on  
23          this idea within a couple of months. If you  
24          have questions or thoughts about the topic,  
25          I'm going to direct you towards Leslie

Trisha B. Morley, Court Reporter  
An/Dor Reporting & Video Technologies, Inc.

1 Vincent to share those.

2 All right. The next item on the agenda is  
3 the Vice-Chairs report. DeShana, do you have  
4 a report today?

5 COLLETT: No. I do not have a report today.

6 CRAMER: All right. Next would be the  
7 parliamentary's report. I think Clayton  
8 said he's going to be a little late today, so  
9 I don't even know if he's on yet.

10 All right. Trustees Blonder and Swanson, do  
11 you have a report today?

12 SWANSON: Surely. The University of Kentucky Board of  
13 Trustees will be meeting on February 17th and  
14 the 18th. Some of the items we will be  
15 considering include the following; an  
16 expansion of the student-managed investment  
17 programs to include a responsible investing  
18 focus. This will be open to all campus  
19 students -- students, sorry, who have  
20 completed a course in finance and one in the  
21 environmental sciences, and will be co-taught  
22 by faculty in finance and in sustainability.  
23 We'll be looking at approval for capital  
24 projects, including improvements in  
25 athletics, construction of the Beam

1 Institute, and continuation of the Smart  
2 Campus Initiative. We'll be looking at the  
3 approval of honorary degree recipients, and  
4 philanthropy gifts that exceed \$20 million.  
5 And then we'll be hearing reports from  
6 Vice-President Katrice Albert on DEI  
7 facilities and spaces, as well as supplier  
8 diversity. From VP Kristen Turner on the  
9 status of first-generation students and the  
10 impact of programs such as UK Leads on their  
11 success. The provost will provide us updates  
12 on transdisciplinary programs and ongoing  
13 administrative searches. And finally,  
14 Director Erika Chambers will be giving her  
15 report on the 2021 work-life survey. Any  
16 questions?

17 CRAMER:

17 Are there any questions for Hollie?  
18 All right. I don't see any. Thank you,  
19 Hollie. All right. So the next item on the  
20 agenda is Spring 2022 degree list for the  
21 social work graduates at Fort Sam Houston.  
22 We have a program with the Department of  
23 Defense down there. They finished their  
24 work, I think in April, and at the moment,  
25 because of the relationship with the

1 Department of Defense, it's advantageous if  
2 we're able to actually confer the degrees at  
3 the moment that they're graduating. And so,  
4 because that's earlier, we typically consider  
5 the degree list for these students earlier  
6 and have it considered by the Board of  
7 Trustees earlier. So it will be considered  
8 by the Board of Trustees later this week as  
9 Dr. Swanson mentioned.

10 So the motion from the committee, then, is  
11 for the elected faculty senators -- the  
12 elected faculty senators. This is also a  
13 test of our voting software, whether it only  
14 lets the elected faculty senators vote  
15 directly on this item. For the elected  
16 faculty senators to approve the UK Spring  
17 2022 social work graduates at Fort Sam  
18 Houston's degree list for submission through  
19 the president to the Board of Trustees.

20 Is there any debate on this motion? All  
21 right. Seeing none, this is the moment where  
22 we've -- I hope I -- actually Ken. Are you  
23 debating or asking a question?

24 TROSKE: I'm asking a question, yes. I'm sorry. And  
25 my camera's off because my --

1 CRAMER: No worries.

2 TROSKE: Okay. And this is Ken Troske from B&E. Last  
3 semester, I was approached by a student in  
4 ROTC about a similar issue of "Tell me early  
5 that I am waiting before my grades were due."  
6 I worked with the folks in A&S because  
7 obviously, ROTC is A&S, and which we did not  
8 provide. But it -- that, it seemed as though  
9 he basically told me, "If you don't give me a  
10 letter, I'm going to get in trouble." Which  
11 I felt was incredibly inappropriate for  
12 someone in ROTC to do. And I'm trying to  
13 figure -- but the claim was, "We need it  
14 early so that we can do all of these things  
15 he can get commissioned (inaudible) this,  
16 that, and the other thing."  
17 So I guess I think it's a broader problem,  
18 perhaps? Or am I missing something about  
19 this? Because I'm uncomfortable providing  
20 information about grades before -- on a  
21 single student before I've actually graded --  
22 provided grades for the entire class. And I  
23 don't know what -- how that relates to this,  
24 but it seems similar.

25 CRAMER: So this is -- I think I'd be interested in

1 the details. I think we could probably find  
2 out and determine what the requirement is,  
3 and where these things are coming from. And  
4 maybe find a better answer. This is a little  
5 bit different. The students in this program  
6 actually finish -- they actually finish  
7 early. They're finishing by the date that the  
8 degrees are conferred. The presence to the  
9 students' names on a degree list that the  
10 Senate approves and submits through the  
11 president to the Board of Trustees is a  
12 necessary condition for them to graduate.  
13 But, of course, us putting them on this list  
14 or approving this list with them on it is not  
15 sufficient. They actually do have to pass  
16 their classes; right? And so, these  
17 students, for example, have not finished yet.  
18 They still have to finish their course  
19 requirements, but the list does need to be  
20 approved. And it's a necessary, but not  
21 sufficient condition for them to receive the  
22 degrees.

23 So, Ken, let's maybe send an email and follow  
24 up and we can try to figure out what's going  
25 on. And if we can direct that to an office

1 to figure out, "Hey, why are they asking  
2 this?" Or, "Is there a way we can answer in a  
3 way that it's appropriate?" But this a  
4 little bit different, I think, than this  
5 situation. Allison?

6 GIBSON: Hey, Alison Gibson, College of Social Work.  
7 I can provide a little bit of insight on  
8 this, but I may not be able to answer all  
9 questions. So Fort Sam, Houston, is kind of  
10 like the equivalent of almost like a branch  
11 campus for us as the College of Social Work.  
12 They are approved too. Their faculty  
13 facilitate our accredited program for the MSW  
14 students in the Fort Sam, Houston, program.  
15 So they're actually running their own  
16 classes, their own calendar. They kind of  
17 work in tandem with our program, but they are  
18 kind of their own thing. And so that's part  
19 of why their timeline is a little bit  
20 different than ours as a university. It  
21 partly has to do with their requirements as  
22 service members.

23 CRAMER: All right. Are there any other questions or  
24 any debate on this motion?

25 All right. So I think when I proceed to the

1 next slide, voting will be open. If you're  
2 logged in to a web tab, you should see the  
3 question appear along with the button to be  
4 able to make your choices. And same thing in  
5 the app. When the slide appears, you should  
6 be able to also text in your results. So  
7 we're going to see the moment it's going to  
8 happen when I turn to the next slide. So  
9 let's give this a shot here.

10 All right, so this question is now open. And  
11 you should be able, for example, to text one,  
12 two, or three to the number. Or if you're in  
13 a web tab, actually be able to push the  
14 button and we'll see it.

15 Christopher, do you have a question about  
16 voting? Oh, hang on. I got to let you talk.  
17 Christopher, do you have a question about  
18 voting?

19 CHRISTOPHER: (Inaudible) do I have to -- I logged in, but  
20 do I have to type something into like in that  
21 -- do I have to type a certain presentation  
22 or something?

23 CRAMER: Yes. The presentation is yousenate789.

24 CHRISTOPHER: Yousenate789. Thank you.

25 CRAMER: Can you tell me how many people have voted?

1 UNKNOWN: Aaron, will we see the results of the voting?

2 CRAMER: Yes, when I proceed to the next slide, I  
3 should see the result. I'm actually a little  
4 surprised. I'm supposed to be able to see on  
5 this slide how many people have voted. And  
6 so, I want to make sure that we've got a  
7 sense that the rightish number of people have  
8 voted before I proceeded the next slide.

9 Yeah. When I proceed to the next slide, the  
10 question will be closed and we'll have vote  
11 totals.

12 Christopher, do you have another question?

13 So this should be only elected faculty  
14 senators. I would be interested to know --  
15 maybe we can check the logs later, but it'd  
16 be -- we'll check to make sure we only got  
17 elected faculty senators in the logs  
18 afterwards. All right. So I think we have  
19 enough votes. I'm going to move forward and  
20 see that we can see the votes.

21 Okay. So the motion passed with 77 votes, 74  
22 approved, three abstaining. I see, at least  
23 in the chat from one non-elected faculty  
24 senator that the option to vote didn't show  
25 for that individual. It should show for

1 non-elected faculty senators on the next  
2 item, which is one for which those  
3 individuals can vote. So, anyway, that  
4 motion passes. And so far, so good.  
5 All right. The next item on the agenda is a  
6 report from the Senate Academic Programs  
7 Committee. Leslie Vincent's the chair.  
8 Leslie, are you ready?

9 VINCENT: Yes, I'm ready. Thanks. So this is a  
10 recommendation that the University Senate  
11 approve for submission to the Board of  
12 Trustees, the establishment of a new BS  
13 degree - Leadership for Community Education  
14 and Human Learning in the Department of  
15 Educational Leadership Studies within the  
16 College of Education. The proposed Bachelor  
17 of Science in Leadership for Community  
18 Education and Human Learning degree offers  
19 curriculum designed to prepare students to  
20 become effective leaders and implementing  
21 educational programs within community  
22 context. This includes individuals seeking a  
23 professional career and educational  
24 programming for youth and adult learners  
25 within communities and organizations outside

1 of the traditional school and classroom  
2 structure.

3 This degree is a collaboration between the  
4 College of Education and the College of  
5 Agriculture, Food, and Environment, and  
6 builds upon the current collaborative  
7 undergraduate certificate program in  
8 educational leadership. The target audience  
9 includes undergraduate education majors that  
10 have completed general education  
11 requirements, but do not wish to complete the  
12 Teacher Education Preparation programs. As  
13 well as non-traditional students that desire  
14 a two-year completer degree to support  
15 matriculation from KCTCS programs. A total  
16 of 120 credit hours are required for the  
17 degree, with 12 credit hours as guided  
18 electives where students can specialize in  
19 areas of interests based on future career  
20 goals. Expected demand for this program or  
21 15 students in year one growing to 60  
22 students by year five.

23 CRAMER: All right. So we have a motion from the  
24 committee to approve the establishment of the  
25 new program. We also have the (inaudible)

1                   who's on the line as well. Are there  
2                   questions of fact about this proposal?  
3                   Roger?

4       BROWN:           Roger, College of Ag. My memory is that at  
5                   Senate Council, there was some discussion  
6                   about whether this should be a Bachelor of  
7                   Science or Bachelor of Arts. Was there ever  
8                   any response or consideration given to that?

9       VINCENT:        Sure, thanks for --

10      CRAMER:         Beth.

11      VINCENT:        Oh, sorry.

12      CRAMER:         Go ahead, Beth. Oh, sorry was it --

13      VINCENT:        It was me. Sorry, I have the answer.

14      CRAMER:         Sorry, go ahead Leslie.

15      VINCENT:        So I did receive a message follow-up  
16                   discussing the rationale for BS. In both the  
17                   College of Education and CAFE, most degrees  
18                   are current -- that are currently offered are  
19                   Bachelor of Science designation. They also  
20                   -- faculty discussed this and selected the BS  
21                   as the degree because core courses within  
22                   this program are focused in the area of  
23                   social science, and so through these  
24                   community-based -- or by training these  
25                   educational leaders, they're going to be

1 using research-based practices through  
2 applied experiences. And they felt that this  
3 was the right approach to use for the degree.

4 CRAMER: All right. Are there any other questions of  
5 fact about this motion?

6 All right. Seeing none, is there any debate  
7 on this motion?

8 All right. Seeing no debate -- all right,  
9 this is the first moment for our student  
10 members and like our ex officio members who  
11 weren't able to vote on the previous motion.  
12 This is the first motion that you should see  
13 up here on your screen, or be able to vote  
14 via text on. So when I move to the next  
15 slide, the question will be open, and you'll  
16 be able to open to indicate your vote. So  
17 let's give that a try.

18 All right. Looks like the vote count  
19 stabilizing. So we'll go ahead and close the  
20 question here. All right. So that motion  
21 passes with 83 approving and two abstaining.

22 All right. The next item on the agenda --  
23 thank you, Leslie. The next item on the  
24 agenda is a report from the Academic  
25 Organization and Structures Committee. Greg,

1 are you ready?

2 HALL: I'm ready.

3 CRAMER: All right.

4 HALL: Okay. Yeah, this is a proposal to close a  
5 program in the College of Public Health. To  
6 close the Doctor of Public Health Program.  
7 Revised accreditation standards mandated the  
8 Doctor of Public Health programs focus on  
9 public health practice competencies. UK's  
10 Doctor of Public Health program faculty  
11 suspended admissions in 2016 to consider the  
12 curriculum changes necessary to shift its  
13 research-focused program to a practice-based  
14 degree. Determined fit with faculty  
15 qualifications and forecast student demand.  
16 As of 2021 program faculty of all  
17 concentrations, biostatistics, epidemiology,  
18 health behavior, and health management and  
19 policy have decided to focus on their  
20 respective Ph.D. programs.  
21 Now, there is a teach-out plan for this  
22 program, and at the start of this current  
23 semester, the program has five enrolled  
24 doctoral students. Two courses are required  
25 field courses, and they're being offered this

1 semester. And these students will continue  
2 to work with the committees to achieve  
3 successful defense within the parameters of  
4 the requirements specified by the university.  
5 The current DGS in the program Dr. Rick  
6 Ingram will continue in that role until the  
7 last year to complete his or her degree  
8 requirements. Thank you.

9 CRAMER: All right. So we have a motion from the  
10 committee acknowledging a waiver of SR  
11 3.3.2.2.2 which would require an open hearing  
12 for such an action and a move to approve the  
13 suspension of admissions into the Doctor of  
14 Public Health effective immediately. Are  
15 there any questions of fact on this motion?  
16 Bob Grossman.

17 GROSSMAN: Hi, Bob Grossman A&S, can you hear me?

18 CRAMER: Yes.

19 GROSSMAN: Okay, great. So my question is related to  
20 the very last item. That "the DGS will remain  
21 in place until the last person graduates."  
22 It seems like we don't really have much  
23 control over when a person graduates. So how  
24 many years -- shouldn't there be a deadline  
25 for the last person -- student to graduate?

1                   Where if they haven't completed everything by  
2                   five years from now or 10 years from now that  
3                   the DGS will be free to retire or move to a  
4                   different university or something? Because  
5                   as it stands now, it sounds like he's  
6                   committed as long as the students are still  
7                   enrolled.

8           CRAMER:       Bob, I think you've actually wandered across  
9                   a topic of conversation over the past week,  
10                   which is what the Senate means or what the  
11                   board means when it talks about suspension of  
12                   admissions, versus a final closure of the  
13                   program. Of course, there should be some  
14                   bound on this; right? That somebody couldn't  
15                   come back 40 years later and expect the same  
16                   DGS to be serving and so forth. But I would  
17                   suspect that the proposers don't have an  
18                   answer to that question right now. And Greg,  
19                   you might have some thoughts.

20          HALL:        No. Well, the -- as close as we could come  
21                   in the committee in addressing such concerns,  
22                   we have these language parameters as  
23                   specified by the university. And what that  
24                   refers to basically is the time clock for  
25                   finishing the degree. And, of course, the

1 matter of the DGS remaining in place, that  
2 did not come up in our discussions,  
3 specifically as relates to Rick Ingram. But  
4 certainly, that could occur. That the  
5 program is bound to complete -- to allow  
6 students to complete so long as they complete  
7 satisfactorily within the calendar. But I  
8 get what Bob was saying there, and I'd be  
9 interested to hear others' thoughts on that.

10 CRAMER: Also, my understanding is that SACCOG's view  
11 on this is that when you initiate this  
12 closure, which in their nomenclature means  
13 suspension of admissions, that there's sort  
14 of a five-year clock, at that point, to make  
15 sure you teach out for five years. Kaveh?

16 TAGAVI: Yes. Kaveh Tagavi, College of Engineering.  
17 From memory, grad school has limitations on  
18 how long a person has to finish a degree. I  
19 think maybe fortuitously it's five years. So  
20 what I suggest -- but under some extreme  
21 circumstances, they do extension one time,  
22 two times, maybe three times. If somebody is  
23 in a coma for 20 years and they come back  
24 after 20 years, they want to get a degree,  
25 it's inhumane not to give them a degree. So

1 my suggestion is to say, and to allow anybody  
2 who is otherwise qualified to graduate to be  
3 receiving that degree or certificate. That  
4 would solve it. Of course, when you close  
5 the back door, nobody could get in. So  
6 eventually, everybody has to move out except  
7 for some extraordinary cases where somebody  
8 gets the extension. With such a provision,  
9 by saying everybody -- anybody who is  
10 otherwise eligible to graduate will be  
11 graduated. I think that would solve the  
12 problem.

13 CRAMER: Davy?

14 JONES: And this an important question that's being  
15 raised, but, actually, this is not the  
16 motion. The motion is on the narrow question  
17 about suspending admissions. What happens to  
18 the students in the program is actually a  
19 different question that's not in the motion.

20 CRAMER: This is actually, precisely the reason Senate  
21 Council modified the motion for the committee  
22 to make it "suspension of admissions" and not  
23 "suspension and closure" at the meeting last  
24 week. It's to close the front door and not  
25 the back door for those students that are in

1 the program. Are there any other -- Bob, I  
2 see your hand still up, but it might be up  
3 from before.

4 GROSSMAN: It's up from before. Sorry.

5 CRAMER: All right, Davy, your hands still up, but it  
6 might also be up from before. Yep. Okay.

7 All right, seeing no other questions about  
8 the motion, is there any debate on the  
9 motion?

10 All right, seeing no debate, we are going to  
11 vote on this question. This is a question  
12 that any of the voting senators can vote on.  
13 So unlike the degree list earlier, the  
14 elected faculty senators can certainly vote  
15 on it, but also the student voting members of  
16 the Senate, as well as the ex officio voting  
17 members of the Senate, should be able to vote  
18 on this question when I proceed to the next  
19 slide. So let's give that a try.

20 Looks like the voting's concluded, and that  
21 motion passed with 82 in favor and four  
22 abstaining. And just as an observation, it  
23 seems like this voting is working okay. So  
24 that's good. It's working so well actually,  
25 that we are two items from the floor at 3:42.

1 It was admittedly a light agenda, but perhaps  
2 our efficiency in voting in this way was, was  
3 so overpowering that we have plenty of  
4 opportunity for senators to raise issues that  
5 are not on the agenda. So if you'd like to  
6 do so at this time, please raise your hand  
7 now. Eric?

8 BLALOCK: Hi, Eric Blalock, College of Medicine. An  
9 issue I thought might be worth discussing is  
10 the idea that as the pandemic prevalence  
11 reduces, we're likely going to get to a  
12 position where we don't do -- have masking  
13 required anymore. What is this going to mean  
14 for faculty and staff that have chosen to do  
15 weekly testing instead or staying at home?  
16 Are they going to be invited back to campus  
17 or will they still insist on vaccinations, et  
18 cetera?

19 CRAMER: Is there -- I'm trying to look and see if  
20 perhaps the provost is on the call and might  
21 have some comments on this, or at least offer  
22 some next directions about how the  
23 administration might --

24 DIPAOLOLA: Sure. I'm always here for you. Always. And  
25 you all. I was just keeping quiet, listening

1 in, but, yeah, Eric, it's an important topic.  
2 And there are a lot of universities around  
3 the country now wrestling with this. Some  
4 that have already switched in terms of the  
5 way they're approaching mask mandates. We're  
6 going to have a whole series of meetings  
7 coming up. And in fact, we're going to also  
8 have a meeting with Senate Council, with the  
9 president's group as well, and we'll make  
10 sure to report back. So I can tell you,  
11 there's a lot of discussion over this. What  
12 are we going to do in terms of the timing?  
13 You know, we've always approached things with  
14 all of you, too, in a very careful way  
15 without just jumping to make a change. But  
16 at the same time, this is an important topic.  
17 START team will be involved as well. So I  
18 don't know if that -- I don't think I've  
19 given you an answer, but I can tell you that  
20 we should have an answer in terms of where  
21 we're going and planning it out from a  
22 timeline perspective soon.

23 CRAMER: Provost, DiPaola, I think there was at least  
24 a portion of that question that also related  
25 to the idea of like what happens to people

1 that are like testing weekly. Are they going  
2 to test weekly the rest of their career? Or  
3 is there some moment at which that sort of  
4 thing would wind down as well for those  
5 people? Do you have a sense of -- that that  
6 would be part of the consideration?

7 DIPAOLA: What I promise is, is I always take your  
8 input very seriously as I will bring that  
9 back, as I'm part of those discussions, and  
10 make sure that we're addressing that as well.

11 CRAMER: Davy?

12 JONES: Davy Jones, College of Medicine. A few years  
13 ago, there was some discussion at several  
14 Senate Council meetings about donors buying  
15 their name into the name of educational  
16 units. And there was concern about, "Where's  
17 this going?" Buying degree names, buying a  
18 course name, what's the policy on this? And  
19 I remember there was some talk about maybe  
20 some administrative Senate joint thinking  
21 about it, but I've lost track of where that  
22 is. Is that someplace now?

23 CRAMER: So Davy, of course, there's a lot that's  
24 happened in that time period, but it is a  
25 topic that I've raised with the president

1 repeatedly. I've expressed an interest by  
2 the Senate in having the sort of more  
3 abstract question in a more general sense as  
4 opposed to being attached to a specific donor  
5 or specific benefactor of the university. I  
6 had requested whether or not perhaps the Vice  
7 President for Philanthropy would be  
8 interested in having a discussion with the  
9 Senate. And that's not really a move forward.  
10 That said, I think the last time I talked  
11 about it with the president, he did suggest  
12 that if there were questions about the  
13 process, perhaps I could kind of watch along  
14 the next time one of these happens and report  
15 to the Senate, "Hey, how's that go?" So we  
16 could understand a little bit better what's  
17 happening on that side. Yet, I've not heard  
18 anything else about that. So I don't know if  
19 such sort of naming considerations are being  
20 considered any specific cases or not right  
21 now, but I -- it is something that I've  
22 raised with the president repeatedly at this  
23 point. Provost DiPaola, are you discussing  
24 that same topic?

25 DIPAOLA: Yeah, I was just going to -- one thing to

1 finish up on terms of -- not that topic, I'm  
2 sorry, the prior question -- but if Eric or  
3 others had some thoughts on that, that you  
4 want me to make sure to bring back as  
5 discussions occur, feel free to either say  
6 something or send a note or whatever is best.  
7 I would always appreciate your input. On the  
8 masking, for instance. In terms of where  
9 everybody's at, obviously, there's a question  
10 about then classrooms, and how do you time  
11 that, and making sure everybody's still  
12 feeling comfortable in terms of safety. Even  
13 though I know the percentages are going down,  
14 they're not -- the question is do we look at  
15 a certain level, that type of thing. So  
16 input would be welcome. That's all.

17 CRAMER: Marilyn?

18 DUNCAN: Marilyn Duncan, College of Medicine. So  
19 related to masking, I learned just a couple  
20 hours before our meeting that the Kentucky  
21 General Assembly has a bill on the floor,  
22 House Bill 51, that they're voting on  
23 tomorrow, which would prohibit requirements  
24 for masking in schools and colleges. And this  
25 would obviously have a big effect on our

1 campus. And I, for one, think it's pretty  
2 early to have prohibition of masked mandates.  
3 The positivity rate is still around 20  
4 percent. That's less than it was when we were  
5 up to 33 percent, but 20 percent positivity  
6 is still pretty high. And the UK Chandler  
7 Hospital is still packed with patients from  
8 the reports that I see regularly. So Dr.  
9 DiPaola, do you have any comments on this?  
10 Are you in communication with the house  
11 representatives?

12 DIPAOLA: We're in communication with Burt Hardin who  
13 lives up for the university. And so, yes,  
14 they're aware. And I know they pay attention  
15 to that, and they're, at least, dealing with  
16 this as appropriate and as they can in terms  
17 of those discussions. So I know they're  
18 aware, and they're approaching it. As you  
19 know, we are careful, as I just mentioned a  
20 moment ago, in terms of making any decisions.  
21 To make a change, like changing our masking  
22 policies. So, Marilyn, I do agree with your  
23 comments in terms of us being very careful as  
24 we approach things. We have never, in this  
25 whole process, just flipped quickly in terms

1 of our procedures because they've been  
2 working fairly well. So we will be careful.  
3 And I can tell you the university's very  
4 aware of that. And if there is a question  
5 regarding something specific in terms of  
6 approach, I would encourage you to touch base  
7 with Burt Hardin who's our leader in that  
8 regard.

9 DUNCAN: Well, we can't have a separate policy from  
10 the state; can we if they pass this bill?  
11 Can we have a separate policy?

12 DIPAOLOLA: I mean, I wouldn't think, but I don't know.  
13 I wouldn't think so.

14 DUNCAN: It's kind of frightening, really, with so  
15 many university students in lots of classes.  
16 And mixing and matching with lots of other  
17 students, that they will be allowed to come  
18 to classes without masks on.

19 DIPAOLOLA: Yeah, no, no. The only thing I can assure  
20 you is they are very aware of this. In fact,  
21 I had a discussion with Burt even today.

22 DUNCAN: Thank you.

23 CRAMER: Scott?

24 SCOTT: Yeah, I was just going to ask a follow-up to  
25 our last month Senate meeting. A similar

1 topic about COVID, where they kind of gave  
2 some statistics about the booster shot, and  
3 maybe the university is going to put a promo  
4 or put a promotion for getting people to seek  
5 a booster shot. At that time, there was no  
6 conversation or no discussion, or no  
7 accommodation, shall we say, for people who  
8 have actually have recovered from COVID. So  
9 naturally -- basically, natural immunity.  
10 Where does natural immunity fit into things  
11 going forward?

12 CRAMER: Provost DiPaola do you have a comment on  
13 that?

14 DIPAOLA: Sure, I can, Scott. And I think it's an  
15 important topic. In fact, there was a New  
16 England Journal paper that came out, at least  
17 that I know is peer-reviewed and in a pretty  
18 rigorous way as well. And I don't know if  
19 you've got to see that, but it was looking at  
20 that exact topic.

21 The thing about it is we do know natural  
22 immunity does make a difference. When they  
23 looked at natural immunity in that particular  
24 paper, obviously, it could have been natural  
25 immunity from a number of the different

1 variants. And then they looked at the  
2 ability to protect in terms of symptomatic  
3 disease in the different variants. Omicron  
4 -- it was not quite as effective in Omicron  
5 as it was, but still effective to some  
6 degree. I think the bottom line is, is we do  
7 know that natural immunity does help, but  
8 that vaccination plus natural immunity is  
9 even better.

10 You saw some of the CDC documentation of that  
11 CDC study and so forth. It is a topic -- one  
12 of the difficulties in operationalizing that  
13 is verifying the natural immunity, to some  
14 degree, and it's going to probably become  
15 even a little more difficult with these rapid  
16 tests that people have, where we're not even  
17 able to see necessarily the testing in terms  
18 of people getting COVID. Or you go to  
19 antibody testing and there's some variability  
20 in the testing. So I don't disagree with the  
21 importance of natural immunity and  
22 protection. I do believe that the data would  
23 suggest that both natural immunity plus  
24 vaccination is better than natural immunity  
25 alone. And depending on the natural immunity

1           they got from whichever particular variant  
2           may affect its protection against Omicron.  
3           And I think in that paper - don't quote me  
4           exactly in the New England Journal and I can  
5           get it to Aaron if you want to take a look at  
6           it I believe the table actually showed that  
7           it was only about 60 percent effective in  
8           symptomatic disease with Omicron when they  
9           had natural immunity. So obviously there is  
10          still some room in there in terms of  
11          vaccination.

12          I don't know if that answers everything, but  
13          we're looking at all of that. And I take  
14          that back always to the START team in terms  
15          of advice to see if there is a way to advise  
16          how we would include that in some of the  
17          determinations that we would consider. But  
18          then we also have to deal with the  
19          operationalizing it and how we would track it  
20          and sort it through. Sorry, for the long  
21          answer, Aaron. I've always promised Aaron  
22          that I would try to be more concise.

23          CRAMER:           Jurgen?

24          ROHR:            Yeah, I have a quick question. How about  
25          people who went through COVID and recovered

1 and have antibodies and are basically  
2 protected?

3 CRAMER: Yeah, I think that's pretty similar to what  
4 Scott was asking. I think that the provost's  
5 comment was essentially that they don't have  
6 a really good way to operationalize that in  
7 terms of like being able to like markdown  
8 that that happened on a certain day, or.

9 DIPAOLA: And there is some variability in terms of  
10 antibody response and protection. And  
11 antibody response doesn't necessarily equate  
12 to preventing severe illness since its  
13 cellular immunity that's the more long-term  
14 protector. So there's the two components. I  
15 won't get into that here, but there's  
16 antibody immunity and that's preventing  
17 infection to a large degree. There's  
18 cellular immunity, which is usually  
19 protecting more in terms of disease  
20 progression or severity. And cellular  
21 immunity is not usually measured. So we  
22 would have to even figure out how we're going  
23 to measure, how we would operationalize. And  
24 still, at the end of the day, vaccination, in  
25 addition to, natural immunity is better than

1 natural immunity alone. And you wouldn't  
2 want to just have everybody necessarily just  
3 go out to get infected, to get as opposed to  
4 trying to get vaccinated and even prevent  
5 serious infections. So those are, at least,  
6 based on some of the evidence that we're  
7 seeing and what we're hearing from the START  
8 team as well.

9 CRAMER: Scott?

10 SCOTT: Just one quick follow-up. And it's related,  
11 but that is -- you have the weekly testing  
12 mandate, I believe, for the people who are  
13 not vaccinated. But we also know that  
14 especially when Omicron came along that  
15 people with the vaccine were still  
16 contracting and spreading it. Why is it that  
17 the testing is only for those that are "not  
18 vaccinated" and -- or maybe you're going to  
19 adjust that particular program as well. And  
20 just, I'm just curious, I understood before,  
21 but there seems to be no evidence that this  
22 is not just non-vaccinated people who can get  
23 COVID and spread it, but yet you're only  
24 making people with not vaccinated to be  
25 actually tested weekly.

1 CRAMER: Provost DiPaola do you want to -- I hate to  
2 keep coming back to you, but, Provost  
3 DiPaola, are you --

4 DIPAOLA: I'll just be really quick, Aaron. Scott, the  
5 one thing I would say is that what you're  
6 saying, it makes a lot of sense, but there is  
7 truth to the fact that, as best, we can tell,  
8 based on the evidence, that those that are  
9 vaccinated, their viral loads drop much  
10 quicker than those that are not vaccinated  
11 when they have COVID. So it gets into that  
12 issue of transmissibility. That obviously  
13 there's some studies that look at it in a lot  
14 of different ways, but you've got to keep in  
15 mind, some of those studies had different  
16 variants when they were looked at as well.  
17 And obviously, you're right. Omicron variant  
18 is much more transmissible, just in general.  
19 And it also comes down to operationalizing it  
20 as well, doing massive testing through the  
21 whole campus. And then the other thing is,  
22 we are in a setting where -- and this is,  
23 we're all thankful for this -- is that we are  
24 seeing, even though we're not all the way  
25 there, decreasing percentage positivity in

1 terms of Omicron overall. So we might get to  
2 a point where we feel even differently about  
3 our testing program and make decisions on  
4 that. But I agree. I mean, we could have  
5 done the whole campus.

6 People did look, though, at entry testing and  
7 realize now, after vaccination, this whole  
8 phase in this past year, that it wasn't as  
9 helpful as it was at the very beginning when  
10 COVID started. Because you remember at the  
11 beginning, we just tested everyone coming in  
12 the door back a couple of years ago. So I  
13 take your point, Scott. It's all valid  
14 points. And some of it relates to the  
15 evidence, some of it relates to what we  
16 actually can do in a feasible way.

17 CRAMER: Herman?

18 FARRELL: Aaron, can you read the question that's in  
19 the chat?

20 CRAMER: Ah, yes, I see it. Herman's in the library  
21 and can't speak except for perhaps that just  
22 a couple of words he did, but I will share  
23 his question here. It's also perhaps related  
24 to university legislative priorities. He has  
25 a question about the Anti-CRT legislation

1 going through the state legislature. What's  
2 the status of those bills? And what is UK  
3 doing about the legislation? Is it possible  
4 for education leaders, the provost office,  
5 deans, faculty, to testify or issue  
6 statements and opposition to the potential  
7 threat to academic freedom and first  
8 amendment rights? This is a question for the  
9 provost.

10 DIPAOLA: Yeah, no, the -- Herman, I understand. And I  
11 can tell you that university leadership and  
12 especially out of the office -- you know,  
13 Burt Hardin, are experts at all that. We  
14 know what we've been able to do and should be  
15 able to do here at the University of Kentucky  
16 in terms of the various freedoms that we've  
17 had. And they are working, in many ways,  
18 behind the scenes, and in another ways, in  
19 dealing with this in behalf of the  
20 university. I would suggest if there is a  
21 concern, by anybody, in particular, reach out  
22 to Burt Hardin. And I'll let him know that  
23 you reached out and asked that question as  
24 well.

25 CRAMER: And just to offer perhaps a personal

1 observation. Seeing the way that certain  
2 conversations happen and so forth, this is an  
3 area where I don't think the administration  
4 is on a different page than the faculty, but  
5 they're sort of pursuing the -- they're  
6 pursuing the university's agenda in a sort of  
7 careful way, but I don't see a lot of gap  
8 between the university's faculty and its  
9 administration on these questions. So I  
10 would just say I personally trust them as  
11 good advocates for the university's ability  
12 to continue operating freely. Greg?

13 HALL: Yeah, just on Herman's question, I just want  
14 to follow up with just a -- just sort of  
15 point a fact. Sponsor of the legislation is  
16 teaching as an adjunct in my program, my  
17 department. I've really been grappling with  
18 this, and I'm just wondering if there are  
19 possible conflicts of interest, I haven't  
20 taken the time to research this. It recently  
21 came to my attention, but I think that -- I  
22 think that's an important matter and should  
23 be considered by the Provost Office. Thank  
24 you.

25 CRAMER: All right. Any other items from the floor?

1 Scott?

2 SCOTT: Yeah, sorry. I got to keep hitting the wrong  
3 button here. Unrelated, shift gears for the  
4 provost and this was probably should have  
5 been a statement/question to Dr. Monday.  
6 Last time, I do want to make a quick  
7 statement to command our faculty trustees who  
8 gave us an update relative to the president's  
9 salary package that was approved by the Board  
10 of Trustees unanimously with the exception of  
11 our two faculty trustees.  
12 I have -- and again, provost I -- maybe it's  
13 for Dr. Monday, but you know, I have to  
14 scratch my head that nobody from the  
15 administration, given what the university was  
16 going through relative to budget cuts, maybe  
17 some furloughs here or there, certainly not  
18 being able to replace people that retired  
19 because of the budget cuts, lack of pay  
20 raise, or at least a half a year of pay raise  
21 nowadays 2 percent, which is -- we appreciate  
22 don't get me wrong. But the optics of what  
23 the Board of Trustees and the administration  
24 did for the president in the midst of that  
25 going on, it makes me really wonder about the

1 ability for the administration to be in tune  
2 with just, I guess, the campus, when they --  
3 no one thought that that optic of him getting  
4 such a big pay raise and two years added onto  
5 his term after retirements, that that would  
6 actually be a good thing. I mean, what  
7 happened to the just a judgment and an optic  
8 standpoint. I'm not going to say the  
9 president's not worth it, that's not the  
10 issue. Matter of fact, if he can get five  
11 times to pay, go after it, but given what's  
12 going on campus, why wasn't there someone to  
13 step back and say, "You know what, maybe we  
14 should wait." I'm just curious. The other  
15 thing, on a lighter note, I think I'm going  
16 to take in -- when I go to retire, I'm just  
17 going to retire and I'm not going to tell  
18 anybody for two years. And I think that  
19 would probably just be something good for the  
20 faculty as well. But that's just on the  
21 lighter note of things. Anyways, just want  
22 to hear your thoughts.

23 CRAMER: So I would suggest that Scott made a  
24 statement I don't know if the provost has any  
25 sort of meaningful way to respond to the

1 question, but the president has suggested  
2 that the provost -- he trusts the provost to  
3 be a conduit between the Senate and himself,  
4 and so I think Provost DiPaola if you'd like  
5 to respond, you can, but if not, certainly  
6 it'd be reasonable to convey what you've  
7 heard here.

8 DIPAOLA: I will, Aaron. Thank you. And thank you,  
9 Scott.

10 CRAMER: Are there any other items from the floor or  
11 discussion from the floor? Greg, I see your  
12 hand, but I think it's still up from before.

13 HALL: I forgot to lower it. Sorry about that.

14 CRAMER: No problem. I see a link. I don't think you  
15 guys can see it. I'm going to copy it over to  
16 everyone. Those of you interested in Senate  
17 Bill 138. That was from Rae Goodwin. Thank  
18 you, Rae, for that.

19 All right. Is there any other discussion or  
20 items from the floor?

21 If not, are there any objections to  
22 adjournment?

23 Seeing none, then we are adjourned. Happy  
24 Valentine's Day, everyone. Remember the next  
25 Senate meeting is on March 21st. Not on

March 14th. We'll see you on March 21st.

Have a good afternoon, everyone.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25