

* * * * *

CRAMER: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the March 21st University Senate meeting. Attendance for this meeting will be captured via Zoom report. Any chat sent will be received only by office personnel. Office staff might be able to, for example, if there's motion language or something, to insert it in the chat so we all know what we're voting on, but other than that chat will not be used during the meeting.

Please mute yourself when not speaking although Sheila will help do that as needed if you forget. This is just a friendly reminder that Senate Council suggested asking senators to turn on cameras, if possible, especially while speaking. Of course, if you can't do this for any reason, there's no explanation needed, it was just a suggestion.

If you're attending via phone and using the speaker phone to talk, it can be difficult for others to hear you, so please make sure to hold the phone to your ear or use your buds or headset as appropriate to make sure that everyone's able to hear you when you're connected in this way.

The meeting is being recorded for note-taking purposes. If any member of Senate is disconnected and cannot reconnect at all, please send an email to Sheila Brothers, sbrothers@uky.edu, so we're aware of the situation.

Senate meetings are open meetings. We, to the best of my ability, follow Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised. There's no voting by proxy. If you're not the member, you cannot vote. Please be civil. If there's discussion, you can address comments to the chair, not to each other if there's disagreement. Please be a good citizen. That means to communicate the -- about the activities of the Senate with your academic units to let them know about the activities of the Senate, and make sure you understand their views and concerns so that you can represent them well as their representative. And please participate. If you have a question about something that we're voting on or discussing, please use the Zoom "raise-hand" feature. Ask your question -- don't vote on something you don't know what it is. If you have questions, make sure to raise your hand so that we can address those.

All right. I'm seeing a couple of chat questions about how to log in on Poll Everywhere. It looks like -- make sure you're typing in yousenate789 as the username of the meeting to attend, that's the meeting that you want to attend. Don't -- you need to be logged in with yourself, but you need to join the meeting called yousenate789.

Right now, and maybe this is the last time we'll see, now that the voting's been sorted out. Participants are divided into two categories: Panelists and attendees. Both can participate in the meeting, voting senators or panelists. They would have received a unique link via an email from Katie Silver, probably came a couple of times. You got a

warning like 24 hours ago, and then maybe one earlier today, or about an hour ago. Using that unique link to join, you'll be joining the meeting as a panelist and you're eligible to vote.

Non-voting senators and guests are attendees, they would use the link on the Senate site and do not vote.

To speak for any reason, or otherwise be recognized, including making motions or seconds, use the "raise-hand" button at the bottom of the screen. If you cannot see this, click on the three dots with "more", I think it's all under -- "what is it called?" under reactions, is where the "raise-hand feature is now in Zoom.

I see most of the questions here are probably related to voting, so let's see if we get those answered on this slide here. If voting via text, you'll text yousenate789 to the number 22333 to join the session. You won't see the motion language via text, but you'll -- automatically when you vote it'll apply to the current question. You'd use one, for approve. Two, for oppose. Three, for abstain on the motions as they appear in the PowerPoint at the time they appear.

If you're voting via the app, open it. If you've not done so already log in and then you'll click on the house icon, the home button, and join presentation by entering youseven -- yousenate789, and responding to the questions or votes as they appear on your screen. If you're voting via the web, you can navigate to this URL here, pollev.com/yousenate789. If you're not already logged in, log in and

then click on the house icon and join presentation by entering yousenate789, and responding to questions and votes as they appear on your screen. Just going to check the chat real quick one more time and make sure -- everybody seems to--

Okay. So I think everybody says -- okay, this is right. If you see the March 21st meeting has not yet begun, that's correct. That means that we're sitting here, we don't have a motion on the floor yet. So if you see that the March 21st meeting is not yet begun, you're in the exact right spot, stay there. All right. Very good.

A reminder before speaking, please remember to state your name and your college affiliation, so we know who we're listening to.

And the first item on our agenda are the minutes from February 14th, no minute -- no edits to the minutes were received. So unless objections are heard now, the minutes from February 14th will stand approved as distributed by unanimous consent. Those minutes are approved.

Continuing with announcements. Just as an announcement, the President has initiated dismissal proceedings against a tenured faculty member, there are procedures for these that unfold they're described in governing regulation 10, so the announcement is simply that those procedures are being followed.

ITS sent out some requests for people to participate in focus groups, to help inform the abuse on campus about IT resources. So thanks to those of you that are participating in these ITS focus groups.

Also, there's going to be an annual campus-wide solicitation for nominees, for campus committees coming this week, so look for an email there. Please make sure to nominate your colleagues to serve on these committees. Senate Council has to pick people to shuffle into these committees. So the more nominees we get, the better that goes and so I will thank you ahead of time for your nominations.

Roger, are you ready to speak on the slide?

BROWN: Yes. Just a couple of updates on the Faculty Trustee Election. The -- there are five nominees named there on the slide in alphabetical order. You'll receive an email if you're eligible to vote sometime before April the 4th, which will be the beginning of the preliminary round. Following that, we will narrow it to three candidates, and there'll be a final round of voting that will follow soon after that.

CRAMER: Thank you, Roger. This is your monthly reminder of curriculum proposal deadlines for curricular proposals that are for the Fall 2022 effective date. You'll see many of these have passed already, but this is just a reminder that if you're seeking a Fall 2022 effective date for a curriculum proposal, it must have been reviewed by the appropriate Academic Council, either the Grad Council, the Undergrad Council, or

the Health Care Colleges Council, and received in the Senate Council Office by these dates.

It's not like a guaranteed date, we keep working past these dates, but it's also not guaranteed if there's some problem with the proposal or something like that, it doesn't guarantee that you'll have it approved by Fall 2022. But it does create the opportunity at least that you would have an expectation it might go through for Fall 2022. So make sure that you're -- you continue to be aware of these dates. These dates are posted in every Senate meeting. They're going to continue to be posted in every Senate meeting from now on, but it is important to kind of keep these dates in your mind.

The next item on the agenda is the Chair's Report. The Senate Rules give the Senate Council the authority to take some actions on behalf of the Senate, as long as they're reported to the Senate. So today I'm reporting that Senate Council approved to change to the law 2022, 2023 calendar, specifically creating a fall break making federal election day an academic holiday, and a few associated adjustments to dates. So that action was taken by Senate Council at its last meeting.

Senate Council also appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on academic policies for unscheduled closings, like snow days. Specifically, they're going to be investigating what's reasonable [inaudible 00:21:13] feasible when the campus opens late, closes earlier, is closed for the day due to weather. The committee is composed of diverse faculty and

Senate committee membership, but we requested a preliminary report in early April from this body, so we'll certainly keep Senate updated as we hear from this committee.

Senate Council also approved a second one-year term for Ombud Alice Turkington. The Senate Rules dictate that a second term without a search process is allowable for an Ombuds second term. The Ombud, the Provost, and Senate Council must all concur for this to happen, and Senate Council gave its concurrence for Dr. Turkington to survey a second term.

Now the Vice-Chair's Report. DeShana?

COLLETT: Good afternoon, everybody. It's again, that time of the year where Senate Council solicits nominations for the outstanding Senator Award. The award recognizes senators who currently or previously had exemplary service records and a commitment to the University Senate.

So in the next coming weeks, please look out for an email. You'll receive from me that outlines the award selection criteria.

Nominations can be -- you can submit nominations or you can even do self-nominations, they are welcome. Please remember to read the selection criteria and actually provide some specific evidences and examples of how the nominee meets the outlined criteria. So just be on the lookout for that in the next coming weeks.

CRAMER: Thank you, DeShana. Clayton, do you have a report today? Sure I saw you. I don't think actually Clayton's on today anyway, so no report from our parliamentarian today. Earlier today, I received a message that Lee and Holly don't have a report today. So no report from our faculty trustees today, either.

So our -- next item on our agenda which is the first item that we would vote on. So we need to make sure we get these voting issues settled. It seems like there's actually a good tech support stream going on in the chat right now. I thought that the chat wasn't working, but because of this panelist attendee's distinction, I think that actually most of you can actually chat during the meeting. Hopefully, we get this squared away here in a moment. Leslie, are you ready?

VINCENT: Yes, thanks. So this is a recommendation that the University Senate approved the establishment of a new University Scholars Program, BA/BS Political Science in the Department of Political Science in the College of Arts and Sciences. And MPA Public Administration in the Martin School of Public Administration within the Graduate School.

The proposed USP program provides a pathway for high achieving undergraduates in the BS/BA Political Science Program to start taking graduate-level courses during their senior year of study, that will count towards the requirements of the MPA in Public Administration. This USP was designed in response to the high demand from employers, especially government agencies, for employees with experience

analyzing policy data, crafting political communication, understanding policy processes, and public finance. The proposed curriculum would allow for up to nine hours of credit to count toward both degree programs, and students are able to complete their graduate studies in less time.

CRAMER: All right, so we have a motion from the committee. Are there any questions of fact related to this motion? If so, use the "raise-hand" feature in your Zoom.

All right. I do not see any -- oh, actually I do. Oh, no, I do not. All right. I do not see any questions. We have a motion from the committee that the Senate approved the establishment of the USP. Is there any debate on this motion? If so you the "raise-hand" feature to debate.

All right. Seeing no debate here, we'll try Poll Everywhere again. We'll go through it a little slowly and give you a chance to try to get your votes in.

So this is the text of the motion that we're voting on. I haven't opened the poll yet. So if you can't vote yet, that's because I haven't opened the poll yet. I'm getting -- oh, actually apparently it is open and you're voting, keep voting, you're doing well. Vote just like it says.

All right. The vote numbers have stabilized. I think there's a good suggestion in the chat -- I'm going to go and lock the votes here.

There's a good suggestion in the chat that could folks who can't get Poll Everywhere working, go to. Maybe if this meeting runs a little short, maybe we'll spend a little time screen-sharing and making sure everybody gets on the same page about Poll Everywhere. I don't -- if there's anything that you feel is very controversial, we need to do like vote by hand or something like that, maybe make a motion to that effect when we're debating, but otherwise, I'm going to keep moving with Poll Everywhere. And if we have time towards the end of people want to remain on the line, I can maybe spend some time trying to do some tech support.

All right. So the results then are here, that motion passes.

All right. The next item on the agenda is a report from the Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee. Greg, are you ready?

HALL: Yes, I am, Aaron.

CRAMER: Go ahead, Greg.

HALL: Sure. The first proposal is a proposal from the College of Engineering. It's a name change, and let's see. The proposal was to change the name of the Department of Mechanical Engineering to the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. The department has recently been approved to add BS/MS and Ph.D. programs in Aerospace Engineering. BMS and Ph.D. programs have begun effective Fall '21,

and already have students enrolled. The new BS program will begin in Fall '22 with both a freshmen and a sophomore class.

Students that are currently freshmen in the College of Engineering, which has a common curriculum for all majors, will be permitted to select Aerospace Engineering as their major and enter as sophomores to Fall '22. A new incoming class of freshmen is also being recruited this year for Fall '22. And the department will seek its ABET accreditation for the program at the earliest permitted date.

The impetus for the proposed change since the department will now offer two separate accredited major undergraduate degree programs. The new name will -- is intended to better reflect offerings to students. In all departments in the College of Engineering with multiple major degree programs have such names reflecting both degrees. And this is also common to other universities nationwide that offer Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering in one department.

Let's see, [inaudible 00:30:05]. There are no anticipated department organization or leadership changes as a result of the proposal. And faculty and staff organization within the department are not being changed as a result of the proposal. And the SAOSC approved -- endorsed this proposal.

CRAMER:

All right. So we have a motion from the committee that the Senate endorse the proposed name change from the Department of Mechanical Engineering to the Department of Mechanical and

Aerospace Engineering. Are there any questions of fact about this proposal for Greg perhaps to answer?

All right. Seeing none, we have a motion from the committee. Is there any debate on this motion? Now would be a time where if you really thought we needed to vote a different way for the rest of the meeting, because of some of the issues people are having with Poll Everywhere. Now might be a time to move that we do that.

Okay. Seeing no debate, then we'll proceed. This question is now open. This is the motion that we're voting on. Got a few more votes than last time, so I feel like that means people are figuring out Poll Everywhere. Very good. I'm going to stop the voting now. And that motion passes. So the Senate has endorsed this name change, which would go before the Board of Trustees. Thank you, Greg.

HALL: Okay. The next proposal is the proposal for closure of the MA Program in Middle School Education. This program has not had students in over a decade and the courses -- yes, the courses are used by multiple programs and so they'll continue to exist. And so SAOSC proposes approval of this proposal to close the program, MA Middle School Education. Previously, we reviewed a proposal for the closure of the MS, Middle School Education Program.

CRAMER: All right. So we have the motion from the committee, which is acknowledging that such closures typically require an open hearing under Senate Rule 3.3.2.2.2, and acknowledging that we're -- in taking

this action, we would be waiving that requirement. We have the motion from the committee recommend to the Senate that the Senate approve the suspension of admissions and closure of the MA in Middle School Education effective immediately. As Greg mentioned, we previously did this for the MS in middle-school education that came through, I think, at the last part of 2021.

Are there any questions of fact for Greg about this proposal?

All right. Seeing none, we have a motion from the committee to approve suspension of admissions and closure of this program. Is there any debate on this motion?

All right, then we will move forward.

And voting on this motion is now open.

All right, I'm going to close voting now.

And that motion passes.

HALL:

Okay. This final proposal is a proposed name change and a consolidation of educational units. And the proposal is that the Department of Preventive Medicine and Environmental Health has just two tenure-eligible title series faculty members. One tenure special title series associate professor, and one regular title series tenure earning assistant professor.

In the Fall of 2019, the college conducted an external evaluation of the department, PMEH, to determine how to move the small department toward excellence. Viewers -- reviewers noted that the department required a minimum of 10 new faculty and an externally recruited chair to be a viable standalone department.

Since the college does not currently have the resources to hire this number of faculty **team**. The college explored alternative administrative structures that would maintain visibility for one -- or one of our essential disciplines namely "environmental health". And so the -- this proposal then -- under this proposal, the current newly hired assistant professors would have access to senior faculty for mentorship and support towards promotion tenure.

New faculty would continue to contribute to [unintelligible 00:36:58] and undergraduate training programs. An additional faculty would serve on capstones and future MS thesis research projects, as our faculty already serving at our over extended. Server's roles would be shared there by reducing committee burdens on faculty.

And so the SEOSC after reviewing this proposal endorse and recommends an endorsement by the Senate.

CRAMER: All right. So we have a motion from the committee to endorse the proposed consolidation of the Departments of Epidemiology and of Preventative Medicine and Environmental Health into a single Department of Epidemiology and Environmental Health within the

College of Public Health. Are there questions of fact related to this proposal? Eric?

BLALOCK: Hi, Eric Blalock, College of Medicine. Does the shift impact the trajectory for the tenure clock of the assistant professor?

CRAMER: Greg, do you have any knowledge of the answer to that question?

HALL: That particular one I do not.

CRAMER: Okay.

HAYNES: This is Erin Haynes and I am on the line [inaudible 00:38:35].

CRAMER: Yes, Erin, please.

HAYNES: I'm currently the chair of both of the departments and I'm continuing to work with that faculty member and she's maintaining her clock. We're seeking -- you know, she's up this year, so we're working forward -- moving forward ahead with --

BLALOCK: Great, thanks.

CRAMER: Sandra?

BASTIN: Sandra Bastin, College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. This is just so that I'll understand. So this -- will we have to go back and eventually clean up the books by getting rid of the department that is consolidating, or does that all happen with this motion?

CRAMER: So this motion should have the -- well, not by our final action alone, but by the Board of Trustees' final action on this proposal would have the effect of creating one unit with the academic homes of the faculty members and curriculum in that combined department.

BASTIN: Okay, thank you.

CRAMER: All right. Any other questions of fact about this proposal?

Okay. We have a motion from the committee to endorse this proposal.

Is there any debate on this motion?

Okay. Seeing none, I think this is the last item we're voting on today.

So you've been disenfranchised. I'm very sorry, but we'll get this figured out after the meeting.

All right, I'm going to close the voting. Well, hang on. I was waiting on two more votes and then they just came in. All right. Now I'm going to close the voting.

And that motion passes. So this item will go on to the Board of Trustees for final consideration. Thank you, Greg.

The next item on the agenda is Senate input on a facilities-related survey from the Senate Academic Facilities Committee. Mark, are you ready to describe a little bit what you're planning on doing, and then we can have some discussion and help steer you guys?

MARK: Sure. Can you hear me?

CRAMER: Yes.

MARK: Okay. So last, I guess it was last October we met -- of the previous year we met too. I met with Mary Vosevich, who's the head of the -- she's sort of the Director of Planning Facilities. And we were talking about our previous survey that we concluded and wrapped up and presented. And she asked if there was anything that you all had in addition to that, that you wanted to get us -- give us some input. We want to hear your input. That's what Mary asked for.

So thinking about that, I had emailed her again and asked her if she had a survey, like a survey that we could put together that she was familiar with that would help her give her some input and feedback from faculty senate. And so I presented that to our committee two weeks ago, and they liked everything and it was a survey instrument that had been put together, you know, before I think the last time it had been used is -- was 2006, and it's pretty standard stuff that it asks questions like, "Do you -- could you comment on things like the alarm system functions of the building that you're at? The sidewalks going into the building that you're in? The electrical system that --" it's pretty detailed, there's about 24 questions that really have to do with the physical environment, and so we kind of thought that it was a good place to start with a survey.

We met and kind of talked about it. I think the only additional comments that were made by members of our committee was it -- maybe we had something at the end, like if the last question which would just be an open-ended question for those to just give ideas about facilities or things that were concerning about facilities or their facilities, and then they would have their name on survey, so it would identify the building, it would identify the person who's doing the survey, and that way, if we -- if all of us did it, it really wouldn't take that long, we would get a lot of information back to Mary's team. And it could also give us something that we could discuss amongst ourselves to find maybe things that we could improve on. So that's kind of where we are. I was going to present it, I think, to Senate Council on the 28th next Monday to get some recommendation from them.

So Aaron, is that all you were asking -- you were anticipating?

CRAMER: Yeah, I think now it's a good time for Senate -- senators to give some feedback since we're here, we're at this venue. I think things got a little out of sync at the last Senate Council meeting and so we're having this conversation in the Senate a little bit earlier than we normally would, but this is a good time for this conversation, so.

MARK: Okay.

CRAMER: So I'm going to call on people that raise their hands and hear what input they have on the survey. Ken?

TROSKE: Yeah. Can you -- if you can hear me okay, this is Ken Troske from the College of Business and Economics. Sort of -- kind of somewhat related to this, but maybe not exactly. I became aware that disability services, which used to be located in a central part of campus next to the Student Center has been moved to a building, I think that near -- sort of close to the hospital, sort of outside the center part of campus.

In the building, I have went over there several times to collect exams of students who had to go over there to **teach**, in a building that didn't really seem well set up for students with disabilities, it wasn't the friendliest building in the world to use. And I guess there's nothing in the survey that would allow us to say, "Hey, are we planning on moving disability services back to Frazee Hall. Frazee Hall when the renovations have been finished, why hasn't it been located in the new expanded Student Center where the disability services have an office? My understanding is that's not the plan.

I would think that we would want offices designed to help students with, you know, disability services offices to be as conveniently located on our campus as possible. And it doesn't seem like that's what has happened here. So, thank you.

CRAMER: Okay, Ken. Yeah, I mean, this might be -- I'm not sure if that's input that Mark O'Brien can easily take back, but it's certainly something I'm going to jot down and at least look into it a little bit. Richard?

CHARNIGO: Hi, Richard Charnigo, Public Health. A couple of things. I was just looking at the survey PDF quickly. Maybe I missed it, but I didn't see anything about maintenance of clocks, clocks being on time, that's an issue. And my building one clock doesn't move at all, another clock is three minutes ahead. There is an issue -- there's an item about whiteboards and chalkboards. There are probably multiple components to that, you know, the whiteboard or chalkboard itself may be fine, but if there's not an adequate supply of markers or chalk, I don't know whose responsibility that is or whether that should be captured in the survey.

So the other thing is with the pandemic receding we hope, it may not be as much of a consideration as it was before, but the question, "Are there adequate provisions for a hand sanitizer available? Are the hand sanitizers maintained?" That may be good, you know, just in a regular flu season, even if the pandemic were no longer a consideration.

Thank you.

CRAMER: Thank you, Richard. The clock that doesn't move at all is right twice a day, but the one that's always three minutes ahead is never right. Akiko?

TAKENAKA: Akiko Takenaka, Arts and Sciences. I have two quick comments which may be adjacent and not directly related. But I'm thinking about accessibility. Accessibility in many of the buildings is really horrible. And I wonder if -- I don't know who is in charge of that, but somebody

should, you know, look at, especially the older buildings and see what's up with that. I have a colleague who's wheelchair-bound and she has to [inaudible 00:48:44], go down to the second floor to use the facilities and so on and so forth.

The other is, early days of the pandemic, there was always like a phone number next to the podium for tech support that I could call if something went wrong, which was really nice. And maybe it's just the building that I'm in. I'm teaching in a law school building right now, which is really nice, but I've been having a lot of technical issues, and there are no phone numbers and I had to find it out and I think it should be labeled next to the computer in every single classroom. Thank you.

CRAMER: Thank you, Akiko. Let's see. Cagle?

CAGLE: Hi, Cagle, Arts, and Sciences. I was thinking about the survey design. So two thoughts on that. One is that the move from the building to campus grounds on sidewalks. It's not clear if -- like if I'm imagining taking the survey if that means campus grounds and sidewalks specifically around that building or just in general. So, and I don't know what the intention there is, so I'm looking specifically at items 2021, because I would answer that very differently depending on the part of campus I'm thinking about.

And then similarly I wonder about the Likert scale approach for something like classroom spaces or HVAC where it's variable across

buildings. So, I mean, even Akiko's example, if you wanted to build something in about accessibility, it depends on the floor that you're in, my office is in POT and some floors have HVAC challenges, the other floors don't, so I don't know if it would be too much on the data end to have like open-ended response option of like, would you like to explain your response? That might be more data than you want to collect, but just from a survey design perspective that might let you see where answers are falling through the cracks.

MARK: Okay.

CAGLE: Thank you for doing this by the way.

MARK: Thank you, yeah.

CRAMER: Mark, can you clarify? This will be a survey that you would intend to administer to senators?

MARK: I think that's what we talked about, because I think you want it -- you thought that it needed stay within senators, you know, this within us, that we could take it and then maybe get feedback from our own faculty and then give, you know, instead of an instrument that goes out to all the faculty that would just be within this group; isn't that right? I mean, it doesn't matter. I don't think from the point of view of data collection might be more thorough, more data if we sent it out across campus, but I think we were kind of limited to just the Senate; right, Aaron?

CRAMER: I think that's what was done last time. I think it was at a couple of chairs ago [inaudible 00:51:52], right? Yeah, I think. Well, that's a question perhaps some of the senators can weigh in on too. Hank?

DIETZ: Yeah. Henry Dietz, Engineering. So this form is saying, "State the name of the building you're rating." If it's going to senators, there's more than one building that we're associated with. So would we then fill out multiple copies of the form or how would you envision that working?

And I think the other question is to -- you know, some of the things, for example, I'm in the Marksbury Building, and in the Marksbury Building, we don't have problems with the heating and air conditioning other than the fact that it's not controlled by us. So I'm not sure that that really fits into the functioning properly category. So I think it would be useful to have one extra kind of catchall open response at the end of the questionnaire.

MARK: Yeah. Good point. I think that's what our plan was to leave something at the end there where you could write in; concerns that you have, issues that you have, because in our committee we discussed lots of things like who collects data, energy use in the building, and who controls the building's energy use, and how is that introduced, being communicated back to us so that we can be smarter in how we turn off, turn on rooms and control that.

And there are a lot of implications to that, and I'm not sure that we are able to fully turn that over to just manual controls you have to -- I mean, some buildings are very petty use on one end. Maybe one part of the building is air-conditioned where the other part of the building is heated. You know, given the size of the building, there's a lot of complexities to it. But we wanted to do something that would give her some feedback. And I think keeping the -- a category at the end, or like a question at the end, an open-ended response, I think would be really useful.

CRAMER: Other thoughts? Can -- Richard, Cagle I see your hands up, but Cagle, you maybe put yours back up.

All right. I'm going to call Tad first and then Cagle. Tad?

MUTERSBAUGH: Oh, hi. Tad Mutersbaugh, Arts and Sciences. Yeah, you know, we do in my one of my classes that we do analyses of buildings every year, and one of the things we look at is to have students figure out if, you know, if you arrived in a wheelchair van to go to a classroom in a particular building, what does that entire -- how do you trace that entire route? Sometimes there isn't a spot nearby, sometimes their spots are full of cars without stickers on them, sometimes the parking lots have potholes in one case it was right in front of the wheelchair ramp, sometimes the snow isn't cleared off the wheelchair ramp you get to the building. You know there are door pull devices that

measure like how much pounds of pressure it takes to open a door, how accessible are -- you know, so, I mean, I like -- I mean, I'm glad that you're doing this, this is great. But it would be good if there were some systematic approach to ask, "what is the entire process? How long would it take a student or a professor to actually get to their classroom if, you know, for various levels of disability some of the libraries don't have, you know --" anyway, there are many, many -- there's a whole list of things that should be done from each -- to make each building accessible, and it would be nice if there were a more systematic look at, for each building on campus, maybe hierarchically done so that the most important ones would get some attention first. Thank you.

MARK: Thanks.

CRAMER: Cagle?

CAGLE: Cagle, Arts, and Sciences. So with that clarification about the relatively limited pool of respondents, I don't know that it would be too much work to -- literally for all of the questions, four through 23, just have an open text box, like, you know, and just clearly mark it as optional, like opportunity to explain your answer. In my experience running survey studies, which I'm not sure if you've done, but the most people skip those, but then you get, you know, those explanations

when people do have something. And if it's not going out to the full campus community, that wouldn't be like, crazy, overwhelming.

The other thing I wanted to mention is on the accessibility front, it's not just about mobility questions, although that's a big part of it. And, you know, wheelchair users is a big part. Also, other sort of mobility devices. Like I would love a chance to tell somebody, "Please stop scheduling classes in the ROTC Building, because I've had to move classes because like a student broke a leg during the middle of the semester and there's no elevator in that building," so that kind of thing.

But it sounds like this is more about like facilities upkeep and such, so I think Tad's point about things like potholes, you know, that might cause problems for accessibility, but in addition to mobility-based disabilities there's issues like, "Is the lighting adequate?" One of the things that I would love to be able to do is actually have better controls over lighting in my classroom, so that I can control the lights when I'm trying to project something. It's really hard to see if you can't turn off just part of the lights, which is an accessibility issue too for people with very old eyes like mine.

So the open-ended box sounds great, but it might be worth just putting a small open-ended on each question if you're only looking at 100 odd responses.

MARK: Good idea.

CRAMER: Shannon?

OLTMANN: Shannon Oltmann, College of Communication and Information. I wanted to just revisit the decision to -- maybe not revisit, but get more information about the decision to share it only with college senators. In my opinion, college senators are not necessarily a representative sample of faculty as a whole. And, I mean, I can think like in my college we have I think four, five senators, and we're all concentrated in two of the eight buildings that our college's spread across. So you're not going to get a very thorough representative answer. And I think this also goes to the earlier question about what if a college is in multiple buildings or people use multiple buildings. So I just -- I would encourage getting more feedback from more people I guess.

CRAMER: Okay. So I would say that I work for you guys. If she wanted to go out to everyone. I have an email button I can click that does that, but I think that's for you guys to decide how you want the survey distributed. Richard?

CHARNIGO: Richard Charnigo, Public Health. I acknowledge the comments of both Cagle and Shannon. In one case to request more opportunity for free text response, and in the other case to request a wider distribution of the survey. I'm not sure if those two suggestions are compatible with each other, but it could be possible, and maybe this is getting unwieldy, but I'll just put it out for people to consider. Could be possible to have two versions of the survey: One survey that goes to

everyone that's short, fairly cut, and dried, maybe with a free-response at the end. And then another more detailed survey that would be directed to the senators with a lot of free response opportunities. Just a thought, just an idea. Thank you.

CRAMER: Cagle?

CAGLE: Okay. Cagle, Arts, and Sciences. Sorry, I keep jumping in. But if that's the case what Richard was just suggesting, and I don't know the history of this survey, so forgive me if I'm way out of left field, but this is the kind of research that I do. So I do a lot of engaged research, I'm in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies, and I'm working for example, with UK recycling, which is in facilities and under Mary's auspices also. And my experience working with facilities is that they're keen to connect with researchers. And so not for this version, but if this is something that we're doing regularly, I mean, this would be a great actual research project that someone could publish on. And like that would actually help facilities out in terms of having someone with analytic skills who could handle a larger volume of data, right? Like even if it went out to everybody and even if there was an open-ended text box with only 25 short items that are otherwise Likert scale, that's a pretty easy lift analytically. I just -- I felt like I would be remiss if I didn't mention the opportunity for collaboration with the research mission of the university, which is something I know facilities is interested in from my own experience, at least at some point in the future.

CRAMER: Rae?

GOODWIN: Rae Goodwin, College of Fine Arts. I appreciate the comments of my colleagues prior -- to get in the weeds a little bit. In our current buildings, we have security systems, we have auto door openers, and another thing that it dismissing is flooring. And I think flooring actually makes a huge difference if it -- if a floor is torn up or in damaged or in need of repair. So if you could add those to the survey, that would be very helpful.

CRAMER: Ken?

TROSKE: Yeah. Ken Troske, B&E. So just -- I don't disagree with anything that anyone has said, but maybe a little -- my experience. I was the Associate Dean and so overseeing the renovation of the Gatton College of Business and Economics number of years ago, and worked closely with PPD and the folks over there during that process, along with faculty to try to get things designed. I will say in my opinion, facilities has not been very good at communicating to faculty about how business -- buildings operate, and how they work in the systems that they've designed, and changes that they've made into those systems.

And so I guess I'm concerned that a survey like this are going to go to people who don't understand the -- a lot of what's set up already. So for example, you have the ability to adjust your thermostat, but it's a very limited ability. There's a set point that BPD sets and you can

adjust to three degrees above and three degrees below that set point, but after that, you're not getting anything.

Sometimes there are shared thermostats. There are sensors in a lots of buildings, that sense the number of people in there. If they don't click off more than 10 people are occupying the space of the building, then it goes back to being an unoccupied state. There are a lot of these things that they set up they've changed that point to -- they brought in a company that then advised them on saving energy, and so they changed set points and buildings without sort of -- there was an email that went out, but most people, I don't think read it very carefully or maybe didn't understand what they were saying.

Regardless, there's a lot of details about how these buildings are administrated by facilities management, but I think it would be helpful for facilities management, just to do a better job of communicating with people who occupied the buildings about things that they're doing. Because my own experience, you know, I know a lot of people over there from my work over there, I can contact them and say, "What's going on?" And -- but I don't think most people -- there just isn't a lot of communication. So maybe one of the things that would be useful before survey went out would be for Mary to work on basically communication about what facilities management is trying to accomplish in administering these buildings and limitations that there are based on the age of the building and things like that.

There's a phone number next to every podium in the Gatton Building, but that's because our IT Department makes sure there is, and they manage our system. Don't know why it lost -- losing --doing something similar, but that's not -- that maybe facilities can affect that, but I'm not sure. So I do think that there's a large amount of room for facilities management to do a better job, communicating with people on campus about how our buildings are being -- our facilities are being managed. And I think that would improve the quality of responses in any survey.

MARK: Good point, Ken.

CRAMER: All right. Mark, I think it's a good amount of feedback. You know, we're going to discuss this again at Senate Council next week. So, you know, by then we can get probably the weeds a little bit about how it gets distributed and so forth and the scale --

MARK: Sounds good.

CRAMER: -- hopefully, this has been helpful to the committee --

MARK: It has, thank you all. I just want to make one thing clear that the decision to just limit it to faculty Senate was really -- it was really a decision based on what I assumed that we could only go to our Senate Council. Initially, I thought it would be a good thing to send out to everyone, so I'm really open to that. I think it'd be a good idea. The more feedback we can get about all the buildings, the better, so there it is. So we can talk about it next week at Senate Council.

CRAMER: Sounds good.

MARK: Thanks Aaron.

CRAMER: All right, the next item on the agenda -- we're almost like exactly on time, so this is very good. Is some discussion from the VPR on the Scholars@UK platform. Lisa and Baron are you --? I saw both of you a minute ago are you ready to --?

CASSIS: Yeah, we're ready. And could I sha -- thank you.

CRAMER: Yeah. Are you going to share your screen, Lisa?

CASSIS: I am. So far I'm disabled, so.

CRAMER: One second. Sorry. Hang on. One moment. I think you should be set now.

CASSIS: Yeah, thank you. Let me pull this up, I want to begin by thanking Chair Cramer and all of the senators for what I hope will be -- let's see if I can get this to -- are you seeing two screens?

CRAMER: Yes.

CASSIS: Okay. Now, okay?

CRAMER: Looks right now.

CASSIS:

Okay. So I hope we'll be -- some information for you on Scholars@UK. I'm going to talk like a newspaper reporter today. "What, why, who, and how" even though I'm not a good newspaper reporter, to try to describe what we're trying to do here. So Scholars@UK is a commercial platform that we have a site license to, it illustrates -- and its whole purpose is to illustrate you as researchers and these little outputs over here, and I'll show you my page.

So in terms of the "what", what it does is it pulls data from many different sources, and I'm going to share with you some of those sources and you'll have these slides to review, and it gives you an output of the scholar. So that's why we went down this direction.

"What does it pull? What are its data sources?" It has automatic data feeds from our internal HR data, meaning the faculty database, our ASP database, and then Scopus as well. And then there are automatic data feeds requiring the researcher to enable certain things, so that their outputs can be visualized, but there's can be a lag, so be patient with us, as you play and look at your own page, which is what I'm hoping you will do if you've not done already.

I'm not going to talk about these data on the slides, I just wanted you to have where all it is pulling from, outside of UK, so that you could see some of the sources of where this program will pull to visualize you as a UK research scholar.

Now, and also along the "what" lines, we can't pull from everything. So things that cannot be automated, that are some discipline-specific databases that don't have a relationship with Elsevier, and then especially we cannot pull from our internal pilot funding, however, faculty can themselves add into the scholar's page their funding from internal sources if they would like to. And researchers can also manually add content to their templates in these areas.

All right. On to the "why" which is probably the most important reason I wanted to have time with you as our senators today. So why are we doing this? We are doing this because we wanted a standardized automated way to profile you as researchers. We wanted to profile you, so we could promote research internally, and importantly, externally. External -- anyone external can access Scholars@UK, if -- once it goes up and visualize your scholar page.

We wanted to highlight the research of our faculty for international visibility and I'll show you how I can do some of that. Now, what did we not do it for? We did not do it with any intention that it be a mode of performance review or evaluation, it's not set up to replace digital measures, and we did not go about this to add burden to your already busy lives as faculty at UK. We had no intention to do that. What we were hoping is because it is an automated program that beyond the initial setup, your workload would not be extensive. Who is it for?

It's for the pages are for all full-time regular title series, research title series, and tenure, tenure-eligible faculty. Any faculty or staff that is listed as PI or co-investigator on an electronic internal approval form and therefore has sponsored research. And as we have visited your college leadership, they have told us whether they would like additional faculty or others in their college to have a page and we tried to accommodate those requests as much as we can.

Okay. Now I'm going to stop sharing here and show you, my page; okay? I'm going to first show you the university page real quickly, and then I'll show you mine, so you can see what one looks like. Hold on a minute. How to find the thing. Okay, here we go. So this is the UK overall Scholars@UK page. You can see that it shows the units, it will show each college, centers, and institutes, it also shows our research priority areas as groupings. It will go down to you at the level of a faculty researcher. It will illustrate grants and contracts, other outputs, and we will be adding to it an honorifics database that we've now created here at UK to highlight the awards of research-related awards and others of our faculty.

This is one example of the power of this program. These are either grants or publications of our faculty within the United States and all over the world. You can drill down on any of these bubbles, and it will tell you for example, who we are collaborating with in Pakistan and what is the collaboration.

It also has some nice nifty tools. I'm going to move over if I can, to my own page. So I've taken a few minutes and created my own page, personalized. I wasn't too painful, but I'll be happy to hear if it is for you or not. There's my picture. I shoved an old picture in there of me that looks better than I do now. It will tell you all of my outputs in publications. I think I need to go to my home. Sorry. I'm not very good at showing you this. I wanted to show you a few things that this thing will do. It will -- I'm on the wrong page for you.

Well, I think that's me. So, oops. Well, this just isn't working. What it will do is it will show you who I am. I think I just have to click it here maybe, there you go. You can take this stuff off. If you don't want it to show your h-index or citations, whatever you can. I've talked about my research interests, my education, and background, I've loaded that in there. It fingerprinted me and it got incredibly close to what I actually do. It networks me in showing where I'm collaborating, and it has these cool other network tools. Here's an example. It shows all the people within UK or outside that I am collaborating with. I see some senators there, so it's really a cool tool. It shows my grants and contracts. You can click down into each grant and see what the abstract is, and of course, it shows my research outputs in terms of publications and citations, including Altmetrics around, and takes you straight to the paper. So you can visualize the paper.

I hope, and I intended as did Baron, who's been instrumental and setting all of this up, that this would be a great resource for our faculty

to promote their research internally, find people, and specifically have people find them. And I wanted to come to you today to hear about it, and whether you've tried to do your page or whether you've even heard about this, and we're happy to take your questions, appreciate your time.

CRAMER: Thank you, Lisa. With respect to our colleagues in CNI. I think you will be a fine newspaper reporter. The "who, what, where" and so forth went smoothly. Do we have questions, I think, our comments about the Scholars@UK platform? Jurgen?

CASSIS: I think you're muted, Jurgen.

ROHR: Jurgen Rohr, College of Pharmacy. Yeah, I'm on that page right now, and I try to get my own, I don't know how to do it. I see this **data part of hex, get excess data, put it**. So which one do I press?

CASSIS: Well, the one thing I did not do in my presentation, but it sends slides, is share with you the help sessions. Baron who is on this with me today is running help sessions you can join in, that will be going on all through the summer, and we can help you figure out how to get everything set up the way you want it on your own page. Baron, do you have any comments on Jurgen's, Dr. Ward's questions?

WOLF: Yeah. So if you're trying to go to your profile to make edits or changes, the log-in link is all the way at the very bottom of the screen. So scroll down to the bottom of the portal. There's a little link saying

"log into pure", we can't control the size or location of that, but that's -- if you find that -- and you should be able to use your linkblue credentials, so it's not a special password, just use linkblue and you should be able to log in.

ROHR: Alright.

CASSIS: Your colleges should have received a series of instructions, that we hoped was disseminated to the faculty that gives you pretty specific instructions on how to personalize your own page. Honestly, Dr. Ward, that's how I did it. I followed those directions.

ROHR: All right. Thank you, Lisa.

CRAMER: So that would have come from like an ADR or perhaps a department chair in the colleges?

CASSIS: Yes, it should. If not, Aaron, we can send it to you. If you'd like to distribute to the senators, we'd be happy to.

CRAMER: If you have a message like that, I can set out to the Senate, Lisa that's -
- that'd be fine.

CASSIS: We will do so. We will.

CRAMER: Cagle?

CAGLE: Cagle, Arts, and sciences. Thank you for setting this up. I see the promise. And we did in fact get the instructions through our department chair. I did want to ask about the tension between two things on the slides that you just presented, Lisa, which are, on the one hand, noting that the automated aspect is way, way, way, underpowered for arts and humanities. And also hoping that it's not a burden on faculty to do this and get the most out of it because once you do the auto setup, it'll be automated, but it sounds like there's a group of faculty for whom this tool is only beneficial if they put a lot more time in it than others. So do you have any plans to address that inequity of the benefit of this tool?

CASSIS: Yeah, I'm going to give just a comment and then see Baron because I know he's been working on this extensively. We understand Dr. Cagle, this is something that we -- yes, we have struggled with. It is powerful, but it -- we knew right away that it would be more work to highlight the humanities in other areas.

So, but what we did want to do, we even thought about opting in and opting out. And honestly, we did not go that path because we wanted it to highlight all of the breadth of UK. And we felt as if only certain colleges were illustrated through the platform, that that might send the wrong message or even disadvantage our faculty in those colleges. So Baron, could you want to speak to how you've been trying to address some of those issues?

WOLF: Sure. There's a couple things that have already happened for integration. So a lot of the automatic integrations that we do on the scholarly output side is what Elsevier has partnered with those databases or those other third-party entities.

What we have been able to do is they did set up a special digital commons integration with our UK knowledge database. And now -- so UK has been a leader in that space. And so now anyone using globally digital commons as their data -- their repository for output now have this ability to integrate. So if you are a researcher that puts things in UK knowledge, that is an integration that is automatic, so hopefully, that helps some groups. The College of Law specifically uses that quite a bit, so that helped them.

The others are things like we are working on integrating with digital measures, as best as we can. We have created some -- we've encountered some roadblocks because of data quality. So digital measures is a performance management tool and it is an internal tool. So what we found were a lot of content where incomplete sentences, punctuation wasn't there because it simply was the report output to internal audiences and that didn't really matter. And so if we automatically integrate those data to a public site, we then have some really bad data quality issues. So we've kind of slowed that down, but are still trying to work on that.

The other is we are working on some other databases that the libraries have, Ex Libris and Primo, and those are our scholarly activity databases that do contain a lot more of arts and humanities. The problem is, is being able to identify a researcher that has content there, and knowing it that that's the Dr. Lisa Cassis here at UK versus someone's elsewhere. So we're working on those.

The other is if you have another page like Google Scholar, so if you maintain your Google Scholar account and really have that curated, you can download a list of output from Google Scholar and automatically upload it via text format or another research IS format like EndNote and so that takes some of that workload off.

So those are some of the strategies around it. I will say that all of the profiles do have a lot of content already based on who you are and the data -- internal data we have, the missing pieces are those internally funded grants that we don't have access to or scholarship that's not in Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, and those things.

CASSIS: Dr. Cagle, we do have a task force that's working on outputs and how to best highlight and illustrate the outputs of research in the humanities and other areas across campus. We're looking forward to how they come to us. You may even be serving on that, but we're looking forward to what they bring to us to help us.

CRAMER: Roger?

BROWN: Roger Brown, College of Ag. I just wanted to clarify. So for people that are faculty members who are not automatically included in this, is there a process for those people to easily have this accessible to them? For instance, there's 216 lecture series faculty members right now who are all experts in teaching and publish in that area, I think. You know, there's a whole lot of clinical, it looks like there's some allowances for that. How is that going to work for those people that want to participate?

CASSIS: Yeah, that's a great question, Dr. Brown. And obviously, as you can understand, we do have a site license for so many profiles. And we discussed this and that's why I think we've been tailoring it to needs of colleges as Baron has gone and worked with their leadership. I'm going to turn that to Baron too and see if he has some inputs.

WOLF: Sure. As Dr. Cassis mentioned, we do pay for the each profile basically. And so what we're paying for in this round of implementation is for those standard-title series, regular faculty ranks that would be considered research as an expectation of their work. And so that is our first round. And so when a new faculty member that is hired as in a tenure track position, or one of those titles series after they're here and put on payroll, they will automatically get a profile. We have it in the system, so that captures new people.

For those individuals, we have gone through your associate deans for research in their leadership team and HR and talked about other

individuals. So we have added clinicians, the College of Ag I believe we do have some added extension faculty that might not have made the original cut and they have been added. But for the most part, I'll be honest, a lot of colleges when they see a lecturer on there, they actually want them removed because they don't fit in those traditional areas. So we have worked with your colleges and we'll continue to do so.

I have had preliminary conversations with some colleges that want all their faculty on there, and we can discuss how that might happen, whether it's they help contribute to those additional profiles, for payment, those kinds of things. It is possible, it's just -- this is where we started.

BROWN: Can you -- can I just ask a follow-up question of clarification?

WOLF: Please.

BROWN: It says, "All full-time tenured eligible faculty" so does that include all special title, all extension title series?

WOLF: It does, as long as they're -- as long as the data in SAP indicates that they're tenure-eligible in a tenure track, then yes. There have been some data quality issues, and this process has actually helped improve the faculty database. People are finding that some of their data is inaccurate and so those are being updated. So it should, yes.

BROWN: Thank you.

CRAMER: Mel?

MEL: Thank you. This is a follow-up question about the humanities scholar's issue. Because the setup of this seems very, very geared toward the sciences and perhaps social sciences, which I understand that you're all dealing with, but I'm wondering about how these profiles look compared to each other across different fields. And you mentioned that you could turn off things like the citation metric at the top, but do we have any ability to change up like the tabs, like collaborations, and grant funding and things like that and add-in, you know, I don't know something like archival work or editorial work or something of that nature. You know, my background is in history. We don't typically co-write articles, or other works unless it's in like an editorial capacity.

WOLF: So while it's not flexible where you can change the times, you can turn some things off, like you mentioned. So for instance, if your collaboration map, you're only collaborating with UK people or US people, you can turn that map off if it's not really robust for you. But in addition to that, editorial work would be considered a research output. There is templates, so in the portal when you add new content, you can add anything from a book to a chapter, to a conference proceeding, to a conference presentation, to all different types of things, even non-- what they call non-textual. So if you are in the performing arts and your research is modern dance, and you did a recital, you can put that on your profile and it -- while it won't have

citations, like scholarly output would, it would be in that same area of as an output of your scholarly work or your expertise. So that is available there for you to be able to do, and we go over a lot of that in trainings, because a lot of people that have to do it manually, they're not seeing their content, and so we go to those templates to show them how they can add it there.

And you can even add documents. So if you want to add the PowerPoint of your conference proceeding or a PDF, if it's allowed, if the copy -- if it's not with a journal that has restrictions and things, and you can put it out there, you can attach that for anyone to be able to access.

CRAMER: Cagle?

CAGLE: Cagle, Arts, and Sciences. That reminded me Mel's question about question I was asked to bring by a colleague, which is, if there is any way to include other relevant information that would be especially helpful for identifying collaborators. So specifically, languages spoken and research sites. So international or national field research sites.

WOLF: So language is spoken. So the more information an individual puts on their profile, the better the search engine is. So the fact that Dr. Cassis put a description of her lab, impacts her fingerprint, and it also impacts anytime anyone, you know, does a search. So for instance, I know Dr. Cassis did a post-doc in Germany. If she had put on her profile, languages spoken English and German, and somebody specifically

kind of did a search for anyone at UK that speaks German, Lisa would come up because she's added that to her profile. So the search engine is as good as the content that's there, and gets more powerful as you add more content.

Now, the question about other research sites or stations, if they're affiliated with it, you know, so if they're an affiliate of something that can be added, you can add external affiliations and things like that. Go ahead.

CAGLE: Can I clarify? So field site would mean like a location that one does research, not necessarily -- that wouldn't necessarily be an institution. Is there any way to map that? So not just listing in the profile, but actually developing maps.

WOLF: Not off the top of my head. I'd have to -- so you would have to have a coauthored publication. If you're doing things in Honduras or something, you'd have to have a coauthor in Honduras for it to show up that you're working in Honduras.

Now, if you add it to your profile, in your section, I'll write a note. We could add a section in that section where Dr. Cassis had a research interest, you can add things like your list of courses that you teach. You can add your graduate students that you mentor. We could add a section that might say, "research sites" or something like that. We can improve it that way for them to be able to have a category to fill out.

CASSIS: Good question.

CAGLE: Thank you.

CRAMER: Akiko?

TAKENAKA: Akiko Takenaka, Arts and Sciences. Another humanities scholar I've been nodding while Cagle and Mel have been talking, and I do have concerns. And I wonder if you could consider maybe offering a workshop for humanities scholars who are interested and not make that a one-directional thing, but perhaps you could take some input from us and perhaps try to accommodate some of them for us. That would be really great.

CASSIS: Well, we have been -- we've reached out to each college and their leadership structure and have been giving a similar presentation. I know Baron has worked with the colleges individually, but if that is something that the different humanities areas with would like, I'm sure Baron and his team can pull that together for you. So Baron, alright?

WOLF: Yeah, sure. We -- yeah. And like I -- like Dr. Cassis mentioned, we do have bi-weekly training sessions. On average, there's about five to seven people that attend those. So we typically go over a high-level overview and then we really get down to the weeds, "What specific questions do you individuals have?" So anyone is welcome to join those and things.

There are some limitations. So for instance, when you talk about two-way communications and changing some things, there's some things that are out of our control that we can't do. So we've turned on as many subscriptions to some of the things like EBSCOhost and different data sources that might not be biomedical only kind of things, so there is always going to be limitations that sure. If you want to do a college-specific training, we'd be more than happy to set that up.

CASSIS: It would be helpful to us if perhaps you Chair Cramer, you could say which areas or departments would like to participate in that, and then we can reach out and follow up.

CRAMER: Certainly. Rae?

GOODWIN: Rae Goodwin, College of Fine Arts. Thank you all for talking about arts in humanity arts. I'm a sculptor and performance artists. So certainly, I'm looking forward to getting in there at the opportunity to have my research be searchable. I'm not looking forward to the amount of copying and pasting I'm going to have to do in this. But I also would like you, Baron, please include the arts -- artists, musicians, et cetera, in these kinds of workshops, because I think it will help you to speak directly with us, about what could be helpful to us and what we would like to have present on this page. So thank you, Dr. Cassis, for trying to make this a smooth transition for us and for highlighting research at UK.

CRAMER: Monica?

UDVARDY: Yeah. So I just want to follow up on Cagle's comment. Monica Udvardy, Arts and Sciences. And it would be best to have our field sites listed. And also, I have a question which is if we are collaborating with people in other countries, but not through research grants, through activities. Can that be put up?

CASSIS: I don't know that it can be mapped, but I think you can add it yourself, but the program is pulling from publications and grants to do the mapping. So that might be a challenge, but you certainly could add information yourself to your platform.

UDVARDY: Okay. Thank you.

CRAMER: All right. I see no more hands. Lisa and Baron, thank you for this. I do know, I guess I've become aware of activities in the BPRS office, perhaps motivated in part by previous discussions with the Senate to try to sort of take a look at how the BPRS office interacts with research in humanities and arts and areas like this. So I'm at least aware of some of these activities happening and -- to the extent that we've helped frame that conversation a little bit with discussions with the VPR here in the Senate. We appreciate that opportunity.

CASSIS: Yeah, you have, I can't tell you how valuable those conversations have been for us as well. And things like developing the research leadership academy, they've been incredibly helpful. So thank you for giving us the time and opportunity.

CRAMER: All right. Give me one second to get my slides back. All right. The next item on the agenda is items from the floor time permitting. It is 4:30 there is time permitting. Bob?

GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, ANS. Of the item about the merger of the two departments in public health -- can you hear me? Okay. The item about the merging of the two departments in public health remind me of something -- a problem that was identified there that I also remember was identifying the colleges of design. And that is if you have a faculty members on the tenure track. This is especially for -- related to people -- assistant professors on the tenure track. It is to make the tenure process work the way it needs to work or the way it should work. It seems like you have to have a certain body of faculty, a certain number of faculty in that department so that the person can get advice from more than one person for one, and then when people write their letters of recommendation, that there's a variety of -- opportunity for a variety of opinions to be solicited about whether that person should obtain tenure.

So you mentioned the one of the departments, which I understand is being merged into a larger department. So it's not -- hopefully, it won't be a problem once the two departments merge. But one of them has mentioned that it had two faculty, one of whom was special title series. The other who was on the tenure track, but hadn't earned tenure yet. And something similar happened in design. There was a -- they wanted to establish a new department in design, but there were only

one or two faculty who would be in that department. And especially if one of the two faculty is chair, it's really hard to know how that person can be fairly evaluated, and how the chair can express the opinion of the faculty of the department when there's no other faculty in that department, but the chair. So maybe it would be appropriate for the Senate -- for some committee of a committee of the Senate to look at the question of how many faculty are needed in a department, for that department to be viable or to have a viable tenure acquiring process.

CRAMER: All right, Bob. I've written that one down. I mean, it's a fair question, right? There has to be -- we have a process for awarding tenure involves faculty in the unit; right? So there have to be faculty in the unit. I'll think about it and probably come up with a proposed place to stick this question. Rae?

GOODWIN: Thank you. Rae Goodwin, College of Fine Arts. I've been asked by my faculty in the School of Art and Visual Studies to bring something forward to see how we can help advance understanding within accounts payable, about our research travel. We have had research travel expenditures been kicked back. They've -- these are expenditures that have been approved by our Associate Dean for Research and yet the affected faculty have been told by accounts payable, this is not research travel and that the expenditures are not valid. And so then we've had these back and forth, not just with one faculty member, but several with accounts payable, it leaves the faculty with a sense of being not trusted, of being demoralized, it's not

necessarily professional exchange all the time. The faculty then have to generate an abundance of documentation, email exchanges go back and forth. And this seems to me like time better-spent teaching or doing research.

So I've been asked to bring this to the Senate for, to see how we can affect positive change in the understanding of arts and perhaps humanities research within accounts payable communications. Any advice you have for us would be wonderful.

CRAMER: Sure. I think that this is something that -- accounts payable doesn't work for the provost, but the provost is here and I think he's here, he's hearing what we're saying. And certainly, this is a conversation I'll follow up with him about, but I think that this is a place where we want the Provost Office to be able to ensure that through advocacy for the academic side of the house, that what we need to do to do our scholarship is feasible within the Scholars@UK. Provost DiPaola, do you have any --?

DIPAOLA: No, I actually wrote that down for the exact reason. I will follow up.

GOODWIN: Thank you.

CRAMER: Eric?

BLALOCK: Hi Eric Blalock, College of Medicine. I have -- I had one thing I wanted to bring up, but I also wanted to second Dr. Grossman's

comments about department size and add that there might also be a maximum department size. As, you know, a single chair, I mean, you can add horsepower with a vice-chair, et cetera, but being able to manage the number of faculty also reaches a top critical mass too, that's something that ought to be paid attention to.

And also, I can second from being on the -- our college's APT Committee that, you know, put you -- put in your CV for traveling and succeeding and talks and things like that, going to meetings is important for promotion. So getting pushed back from accounts for legitimately applied for travel is disheartening.

My comment though was about the situation in the Ukraine. I was hoping we could all solve it here today. I'm kidding. But I really haven't seen much from UK nationally as far as, "How are we reaching out? What are we trying to do?" You know, from my own lab, I'm thinking about, "Can I hire somebody as a technician or a post-doc?" And I did see an article about scientists trying to organize something like this, and I'm going to put the link for it in the chat. But it might not be a bad idea to start looking at what we could do as a university to try and just do a little bit to try and help.

CRAMER: Sure. So there's certainly been a conversation about this since the first days of the war in Ukraine. I don't -- I thought I saw -- I don't want to put her on the spot in case she's not super actively listening, but I did see Sue Roberts who -- in the attendee list who's had some

conversations with some faculty that brought these questions up too, and I if I don't see her hand pop up, we'll just have to follow up with her offline, but -- oh, maybe our hand is -- yes, it is. Okay. I'm going to allow Sue to talk and maybe she can give a little bit of context of what UK's efforts have been so far and --

ROBERTS: Hello, Aaron. Hello everybody?

CRAMER: Yes, we can hear you.

ROBERTS: Okay. Aaron, could you please repeat the question because I heard my name, but I didn't catch the whole question, sorry.

CRAMER: I think it started with the idea that you might solve the problem in Ukraine, but I think it basically was a concern about the situation there, and if there are things at UK that can be done that are positive. Some have mentioned hiring a researcher from there or something along those lines and just anything you can provide that would be helpful in terms of UK and Ukraine.

ROBERTS: Sure. Well, thanks to whoever asked the question, it's --

CRAMER: Right. That was Eric Blalock.

ROBERTS: Okay, Eric. It's on a lot of people's minds I think, so I appreciate it being raised here. The University of Kentucky doesn't have a whole lot of, we don't have any formal partnerships with institutions in Ukraine, for example. We do have obviously folks with families there

and we do have people who have colleagues in Ukraine that they're concerned about and so on. So I have been in touch with those faculty members primarily who have reached out to me about specific situations and I'm happy to respond.

In terms of a kind of general approach, we have been watching what's happening with various groups. There's a group called Scholars at Risk, for example, that seeks to place scholars who are at risk for various reasons. So we're keeping our eye on the visa situation that will determine the status of anybody coming from Ukraine and so on. It's evolving or devolving kind of rapidly, but we're sort of keeping our eye open.

And we're also watching the situation with regards to Russia because the sanctions could have an effect on our ability to interact with Russian entities at some point. So we're keeping an eye on that. I don't know if that exactly addresses the question, but that's what's happening.

CRAMER: Thank you, Sue. I just think it was probably helpful to have some context of where your office sort of saw things right at the moment.

All right. Any other -- I thought I had another hand up, but I don't see it now. Any other items from the floor today?

Okay. So before we adjourn, if you would like to stay on here and try to troubleshoot your Poll Everywhere situation, I will at least stay on

here, we'll turn off the recording, we're in the meeting, but I will stay on here. Feel free to stay on here. We'll try to get you logged into Poll Everywhere, so that you're all set to vote.

All right. So unless I hear objections now we will adjourn. Okay, we're adjourned.