UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

* * * * *

SEPTEMBER 13, 2021

* * * * *

AARON CRAMER, CHAIR

DESHANA COLLETT, VICE CHAIR

SHEILA BROTHERS, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR

KATIE SILVER, STAFF ASSISTANT

* * * * *

1 * * * * * * * *

CRAMER:

1 4

2.5

Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the September University Senate Meeting our first Senate meeting of the academic year. Senate members, please type, if you haven't already, your name and affiliation into the chat box for attendance purposes.

The chat function is only used for attendance, it's not monitored during the meeting. I don't generally see the chat during the meetings, so don't use it to try to get my attention or to try to raise some point. If you need to speak, use the "raise hand" feature. Please mute yourself when not speaking, although Katie is empowered to mute others as needed. And so if you leave your mic open, we'll probably click the mute button for you.

The meeting is being recorded for note-taking purposes. If any member of the Senate is disconnected and can't 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 follow

1 4

2.5

Robert's Rules of Order, newly revised.

There's no voting by proxy. If you're not a member, you cannot vote. Be civil during the meeting. Be a good citizen. Here, that specifically will also mean communicating with your constituents about the activities of the Senate, making sure they're aware of what happens in the space, and also that you're aware of how they would like you to represent them and participate in the meeting.

The participants in this meeting are divided into two categories: Panelists and attendees. Both can participate in the meeting. The voting senators, our panelists, panelists should have received a unique link via email from Katie Silver last week with your Zoom information and are eligible to vote.

Non-voting senators and guests or attendees get the Zoom link from the senate site or from the general email about the meeting and do not vote. If you think you are an attendee who is supposed to be a panelist, if you think you're a voting member of the Senate and yet you're not in here as a

2 4

panelist, you might chat a message specifically to Katie Silver who is able to add you over into the panelist if you're in the wrong set here.

To speak for any reason or otherwise be recognized, including making motions or seconds or to vote, you'll use the "raise hand" button at the bottom of the screen. If you cannot see this, you can click on the three dots beneath it, and then click "raise hand".

The way that we'll do voting in these meetings is the same as last year. I'll state the motion and ask voting members, the panelist wishing to vote in favor, to click the Zoom feature "raise hand." You'll leave your hand up. Don't just click it and then unclick it. Leave your hand up. The vote count will be recorded, and then we'll clear the hands on our end. You don't have to unclick your hand. We'll clear the hands. Then the chair will ask for voting members who wish to vote opposed to raise their hands. And, again, leave those up. We'll record that count and the hands will be

22

23

24

25

cleared. And, finally, I'll ask for any voting members who wish to formally abstain to raise their hands in Zoom again, leaving your hand up. The count will be recorded and the hands will be cleared on our side. It's difficult to note the individual names when they are maybe a hundred plus senators are voting. So we will document those in the minority and those abstaining. These are going to be smaller numbers. If you're not in one of those two sets but you're a voting member present today, you'll be assumed to have voted with the majority. If the vote's perceived to be close, Katie here is prepared to assist with a roll-call vote. And, as always in Senate Meetings, before speaking please remember to state your name and college affiliation. So if I were to raise my hand and some other chair were to call on me, I would say, "Aaron Cramer, College of Engineering," and then I would speak what I was planning to speak. So, please, make sure to do that. That's important in Zoom. Even though your name's on the screen, it helps us understand where

1 4

2 4

2.5

you're coming from on campus, but also when we resume in-person meetings, if we're able to do that, that's an important element of participation in-person meetings for the Senate. So we want to get back in the habit of doing that this year.

The first item on our agenda is from the Chair of the University Senate, President Eli Capilouto.

CAPILOUTO:

Thank you Dr. Cramer, and welcome all of you. Greatly appreciate the opportunity to talk with you this afternoon. I know you have a very crowded agenda, and it reminds me of yeoman's work we turned to our faculty to complete, to keep our university moving forward.

In June when we officially closed out the academic year, I communicated with you and our Board of Trustees that one of my most important commitments and goals for the next year would be to redouble my efforts to communicate and collaborate and partner with you.

All three components of our shared governance are essential in continued progress, and

3

4

5

-

'/

8

9

10

11 12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

2.5

that's participation, our faculty, staff, and students. And I know we all have a responsibility to each other and to those we serve, and who turn to us in hope to honor that shared governance through our commitment to communication, transparency and accountability.

I know from spending most of my adult life in the academy that the most vibrant places, the most vibrant places are ones where ideas are shared and debated freely and frequently and without hesitation and reservation. And I can certainly testify that the University of Kentucky is one of those vibrant places. I like to say I'm the president of about 30-, 40,000 presidents. It's hard for me to go even to the grocery store here without someone telling me how we can do things better or, really, many times thanking me for all the work that all of you do. So while we have much more in front of us, I do want to take the opportunity today to give you an update on a few things. But I want to start with my thanks to the

elected faculty, staff and student leaders,

2.5

their executive teams. As part of our commitment to better communicate, I have met with those groups three times, the Executive Council, in the last few weeks. I know our senior leaders have engaged often with the elected leaders and many others on the campus. And in each one of these meetings those leaders, your leaders, some of whom are on this meeting call today, have provided us with essential feedback and input on the critical challenges that we face. I want to publicly thank three key leaders: Aaron Cramer, who you've heard from already. But, also, Olivia Ellis, who chairs our Staff Senate, and Michael Hawse, who's the president of our Student Government Association. They have been most willing to engage. We are honoring our vision of advancing Kentucky all at the same time facing an unprecedented pandemic. And I know through all of these conversations -- and I hope they will agree -- that our approaches to respond in COVID are better because of our discussions. We have all been better-informed, and I will be forever

-

O

/

O

grateful.

So let me return to some of the accomplishments that I hope you'll take pride in. I certainly do with deep gratitude. And then we'll return to our response to COVID at the end. So on Friday, I announced to the Board of Trustees and communicated wildly that our preliminary Fall 2021 enrollment has reached another record high of 31,800.

That's up 2 percent from the record how we achieved last year.

And though enrollment is, in a large way, a reflection of the outstanding work of our faculty and staff, more people want to come here to learn and grow. I'm most proud of what's happened when our students have arrived. We have been on more than a five-year trajectory of dramatic increases in student persistence as reflected in our retention and graduation rates.

Now, to move these numbers takes painstaking work, and it takes everybody, but I'm proud to share this: The first-to-second-year retention rate is at 86 percent, according to our preliminary numbers. That's up almost 10

./

1 4

2 4

percentage points from the Fall 2006 cohort
that entered in and graduated. If you look
at the 2012 graduation rates, that's the
six-year rates through to fall. But our
preliminary six-year graduation rate has
reached a record of 68 percent -- excuse me.

I think I said 68 percent for retention.

It's 86 percent, but 68 percent up 10
percentage points for a six-year graduation
rate. Keep in mind those are only the first
year, first time fall enrollments not
transferred, but it is a number that is used
across the country to measure students'
success.

Perhaps more remarkable, our four-year graduation rate has climb 23 percentage points from 31 to 54 percent. To put this in further context, if you look at all publicly funded universities in the country, they're only fewer than a hundred that have a six-year graduation rate of higher than 70 percent. So we are on that trajectory. We also experienced an almost 10 percent increase in our graduate and professional students, and those students especially, I

Ю

2 4

think, look to the caliber of faculty in making their choices, so I tip my hat to you in great appreciation.

We are also more diverse. The percentage of underrepresented minorities as defined by the State of Kentucky has grown to 16 percent of our student population. That's up 6 percent in the last year. First-year enrollment has been basically flat. This year, entering students total 4,764 compared to 4,891 last year.

Many universities are facing a demographic cliff, and certainly the pandemic have experienced this. I think we have been pretty robust in responding to those forces. That's certainly an area of more focus as we undertake our strategic plan.

And, lastly, something that will become more important in this country, is our transfer enrollment is up by 13 percent to 997. If you watch some of the federal legislation that could possibly make it through Congress, this opportunity for free education at the community college level is certainly something that is certainly good for our

2 4

country, but could have an impact on the University of Kentucky.

So, to me, the bottom line is this: Although we have much more to do and we're not satisfied, we have made incredible strides in elevating academic excellence in student success while working together to grow a more diverse and inclusive community.

These incredible markers of progress,

especially in light of the pandemic, is why

I'm convinced and remain so positive that the

future is bright for the University of

Kentucky and the Commonwealth we serve.

A little bit about our strategic plan, as I reported to the campus last week, five teams, composed of faculty, staff, students, deans and other administrators have developed draft plans around the five principles that I think should drive our mission of advancing Kentucky.

Those are putting students first, inspiring ingenuity in everything we do, taking care of our people so we can better take care of Kentucky, ensuring greater trust, accountability and transparency, and

3

4

5

6

./

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

empowering the promise embedded in being many people -- we're one of the most diverse communities in Kentucky -- many people, but one community.

So as we develop objectives, tactics and metrics to track our progress, we distributed a first draft to the campus. I appreciate those who have provided us feedback and input, the faculty, staff, and students. We've got groups like the International Center that provided productive and constructive feedback, our Alumni Association did so as well. And, finally, there have been additional reviews about those workgroups or teams set up for the respective principles. We've asked our institutional research area to look carefully at the metrics we are considering to be sure that they can tangibly measure our progress. And last week the provost met with our elected faculty leaders of the Senate Council to receive additional input, especially around matters that relate to curriculum. I'll be reviewing all of that feedback in the coming days with the hopes of distributing

2 4

the second draft of the plan as soon as possible.

And that will provide another opportunity for broad-based feedback. Our goal is certainly to present something to our Board of Trustees at their retreat in October. This is expedited, certainly, but necessary for us to develop a roadmap for future efforts to educate Kentucky. And I appreciate the diverse opinions and perspectives shared across our disciplines. It reflects the richness of this campus, and I encourage you to provide feedback when we distribute the next draft.

Lastly, to talk a little more about our COVID-19 response, I hope you all saw the communication last week in which I shared that our vaccination rate is 81.5 percent.

We have moved roughly 10 percentage points in less than a month. And I encourage all of you to look at our Coronavirus dashboard, because it gives detailed information on the breakdown of vaccination rates across faculty, staff, and students, but we also shared in more detail -- I've seen that

2.5

others have looked at across the country, how we derive and calculate those numbers.

And as we've exceeded that goal of 80 percent in this first month, our work is far from over. We've done all this without employee incentives and introducing disciplinary measures for our mandatory testing program, so I expect more progress. Let me be clear about this: 80 percent is a starting goal. It was never to be the finish line. And so we're going to keep pushing and pushing and pushing until those rates are certainly going to exceed 85 percent, and I hope more than 90 percent.

Targets that have become -- from what we've learned in modeling and so forth -- optimal given the evolution of this virus. We will unveil our employee incentive program for vaccines early this week. The student program already is active, and we have created a new incentive program for student organizations and activities that we'll put into place this week.

We also communicate clearly regarding meaningful and fair disciplinary measures,

10

9

13

12

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

23

2 4

25

and we have more work to do on this. For those who are required to test each week, and those are the individuals who are unvaccinated, those disciplinary measures, I want to tip my hat again to our faculty, staff, and student groups who have provided us valuable input. I think they'll agree, it's not an easy task and we're working hard to be both fair, but at the same time effective in moving our vaccine rates. So I believe this combination of measures, incentives, required testing, disciplinary and compliance steps where necessary, will help us continue on this path in our vaccine rate. So that is a shared goal. We all want as many people vaccinated as possible, and the question is: What is the best process to do this? What is our path to get there? And I know a number of members of our community, including those who are at this meeting, have asked us to consider a vaccine mandate for the entire campus. I want you to know I deeply respect that

I want you to know I deeply respect that request, and I want to encourage continued dialogue and debate, because we all want the

2.5

same thing, the highest vaccination rates possible. I don't have to convince this group, I hope, in terms of my advocacy for vaccines given what we did as a community last year at Kroger Field. Vaccines remain our best weapon against this virus. They offer the best protection against serious illness and hospitalization. They are the best we have in our efforts to return to something more normal.

And although a mandate has many benefits, as

I continue to take in all of the available
information, I believe we have the right
approach at this time to continue increasing
campus vaccination levels. I hope we can all
agree that we share the same goal, even
though we may not always agree on the path to
get there.

So a little bit on why not a vaccine mandate as we did with flu shots for students last year. First, we're making rapid and continued progress. And the numbers are simply undeniable. I believe we can continue that progress with the right leavers of education, incentives, communication, and

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

2 4

25

compliance measures.

Second, vaccines are a deeply polarizing measure, at least vaccine mandates, in what is already a deeply polarized world. National polls show it, and a number of state actions prohibiting mandates underscore. So my interest, like yours, is getting people vaccinated. And I simply believe that using all these tools of education, helping students and others understand that they have urgency, many of them for the first time over their health, for example, can be a more effective path in moving our vaccine levels. And one thing I'll also add. Unlike a vaccine mandate, which if you look at these across the country, you see one vaccine mandate, you've seen another in terms of all their details, unlike a vaccine mandate, in which we must respect exceptions with a universal testing requirement for everyone who comes to our campus and is not vaccinated. There are no exceptions. So the flu-shot mandate that I mentioned earlier, with students last year, is a telling example. Despite all of our pushing

2 4

and prodding and so forth, only about 65

percent of our students received a flu

vaccine. So they're not a guarantee of

compliance, but I believe our current course

of action is working.

I've said from the beginning since we started at this over 18 months ago, if new information or circumstances become available, we will pivot. We have all along, and I'll pledge to you that we would do so. That said, I appreciate the healthy debate and dialogue. They are necessary. They are wanted, and I deeply appreciate the discussions we have had around all of these areas that have meant so much to us, and that we share the same goal. And that is to further improve the success of our students, advance our discoveries and better serve Kentucky.

So thank you for all you do. I hope you're proud of what we've been able to accomplish, especially under these circumstances. And, Aaron, I'm happy to take questions, but I'm going to need you to handle these. I'm not great at the screen and all and observing

1 everyone. So if you don't mind, some assistance. Sure. If you have questions for the 3 CRAMER: president, go ahead and use the "raise hand" feature in Zoom, and then I'll call on you. 5 6 Herman Farrell. 7 FARRELL: Hi, President Capilouto. First off, I hope you had a good summer. I hope you had a chance for rejuvenation and rest. I think we 9 all needed that, and I know you've had a very 10 11 rough year. 12 So my question is about UK HealthCare's It's my understanding that UK 13 mandate: HealthCare mandated vaccines a month or two 1 4 15 ago. I'm curious to know what their numbers are like and if they're up at 90 or 95 16 17 percent? Are their numbers being included in the total dashboard numbers for the total 18 19 number of students and faculty, employees at 20 UK? 21 But more importantly, I'm just wondering if 22 that's perhaps an example of how a vaccine 23 mandate actually does work in a -- actually 24 within our bubble if they did that vaccine mandate and it went up to 90, 95 percent. 2.5

1 And I'm sure you guys have the numbers; isn't that proof that a vaccine mandate works? Can 2 this --3 CAPILOUTO: And so all of those individuals are included in the numbers we report to the campus. I 5 6 would say that not all programs are equal in 7 their timing, and you recognize at UK 8 HealthCare you're mandated to take a vaccine. Exemptions are available for religious and 9 10 medical reasons, and if one receives those 11 exemptions, you're qualified to test weekly. 12 It's very similar to what we're doing on 13 campus. They started theirs at a little different 1 4 15 time, and given everything else they're 16 handling, their mandatory testing doesn't 17 start until September 15th. So it's a little 18 bit of an apple and oranges comparison. I 19 would say we are converging in those numbers. I'm sorry. Just a quick follow-up. Do we 20 FARRELL: 21 know what their numbers are in terms of the 22 total? 23 CAPILOUTO: I do not know that off the top of my head, 24 but I think, Herman, our campus is starting 2.5 to align like this. But keep in mind, that's

/

2 4

a different population, you know. I mean, but I think if you look around the country, Herman, at universities who have instituted mandates, you're seeing success as low as in the 60 or 70 percent, and most are in that 80 percent range.

CRAMER: Laura Fanucchi.

FANUCCHI:

Hi. Thank you, President Capilouto. This is
Laura Fanucchi from the College of Medicine.

We are hoping for some clarification also
related to the UK HealthCare vaccine mandate.

So we have a number of research, faculty, and
staff that conduct in-person research in the

UK HealthCare facilities. All of the
guidance that has come out from UK HealthCare
about the vaccine mandates includes people
that are not necessarily UK HealthCare
employees, but that are working in UK

HealthCare facilities.

We've been trying to seek guidance from HR, from the College of Medicine in particular, and we are left still unclear on how we advise our research faculty and staff, because their designation is technically campus, not UK HealthCare.

1	CAPILOUTO:	Laura, thank you for your question. I'm
2		going to have Vice President for Research,
3		Lisa Cassis, follow up with you. She
4		communicated to the campus about the
5		guidelines for researchers we have discussed,
6		those situations where those groups overlap,
7		and I'll make certain, she follows up with
8		you. We were doing our best to clear up any
9		inconsistencies there. I will turn to Bob
10		DiPaola also to help answer this question.
11	DIPAOLA:	There we go. Can you hear me okay? Yeah.
12		So I don't know where you went, Laura, but
13		right now, I mean, in general and Dr.
14		Cassis really should speak to this, but in
15		general, if those faculty and staff are in
16		nonclinical spaces throughout their day to
17		day and campus faculty and staff, they would
18		be under the campus rules. But Dr. Cassis
19		will clarify that better, and I think we'll
20		make sure to follow up as well. And I'll
21		talk to your associate or your acting dean,
22		Dr. Griffith, as well to make sure that
23		there's a communication that goes out.
2 4	FANUCCHI:	Thank you. Some of them are enrolling and
25		recruiting participants in clinical settings,

		2.1
1		and so that places us in the pickle that
2		we're in. Thank you.
3	DIPAOLA:	Understood, we'll follow up Laura.
4	CRAMER:	Kaveh Tagavi.
5	TAGAVI:	Hi, President Capilouto. I'm not going to
6		make a comment regarding the vaccination,
7		although my comment is about COVID. I just
8		want to tell you that I'm grateful that
9		during these COVID times, UK did not come off
10		at the seams and is still standing and I have
11		a job and I'm employed. But when you share
12		with us the grocery store that you shop so we
13		could show up and properly comment on your
1 4		performance.
15	CAPILOUTO:	Kaveh, I also live on campus, you know, and
16		one of the things I've missed is I did on
17		more than one occasion see you with a
18		colleague in one of those Adirondack chairs
19		under a tree on our campus, so I hope I'll
20		see you soon and you can offer me your advice
21		on how to do things better.
22	TAGAVI:	Thank you, sir.
23	CRAMER:	Bob Grossman.
2 4	GROSSMAN:	Yes. Hi, President Capilouto. Happy New
2 5		Year, by the way. My question is about the

Ь

1 4

2 4

Ω Γ

measures that President Biden announced last week. It may have been maybe a little too soon for you to really understand how those are going to affect our situation, but if OSHA goes through with the rules about workplace -- companies that employ more than a hundred people having to vaccinate their people, would we fall under that or we not considered under that rule because we're a state university.

CAPILOUTO:

Oh, Bob, I'll look at the preliminary information about that. I did wonder if President Biden read the University of Kentucky plan, because it's quite similar, and in terms of the weekly testing, we have that in place, I think I'll just share this: "I'm so grateful for the infrastructure and talent we have at the University of Kentucky. From setting up a mass vaccination center to being able to integrate all this data to monitor testing and vaccination levels, and then we're going to have to come back and do this on a weekly basis when you introduce compliance measures."

In talking to presidents of sister

1 universities in the state, they just don't have this kind of infrastructure, and they 3 don't have vaccine levels nearly as high as ours. So I often think, Bob, and I see this as a lofty goal, to reach another 80 to a 5 6 hundred million Americans. I'm going to be 7 very interested in the timeline everybody's 8 given to comply with this. It makes me grateful for what we've done at the 9 10 University of Kentucky and what we have in 11 place to, I think, meet whatever standards 12 would come out, whether we fall under those OSHA quidelines or not. 13 1 4 CRAMER: President Capilouto, I've got two more hands 15 if you can take two more. 16 CAPILOUTO: Yes, sir. CRAMER: 17 Gail Brion. Gail Brion, College of Engineering. Eli, I'd 18 BRION: 19 just like to know your thoughts. This whole 20 -- this is a messy situation, and I have two 21 things that I keep thinking about: Equity for 22 employees; whereas people in healthcare know 23 that the people that they're working next to 24 are vaccinated or being tested weekly, versus 2.5 this side of campus where we don't know that,

2.5

themselves immunocompromised or taking care of or having contact with people who are immunocompromised who do not know that the students that they're now sitting next to in class, not socially distanced, just masked, how they may be not getting the robust residential experience that we're offering because they cannot engage because they don't

know what their level of risk is. I'd just

like your thoughts on that.

and equity for students who are either

CAPILOUTO:

Well, Gail, first of all, employee relationships and student relationships all fall under some privacy issues to be able to share that kind of information freely. One has to be very cautious, and we certainly try to do that.

I also am encouraged here, if you look carefully at our dashboard, I mean, to keep this community safe, we're following CDC guidelines in a way that we are requiring testing for unvaccinated individuals. CDC does not suggest surveillance testing for vaccinated individuals.

But looking at the students thus far, now

1 4

we're going to see employees, including faculty and staff, the rates, the positive have remained, you know, constant and flat.

Believe me, those certainly could change.

That is some reinforcement that the level of vaccines we have on campus, the masking we're insisting on, not perfect, but we're pushing it, some of those measures are keeping us as safe as possible.

CRAMER: Akiko Takenaka.

TAKENAKA:

Akiko Takenaka, College of Arts and Sciences.

Thank you, President Capilouto, for staying on to respond to our questions. I have one clarification question and a couple of requests about the dashboard. And the question is a very simple question: What does -- in the process of being vaccinated, does that mean one shot has been -- is if a reservation, appointment, has been made for vaccination, is it like a student thinks about being vaccinated, and if there's -- if it is a single shot -- one shot received, then I think it'd be more clear to use the language that other universities have been using "partially or fully vaccinated." I

1 4

2.5

think that would be more clear, but I'm wondering what that means.

And some requests, as you said, perhaps the health care side and the non-health care side of the campus are apples and oranges. If that is the case, we would love to see a separated vaccination percentage for the non-health care side of the campus and the health care side of the campus, so that the side without a vaccine mandate can see the numbers and keep track of the numbers. And I think that will be very reassuring for us to see that separate number.

We would love it if the dashboard was updated a little more frequently. We would love it if the case numbers -- you know, there are detailed case numbers for the students, but we would like to see case numbers for the faculty and staff. We would like to see historical data of case numbers so that we can see where we are going. Are we improving? Are cases increasing? Because if we only see the numbers for this week, it's quite difficult to understand it. I understand there is a graph, but all of --

2

3

4

5

6

/

-

9

10

11 12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

2 4

25

you know, I have old eyes. I've been, like, taking off my glasses in order to decipher the numbers and it was very difficult to make sense of that graph. Thank you.

CAPILOUTO:

Well, thank you for your questions. And I have Bob DiPaola, and Todd Brann on the call here. I'll let them answer the questions about how we report those numbers. I will say in advance, integrating data from several sources takes some scrubbing and careful attention. You can remember last year our county got thousands of cases behind and so forth. We have a team that works carefully that when we report that information, it's been carefully scrutinized. We'll see if we can make the graph bigger for you, but we're reporting all the numbers since we opened in August. We'll work on some of those other comparisons that you would find interest in. But, Todd, do you want to answer her? And I would say, you know, many universities are reporting like we do, and I think if you look across the country, even if somebody had

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

their first vaccine, it seems to be that

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 4

25

DIPAOLA:

second vaccine number is about 6 percent lagging it. And so I think our experience is, when somebody has that vaccine, they have the second one, but we did offer Johnson & Johnson for a period of time, but Todd -and, Bob, do you want to add further to this? Sure. I mean, I can just start in general, and then, Todd, maybe if you're okay with giving some specifics, especially related to the part of the question of the generation of data of one shot or two shots. But, first off, you know, just as the president said to you, thank you for the input, because we do take this back to take a look at what would be best going forward in terms of data and what we -- you know, how we show that. Obviously, we want to make sure the data is accurate. In general, though, that the data that's being presented as analogous to or similar to many of the other universities, you're seeing report -- and I'll let Todd talk about the specifics in terms of that question, meaning that it typically does include any of those that have had at least one shot even on a two-shot regimen, such as

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

2 4

2.5

Pfizer or Moderna.

Anyway, but like I said, the input is appreciated because we will take it back and see what can be done, as long as we're able to do it in an accurate way and a timely way. Todd.

BRANN:

Good afternoon, everyone. Yeah, that's correct. That is one or two doses. So they could have had the first dose but yet had their second dose or be waiting out their 14-day period to be fully vaccinated. That's the vast majority of the cases. I would just point out as we also work with our health care team on communications, and that's the way of representing the numbers consistent with other institutions, as Provost DiPaola mentioned, but when we're actually communicating with our students and employees, they stay in that having -they're required to have a test until they're fully vaccinated, their second dose plus 14 days. So we do have some coverage on that. We're just presenting the numbers as vaccinated are in the process. And then we'll definitely go back and can look at the

		3.3
1		frequency of the updates, the different
2		splits in the population, then perhaps we'll
3		add a table to make that a little easier to
4		read.
5	FANUCCHI:	Can I just add quickly, OSU, our neighbor
6		OSU, has an amazing COVID dashboard that
7		should be the model for all universities.
8	CRAMER:	Thank you, President Capilouto, for joining
9		us today. Lee, I see you
10	BLONDER:	May I please may I ask a question?
11	CRAMER:	I see you, but I told him two questions if he
12		wants to Dr. Capilouto, could you answer
13		one more question? Oh, you're muted, sir.
1 4	CAPILOUTO:	Sure.
15	BLONDER:	Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Lee
16		Blonder, Faculty Trustee. I think we really
17		need to recognize that the reason why so many
18		faculty want a vaccine mandate is because
19		they don't feel safe in the classroom or on
20		campus. That's the reason, and this is one
21		way that would make them feel safer.
22		So what I'd like you to do, please, is how
23		can you and your team address the underlying
2 4		issue of safety on campus? One thing we've
25		proposed in Senate Council is to allow

1 professors the opportunity to switch modalities to be -- to go online, to do 3 hybrid without having to go through committees, and deans, and associate provost. That's one possibility, but would you please 5 6 try and address the underlying issue which is faculty not feeling safe? CAPILOUTO: Well, Trustee Blonder I agree with you that vaccines are the way we are going to get 9 10 through this. It is the safest, most 11 effective step we can all take, and we're 12 working to do that. And I would say that the 13 way we have operated on the campus and the 1 4 data we're keeping up with, I do believe we 15 have been able to maintain a safe campus. CRAMER: 16 Thank you, President Capilouto. We will move along in our agenda now. 17 The next item on our agenda are the minutes 18 19 from May 3rd. No edits were received in the 20 Senate Council Office to those minutes, so 21 unless objections are heard now, the minutes 22 will stand approved as distributed by 23 unanimous consent. 24 Those minutes are approved. 2.5 In terms of announcements, I'd like to

O

2 4

welcome our new senators. We just finished having the new Senator orientation the hour before this meeting. Typically we'd ask newly elected senators to stand and be recognized in the first Senate meeting. You could stand up at home if you want or in your office.

We certainly appreciate your commitment to the Senate and to supporting shared governance activities at UK. Really encourage you throughout the Senate's meetings over the next year, even between meetings, to ask questions. If you don't understand something during the meetings, if a motion is not clear or you don't understand what the effect of a motion would be, ask. Raise your hand and get that clarification so you can make informed decisions about how to act as a Senator.

The vice chair this year is, again, DeShana
Collett from the College of Health Sciences.
Our Parliamentarian this year is Clayton
Thyne, who is from Political Science in the
College of Arts and Sciences. He'll have a
report briefly a little bit later.

23

24

2.5

Our Senate Council office staff are wonderful. I say there are award-winning staff because they're literally an award-winning staff. We have Joanie Ett-Mims. We newly have Katie Silver. joined our office only a couple of weeks ago from UK HealthCare. She is replacing Stephanie Woolery who has taken a position in the office for faculty advancement. We've only been working with Katie for a brief period of time, but she's shown that she's wonderful, and certainly look forward to continuing to work with her. And Sheila Brothers also is in our office. So if you see Katie, make sure to extend our welcome, and always, if you see the various responsibilities of the staff members in the Senate Council Office reach out if you have questions about these items, or if you get the wrong one they'll know which one to send you on to. The Undergraduate Council is chaired by Corrine Williams from Public Health. Again, Senate Councils' Liaison to Undergraduate

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

Council this year is Alberto Corso, who's a

O

2.5

Senator from Art and Sciences. The Health
Care Colleges Council is again, chaired by
Sheila Melander from Nursing, and Senate
Council's Liaison to HCCC is Paco Andrade
from Medicine, and the Graduate Council is
chaired by the acting Graduate School Dean,
Martha Peterson, for Medicine, and Senate
Council's liaison to the Graduate Council
this year is going to be Belinda Wilson from
Medicine.

I got my link today, so, you know, I'm assuming you'll see this, The UK Work-Life surveys. Starting today, it seeks to better understand employee perceptions and experiences about working at UK. Regular faculty and campus staff with full-time equivalent positions and above who joined UK on or before August 16th will receive an email from Willis Towers Watson today with the link to take the survey. The survey is open until Friday, September 24th, so I would encourage you to complete the survey to help provide this understanding of employee perceptions and experiences about working at UK.

24

2.5

This is a slide you'll see from me every Senate meeting forever. It's the curricular proposal deadlines for this year. Curricular proposals must be reviewed by the appropriate academic councils, either the Grad Council, the HCCC or the Undergrad Council, and received in the Senate Council Office by December 1st this year. If it's a new degree program proposal, that dates a little bit earlier than it's been historically, because of some external deadlines from the council post-secondary education. And so if you want a new degree program to have a likelihood of being able to launch by Fall 2022, the Senate Council Office needs to receive it from the Academic Council by December 1st. Other proposals requiring Senate Committee review, these are going to be like new certificate programs transfers to the degree or new department changes to credit hours required for graduation, or significant program changes. Things like this that requires Senate Committee review will need to receive by March 1st, and then things like smaller program changes or new courses or

3

4

5

0

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 4

25

minors, these need to come by April 12. So I think I include this in every Senate newsletter. I'll include it in every senate meeting. Just make sure your colleagues are aware of this, because we want to make sure that proposals are received in a timely way so that we can help these programs come to life.

The next item on the agenda, our chair and officer reports. So for the chair's report, specifically, I would like to acknowledge Senate Councils' continued input over the summer. Grateful for their ongoing guidance and work. They're incredible. Get to know Senate Council members if you don't already know them, and make sure you communicate with them about things that are happening, to help them be more effective at representing you. The Senate Rules and also the Senate Council authority to take some actions on behalf of the Senate, as long as they're reported to the Senate. So right now, I'm reporting to you actions that I've taken as Chair on behalf of the Senate Council and Senate, so I -- you know, the Senate approves a calendar.

23

24

2.5

I changed the K Week date for Fall '21. They were actually supposed to start on Thursday, August 19th, not Wednesday, August 18th. And so I approved that change to the academic calendar to correctly list those dates. I expressed my opinion that proposed changes to Administrative Regulation 5:4 and 5:5 did not need formal Senate Council or Senate input beyond comments from the Senate representatives on the Regulations Review Committee. Specifically, these were regulations related to the appointment and training of Graduate Medical Education for residents and fellows, and their appeal procedure for Graduate Medical Education residents and fellows, so these needed to be updated may to onboard the next group of residents and fellows. The nature of the changes that were made to these errors were not significant enough to require sort of a larger conversation about them and I was -was the opinion that I expressed, and so those errors I believe were propagated. I approved a non-standard calendar request, a

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

one-time, non-standard calendar request for

3

4

5

O

/

8

9

10

11

12

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 4

25

NRE 320 over the summer. This is a course for Natural Resources and Environmental Science students studying away due to COVID-19 scheduling issues. Kept a handful of students from participating in the regular courses for Robinson Forest or in Costa Rica, and so I put it on standard calendar to allow these students to take the course over the summer.

I approved a waiver of language in SR 5.5.2.2 about GPA calculation for degree honors for PharmD 2021 cohort. The 2015 curriculum redesign contains several courses designated as Pass/Fail, which reduced the minimum number of quality hours that could be used effectively in Latin Honors calculation. This waiver allowed the standard historical calculation method involving earned hours versus quality hours to be permitted for the purpose of determining the honor status for the 21 cohort. And we've asked them the PharmD faculty to develop a proposal to the Senate to resolve this issue permanently. And I understand that that proposal is coming shortly, and it will come to the Senate.

131415

16

17

10

11

12

18

19

20

22

23

2 4

25

For the Fall '21 semester only, and only reasons are for reasons related to the pandemic, I delegated authority for temporary DL curricular approvals to the local educational unit administrator on behalf of the unit faculty. So if a course is to be listed as a DL or Distance Learning course, it requires academic approval, curricular approval from the Senate that it follows a typical process where the department faculty approve it, and that goes on through the college faculty and then onto one of the academic councils, and then finally the Senate approves it through a web transmittal. For this semester, that authority was delegated to the local educational unit faculty is represented by the local educational unit administrator and that action to be reported to the Senate Council Office. That does not mean of course that every course to be listed that way, it's not enough, it is necessary condition for the academic approval to be there, but it's also administratively required that somebody actually enters the course in that way.

1 4

2.5

And so, the Senate delegated that approval, the curricular approval, from an academic standpoint to the unit faculty that if the courses aren't listed that way, that's an administrative issue.

The chair also waived SRS related to the calculation of GPA for degree honors for the JD 2021 cohort this is similar to the issue with the PharmD cohort. They requested that three students in the dual degree programs, earning undergraduate and JD Degrees to be evaluated with respect to the earned hours required for their particular JD, rather than the traditional 90 hours JD requirement, that students in the dual degree program have a slightly smaller number of hours.

law courses being graded on a Pass/Fail basis, there were three dual-degree students who had slightly fewer graded hours and they would need to qualify for Latin Honors on the traditional metrics, despite GPS that we qualify them for this recognition, and so I waived the SRS. For this day I'm also preparing a proposal to sort of rectify the

When the pandemic resulted in all Spring 2020

c

1 4

2 4

2.5

situation long-term, which I understand will mirror the PharmD proposal.

I approved clerical changes to laws, 2021, 2022 calendar, there were some typos where Fall '20 should've said '21, and Spring '21 should have said Spring '22. I approved the clerical change to the '21 summer session for the graduate school calendar, the last day for candidates to submit a final thesis or dissertation wasn't correct, and so that date got updated over the summer. I also approved clerical changes to the Fall '21 calendar, the originally approved calendar showed

Friday and Saturday as commencement days, but the fall commencement's only the one day on the Friday. So those are actions I took on your behalf over the summer.

Then Senate Council took a few more actions that also must be reported too, and so the Senate Council approved proposed changes to the 2021, 2022 PharmD calendar, which involved changes to start and end of various rotation blocks.

The Senate Council also approved two late additions to degree lists on August 30th,

2.5

ordinarily request for late additions to the degree list are going to be heard by the full Senate by you, but in September, the board met before the Senate, the Board of Trustees meeting was last week, so the alternative to the Senate Council acting that would have been to schedule a special Senate Meeting for those two students. So Senate Council acted on your behalf, so these both were approved by the board on Friday.

So specifically, Senate Council approved a late edition for Gatton College of Business Economics student, who completed the requirements for a second degree of CBA in Finance, and the requirements were completed prior to the graduation date, but the application for that degree was not entered due to an administrative error.

Senate Council also approved adding a College for Education student who has misadvised to retake two classes in this current semester in Fall '21, without being required to retake these classes, they've completed all the requirements for a master's degree in rehabilitation counseling, and so the program

22

23

24

2.5

faculty voted unanimously to approve that petition and the graduate school stated that would accept her final exam, so Senate Council approved that student as well. then both of those items have -- were subsequently approved by the board on Friday. The Senate Council sent a formal response of the strategic plan draft to the president and the Provost. Then, as the president mentioned, Senate Council met with the provost on Wednesday afternoon for a little over an hour. I think he mentioned in his earlier call -- I think he called it a very effective meeting, so we provided detailed feedback to the provost on the strategic plan draft. Very good interactions and discussion. We anticipate another such meeting after the next strategic plan iteration. The QEP, the Quality Enhancement Plan, associated with the SACSCOC reaffirmation, the reaffirmation or institutional accreditation remains a concern. SACSCOC intends it to be an institution-wide

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

initiative with broad faculty support.

Δ

О

/

Ü

1 4

2.5

provost indicated on Wednesday, when we met in the special session with him last week, that the QEP timeline would not be as tight as the strategic planning timeline, so, you know, we'll report back to the Senate Council about the QEP timeline.

We're aware of a QEP Committee that's been formed, and we've asked about the membership and look to hear about that soon. We do understand that UK will hire a consultant, I think to help with some of the reaffirmation concerns, but that there should be plenty of time for robust engagement on the QEP, so we look forward to that.

Expect an email notice from the Senate

Council Office next week regarding proposed changes to AR 1:5, this is the Substantive

Change Policy that we're required to have for SACSCOC. This will be reviewed by a Senate

Council on September 20th, but we want to make sure to give the senators an opportunity to weigh in. So Senate Council will hear about it. It'll get sent out. If you have feedback, you'll provide it to the appropriate person. They can decide how to

O

2 4

incorporate that, or if it needs to be incorporated that into the presence Administrative Regulation 1:5.

There was a cyber intrusion incident involving the College of Education several weeks ago. Involved a compromise with about 350,000 records. Concern was expressed from Senate Council about the coupling support units from the areas they serve. So, specifically, you know, there were IT Staff in the College of Education that were going to be moved from there.

The provost has worked to ensure that education IT Staff will continue to reside in and serve the college, so we're grateful for his response to that concern. They will report centrally, so to Center ITS with the reason of given enhancing capacity of the staff providing backup support opportunities and also compliance oversight. So this is an ongoing sort of concern about making sure that the educational units that are doing the teaching research and service missions continue to have the appropriate support that they need to do those missions.

1 4

2 4

The last one, I think there was a notice sent over the summer that some faculty members will be losing access to student records, including transcripts in September. The note indicated that access would be granted based on having completed some proper training, and also having a need to access.

And so I asked about this, who makes the determination about a faculty member's need to access, because many activities faculty members perform every day are somewhere on the mentoring-advising spectrum, and its faculty have a need to access this information regularly for a lot of reasons. And I wanted to know who would understand that that would be able to decide on this need to access, and I still don't have an answer to this question. I'm going to continue to follow up on it, but this is something that I think is pretty important for faculty to be able to support student success in a meaningful way.

The next item on the agenda is the Vice

Chairs Report, so I will turn it over to Vice

Chair DeShana Collett.

COLLETT:

1 4

2.5

to do the Outstanding Senator Award. This was created by Senate Council back in 2011.

The award recognizes the Senator or Senators who have an exemplary service record and you have made an outstanding contribution and commitments to the University Senate.

The criteria was reevaluated in March of 2017, so it would allow or expand the award eligibility to include recognition of more than one Senator and also recognition of former senators as well as our current senators.

Thank you, Chair Cramer. So it's time for us

So the criteria for selection include actively exemplary service on one or more Senate Committees during their tenure, and the individual has been effective in representing and communicating important faculty issues to the Senate, and they must have a proven track record of being a voice and an advocate for shared governance.

This year's awardee has been a continuous member of the University Senate since 2010, this individual has been elected and served two full three-year terms to the Senate

1 Council where she continued to advocate for shared governance and support the Senate's 3 broad agenda and goals. This individual has also shown exemplary service and made substantive contributions on 5 6 many Senate Committees, including ten years of service as a member of SREC where she has been instrumental in providing meaningful interpretations and revisions of our Senate 9 10 Rules. This individual has been consistently 11 a strong voice and a representative of 12 faculty viewpoint during her past and current service. 13 So the 2021 outstanding Senator award goes to 1 4 15 Gail Brion, Professor in the College of 16 Engineering Department of Civil Engineering. 17 Normally, we would do this in person and provide Gail with an award, and I can't see 18 19 her from my screen, but she is well-deserving 20 of this award and more. 21 BRION: Thank you. 22 CRAMER: Certainly. Yeah, Gail unmute yourself so we can see you. There you are. 23 Thank you. Most unexpected, and I can think 24 BRION: 2.5 of many others who deserve this recognition

52 1 but thank you very much. Thank you, Gail, and thank you, DeShana. CRAMER: 2 next item is the Parliamentarian's Report. 3 Clayton, are you ready? THYNE: Yeah. Can you hear me, Aaron? 5 6 CRAMER: Yes. 7 So I'm going to be very brief on this. THYNE: appreciate being given the opportunity to do this, though I was a bit reluctant to take on 9 10 the job. There are probably a lot of people 11 on the call that know Robert's better than 12 me, but I'll do my very best to help Aaron run these meetings effectively. 13 1 4 The only really kind of point I want to point 15 out is just reiterating what Aaron said in 16 terms of the -- my final point here: The 17 point of information. Just make sure you 18 speak up if you don't know what's going on. I recall when I was a new Senator -- and 19 20 there's a bunch of new senators on the call. 21 It's really easy to get confused, and we have 22 a tendency to mention, you know, meetings 23 that happened in the past or administrators, 24 you don't know who they are. So it's not

2.5

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

rude to interrupt a point of information is

1 that it's not a motion. It's not weird. You can actually raise your hand at any point and 3 just speak up. So please help Aaron run the meeting effectively by letting him know if you don't 5 6 know what's going on. If you forget a point 7 of information, that's fine. I'm sure Aaron will be fine if you just sit, raise your hand, say, "Hey, I have no idea what's going 9 on." 10 11 CRAMER: Thank you, Clayton. Trustees Report. This 12 is where we hear from our faculty trustees. Lee. 13 1 4 BLONDER: Thank you. Trustee Swanson can't be here 15 today. She's teaching, so I'll give the 16 trustee report. The Board of Trustees met last Thursday and Friday, and if you want to 17 18 see the agenda and many of the meeting documents there on the website. The 19 Executive Committee discussed the President's 20 21 Evaluation Process and the board 22 self-evaluation, and we will continue to 23 discuss this at the October retreat, which is 24 mid-October. 2.5 We also approved the additions to the degree

/

list as Aaron mentioned, and we heard several reports, the provost conversation today at noon discuss some of the things he talked to the board about. We voted to approve the appointment of Dr. Katrice Albert as Vice President for Institutional Diversity, effective September 27th.

The Healthcare Committee Report, we discussed the ongoing COVID prices as of Dr. Newton's report on September 10th. 135 patients are hospitalized with COVID, of those 16 percent are vaccinated. 50 patients are in the ICU, 10 percent vaccinated, and 38 are on ventilators, 5 percent vaccinated. We reviewed in that committee the 2025 strategic plan, which includes the need to patient access and efficiency of clinical services. Plans include increasing primary care by creating a network of services, and plans are also underway to construct a new comprehensive cancer facility.

The Investment Committee also had a retreat,

The Investment Committee also had a retreat, healthcare and investment had retreats. Our current endowment now exceeds \$2 billion after a 27 percent gain this past year. We

		5 5
1		reviewed a presentation by our new investment
2		consultant, Cambridge Associates, who has
3		considerable expertise working with
4		endowments of a number of private and public
5		universities.
6		But we also reviewed a presentation by one of
7		our funds managers who outlined investment in
8		firms focused on new energy, renewable
9		energy, energy efficiencies, and vehicle
10		electrification. During the board meeting,
11		the President gave an address some of that
12		address he reviewed today in our meeting, and
13		that concludes my report.
1 4	CRAMER:	Thank you, Lee. The next item on the agenda
15		is a Memorial Resolution for Professor David
16		Randall. Past Senate Council Chair David,
17		are you ready?
18	DAVID:	Ready.
19	CRAMER:	Thanks.
20	DAVID:	David Clark Randall departed this life on the
21		11th of April this year for metastatic colon
22		cancer. Born in 1945 in St. Louis, Missouri,
23		where his father was a physiologist in St.
2 4		Louis University, the family later moved to
25		Chicago so his dad could assume Chair of

24

2.5

Physiology at Loyola University College of Medicine. Dave was an Eagle Scout who graduated from Maine state school in 1963, Taylor University in Indiana in 1967, and the University of Washington in Seattle in '72. Following in his father's footsteps, he had jumped in a faculty position at John Hopkins after graduate school, and three years after that, in 1975, he accepted a faculty position at UK in the Department of Physiology. Dave actually had two primary appointments, one in physiology, the other in the Center for Biomedical Engineering, now the F. Joseph Hopkins III for biomedical engineering. Dave had an active physiology research program studying cardiovascular function, operating condition, and behavioral aspects of autonomic regulation. His research had direct healthcare applications and biomedical engineering particularly those applied to the environment. He was active until his illness and co-wrote or wrote several textbooks and authored more than a hundred publications and tenaciously secured extramural funding. His myriad multidisciplinary, and

Ь

/

1 4

2 4

multi-institutional collaboration with students, staff, and faculty was a major source of delight. Dave loved teaching and the students, he put as much into it as exams as even his lecture. He often said it took him 45 minutes to write each exam question so that he had the correct discriminators to produce a great distribution, mimicking a normal curve.

He was a member of fabulous master's or doctorate, medics, and would read every draft of a dissertation in its entirety. This, he considered one of its most important, yet enjoyable responsibilities. For 35 years he also taught a night class of physiology at Asbury University. His passion for students extended beyond the classroom as he frequently invited students to his home or his farm.

Randall also enjoyed mentoring and helping the faculty. He'd respond at a moment's notice, the full vacancies in the absence of his colleagues. During his more than 43 years at UK, Dave served up countless committees in the College of Medicine, as

2 4

well as the faculty Senate, which he chaired for two years. The library and institutional animal care and immunization committee.

He joked that his middle initial "C" stood for "committee" after he received a note to attend a meeting of a committee he didn't even know he was a member. He was a past president of the International Pavlovian Society. Dr. Randall was clearly a man of strong faith. He was the advisor -- faculty advisor for the student chapter of the Christian Medical and Dental Association during his entire stay in UK. He loved teaching Sunday school at his church where he served as an elder.

Dave was a voracious reader, mostly
non-fiction, American, European, and ancient
history. He researched physiology and as
well as his family tree and dated it back to
the 16th century. He loved farming, horses,
photography. He was a licensed ham radio
operator, as well as a licensed pilot. He
loved traveling his pet snapping turtles and
getting to know people from all walks of
life. Surviving him or his wife, three sons,

1		four grandchildren, and a sister.
2	CRAMER:	So that's a resolution offered by David.
3		David's not a Senator, so he can't offer the
4		resolution. Would somebody like to offer the
5		resolution? Kaveh, I see your hand up.
6	TAGAVI:	I will offer a resolution, and I also would
7		like to make a comment when you think it's
8		appropriate.
9	CRAMER:	Okay. Is it on this item, or
10	TAGAVI:	On this item.
11	CRAMER:	So a motion from Kaveh to accept this
12		resolution. Is there a second? DeShana?
13		DeShana seconds. I suppose maybe not debate
1 4		on the resolution, but, Kaveh?
15	TAGAVI:	Yes. I just want to mention that David
16		Randall was vice chair when I was chair of
17		Senate Council. We often did not agree on
18		academic or even social matters, but he
19		always treated me with integrity and
20		compassion. I could trust him 110 percent
21		and he was always willing and ready to serve
22		this University. This is a big loss and I'm
23		very saddened.
2 4	CRAMER:	Again, not really debated, but is there other
25		debate on this motion? If not, then voting

2.5

senators, if you'd like to vote yes on this motion to adopt this Memorial Resolution, please use the "raise hand" feature in Zoom now and leave your hand up.

If you'd like to vote no on the motion to adopt the resolution, please use the "raise hand" feature now.

If you'd like to abstain on the resolution, please use the -- on the motion to adopt the resolution, please use the "raise hand" feature now.

The motion passes and the resolution is adopted. I'd like to take a moment of silence now.

Thank you, David, for bringing this resolution to us.

The next item on the agenda is a proposal.

It's a proposed change to Senate Rule 2.1.3

about academic holidays. This is actually a proposal from the Senate Council to the Senate. An issue was identified by the Rules Committee that Senate Council decided, hey, this is the most obvious way to resolve this concern, but it's a change to the Senate Rules and so the Senate Council need to bring

2 4

that to the University Senate specifically
the annual calendar that the Senate approves,
as regularly described the Saturday after
Thanksgiving as an official academic holiday,
which would mean that like assignments
couldn't be due and things like this. You
couldn't have a class on a Saturday after
Thanksgiving.

Senate Rules do not explicitly include this state as an academic holiday, the recommendation from the Senate Council to the Senate is to change Senate Rule 2.1.3, to codify the Saturday after Thanksgiving as an academic holiday.

Are there any questions about this proposal?

Seeing none, this is a motion from the Senate

Council. It doesn't need a second. Is there

any debate on this motion? Alan? Alan, are

you debating or voting? Maybe voting.

Okay. Bob, are you debating or voting?

GROSSMAN:

Debating. Actually, looking at the proposed change, it says the Wednesday immediately before Thanksgiving Day is designated as a Thanksgiving break and the Saturday after -- oh, never mind. I see. It's something in

2.5

the previous paragraph. The Friday following Thanksgiving Day was what I was going to ask about. That's in the preceding paragraph, so never mind.

CRAMER:

Well, seeing no further debate, if you'd like to vote in favor of the motion of recognizing the Saturday after Thanksgiving as an academic holiday, please use the "raise hand" feature now.

If you'd like to vote against the motion, please use the "raise hand" feature now.

If you'd like to abstain on the motion, please use the "raise hand" feature now.

That motion passes.

The next item is an item brought to us by the Registrar. The Registrar identified the need for a placeholder course for students that have consortium agreements on file for a given semester. UK is required to have a mechanism to track hours taken at the outside institution and apply them to the student's record.

When the student completes the course, this course will be removed from that student's transcript and the course that transfer

1		credit from the other institution would be
2		added to the transcript instead. This is a
3		temporary notation on the student's
4		transcript indicating that indicating
5		their current status in this semester.
6		The course will not appear and will be
7		removed upon the completion of the consortium
8		agreement. This item came to us from the
9		Registrar Kim Taylor, Senate Council agreed
10		that this should be brought to the Senate for
11		approval of construction of this course for
12		this purpose.
13		Are there any questions about this proposal
1 4		that's been brought to the Senate from the
15		Senate? Kaveh.
16	TAGAVI:	Just a point of clarification. This course
17		is if I recall correctly, I don't see it
18		on this screen. What is the POS599?
19	CRAMER:	I think the number was like CONS599.
20	TAGAVI:	CON? So does this contemplate that there
21		might be a course called ME599, or there is
22		no problem with other departments using 599?
23	CRAMER:	I don't think this would interfere with any
2 4		department unless there was one that was
25		using the prefix CONS.

		6 4
1	TAGAVI:	Okay. Thank you.
2	CRAMER:	Any other questions about the proposal? If
3		not, the motion comes from Senate Council, it
4		doesn't require a second. Is there any debate
5		on this motion?
6		Seeing none, if you'd like to vote in favor
7		of this motion, please use the "raise hand"
8		feature.
9		If you'd like to vote against the motion,
10		please use the "raise hand" feature now.
11		If you'd like to abstain, please use the
12		"raise hand" feature now.
13		That motion passes.
1 4		The next item is another item from Senate
15		Council. This is unusual. Normally, I would
16		not be bringing so many items to you.
17		Normally, they would come from our committee
18		chairs to have so many coming from Senate
19		Council. But at the beginning of the
20		pandemic, Senate Council made an informal
21		interpretation of the Senate Rules regarding
22		excused absences. Specifically, it found
23		that quarantine fell under the policy related
2 4		to a significant illness.
25		Senate Council reauthorized the use of this

/

interpretation again for this coming year, again for the coming year only. It appears that it would be cleaner perhaps to have Senate go ahead and include this within our policy more explicitly by adopting the proposed changes to SR 5.2.5.2.1.

If we're coming out of the pandemic, maybe we won't need it again for another a hundred years, but if this continues with us for some time, it will be useful for a Senate to have made this clear and its policy on excused absences.

Are there any questions about the proposal here from Senate Council? Kaveh.

TAGAVI:

So I see the rationale for this proposal or addition. After all, if a student is told to quarantine, obviously they are not able to attend in-person interactions. However, quarantining doesn't nearly affect in-person attendance. It may also affect studying with peers, attending office hours, going to places with Wi-Fi, going to tutoring services, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So it's my understanding quarantining is usually, I don't know, ten days, two weeks.

1 It's a matter of in that order. My question is this: Has it been ever considered to 3 simply declare that activities during --whether in person or not, activities during the mandated period is excused? 5 And lastly -- and I think this is the rhetorical question. Has the academic ombud been consulted or asked to give an input on this, because it does affect a lot of 9 10 concerns between students and instructors? 11 CRAMER: So that may be a rhetorical question from our 12 past ombud. The answer I would give is that this excuses students from required in-person 13 interactions if they're ordered to 1 4 15 quarantine, so that's going to be required 16 interactions. If they can access other 17 services, they can, if they're sick and can't do those other things, then they're covered 18 19 under the excused absence due to actually 20 being ill, as opposed to being quarantined, 21 which is an order to stay away; right? 22 So I think my sense is that the 23 interpretation covers the case that you mentioned first. I would certainly confess 24 2.5 that we did not speak to the ombud,

TAGAVI:

CRAMER:

specifically about this, but believe that
since we had walked through a year, perhaps,
with -- beyond, but not calling me and
telling me this was not working, that perhaps
this was --

With all due respect, Aaron-- Mr. Chairman, a student might not be sick, but ordered to quarantine and then they cannot do studying as well as otherwise. Meanwhile, there's going to be a quiz, perhaps even online. I just want to know if you give consideration to say, look, if you are ordered to be quarantined, during that quarantine days, 10, 14, whatever it is, any activity that is not met whether in person or not will be considered excuse. It is cleaner, but I just want to know if you gave consideration to that.

I -- when Senate Council first did, of course

-- this might be it. We're on the verge of

debate here. Maybe we should wait until the

motion's on the floor. But when the

interpretation was first made, it was

considered that if a student required

in-person interactions covers that sort of

1 4

2 4

things that you're saying, if I can't meet with the study group, that's a required in-person interaction, or if it's something along these lines can't access some required study materials that I can only access in person, that there was a difference between quarantine, which is a healthy person being excluded from physically being on campus versus an illness which is already covered under our Senate Rules which involves somebody that actually can't do those things because perhaps they're incapacitated by their illness.

So let's come back to the question if you think it needs amendment during the debate when the motions on the floor. Christian Brady.

BRADY:

Christian Brady, Arts, and Sciences. It may just be an error of how the PDF was produced, but on page 2, the second asterisk under 5, it says "Pursuant to SR -- error. Reference source not found, 6.1.1," which -- Section 6 1.1.1 syllabi does exist. So I just wondered if that was simply a sort of a PDF production error.

2.5

CRAMER:

GROSSMAN:

I believe that you have that right. Our
Rules Committee helpfully added all of the
cross-referencing, but if we're not careful,
when we copy and paste out of that, we'll
lose the references for those
cross-references and that appears to be what
happened. Of course, our Rules Committee
within their scope and authority has the
ability to fix that, so when we -- if we
adopt this change, they can fix that when
they incorporate it. Bob Grossman.

Bob Grossman, ANS. First of all, to address Dr. Brady's question, yes, it's -- when you have hyperlinks in a Word document and you copy a section of Word document, and you don't have the hyperlink included, then you get that error message, so it's just that effect of copying from a Word document.

I would like to address -- well, maybe this is more for the debate section, but I would like to address COVID concerns. First of

all, one thing, Aaron -- you addressed most

of them very well, but one thing that you

didn't mention is that an excused absence

doesn't excuse a student from eventually

3

4

5

6

7

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

CRAMER:

doing the work. It just -- it would excuse the student-- if a student has an excused absence, they're supposed to work with the professor, the instructor, to develop a way for making up the work that was lost, that wasn't done on time.

And so if a student's quarantined and they're healthy and they can do work, for example, they can attend lectures by watching at the Echo360 recordings if those are being offered, they can participate in Zoom sessions if those are being offered, but if there's things that they can't do during the quarantine period, because of the quarantine this -- the acceptance of this as excused absence, doesn't excuse them from doing the work at all, it just means that they'll do the work, or make up the work later in a way that's mutually acceptable to the instructor and the student. That's true of all excused absences. We're just trying to include among those excused absences, something that was due to all of us last year, which is the need for quarantine.

Roger. You're muted, Roger.

1	BROWN:	So quarantine seems like it's a pretty
2		complicated process for some students. I'm
3		just thinking of the case where you have
4		three roommates; you need to quarantine so
5		you have to find another place to go, which
6		may not have internet. And to some of the
7		issues that Kaveh raised about taking
8		advantage of the same opportunities that
9		other students have, or are not restricted by
10		their movements for studying in person and so
11		forth. I just wonder, it seems like it would
12		work in the best interest of the student to
13		complete as many of the assignments as they
14		can, while they're in quarantine, but it
15		seems like it would be left up to the
16		discretion of the student, that wouldn't be
17		such a bad thing, for instance, in this
18		motion, if we just removed the term
19		"in-person" and left it that way.
20	CRAMER:	So it sounds like you guys have a potential
21		amendment to offer once we put this motion on
22		the floor.
23	BROWN:	Yes.
2 4	CRAMER:	Are there other questions of fact though,
25		we're not debating the motion itself, which

		7 2
1		is not on the floor yet. Any other questions
2		about the proposal itself? If not, we have a
3		motion from the Senate Council, it requires
4		no second.
5		Is there a debate on this motion, which would
6		also include the ability to amend or propose
7		amendments to the motion? Roger?
8	BROWN:	Okay. I'd like to just move the what I
9		just said to strike the words "in-person" to
10		give students in quarantine more flexibility.
11	CRAMER:	Is there a second for Roger's motion? Kaveh.
12	TAGAVI:	Second.
13	CRAMER:	So we have a motion and a second to amend the
1 4		proposed language from Senate Council to
15		strike the words "in-person" excusing
16		students from all required interactions
17		during a period of quarantine. Is there any
18		debate on this motion? The motion to amend.
19		Gail.
20	BRION:	I would not support this motion because
21		students should be able to attend virtually
22		during their quarantine, especially if
23		they're here on campus. If a student cannot
2 4		attend virtually, then they should work it
2 5		out with the professor. I think that this

2 4

should just be limited for in-person required interactions as would be stated in the syllabus that would be part of the grade that a student receives.

CRAMER: Bob.

GROSSMAN:

Yeah. I agree with what Gail said -- oh, Bob Grossman, ANSWER. We purposely didn't make this to such a wide, to capture all types of interactions because the -- we just wanted to get at the interactions that the quarantine was guaranteed to prevent students from participating in.

I would remind everyone that if it's a case of student's roommates have to go into isolation or quarantine, and the student is displaced as to go somewhere where they don't have access to the required interactions at that is all -- can all be handled under the current rules where they -- absences at the discretion of the instructor can be excused. So I think those are unusual cases and we've all seen unusual cases over the years where a student has, you know, has -- there's something that's prevented student from interacting that -- those kinds of things

		/ 4
1		will be handled there, but specifically, the
2		quarantine specifically prevents in-person
3		interactions, so that's what we wanted to get
4		at the students who've had to quarantine did
5		not were not penalized for that order.
6	CRAMER:	Calvert, Ken Calvert.
7	CALVERT:	Ken Calvert, College of Engineering. I just
8		wanted to plus-one what Gail and Bob said. I
9		think instructors in the case of any excused
10		absence, the student's going to talk to the
11		instructor about making up the work, and I
12		think this can all be covered under that.
13	CRAMER:	Shannon Oltmann.
1 4	OLTMANN:	Thank you. I'm Shannon Oltmann, College of
15		Communication and Information. You know,
16		some instructors don't put their lectures
17		online or their lecture notes online, so
18		instructors are not very accommodating when
19		it comes to students. I prefer to give
20		students more leeway and more cushion, so I
21		support the amendment.
22	CRAMER:	Kaveh.
23	TAGAVI:	The problem is at the discretion of the
2 4		instructor. If a student is ordered to
2 5		quarantine, I consider this, they are already

Ü

2 4

on their -- a lot of stress, they have to study, they might not have Wi-Fi, they might use to go to Starbucks for their Wi-Fi to contact or the university library to do research.

There are some research, if this is a plant, plants department, you have to go out to look at the nature, not as a requirement, but as a way of performing well. There are many things that if a person has to quarantine, they will -- they might not be able to do.

And I think the most humane thing to do would be, if you're ordered by the university to quarantine, then any activity during that time should be unexcused and not at the discretion of the instructor.

CRAMER: Tad Mutersbaugh.

MUTERSBAUGH: Ye

Yeah. I completely agree with that last assessment. You know, it seems that students should receive completely the benefit of the doubt here. I don't think that we, you know, why should we bother trying to second guess students who have actually been sent to quarantine. I think those are official decisions and they're not taken lightly, and

1		so we can just accept those official
2		designations because it can be
3		psychologically very difficult for students.
4		I mean, we know full well from this pandemic,
5		people have committed suicide from
6		quarantine. This is a really difficult type
7		of thing, and I don't think that, you know,
8		kind of negotiating with professors is in the
9		best interest of either professors or
10		students, so I support the amendment.
11	CRAMER:	Ken Calvert.
12	CALVERT:	Ken Calvert, College of Engineering. I have
13		to react to that last statement. If students
1 4		can't talk to their professors, I think
15		that's a serious issue, but since I would
16		tell me if I'm out of line, out of order
17		here, but I'd like to call a question on the
18		amendment.
19	CRAMER:	That's a motion to call a question or to in
20		debate on the amendment. Is there a second
21		for that motion?
22	BRION:	Second, Gail Brion.
23	CRAMER:	So this a motion to call the question.
2 4		Clayton, is this debatable? I think it needs
25		a two-thirds, majority. I think it shouldn't

1 be debatable, otherwise, we're just debating somewhere. 3 THYNE: You're right, it's not debatable. Requires two-thirds. So if you'd like to vote to call the question 5 CRAMER: 6 in debate and just stop talking about the 7 amendment, use the "raise hand" feature now. If you'd like to vote no and continue debating about the amendment, please use the 9 "raise hand" feature now. 10 11 If you'd like to abstain on the question of 12 calling the question, please use the "raise hand" feature. 13 1 4 That motion passes. So debate is ended on 15 the motion to amend the language by striking 16 out the words "in person, in required 17 in-person interaction, so if you'd like to 18 vote yes on this amendment to strike out 19 those words, please use the "raise hand" 20 feature now. 21 If you'd like to vote no on the amendment to 22 strike the words "in person", use the "raise 23 hand" feature now. 24 If you'd like to abstain on the amendment to 2.5 strike out "in-person", use the "raise hand"

feature now.

That motion passes. So now we're debating on the amended motion. It's the motion from Senate Council with the words in-person" struck out. Is there any further debate now on the amended motion?

Seeing none, if you'd like to vote yes on the amended motion to include excuse from required interactions for students ordered to quarantine, please use the "raise hand" feature now.

If you'd like to vote, no on the amended motion, please use the "raise hand" feature now.

If you'd like to abstain on the amended motion, please use the "raise hand" feature now.

The motion passes as amended.

I would now like to ask to place items eight and nine of our agenda on old business for the next agenda and move on to item ten. If there are no objections to arranging the agenda this way.

Seeing no objections, we will hear the

Academic Facilities Committee Report in our

1 4

2.3

2 4

October meeting as well as the Ombud's Report in the October meeting, and we'll move on to item number ten, which comes to us via Senate Rule 1.2.3.3 on agendas and action items this is an item place on this agenda via ten senator's signatures. I will allow Molly Blasing to introduce the resolution.

BLASING:

So I'm making a motion. Yes, I'd like to make a motion that we consider a resolution.

I'm calling for a vaccine mandate at UK, and

I'm placing the text in the chat if you'd like to follow along, and I'll read it out now.

"Whereas on August 23rd, 2021, the FDA granted full approval of the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine. Whereas the FDA approval has led to new vaccination requirements at hospitals, colleges, universities, the federal government, and private companies across the United States. Whereas on September 8th, 2021, the Commonwealth of Kentucky reached its highest COVID-19 positivity rate, 14.17 percent since the start of the pandemic.

Whereas the Delta variant of the COVID-19

3

5

6

1

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

virus is much more contagious and is affecting more young people in our communities than the original strain. Whereas hospital intensive care units across the Commonwealth are at or near capacity. Whereas as of September 13th, 2021, 1023 other colleges and universities in the United States already require vaccinations, including other flagship state universities, such as the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, Ohio State University, and Indiana University, and four institutions in Kentucky; Transylvania University, Bellarmine University, Berea College and Centre College. Whereas public health and immunology experts at UK, believe that population immunity against the Delta variant can only be achieved when we reach 90 to 95 percent vaccinated. Meaning that our current 81.5 percent vaccination rate as of this past Friday still presents conditions that jeopardize the health, welfare, and lives of people on campus and in our local community, particularly children under 12 and others at increased risk.

3

4

5

7

0

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 4

25

Whereas some students, faculty, and staff on our campus are already subject to a vaccine mandate. Whereas as of September 13th, 2021, over 2300 members of the UK Community have signed an open letter in support of a vaccine mandate. And whereas the University of Kentucky, the flagship university of the Commonwealth has a longstanding legacy of playing a leadership role in Kentucky on issues of health, education, agriculture, law, and many other fields that impact the citizens of the Commonwealth. On this particular issue of health policy, the University of Kentucky has a responsibility to lead. Be it resolved that the University Senate calls on President Capilouto to issue an immediate vaccination mandate for eligible University of Kentucky students, faculty, and staff. And that's such a mandate be implemented in a fair and equitable manner with input from the University Senate, Staff Senate, and other impacted stakeholders."

CRAMER: So we have a motion from Senator Blasing. Is there a second for this motion? Akiko

1 Takenaka. TAKENAKA: I second. 2 3 CRAMER: So we have a motion that the University Senate adopt the resolution that Molly just read to us, and the motion has been seconded. 5 6 Is there debate on this motion? Herman. 7 FARRELL: Yes, Herman Farrell, College of Fine Arts. I'm speaking in favor of the vaccine mandate. I believe this is probably the most 9 10 controversial and consequential vote that 11 I've ever taken as a Senator. I have been on 12 the Senate for over a decade. President 13 Capilouto just said to us all that, and he's 1 4 been saying over the last several weeks and 15 over the last year, that vaccines are 16 basically effective. He said we all want the same thing. He said as many people as 17 vaccinated as possible is that same thing 18 19 that we all want. And so I'm just asking 20 that all of the members of the Senate will 21 vote to make that happen by supporting a 22 requirement of vaccination. 23 We know that since 1905, the United States 24 Supreme Court has basically supported vaccine 2.5 mandates across the country. We know that

Ŭ

/

2 4

the vaccines requirements or vaccine rates were going up until the summer, and as the summer came along, there were things that came in the way and it was basically politics and infused with that misinformation, and that did slow the trajectory of vaccinations across the country.

mandates can be considered to be polarizing.

And that is true. The question must be raised: Who's doing the polarizing and what's their motive behind it? If we really look at this, when we think about our own flu vaccine mandate, there was no polarization.

Most of us have put our children through

Our President Capilouto says that vaccine

schools, K through 12 of vaccine
requirements, no polarization, and UK
HealthCare just did it. I'm very curious to
know what their actual numbers are, because
we didn't get the answer from the president
or from the administration, but they did put
in a mandate, and it was not as polarizing as
we're being told it could be.

Our job as a flagship and as a R1, and as a land grant institution, is to provide

1 4

2 4

information, knowledge, new thinking, new technologies, and new medicines and cures to members of the Commonwealth in a variety of fields that are mentioned in the mandate -- in the resolution. So let's just continue to do that work.

It's our job to cut through the misinformation and to provide our -- the citizens, not only of our community, but of the Commonwealth with the truth about the effectiveness of vaccinations and the need for them.

The FDA has already approved that that was one of the strongest arguments against it, and that's been set aside because the FDA has given permanent approval to the vaccination. So let's just go forward with this as, basically as our own form of seal of approval of vaccinations.

And last, I'll just sort of echo what Lee blonder and Gail Brion have already said.

The notion of safety and the feeling of safety among faculty and students and staff on our campus is something that we need to really be taking into consideration. Lee

1		Blonder made the point that we're asking the
2		administration to make us all feel safe when
3		we go into those classrooms and we go into
4		those work environments. And so I hope that
5		if we all know that everyone around us is
6		vaccinated because they're required to do so,
7		it'll not only make us feel safer, but it'll
8		actually make us safer. Thank you.
9	CRAMER:	I owe Molly an apology. My parliamentarian's
10		already told me today once that I need to
11		call on the mover of the motion first and I
12		just completely didn't do it. Molly
13	FARRELL:	I'm sorry.
1 4	CRAMER:	No, no, that's not I looked at the first
15		hand and just went yeah, Molly, please.
16	BLASING:	Thanks. I had similar points to what Herman
17		said, but I want to just add a few things. I
18		think it's always important to begin by
19		recognizing that UK has done amazing work to
20		place vaccination at the center of our
21		efforts to combat the virus.
22		The efforts to vaccinate over 160,000
23		Kentuckians, it's an enormous accomplishment.
2 4		And even today we're participating in
2 5		pediatric clinical trials, which is important

2 4

for someone like me with two kids who are under 12. We're eagerly awaiting the results of those.

The thing that I'd like to emphasize, though, is that in conversations I've had the privilege of having with colleagues across the university in recent weeks, and these are experts in immunology and vaccine efficacy and public health. It's -- and we've seen the administration also understand this; right?

President Capilouto has said in his remarks today and recently that 80 percent is only a starting point. But according to our expert colleagues, people like UK immunologist Jerry Woodward, who's devoted his life to studying vaccines because of the virulence, our campus really needs to hit the 90 to 95 percent vaccinated if we're serious about protecting our faculty and staff, their family members and allowing our students, especially immunocompromised students, of which there are many, to continue to safely engage in our classrooms and dormitories and athletics and extracurricular activities on our campus.

And so the question, as the President said himself today, is: How do we get there? And this is where we differ. We know that vaccine mandates work. Many public colleges and universities across the country with mandates are hitting the 90 to 95 percent mark, and I wanted to bring a few examples. University of Michigan, 92 percent of students, 90 percent faculty. UC Berkeley, 97 percent students, 98.5 percent faculty and staff.

Virginia Tech, 95 percent students, 88

percent employees. University of Virginia,

97 percent students. University of Vermont,

100 percent of students. A mandate on our

campus will mean that thousands more people

get vaccinated in the next four to six weeks.

It will make our campus safer and ensure that

we can continue our work into the winter and

spring semester.

Voting for the resolution doesn't mean that you don't value the work our campuses done to increase vaccination, but voting for this resolution signals that you believe a mandate is the most effective and efficient way to

2

1

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2 4

25

boost our vaccination numbers.

The resolution provides the administration with an additional tool. It's another sign, in addition to the open letter that they received last week, with over 2,300 signatures of support. There was widespread support on our campus for a mandate. And my final point: Critics of vaccine mandates say that mandates are coercion, but vaccination requirements, as Herman said, are a staple of public safety. Vaccination requirement is not coercive. Vaccination requirement, in my view is -- it's more of a covenant. It's a contract of belonging that signals that our leadership and members of this community put the health and safety of all our people first. Thank you.

CRAMER: Richard.

CHARNIGO: Richard Charnigo, College of Public Health.

I am going to vote in favor of this resolution and I would encourage other senators to do so. It's not that I don't have misgivings, I do, but the seriousness of this public health matter to me outweighs considerations of personal preference. And I

2 4

assume that if a vaccine mandate were implemented, there would be exceptions for health reasons or reasons of conscience.

The only other thing I want to say now, though, is that I feel that a vaccine mandate by itself is not sufficient, and I think that other mitigating measures ought to be considered. I'm not proposing an amendment to this resolution, but I'm just speaking my mind that I think that the university ought to be more encouraging of social distancing and flexibility for instructional modalities. But, again, I intend to vote for this vaccine mandate resolution. Thank you.

CRAMER: Ken Troske.

TROSKE:

Sorry. I had to unmute myself. Ken Troske from the Gatton College of Business and Economics. I guess I want to -- I don't disagree with anything that anyone has said. I do want to follow up a little bit with the speaker and I guess I have more of a question. I mean, mandates, without some enforcement mechanisms seem rather weak to me, and I think there's plenty of evidence to suggest that whether we do -- whether the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2 4

25

people who have written this mandate and support the mandate, some idea about what's the enforcement mechanism behind it. What are we going to do? The staff or students or faculty who choose not to be vaccinated, even in the face of a mandate, what's the plan at that point for those students? The University of Virginia has a mandate. They basically dismiss people from campus for not following through on it. Is that what we're suggesting? Are we proposing that? Just a little more information about what the mechanisms designed to actually enforce the mandate are when we are proposing to vote on I think would help me a lot. Thank you. Michael Hawse.

CRAMER: Michael Hawse.

HAWSE:

Thank you. I also want to preface this by saying it's my full intention to vote for this. I will say one of the things that really does concern me is the fact that we're kind of giving this to administration make up a decision. Obviously, that is their call. However, it's something that we as bodies need to make sure that we are in the discussions to make sure that it is truly

24

2.5

fair and equitable, because a lot of -- I would first like say a lot of the current mandates that are already going on across the country are effectively already what we're doing, where it's if you're not vaccinated, you have to get these tests, and there are punishments if you don't get tested. And the schools where they're not doing that, they say that you can be possibly dismissed from your educational programs. At Cal Berkeley, especially they say, if students are not compliant, they can be dismissed from their educational program, which means they're kicked out of school. You know, if we're going to make it equitable, we need to make it equitable. we need to advocate it, so if everybody across the line, whether you're a faculty, student or staff, you're held to that same level. And, you know, as a student, traditionally, we can be the one's kind of thrown under the rug because we're not the ones who are necessarily with -- we don't have the power dynamic that other people at the university have, and so it's one of the

2 4

things it's my intention to vote for this,
but I also didn't feel like I couldn't at
least address that concern of saying if we're
going to do it. It needs to be equitable and
it needs to be right, and we need to hold
everybody to the exact same standards that
we're going to hold towards our students,
because traditionally, those are the ones who
have the strictest measures on them.

CRAMER: Gail Brion.

BRION:

I want to say to Michael and to others that this is one of the things that we thought of when we put together the resolution. We put it forward that there would be implementations with all voices included. Right now we already have implementation in the health sciences area where students who are not getting tested, if they choose not to be vaccinated or employees. As I understand it, the students can have an academic hold put on them, and this is from a Senate Council meeting where Dean DiPaola -- I'm sorry, Provost DiPaola was speaking.

And at this meeting it was brought up that it doesn't need to be a "carrot and stick"

24

2.5

approach, that we need to have a "carrot and stick" approach, and we need to incentivize people to want to go along with a mandate. And as we have talked, I don't believe that requiring people to get tested weekly is an incentive. I think that we need to work very, very hard on what these incentives are. One of the ideas that I put forward was \$100 per shot. Doesn't matter if it's your first, your second or your booster. You go in and get a shot, you get \$100, you know. I know that we can do this, and I know that we have done this because over in the college -- in the clinical side, their vaccination rates are higher than on this side of campus. And we must have ways for people to opt-out, but it has to be -- I think we need to look at way more carrot than we do stick to start with. And one of the sticks that I heard for employees was to take away the raise that was going to start in December that we earned for last year's living and producing through the pandemic, which I would not be in support of, that's why we included that we need to look at how to implement this with the input from

1 all parties. Christopher Crawford. 2 CRAMER: 3 CRAWFORD: I have a mandate from my department to vote yes on this, but I just like to point out what was already pointed out before that 5 6 we're voting on something -- it's kind of --7 we're late in the game. We're voting on something that students have already paid tuition for this semester, and now we're 9 10 changing the rules for them. 11 And also, I'd like to mirror the sentiment 12 that I think offering things like distance learning is -- would be a much more effective 13 1 4 for increasing our safety at this point. 15 CRAMER: Christian Brady. 16 BRADY: Christian Brady, Arts, and Sciences. First, you know, I think everybody here, we want a 17 safe and secure community. I do think 18 19 vaccination is the way to get there. My 20 comments are more at what this particular 21 resolution would do or not do. Dr. Blasing

22

23

24

2.5

I don't think though that while -- she said

and I have talked extensively about it, I'm

grateful for her and the others who have

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

brought this forward.

2 4

that our leader -- this statement, passing this and a mandate would show that our leadership put the health and safety of our community first. I just think it's important we remember that the negative of that doesn't mean -- the negative of that is not having a mandate does not necessarily mean that our leadership is not putting our health and safety first, but rather that there is a legitimate debate about what the mechanism is to get us there if all of those negative particles made sense.

My concern here it's not the sentiment.

Again, I agree with the sentiment and that
the health and safety of our community and
our path forward lies with vaccination of as
many as are feasibly possible due to their
own health and conscience.

My concern is that a vote for this could be further divisive in our community that's already in a very tensed time. Doesn't mean we shouldn't have it and shouldn't be doing it, but I hope, as Dr. Blasing said, that this could be understood in the context of being another tool for the administration to

1 have in their toolbox as they're going to the various constituent groups to look for the 2 3 best path forward. And I hope that we would be gracious to one another in recognizing those that might 5 6 abstain or vote against this again, or not 7 voting against the health and safety of our community, but perhaps simply understanding that a different path might be better in 9 10 terms of efficacy. 11 CRAMER: Rae Goodwin. GOODWIN: Rae Goodwin, College of Fine Arts. I have a 12 point of information as a new senator. 13 1 4 -- I just don't understand what this vote --15 what does this -- if we vote yes, is the 16 president -- is President Capilouto obligated 17 in any form or fashion? No. To answer the point of information that 18 CRAMER: 19 adopting the resolution will be the Senate 20 expressing its sense, but this is not an area 21 where the Senate has specific authority, we 22 would be expressing our sense to the 23 president. GOODWIN: Excellent. Thank you so much. And I had 24 2.5 just one comment to add to the debate, which

2.5

all of the work that you've put into this resolution, and I believe strongly in vaccinations as a whole. I do a great deal of work in Eastern Kentucky and my concern with this resolution, if it were to come to pass through a mandate, would be cultural backlash against the University of Kentucky, because there is such an incredibly strong

vaccine mandates coming from that part of our

aversion, for whatever the reasons, to

is that -- well, first, thank you for putting

CRAMER: Bob DiPaola.

state.

DIPAOLA:

Yeah. I just wanted to just add a little bit as well, if I could. And I'm not debating any of the discussion, but one of the things that I'd like to do, and I know the president feels this way as well, is get your input. And you've already brought up some of the challenges that we're dealing with. For instance, how will we enforce?

And I just wanted to maybe say a few words about it, if I could, Aaron, because I do want to get your -- and we do want to get your input on that as well. I think some of

-

O

2 4

the points at this meeting, not only just this current discussion, but even earlier, are very important. For instance, how we look at the data.

I do think when they really do look at the data, you know, and I think the president put it as apples and oranges or whatever at the campus, I think we need to see that, and we'll get there. So I think that's going to be important and that'll continue to have a steep trajectory.

I do agree with them. We need to get to higher numbers. You know, when you look at the evolution of this virus, and believe me, I follow it very well, that 90 and above is probably the target we need, and I don't disagree with the 90 to 95.

I also want to thank Molly, your kindness in terms of how you even posed the letter, certainly to the administration as well, because I think he acknowledged -- and you have to know that the intent on this end of the -- you know, and I'm seeing it now. I've been at the College of Medicine. I was even supportive and helped set up the

3

5

6 7

0

9

10

11

12

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2 4

25

infrastructure for the vaccine trials, et cetera. Trust me. We're all on the same page in terms of the importance of vaccinating and the importance of bringing up those percentages, and now to even higher levels. So I do appreciate the way this is being posed and I appreciate the input. Some of the challenges that -- and I don't know if this is the right forum, Aaron. This is actually my first full Senate -- Senate meeting as provost or as acting provost. I've been in every Senate Council meeting since I started, and they did incredibly helpful with reasoning out a number of things, as Aaron pointed out with the strategic plan.

But the challenge is you brought out a bit as well, and it would be good to get input, because we're now about to roll out the penalties and incentives. And I think Gail's point is very important. There are -- there is a plan for incentives, but it's at the testing phase. So we are saying people should get vaccinated. If they don't get vaccinated, they have to get tested, and if

2 4

they're not going to get tested, there are penalties. In fact, there's discussion over whether it's going to affect merit, or some fine, and that's been discussed also at Senate Council as well.

So something like that, a rollout, when you roll all that out, as pointed out in just a little while ago, very analogous to -- or even more enforced than what the universities out there that are calling the vaccine mandate a mandate or doing so. It's very, very analogous. It's very similar. In fact, it may even be, in some cases, even a stronger enforcement if there are financial penalties. Not in all universities, like you pointed out in terms of Virginia, you know, as well.

And the other issue too is -- which is a little bit of a dilemma that I've heard now -- and again, this may not be the forum for input -- is for vaccine mandate we would have for legal advice exceptions. For the testing, we don't have exceptions, meaning right now there's not even religious exceptions, as an example. But for the

3

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 4

25

vaccine, there would exceptions, such as medical and so forth, and probably religious as well, though I'm not going to speak in terms of the legal end of that. I know that there has been a lot of discussion over it. So there is -- I mean, you've got to know that everybody is living with this and thinking about this day and night, and I know you do. But the input is important, and I know the president would consider any input that comes from this meeting. And it's been very thoughtful and we're always looking at things, and there's always the option of pivoting, but it is complex. And I think you're all pointing that out as well, so I'll turn it back over to you, Aaron. If there is a form that we could get a bit more input to fine-tune, some of this, it would help. It would help sort things through with many of the things that you already discussed. Anyway, thank you.

CRAMER: Lee Blonder.

BLONDER: Yes, Lee Blonder, Faculty Trustee. I want to speak out and say that I support the approach

that the president is taking of encouraging

1 4

2.5

vaccines, but not mandating them, for a number of reasons, some of which have been mentioned here.

First of all, there are schools like William & Mary who have a 90-something-plus vaccination rate, and they're having a major outbreak of COVID among vaccinated students. We know that the vaccines might reduce infection and transmission, but they don't prevent it.

The other thing I'm really concerned about is how we're going to enforce this mandate, and Ken brought that up. I really do not want to see faculty being fired, being marginalized, being -- having all kinds of actions in their personnel file. I don't want to see that. I don't think that's right.

We know from the College of Medicine survey and the CAFÉ survey about 12 percent of the faculty that responded do not support a mandate. I also know that faculty who do not support a mandate, are afraid to speak out. So I want to speak out on their behalf. I want to support what the administration is doing. We're making progress. We're up over

,

Ö

2 4

80 percent in vaccination. It takes time for the vaccinations to work. We know from countries like Israel and UK that are highly vaccinated, that they have a high number of COVID cases, so I feel like there's enough reasons to not do a mandate.

Plus, there's a national issue now, people that are not vaccinated, unions, et cetera, are digging in their heels as a result of these mandates. It could polarize people even further and make them less likely to get vaccinated.

There's also legal implications in a state
like Kentucky, so my feeling is that we
should not support a mandate. We should
continue to do what the administration is
doing, but I really do want the
administration -- and Provost DiPaola, we've
talked about this, to do something that will
ensure faculty safety in the classroom. We
need to have the power to go hybrid and
online without having to go through
committees, have disability exceptions. We
need to have more safety measures other than
just masks, and the hope that these vaccines

1 will eventually stop the spread.

CRAMER: Alyssa Eckman.

1 4

2.5

ECKMAN: Yeah, Alyssa Eckman, College of Communication and Information. I'm fully vaccinated and I support the concept of a mandate, but without the -- I'm kind of echoing with what Dr.

Blonder just spoke of, and without the enforcement protocols in place, it's kind of difficult for me to support this resolution, especially in light of my untenured colleagues and how this might affect their career path. That's all. Thank you.

CRAMER: Molly Blasing.

BLASING:

I feel really strongly that there's -- so one argument that's been made, and I think it's a strong argument but I disagree with it, that what we're doing is the same as schools that are mandating, but then requiring testing. I think there's a real difference when you say a "mandate." People who are afraid of needles or are, you know, 20 years old and think they don't need the vaccine suddenly will sign up. I think we get thousands more really quickly, like within four to six weeks we have thousands more people. And so my

2

3

5

c

7

8

9

10

11

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 4

25

concern is how to do this as quickly and efficiently as possible.

But the thing that's not different is the enforcement question. We still have individuals in the testing regime who are going to not get vaccinated and not get tested, and the administration is coming up with a series of consequences for that. And those consequences could apply in the case of a mandate. And some models that I look at are OSU. OSU did theirs fairly late, and so it does speak to one of the earlier points. They're orienting toward next semester, so you know, students who don't comply with the vaccine mandate at OSU cannot take in-person classes in the spring. We would have to be thinking about spring semester, right, not doing something like disenrolling people right now.

When I think about efficacy questions, I come back to the dashboard question, and someone mentioned this in the comments, you know, I -- and I appreciate that the provost is suggesting that maybe we can disambiguate those two numbers, right? If the UK

2 4

HealthCare numbers are bringing up the numbers on main campus, then I know the numbers of my classroom are not on average 80 percent, they are lower, and so you have to get there.

And to Rae's point, which I really appreciate about sort of cultural things, I've heard this argument elsewhere as well, that it's the culture of this place, that's why we can't do it. And my response to that is that we have an opportunity to shape the culture, we have UK alumni across the Commonwealth who support our institution and wouldn't want the legislature stripping funding from us and wouldn't support serious consequences. I think there's -- I think we have enough goodwill well built up, and so the university has this opportunity to shape the culture.

Okay. That's all I'll say.

CRAMER:

If it looks like I'm going out of order, it's because I'm supposed to call on people who haven't spoken before I call them by people who've spoken once already, and I'm only supposed to call on people, at most twice, by Robert's Rules. And it's already 5:15.

O

2 4

Akiko.

TAKENAKA:

So very quickly to echo Molly's points about how we're looking into the next semester, it's not about right now, and masking and social distancing, which we're not doing anymore because we're teaching in classrooms full of students. That's -- masking is just a band-aid, even if we go online, that's just a band-aid, unless, you know, 90, 95percent of us do get vaccinated, we're all going to be doing this forever. So let's not just think about band-aids and think about the future.

CRAMER:

Tad.

MUTERSBAUGH:

Yeah. I mean, I support the mandate. And insofar as culture's concerned, how many people said, oh, well, you know, Kentuckians like to smoke in restaurants. Remember now nobody does that. I mean, it's to protect the people that have been vaccinated, so they won't get breakout infections, won't take it home. You know, this is to, like, stop people from dying, which is what these vaccines have been successful at. They also reduce the breakout infection.

2 4

Yeah, I don't -- you know, this idea of culture -- I mean, I grew up here in Kentucky. I just don't -- I mean, I find that a little offensive.

CRAMER: Mel.

STEIN:

Thank you. I just wanted to echo everything that Molly has said. I think this is a really well-structured mandate. And I think the idea of incentivizing is a good one, and I think that's what got us to 80 percentish, you know, because I do think the numbers from the medical campus are skewing that dashboard, as we've said. But I think we've reached the capacity of who we're going to incentivize. The people who weren't going to get vaccinated without being required to do so have gotten vaccinated.

I think, you know, the idea of not wanting to polarize people is -- I find that also rather offensive to the idea that, as a university, we're not supposed to be in a leadership role, but rather pandering to political polarization. I find that really, really troublesome.

And I think -- I applaud all the

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

incentivizing efforts, and I think that we've -- we did a lot and I think we did a great job last year. I don't know why we no longer have the flexibility to go online. Fully, I don't know why the social distancing measures have completely gone away. I don't think masking can be our only mandate right now. Thank you.

CRAMER: Doug?

WAY: Thank you,

Thank you, and I appreciate this motion. I'll just speak very quickly in support of what our trustee has told us. I believe we all, whether we're an administration or not, share the goal of getting as many people vaccinated as possible. I think the president just told us he does agree with that. He respectfully doesn't believe that mandating a vaccine right now is the right thing to do. Many of the speakers, in favor of improving conditions and safety and everything else, made it clear that they believe we should have other options but, yet, the resolution we're being asked to support has one option and one option only, that he immediately call for a vaccine

Δ

2 4

2.5

mandate.

I think strategically, for senators, it's important to remember if we're going to take a step on telling the president how to run the university, it really ought to be at someplace where we have academic gravitas and words to back it up.

And I think it's pretty clear that reasonable people can disagree on how to implement anything, and I don't think that calling him to take a stand right now is what we strategically should do. We've been invited by our provost to enter the dialogue to talk about these things. I think that's a much more productive way to do it.

And I also want to point out that whether you like the idea of it being polarizing or not, if we really meant what we said and we had a vaccine mandate, I promise you in January, we'll have a law that says we can't. It's virtually guaranteed. And I don't -- I think the president told us that. I think our trustee told us that, and I really don't think that's a realistic option.

CRAMER: Herman.

1 FARRELL:

Yeah. I'd like to respond to that last comment and to Lee Blonder's comment as well. First of all, with regard to what Lee blonder stated, I don't believe that the consequences here involve firing faculty, and I think that's an unfair thing being thrown into this debate.

Nobody is suggesting that -- we have made it very clear in our proposal that we treat these issues of consequences, if any, equitably and fairly.

We also already have a mass mandate in place and no one's really talking too much about the consequences. The mass mandate itself does actually take up the numbers in terms of people actually making their way to getting vaccinated, and I think that will happen here at UK.

With regard to this question about telling
the president what to do, my colleague in the
College of Fine Arts, and a point of
information question, made it clear that we
don't have the authority to tell him what to
do. This is as Aaron Cramer said, "The sense
of the Senate." The president has said very

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

1 4

2 4

/

1 4

2 4

clearly and several times that at some point in the future, he might pivot towards the vaccine mandate if he feels that it's necessary.

My argument would be that he will -- others have said that this is a tool in his toolbox, so let's give it to him. Let's vote for it, so he knows that the Senate is strongly in favor of vaccine mandate. We're in favor of it despite the polarization that might come, despite the polarization that is there to stop us from doing what we think is right. We enter into a variety of different controversial issues across the state and a variety of different issues -- and we follow the science. We follow the educational narrative, and that's what we're doing here right now. So I am all in favor of this vaccination mandate.

And like I said, we'll also -- going forward, we will also have an opportunity to treat a lot of the issues that have been raised as alternative remedies that can be used. It's our first meeting. It's September 13th, we've got a long way to go, but let's make a

2 4

clear line in the sand now stating to the entire state and to our students and to our faculty and our staff that we believe a vaccination mandate is necessary. Thank you.

DIPAOLA:

CRAMER:

Yeah -- no. I just was going to finish by saying -- and I'm not, again, debating. I really do -- and I think the president does want to hear input, as you just said, Herman. The possibility of pivoting at some point was always there on the table. The question is: Have we figured it all out? Have we worked out some of the details?

Some of the things that even came up here, I

think are good things to bring back and talk about. You know, Molly, your point about even thinking in terms of --your point and others' about looking into the next semester, even thinking about the long-term consequences in what we do.

And I do agree that you could say that the analogies aren't exactly the same enforcement, but in many cases are similar in different institutions, depending on what they're calling it, as you pointed out as

2.5

well.

But I do think it's important to get more input, especially over the enforcement side of things and how it would look different with a mandate and what we're doing in enforcement, or not saying we have a mandate, but doing it with enforcement.

And like I said, there have been discussions over what that enforcement might be even for the testing, and the exemption opportunities are different is what I'm hearing from legal exemption opportunities, for a mandated vaccine and exemption opportunities not being sent for testing.

So these are still complicated things. It would help -- I can tell you on this side, to help everybody to kind of get to whether or not to pivot or not, by getting a bit more input on the whole gamut of things that you all brought up as well. I just want to say personally, I do appreciate all of your input and we take it to heart. I take it to heart. I know he does as well in terms of input, thinking, always rethinking and trying to be as strategic as possible with the highest

1 priority to keep us all safe and healthy. The one good thing is the numbers of 2 3 percentages of positivity. Granted, it is the unvaccinated group that are testing. It is still at a low percent, which is good. I 5 6 do agree and you've discussed it at a number 7 of points here about getting the data on the 8 vaccination so that we really understand the campus, you know, as well, and we'll bring 9 10 that back. And I promise I'll bring back the 11 number of the points that I've now heard 12 throughout the remainder of the meeting. So just -- I just want to say thank you all. 13 1 4 CRAMER: Robert Lauder. 15 LAUDER: Oh, here we go. I think I'm unmuted here. 16 CRAMER: Yes. 17 LAUDER: I am a member of the Medical IRB, in addition 18 to being a member of the College of Pharmacy. 19 I am fully vaccinated. I wear a mask. I 20 support vaccines, and I agree with Molly, 21 this is our chance to change and improve the 22 culture of the state of Kentucky. 23 Long before COVID-19, everybody in healthcare 24 knew about the requirement for informed 25 consent prior to performing medical

Ю

/

2 4

procedures or experiments on human subjects.

There is an NIH document on the internet for this, and I am pasting in the chat window in case anybody wants to click on it and see it.

Sentence No. 3 of this document says that:

"Informed consent is both an ethical and legal obligation of medical practitioners in the United States and originates from the patient's right to direct what happens to their body."

Paragraph No. 2 begins with:

"Is the obligation of the provider to make it clear that the patient is participating in the decision-making process and avoid making the patient feel forced to agree with the provider."

So informing patients of risks of a procedure is not enough. There also has to be consent to those risks in order to get the benefits of a treatment. In my position as a member of the IRB, I would be kicked off of the IRB if I did not make this point, because I'm sure everyone -- every IRB would make the same point that informed consent without coercion is required for medical procedures.

1 And I just want us to keep that in mind, as we go forward, thoughts about vaccine 3 mandates. But then again, everybody, if you're not vaccinated out there yet, please go get the vaccine. I'm not going to make 5 6 you, but please do. 7 CRAMER: All right. Herman I see your hand. I've already called on you twice and it's 5:00-something, 5:27. Kaveh. 9 10 TAGAVI: You calling on me? Are you calling on me? 11 Can I qo? 12 CRAMER: Please. TAGAVI: For full disclosure, I have had several 13 1 4 exchanges with my colleague Robert Lauder. 15 He invoked this idea of consent, but 16 apparently it doesn't bother him that I am 17 forced to come to work with unvaccinated colleagues. I didn't consent to that, and if 18 19 I refuse to come, I might lose my job. So 20 there is asymmetry in there whether I don't 21 consent to be next to unvaccinated people or 22 supposedly those who, on their own, they get 23 in a car and they go get a vaccine. Now, all 24 of a sudden, he is claiming that there is no 25 consent, of course, there is a consent, they

Okay.

1 think about the risks and the benefits and they want to keep their employment, so they 3 go get a vaccine. So in some context, there is a consent in there. Furthermore, the question of consent, my 5 colleague doesn't mind forcing people to test, because I have had discussion with him and he never said he's against mandated testing. So somehow mandated testing is 9 10 okay, but mandated vaccination is not okay. 11 I think the logic of that just does not 12 follow. CRAMER: Are we ready for the question? Yes. 13 1 4 All in favor of the motion to adopt the 15 resolution presented by Molly Blasing use the 16 "raise hand" feature now. 17 If you're opposed to the motion, please use the "raise hand" feature now. 18 19 Abstaining? 20 That motion passes. So the Senate has 21 adopted this resolution. As Senate Council 22 Chair, I will communicate this resolution to 23 the president. 24 The next item is items from the floor, time 2.5 permitting -- time does not permit. So

unless there are objections to adjournment now, we will stand adjourned. I don't see any objections, so have a great September.