

# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 2/26/2023 11:02:32 PM

**Submitted by:** Hoagg, Jesse B.

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Academic Planning and Priorities

**Charge:** Charged with concern over major, broad, long-range plans and priorities. The SAPPCC is responsible for recommending to the University Senate plausible academic goals for the institution, identifying major academic problems likely to be faced by the University, and developing procedures and criteria for recommending academic priorities.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Committee

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

No

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

[No Response Given]

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

[No Response Given]

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

No

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

[No Response Given]

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**



# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 2/27/2023 12:03:56 AM

**Submitted by:** Gustafson, Alison

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Research and Graduate Education

**Charge:** Responsible for reviewing University research policies and graduation education policies and their implementation. The SRGEC is responsible for making recommendations to the University Senate regarding those policies and the priorities for them.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Committee

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

No

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

[No Response Given]

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

[No Response Given]

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

Yes

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

The implementation of project GATEWAY

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**

We met with Dr. Cassis and she provided key information regarding the process they were in with project GATEWAY. A survey has been sent to all those who submit grants and they are actively engaging in feedback and information gathering.



# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 2/27/2023 3:45:37 PM

**Submitted by:** Duncan, Marilyn J.

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Libraries

**Charge:** Charged with the responsibility for recommending to the University Senate policies to promote the educational interests of the University with respect to the Libraries, the faculty body of which is equivalent to the faculty of a college.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Committee

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

No

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

[No Response Given]

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

[No Response Given]

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

No

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

[No Response Given]

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**

The Libraries Committee will meet on March 3.



# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 2/27/2023 4:14:41 PM

**Submitted by:** Silver, Katie

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Retroactive Withdrawal

**Charge:** Decides all student requests for retroactive withdrawals as provided by Senate Rules 5.1.7.5.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Committee

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

Yes

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

Other

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

1

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

24

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

SRWAC considered 11 student requests for retroactive withdrawal appeal in February. 10 were approved, 1 was deferred to request additional information. 2 requests were pending Senate approval for waiver of SR 5.1.7.5.1. Senate approved the waiver on February 13, 2023, and the requests will be considered at the March 10, 2023 SRWAC meeting. There are currently 24 requests on the agenda for the March 10, 2023 meeting. The committee also discussed standards and expectations for supporting documentation accompanying requests for retroactive withdrawal appeals.

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

No

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

[No Response Given]

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**

Since SRWAC meetings are closed, minutes are not available for SRWAC meetings.





# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 2/27/2023 4:22:24 PM

**Submitted by:** Silver, Katie

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Health Care Colleges Council

**Charge:** It shall consider, (i) all proposed new courses and changes in courses offered in a professional health care program, or (ii) undergraduate or graduate courses that involve students in health care practices that originate from a college represented on the HCC Council and all proposals for new academic professional programs, changes in academic professional programs, changes in professional degrees or degree titles, changes in the admission or graduation requirements, and other academic issues concerning professional health care programs that originate from a college represented on the HCCC.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Council

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

[No Response Given]

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

Reviewing proposals

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

0

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

4

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

[No Response Given]

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

No

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

[No Response Given]

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**

HCCC conducted business via electronic vote in February 2023 in lieu of a meeting. One program change and one

associated course change were reviewed; reviews reported no issues and indicated the proposals were ready to be voted on for approval. HCCC is currently reviewing one program change proposal with three associated course proposals.

# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 2/27/2023 4:37:30 PM

**Submitted by:** Pearson, Kevin J.

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Diversity and Inclusion

**Charge:** Charged to increase diversity among senators, in particular representation of URM; work with senior leadership to disseminate best practices for recruiting & retaining faculty of color and other underrepresented groups; and addressing other related issues.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Committee

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

Yes

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

Discussing issue(s)

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

3

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

3

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

Title IX; My Old Kentucky Home, Good-Night lyrics/singing at UK events; student code of conduct; faculty senate demographics

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

Yes

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

Title IX and Student Code of Conduct Updates. Please see the minutes.

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**

N/A

Meeting Notes Attached

## February 15, 2023 Meeting

- Update on Drs. Nokes, Turner, and Albert
  - March 15th, 3:00pm (Dr. Sue Nokes, Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement, will join us)
  - April 19th, 3:00pm (Dr. Kirsten Turner, Vice President for Student Success, and Todd Brann, Executive Director, Institutional Research, Analytics, & Decision Support, will join us)
  
- Faculty Senate Demographics
  - Laneshia has confirmed that the number of faculty senate members that are from underrepresented backgrounds has doubled since the SACDI formed.
  - <https://www.uky.edu/irads/faculty-appointments-demographics>
  - We've made progress on the diversity of the senate, but can we improve the inclusiveness of how all senator ideas are heard/appreciated/receptiveness.
  - Can we now start to look at increasing length of senate participation and leadership for faculty senators from diverse backgrounds?
  
- Title IX Non-Compliance-Introduction and update during Faculty Senate discussions.
  - Loka (Brittany is unable to make it to this meeting)
  - <https://www.usatoday.com/in-depth/news/investigations/2022/12/15/title-ix-enforcement-essentially-toothless-mired-red-tape-delays/10803850002/>
  - In January, Loka brought this up as an item from the floor during the Faculty Senate meeting, and Chair Collett stated that she would check with the Provost on where UK stands on Title IX Compliance, specifically the status of AR 6.1 and 6.2.
    - Exact language: "Loka Ashwood (AS) asked about a recent USA Today news article about consequences for schools for non-compliance with Title IX. Ashwood mentioned a 2019 working group at the University tasked with making recommendations to President Capilouto regarding sexual assault and harassment. Further, the relevant Administrative Regulation has been an interim regulation since 2020. Ashwood asked if the Senate could gather information about the University's compliance with Title IX and the impact on education. The Chair said she would ask for a written update from Provost DiPaola."
    - Title IV is quite broad.
    - What action items are there for us as SACDI?
  - In a prior faculty senate meeting, the student code of conduct process came up as an open floor item for discussion. In October, Senate Chair reported that past SC Chair Aaron Cramer requested that presentations be provided on changes in Administrative Regulations, which include Student Code of Conduct, but that the University Legal Counsel declined the invitation. How can we get a response on the status of Student Code of Conduct?
  
- New items

- What next for the committee?
- Accessibility (External firm, expertise)
- <https://hdi.uky.edu/category/priority-area/universal-design>
- <https://uknow.uky.edu/campus-news/employee-affinity-groups-gather-annual-advance>
- <https://uknow.uky.edu/campus-news/behind-blue-katrice-albert-discusses-uk-s-dei-implementation-plan>

# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 2/27/2023 6:15:19 PM

**Submitted by:** Grossman, Robert B.

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Nominating

**Charge:** Review and offer recommendations on: requests for faculty representatives, considering all aspects of a nominee (race, gender, ethnicity, unit affiliation, discipline, tenure status, rank, administrative position, previous service to the Senate, etc.) and the purpose of the committee for which the nominee was requested; policies to promote diverse memberships; and any other similar topic assigned to it.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Committee

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

Yes

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

Discussing issue(s)

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

0

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

0

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

[No Response Given]

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

No

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

[No Response Given]

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**





# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 2/28/2023 4:30:35 PM

**Submitted by:** Charnigo, Richard J.

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Calendar

**Charge:** Review and offer recommendations for action on: the Academic Calendars submitted by the Registrar; program- and course- specific requests for calendars that deviate from the Academic Calendar; issues related to closures, academic holidays, and waivers for academic holidays; and any other similar topic assigned to it.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Committee

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

No

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

[No Response Given]

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

[No Response Given]

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

Yes

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

We will consider whether to suggest further revisions to Senate Rule 2.1.

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**

In February we conducted business electronically, voting 8-0-0 to recommend revisions to Senate Rule 2.1 and 7-0-0 to endorse Pharmacy calendars (2022-23 modification, 2023-24 final, 2025-26 tentative). Next up on our docket are a non-standard calendar for PAS and a Dentistry calendar (2023-24 modification).



# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 2/28/2023 7:00:07 PM

**Submitted by:** Cramer, Jennifer S.

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Faculty Affairs

**Charge:** Review and recommend action on issues related to: performance reviews and standards for evaluation; promotion and tenure; employee benefits; work-life matters; recruitment and retention; issues raised by the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure; and any other similar topic assigned to it.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Committee

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

Yes

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

Discussing issue(s)

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

1

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

1

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

[No Response Given]

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

No

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

[No Response Given]

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**

SFAC discussed questions related to title series. Included with the minutes from that meeting are 1) some information about each title series and 2) data from Sue Nokes regarding title series appointments over time (I apologize for the format of these data; I can share the full Excel file instead, if needed).

Meeting Notes Attached

**Draft 2/13/23**

## **Senate Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting**

Minutes

Friday, February 10, 2023

The newly established Senate Faculty Affairs Committee convened its second meeting on Friday, February 10, 2023 on Zoom. Co-Chair Jennifer Cramer called the meeting to order at 9:00 A.M. The members in attendance included: Karen O. Skaff, Co-Chair, Ernest Bailey, Senator Mei Chen, Christopher Bollinger Hayley Hoffman, and Sue Nokes, ex-officio (Provost Representative), and absent: Senator Sarah Hall, Treshani Perera, and an Ex-Officio Representative from the President's office yet to be appointed.

Co-Chair Jennifer Cramer (JC) provided an overview of the agenda for this meeting and began by sharing background information referenced in the (attached) materials which were provided in advance for review by the Committee. JC also referenced a January 2023 meeting with Co-Chair Karen Skaff and the Senate Council Chair DeShana Collett to ascertain the purpose/expectations for the newly established SFAC and the major issues to be addressed. One topic for which Senate Council would appreciate feedback and recommendation is related to **Title Series Appointments** at UK.

JC also thanked Sue Nokes for providing specifically requested information from the past five years about current allocations and trajectories in Title Series Appointments, with attention to the Clinical Title Series (CTS) and Lecturer Title Series (LTS) and data related to tenure/tenure-eligible appointments and non-tenure-eligible faculty appointments in CTS and LTS.

To get a sense of the concerns about Title Series appointments, JC referenced the issue raised by Hollie Swanson (faculty trustee) about alignment of appointment in CTS related to an Endowed Professorship in the UK College of Medicine, where the BOT was asked to approve what was not aligned with UK regulations.

JC led the committee discussion by addressing the questions she provided in the review packet and asked Q1, "*Are there current or potential issues regarding straying too far from tenure-track faculty?*", which JC interpreted to mean issues with having fewer tenure-eligible faculty in favor of having more non-tenure-eligible faculty.

A robust discussion ensued about scenarios in other Colleges in both the CTS and LTS about alignment and perhaps inconsistencies across the University. The discussion followed with concerns about the impact of CTS and LTS on Tenure, Sabbaticals, voting privilege, and the significant differences among and between faculty roles, DOE and position descriptions, and time/effort available for research and service and for faculty engagement in shared governance as it relates to the individual faculty member, their respective units/departments, colleges, and the University. It became clear that the key issues in SFAC discussion in this meeting appeared to be the **alignment (or lack of alignment) and consistency (or lack of consistency) with the ARs and GRs of faculty appointments in the CTS and LTS at UK.**

Another issue was raised about the new clinical (faculty) appointments related to the large number of **incoming community-based physicians from Kings Daughters** that resulted in the creation of a new category for clinical physicians as "staff" rather than "faculty" appointments. This decision raises a Q of alignment/consistency with the current cohort of UK/COM physicians that are hired as "faculty" to serve patients, and also teach undergraduates, medical students, and residents in the current CTS faculty appointments series. Again, are we straying too far away from and hiring too many non-tenure-eligible faculty at UK?

**Another question was raised about faculty appointments that are not aligned/consistent with the UK regulation** that states, "... nontenure faculty appointments shall not exceed 25%." Examination of the data demonstrates that at least five UK Colleges are trending toward increased numbers/percentages of non-tenure eligible faculty lines (Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Social Work, and Communication and Information Sciences). Is it important to examine the impact of these percentages/ratios of tenure to non-tenure-eligible faculty appointments at UK? A further Q asks about the "role" in terms of the DOE for tenure/non-tenure-eligible faculty appointments.

It is clear that there are significant differences among individual faculty appointments/roles across UK units/departments and colleges. A Q was asked, "Have we become too flexible/open when colleges vote (by units) to approve exemptions to existing criteria/functions/roles in the CTS and perhaps the LTS series appointments?" A further Q was raised about the extent to which the administrative rationale, e.g., *Needs of the College*, may trump the alignment/consistency balance among and between the uses of the different title series, especially CTS and LTS.

Another question was raised as it relates to the Lecturer Title Series, asking if there are similar concerns as the numbers in LTS and PTIs (non-tenure-eligible) in some colleges are trending up in faculty hires/appointments rather than in Regular or Special Title Series faculty with tenure eligibility. Here again, the concerns center on the implications that appointments may have on Tenure, Sabbaticals, Voting, DOE functions/roles, and faculty governance.

In summary, the lack of alignment and/or consistency with University regulations (ARs & GRs) specifically with CTS (and perhaps LTS) appointments matters, and it may create a sense of second-class citizenry, result in unfair expectations/treatment of faculty, and non-tenured faculty may not be able to contribute in the way they want and be too cautious to say (vote) in their respective units.

The next SFAC meeting **date, time and location** will be held in March, perhaps after Spring Break. The meeting adjourned at 10:15 AM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Karen O. Skaff, Co-Chair SFAC

## Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (SFAC) – charge related to title series

In January 2023, Karen Skaff and Jennifer Cramer, co-chairs of SFAC, met with DeShana Collett, chair of the UK Senate Council (SC), to discuss and clarify items that SFAC has been charged with pursuing. One topic for which SC would appreciate feedback and recommendations is related to the various title series positions at UK. We have included in this packet various pieces of information that Chair Collett indicated may be useful as well as additional information that will inform our discussion.

We begin with some background information about why a particular item was raised and then provide the specific questions that were posed by the SC on September 19, 2022 (see minutes from that meeting [here](#)):

- Background
  - Hollie Swanson (faculty trustee) indicated that the Board of Trustees were asked to approve something that she believed was not in alignment with regulations.
  - A clinical department (in Medicine) wanted to change the criteria of an endowed professorship so that it could be given to a Clinical Title Series (CTS) faculty member (current criteria require the possessor of the professorship to be in the Regular Title Series [RTS]).
  - Their justification was that they had no RTS faculty.
  - The process for determining sufficient requirements for holding such positions is not consistent across the university (e.g., clearly laid processes in Engineering, no such processes easily found in Medicine).
  - During this meeting, Sue Nokes provided the annual CTS report, and while the focus was on CTS, there were some indications that it might be useful to consider similar questions for lecturers.
  - Perhaps also relevant for CTS – the Board of Trustees approved the creation of a second practice plan group for community-based physicians who will not be categorized as faculty (related to acquisition of King’s Daughters).
  - Swanson also indicated that any changes would require a new AR.
- Questions
  - Are there current or potential issues regarding straying too far from tenure-track faculty? *[JC: I interpret this to mean issues with having fewer tenure-eligible faculty in favor of having more non-tenure-eligible faculty.]*
  - What are the justifications/parameters for the Provost to approve colleges with total faculty in CTS in excess of 25%? What was the justification for allowing a high percentage of non-tenure track faculty in College of Medicine (212%)? Is this only in the hands of the Provost? *[JC: AR 2:6 says, “The ratio of the number of faculty appointments in the Clinical Title Series to the total number in the tenure-track title series (i.e., Regular, Special, Extension, Librarian) in a college shall not exceed 25 percent unless a specific higher ratio is approved by the Provost and the dean after a consultative vote is taken of the faculty council in the college.”]*

- What are acceptable Distribution of Effort (DOE) metrics for CTS research, clinical, etc.? Given the current wording of AR 2:6, what are the expected/appropriate research responsibilities?
- What is the relationship between CTS faculty and the level of participation in unit and University shared governance?
  - Because the DOE is mostly allocated to clinical service, there is less time for involvement in shared governance issues.
  - Each college and department faculty body has the discretion to confer membership, with or without voting privileges, to CTS faculty.
- How does the CTS relate to the newly approved Community-based physicians who are not considered faculty? Could this offer a solution for practicing physicians that were not seeking a faculty title series?
- Can we see data that shows the current allocations and trajectories over the last five years of CTS and lecturer series? Would be interesting to see the trends related to the growth in enrollment. We have seen a significant increase in non-tenure-eligible appointments, such as lecturer. *[JC: We have asked Sue Nokes to see if she can get us this data.]*

To be able to fully consider the issue at hand and provide recommendations to SC on how to move forward, we must understand the parameters for all title series at UK. Below is a bullet point list of relevant information, drawn from various regulations that discuss title series, including parameters, rights, and responsibilities.

- According to GR2 (which can be found [here](#)), in accordance with KRS 164.131 (which can be found [here](#)):
  - Two faculty members representing the University are elected to the Board of Trustees.
  - The faculty member must be at the rank of assistant professor or above.
  - This means lecturers are ineligible.
  - Those eligible to vote must also be at the rank of assistant professor or above.
  - This means lecturers are ineligible.
  - University Senate has authority to develop procedures, but it must be in accordance with state law.
- According to GR7 (which can be found [here](#)):
  - Academic ranks “consist of lecturer and senior lecturer in the lecturer series, and instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, or the equivalent to these recognized in the librarian title series of librarian IV, librarian III, librarian II and librarian I, respectively.”
  - The President sets the title series, ranks, and qualifications after consulting with “appropriate administrative and faculty groups, including the University Senate Council.”
  - Establishing new title series or ranks needs the Board of Trustees to approve.
  - Graduate faculty must hold at least the rank of assistant professor (or equivalent).
  - This means lecturers are ineligible.



- Graduate faculty must demonstrate “scholarly maturity and professional productivity”, which could potentially render ineligible any faculty member without research DOE.
- “The Dean of the Graduate School confers membership in the Graduate Faculty.”
- Associate and assistant deans in Honors College must hold “professorial faculty rank (i.e. assistant, associate, or full professor)” (not made explicit for other colleges).
- This means lecturers are ineligible.
- “Regular members of the Honors Faculty are tenured or tenure-eligible faculty members with primary appointment in another college who have a recurring, dedicated assignment in Honors College, reflected in their Distribution of Effort (DOE).”
- Lecturers who have their primary appointment in Honors are associate members, who may be granted voting rights by the regular members.
- In the other colleges, “The membership of the faculty of a college shall consist of its dean, associate and/or assistant deans, and regular full-time faculty having the rank of assistant professor, associate professor or professor in the regular, special title, or extension series or librarian III, II or I in the librarian title series.”
- “Membership, with or without voting privileges, also may be extended or withdrawn by the above college faculty to any other person assigned to the college for administrative, instruction, research, extension, clinical or librarian work.” Similar wording for schools, departments, multidisciplinary research centers or institutes.
- No rank conferred nor tenure acquired through multidisciplinary research centers or institutes.
- Within the description of the duties of a department chair, it says, “On matters relating to appointment or promotion in the Clinical Title Series, Research Title Series, or Lecturer Series, the department chair shall also consult with all full-time faculty employees in the series of the individual under consideration who are at or above the rank to which the individual would be appointed or promoted. Faculty employees in the tenure-ineligible series shall not be consulted on matters relating to appointment, reappointment, terminal reappointment, decisions not to reappoint, promotion or the granting of tenure of faculty employees in the tenure-eligible title series, except by invitation of the department faculty as provided below.” *[JC: I’m highlighting this because it pulls out CTS, lecturer, and research title series as special.]*
- According to GR10 (which can be found [here](#)):
  - Faculty appointments are in educational units.
  - There are three types: 1) non-tenured, 2) tenured, and 3) post-retirement.
  - There are two types of non-tenured: 1) tenure-ineligible (lecturer, research title series, CTS, adjunct, visiting, voluntary or part-time/temporary employment in any series) and 2) pre-tenure (appointed full-time, year-to-year in RTS, special title series (STS), extension, or librarian (may be considered for tenure)).

- Tenured appointments are full-time, continuous appointments.
- “Probationary periods are applicable to non-tenured appointments of faculty members on a full-time year-to-year basis in the regular, special title, extension, or librarian title series. Such non-tenured appointments may be for one (1) year or for other stated periods, subject to renewal. The total non-tenure period, however, shall not exceed seven (7) years” except in specific instances of approved leave (family, medical, educational, etc.).
- “An individual shall not remain at the rank of instructor in the University for more than three (3) years. If after that period, promotion to a higher rank cannot be justified, the individual's appointment with the University shall not be renewed.”
- Probationary periods are not applicable to faculty in lecturer, research title series, CTS, adjunct, visiting, voluntary or part-time/temporary employment in any series.
- The faculty appointment types outlined in GR10 are further detailed in AR2:1-1 (which can be found [here](#)). *[JC: I think AR2:1-2 is basically the same but with a different effective date.]*
  - About appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure, focus on tenure and promotion processes.
  - Lists all title series: RTS, extension, STS, research, CTS, librarian, adjunct, emeritus, lecturer, voluntary.
  - Indicates the relevant AR for each (see below for more details on these).
  - Each unit has policies on evidences of activity that are appropriate to their field in teaching, research, and service.
  - Emeritus only applies to tenured appointments.

Finally, details related to each title series, taken from the relevant ARs (all of which can be found [here](#)), are listed below:

- RTS (AR2:2) *[JC: AR2:2-1 is for RTS appointed on January 1, 2000 or later; AR2:2-2 is for RTS appointed prior to January 1, 2000.]*
  - Three areas of activity: 1) teaching, advising, other instructional, 2) research, 3) professional, University, public service. *[JC: AR2:2-2 says four areas, with University and public service as separate from professional service.]*
  - Expect high quality teaching, appropriate research dissemination, and broad service (specifically, “Formation of educational policy, participation in faculty governance, and effective performance of administrative duties, shall be taken into consideration in the evaluation process.”)
  - Proportion of activities varies by assigned DOE.
  - Assistant Professor – terminal degree; capacity for excellent teaching, research, and service; potential for growth.
  - Associate Professor – assistant professor plus high scholarly achievements in teaching, research, and service; continuous improvement; external recognition (regional or national).

- Professor – associate professor plus high scholarly achievements in teaching, research, and service; excellence; high level of professional recognition (national or international); not about length of service.
- Extension (AR2:3)
  - Assistant Extension Professor – terminal degree plus any required certification; essential instructional and organizational skills for developing and administering a University service program; potential for growth.
  - Associate Extension Professor – assistant extension professor plus professional development; substantial instructional and organizational skills; significant contributions of service to the University and community.
  - Extension Professor – associate extension professor plus continued professional development; achievements in field; leadership and service to profession; regional and national recognition.
  - Has its own academic area advisory committee (AR2:11).
- STS (AR2:4)
  - Definition: “The special title series is appropriate when the University requires the services of professionally competent faculty employees to meet instructional and service responsibilities in selected areas or positions in which assignments do not necessarily include research or creative work.”
  - Has same ranks as RTS (though the document lists “Instructor” as one of those ranks, which does not appear in AR2:2).
  - To establish a new STS position (each new instantiation goes through this special process; a previously approved STS type may be reused without the full procedure):
    - The educational unit initiating the process prepares a justification, description, and criteria for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure.
    - Dean of the college forwards to Provost.
    - The appropriate Academic Area Advisory Committee reviews, makes suggestions for revision, and approves.
    - Provost approves.
  - “The Special Title Series is not intended to serve as a means for appointing and promoting individuals who are unable to qualify for appointment or promotion in the Regular Title Series because of demonstrated lack of research competence.”
  - Once created, appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure processes for RTS plus the special criteria listed on creation are followed.
  - Does not normally imply a responsibility to engage in research.
  - This implies that Graduate Faculty membership is not guaranteed.
  - Otherwise the same as other tenure-eligible conditions and benefits.
- Research (AR2:5)
  - Not tenure eligible.

- Definition: “The Research Title Series is a professorial series for appointment and promotion of appropriately qualified individuals who participate in the University's academic program but whose activities shall be limited to participation in projects which (1) involve research or other creative activity, (2) are of limited and specified duration, and (3) the institution operates under contracts, grants, or other designated funds.”
- “...shall not have regularly-scheduled teaching or service assignments.”
- Funded by grants, contracts, etc.; can be temporarily on non-grant funds if a gap occurs (<6 months).
- Three areas of activity: research; professional status/activity; grant-getting.
- Assistant Research Professor – independent researcher; can support work with grants; terminal degree; potential for professional growth; <3 years term, may be reappointed.
- Associate Research Professor – continuous improvement in research and grant-getting; regional recognition; <5 years term, may be reappointed.
- Research Professor – outstanding researcher; outstanding at grant-getting; national or perhaps international recognition; not about years of experience or length of appointment; <5 years term, may be reappointed.
- “Procedures for appointment and promotion to academic ranks related to approved positions in the Research Title Series are the same as those for the regular title series. (AR 2:1-1, AR 2:1-2)”.
- May be graduate faculty.
- If converted to RTS, years of service in Research Title Series will not count toward determination of probationary period (that is, you still get the full 6 years).
- Same benefits as RTS except tenure and sabbatical.
- May get voting privileges from educational unit; not eligible to vote on faculty appointments, etc. and cannot be elected to University Senate.
- CTS (AR2:6)
  - Not tenure-eligible.
  - Available in any college that has clinical fields (originally limited to healthcare colleges).
  - “The ratio of the number of faculty appointments in the Clinical Title Series to the total number in the tenure-track title series (i.e., Regular, Special, Extension, Librarian) in a college shall not exceed 25 percent unless a specific higher ratio is approved by the Provost and the dean after a consultative vote is taken of the faculty council in the college.”
  - Definition: “The Clinical Title Series is a series of tenure-ineligible academic ranks and titles for appointment and promotion of qualified individuals, who participate in the University's academic programs and whose duties and responsibilities are essentially related to clinical practice, service to clients or patients, and experiential training of students of the profession.”

- In healthcare programs – primary responsibilities in patient care and directing clinical experiences for healthcare program students.
- A CTS must be created within an educational unit, in consultation with unit faculty, with a demonstrated need and an identified source of funding; approval of dean and provost required.
- Four areas of activity: practice; clinical instruction; professional status/activity; generate practice funds (if applicable).
- No university general funds can be used except with a Provost exception “in cases where: 1. The job assignment is inappropriate for the Regular Title Series; and 2. Fees or practice funds are not collected in relation to the job activities.”
- Clinical Instructor – terminal degree or relevant certification; clinical competence; license to practice; potential for professional growth; term is <3 years, may be reappointed.
- Assistant Clinical Professor – Clinical Instructor plus terminal degree (that is, certification is not sufficient) and local recognition; may waive terminal degree with positive majority vote of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty at Assistant Professor or above in unit, positive recommendation of unity admin; and positive recommendation of area committee and provost; term is <5 years, may be reappointed.
- Associate Clinical Professor – Clinical Assistant Professor plus substantial commitments in practice and clinical instruction; demonstrated creative contributions to instruction and clinical service programs; regional recognition as a clinician; term is <5 years, may be reappointed.
- Clinical Professor – Associate Clinical Professor plus outstanding practitioner; regional or perhaps national recognition; excellence in areas of emphasis; term is <5 years, may be reappointed.
- “Procedures for appointment, reappointment, and promotion to academic ranks related to approved positions in the Clinical Title Series are the same as those for the tenure-eligible title series (AR 2:2-1, AR 2:2-2), except that faculty employees of the Clinical Title Series shall be consulted on a departmental or divisional basis as appropriate about appointment, reappointment, and promotion to academic ranks equal to or below their own.”
- May be associate graduate faculty but may not direct graduate theses or dissertations (can be on committees).
- If converted to tenure-eligible position, years of service in CTS will not count toward determination of probationary period (that is, you still get the full 6 years).
- Same benefits as RTS except tenure and sabbatical.
- May get voting privileges from educational unit; not eligible to vote on faculty appointments, etc.

- “Faculty employees appointed in the Clinical Title Series shall not have regularly assigned duties in University service (see “Areas of Activity” above). However, faculty employees appointed in this title series who have been extended the privilege of membership in the college faculty body (GR part VII, section A.4) may be elected to serve in the University Senate. Individuals appointed in the Clinical Title Series shall not occupy more than 25 percent of the University Senate seats allocated to a college, nor be calculated as more than 25 percent of the faculty employees of a college in the apportionment of University Senate seats among the colleges.”
- “The Office of the Provost shall maintain a record of the number of faculty employees on appointment in the Clinical Title Series for each college, including any exemptions granted pursuant to this Administrative Regulation. The Provost shall provide to the University Senate Council an annual report regarding the status (i.e., total number and exemptions per college) of faculty employees appointed in the Clinical Title Series.”
- Librarian (AR2:7)
  - Ranks: Librarian IV, Librarian III, Librarian II, and Librarian I (analogous to Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, respectively).
  - Appointment in Librarian series limited to Libraries and College of Law.
  - Must have graduate degree in library science (can sub other master’s degrees).
  - Librarian IV – no longer than 5 years at this rank (if promotion is not justified, not renewed).
  - Librarian III – must have at least 3 years of successful library-related experience (can include graduate study); promotion to this rank based on annual performance review at Librarian IV.
  - Librarian II and I – must have at least 5 years of successful library-related experience; may also require subject specialization; promotion to these ranks based on performance and professional development; “In no case shall the assignment of administrative duties be a requirement for promotion to the rank of Librarian II or Librarian I.”
  - One-year appointments during probationary period.
  - “The total probationary period of a Librarian III shall not exceed seven (7) years, including applicable previous full-time service as a professional librarian at another institution or as a Librarian IV. A librarian with more than three (3) years of full-time experience at another institution who is appointed at the rank of Librarian IV, Librarian III, or Librarian II may be required to serve in a probationary status not to exceed four (4) years. If tenure was not granted while on appointment as Librarian III, the individual shall be considered for the granting of tenure coincident with a review for promotion to Librarian II. An individual initially appointed at the rank of Librarian I may be given non-tenured status for a period not to exceed one (1) year. A tenure-eligible faculty employee at the rank of Librarian I shall be considered

for tenure in the first half of a one-year probationary period, unless the individual requests in writing that such not be done because of the intent to resign or willingness to accept a notice of non-renewal of appointment.”

- Procedures for handling tenure in AR2:1-1.
- Appointment as Librarian Title Series does not normally imply research but is eligible to be PI on a grant.
- Eligible for membership in University Senate and sabbatical; same benefits as other tenure-eligible positions.
- Has its own academic area advisory committee (AR2:11).
- Adjunct (AR2:8)
  - Definition: “...individuals employed by a non-University agency or by the University with primary appointments in non-faculty positions, who contribute significantly to the instructional or research missions of the University.”
  - Not tenure eligible, no sabbatical, no university benefits, no election to Senate; may get voting privileges in educational unit.
  - Same ranks as RTS.
  - Term of appointment on notice of academic appointment.
  - Very individualized on how much teaching/research is required.
  - Limited to those who do not already have a faculty appointment of more than 50% (otherwise see regs on join appointments).
  - Rules for appointment are the same as RTS “except that time in rank and involvement of an Academic Area Advisory Committee are not required for appointments or reappointments.”
- Lecturer (AR2:9)
  - Definition: “professionally qualified teachers hired for a fixed term.”
  - Not tenure eligible, no sabbatical, cannot be members of graduate faculty.
  - “...do not have the same responsibilities and professional obligations as faculty in Regular, Special, Extension or Librarian Title Series.”
  - “Lecturer Series appointments shall not be made when appointment in a tenure-eligible title series is appropriate.”
  - Ranks: Lecturer and Senior Lecturer.
  - Dean makes final decision on appointment, etc. of Lecturer; Provost makes final decision on initial appointment to Senior Lecturer without Area Committee; dean makes final decision on reappointment, etc. for Senior Lecturer.
  - “The tenured and tenure-eligible faculty of an educational unit (department, school without departments, graduate center or college without either departments or schools) that employs faculty employee(s) in the Lecturer Series, shall establish by majority vote the maximum number or percentage of Lecturer Series faculty that may be employed by the unit. The number shall be documented in the rules of the unit and shall only be changed by majority vote of the tenured and tenure-eligible faculty of the unit.”

- Initial appointment can be no longer than 2 years.
- Must give 12 months' notice for terminal appointment.
- After review in the fourth year of service as Lecturer, can recommend 2 year rolling contracts or give a terminal appointment.
- After review in the fourth year of service as Senior Lecturer, can recommend 3 year rolling contracts or give terminal appointment.
- Lecturer Series may be 9-, 10-, 11-, or 12-month contracts.
- Poor performance review will result in non-renewal with some variation on whether reappointment can be made without rolling contracts.
- Educational units establish criteria for appointment, etc.; criteria must include terminal degree or evidence of appropriate professional experience/credentials (approved by dean).
- Lecturers undergo performance evaluation annually, Senior Lecturers biennially.
- Promotion to Senior Lecturer at any time after 5 years of service.
- After 6 years of service, may apply for a one-year course reduction (6 credit hours) to devote time to professional development (similar rules as sabbaticals about what counts in the years of service).
- Annual DOE shall normally be 75% instruction (= 9 credit hours per semester) and 25% “apportioned among other assigned duties that serve the undergraduate program of the faculty employee's educational unit or college.”
- Teaching limited to 100-, 200-, and 300-level courses (exceptions may be granted by the Provost).
- Eligible to vote in college and University Senate with approval of tenured and tenure-track members of the faculty of the college; eligible for voting privileges in educational unit (must indicate this privilege in dept policies).
- May apply to faculty positions in other series; time spent in Lecturer Series shall not count toward sabbatical leave nor as part of the probationary period.
- Same benefits as other employees, same ability to appeal on matters of procedure, privilege, and/or academic freedom.
- Voluntary (AR2:10)
  - Definition: “Voluntary faculty employees have an official faculty appointment and devote part of their time to a program in an educational unit, but receive no salary or benefits. Such faculty employees usually are self-employed or hold full-time or part-time positions with other institutions and agencies.”
  - Not tenure eligible, no faculty benefits, cannot serve in Senate, cannot be elected to the Board of Trustees.
  - May be granted voting privileges by educational unit.
  - Very specific and detailed procedures for appointment, etc.

We might benefit from further examination of college and department rules once data about these title series has been reviewed and a clearer plan has been developed from our



committee. There may be information that would be potentially relevant to our discussion at the following links:

- Complete histories of the faculty title series:  
<https://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/faculty-title-series-histories-title-series>
- Other Administrative Regulations beyond those discussed here:  
<https://www.uky.edu/regs/ar2-6>
- University Senate Rules: <https://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/rules-regulations>
- Certain HR policies: <https://www.uky.edu/hr/policies/>
- Some items listed on the Office of Legal Counsel website under “Additional Policies & Resources”: <https://www.uky.edu/regs/additional-policies-resources>
  - Especially items under “Additional Faculty Policies”:  
<https://www.uky.edu/ofa/node/10>
  - Also the process for regulation review and development:  
<https://www.uky.edu/regs/regulations-review-and-development-process>
- Graduate Faculty membership information: <https://gradschool.uky.edu/graduate-faculty>

		2015-2016	
			% of TT
<b>Agriculture, Food and Environment</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	254	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	234	
	Full-Time Lecturers	10	4.27%
	Full-Time Clinical	5	2.14%
<b>Arts and Sciences</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	468	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	395	
	Full-Time Lecturers	52	13.16%
	Full-Time Clinical	0	0.00%
<b>Business and Economics</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	87	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	76	
	Full-Time Lecturers	11	14.47%
	Full-Time Clinical	0	0.00%
<b>Communication and Information</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	82	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	54	
	Full-Time Lecturers	28	51.85%
	Full-Time Clinical	0	0.00%
<b>Dentistry</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	63	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	42	
	Full-Time Lecturers	0	0.00%
	Full-Time Clinical	18	42.86%
<b>Design</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	28	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	21	
	Full-Time Lecturers	6	28.57%
	Full-Time Clinical	0	0.00%
<b>Education</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	122	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	88	
	Full-Time Lecturers	16	18.18%
	Full-Time Clinical	15	17.05%
<b>Engineering</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	142	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	128	
	Full-Time Lecturers	11	8.59%
	Full-Time Clinical	0	0.00%
<b>Fine Arts</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	97	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	71	
	Full-Time Lecturers	20	28.17%
	Full-Time Clinical	0	0.00%
<b>Graduate School</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	14	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	11	
	Full-Time Lecturers	2	18.18%
	Full-Time Clinical	1	9.09%
<b>Health Sciences</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	56	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	43	
	Full-Time Lecturers	6	13.95%

	Full-Time Clinical	4	9.30%
<b>Honors College</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members		
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty		
	Full-Time Lecturers		
	Full-Time Clinical		
<b>Law</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	32	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	26	
	Full-Time Lecturers	0	0.00%
	Full-Time Clinical	4	15.38%
<b>Medicine</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	943	
	Full-Time Tenure Track	358	
	Full-Time Lecturers	4	1.12%
	Full-Time Clinical	519	144.97%
<b>Nursing</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	60	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	33	
	Full-Time Lecturers	13	39.39%
	Full-Time Clinical	13	39.39%
<b>Pharmacy</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	61	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	42	
	Full-Time Lecturers	0	0.00%
	Full-Time Clinical	11	26.19%
<b>Public Health</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	48	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	40	
	Full-Time Lecturers	0	0.00%
	Full-Time Clinical	1	2.50%
<b>Social Work</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	28	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	17	
	Full-Time Lecturers	4	23.53%
	Full-Time Clinical	7	41.18%
<b>UK Libraries</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	54	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	54	
	Full-Time Lecturers	0	0.00%
	Full-Time Clinical	0	0.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	Total Full-Time Faculty Members	2639	
	Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty	1733	
	Full-Time Lecturers	183	10.56%
	Full-Time Clinical	598	34.51%

	2016-2017			2017-2018			2018-2019	
% of Total Faculty		% of TT	% of Total Faculty		% of TT	% of Total Faculty		% of TT
	259			262			261	
92.13%	232		89.58%	233		88.93%	231	
3.94%	17	7.33%	6.56%	18	7.73%	6.87%	17	7.36%
1.97%	5	2.16%	1.93%	7	3.00%	2.67%	8	3.46%
	454			441			472	
84.40%	385		84.80%	374		84.81%	393	
11.11%	55	14.29%	12.11%	52	13.90%	11.79%	55	13.99%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	95			97			102	
87.36%	78		82.11%	78		80.41%	79	
12.64%	15	19.23%	15.79%	17	21.79%	17.53%	22	27.85%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	85			74			80	
65.85%	55		64.71%	51		68.92%	62	
34.15%	30	54.55%	35.29%	21	41.18%	28.38%	18	29.03%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	64			64			68	
66.67%	41		64.06%	36		56.25%	36	
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
28.57%	21	51.22%	32.81%	24	66.67%	37.50%	26	72.22%
	32			36			37	
75.00%	22		68.75%	25		69.44%	28	
21.43%	8	36.36%	25.00%	8	32.00%	22.22%	7	25.00%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	113			117			116	
72.13%	83		73.45%	85		72.65%	86	
13.11%	14	16.87%	12.39%	11	12.94%	9.40%	11	12.79%
12.30%	15	18.07%	13.27%	19	22.35%	16.24%	18	20.93%
	145			150			153	
90.14%	128		88.28%	131		87.33%	131	
7.75%	15	11.72%	10.34%	16	12.21%	10.67%	18	13.74%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	99			100			104	
73.20%	73		73.74%	74		74.00%	77	
20.62%	23	31.51%	23.23%	22	29.73%	22.00%	22	28.57%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	14			14			14	
78.57%	11		78.57%	11		78.57%	10	
14.29%	2	18.18%	14.29%	2	18.18%	14.29%	2	20.00%
7.14%	1	9.09%	7.14%	1	9.09%	7.14%	1	10.00%
	58			65			66	
76.79%	41		70.69%	48		73.85%	49	
10.71%	5	12.20%	8.62%	6	12.50%	9.23%	6	12.24%

7.14%	6	14.63%	10.34%	5	10.42%	7.69%	5	10.20%
	35			31			29	
81.25%	28		80.00%	26		83.87%	22	
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
12.50%	4	14.29%	11.43%	5	19.23%	16.13%	6	27.27%
	961			1037			1097	
37.96%	353		36.73%	357		34.43%	373	
0.42%	4	1.13%	0.42%	3	0.84%	0.29%	2	0.54%
55.04%	538	152.41%	55.98%	592	165.83%	57.09%	652	174.80%
	61			62			61	
55.00%	33		54.10%	32		51.61%	30	
21.67%	14	42.42%	22.95%	14	43.75%	22.58%	15	50.00%
21.67%	13	39.39%	21.31%	15	46.88%	24.19%	12	40.00%
	60			58			56	
68.85%	43		71.67%	42		72.41%	38	
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
18.03%	13	30.23%	21.67%	13	30.95%	22.41%	12	31.58%
	49			47			51	
83.33%	40		81.63%	36		76.60%	42	
0.00%	2	5.00%	4.08%	2	5.56%	4.26%	1	2.38%
2.08%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	1	2.38%
	24			24			24	
60.71%	14		58.33%	14		58.33%	14	
14.29%	3	21.43%	12.50%	4	28.57%	16.67%	4	28.57%
25.00%	7	50.00%	29.17%	6	42.86%	25.00%	6	42.86%
	59			51			59	
100.00%	54		91.53%	51		100.00%	50	
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	9	18.00%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	2667			2730			2850	
65.67%	1714		64.27%	1704		62.42%	1751	
6.93%	207	12.08%	7.76%	196	11.50%	7.18%	209	11.94%
22.66%	623	36.35%	23.36%	687	40.32%	25.16%	747	42.66%

	2019-2020			2020-2021			2021-2022	
% of Total Faculty		% of TT	% of Total Faculty		% of TT	% of Total Faculty		% of TT
	265			269			254	
88.51%	235		88.68%	238		88.48%	229	
6.51%	19	8.09%	7.17%	19	7.98%	7.06%	17	7.42%
3.07%	8	3.40%	3.02%	7	2.94%	2.60%	6	2.62%
	467			462			456	
83.26%	388		83.08%	397		85.93%	387	
11.65%	55	14.18%	11.78%	55	13.85%	11.90%	51	13.18%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	102			104			105	
77.45%	77		75.49%	78		75.00%	77	
21.57%	22	28.57%	21.57%	25	32.05%	24.04%	27	35.06%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	82			82			82	
77.50%	60		73.17%	62		75.61%	61	
22.50%	21	35.00%	25.61%	19	30.65%	23.17%	20	32.79%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	67			68			66	
52.94%	33		49.25%	33		48.53%	31	
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
38.24%	31	93.94%	46.27%	33	100.00%	48.53%	34	109.68%
	35			36			39	
75.68%	26		74.29%	26		72.22%	30	
18.92%	5	19.23%	14.29%	4	15.38%	11.11%	5	16.67%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	114			108			104	
74.14%	85		74.56%	83		76.85%	77	
9.48%	11	12.94%	9.65%	8	9.64%	7.41%	8	10.39%
15.52%	16	18.82%	14.04%	16	19.28%	14.81%	18	23.38%
	163			168			158	
85.62%	141		86.50%	142		84.52%	135	
11.76%	19	13.48%	11.66%	21	14.79%	12.50%	19	14.07%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	111			109			111	
74.04%	81		72.97%	80		73.39%	78	
21.15%	24	29.63%	21.62%	25	31.25%	22.94%	27	34.62%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	13			17			18	
71.43%	10		76.92%	13		76.47%	13	
14.29%	2	20.00%	15.38%	2	15.38%	11.76%	3	23.08%
7.14%	1	10.00%	7.69%	2	15.38%	11.76%	2	15.38%
	67			67			63	
74.24%	52		77.61%	52		77.61%	48	
9.09%	5	9.62%	7.46%	4	7.69%	5.97%	3	6.25%

7.58%	3	5.77%	4.48%	3	5.77%	4.48%	3	6.25%
	12			11			11	
	0			0			0	
	12		100.00%	11		100.00%	11	
	0			0			0	
	29			32			30	
75.86%	24		82.76%	27		84.38%	25	
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
20.69%	5	20.83%	17.24%	5	18.52%	15.63%	5	20.00%
	1123			1135			1179	
34.00%	379		33.75%	371		32.69%	349	
0.18%	2	0.53%	0.18%	3	0.81%	0.26%	3	0.86%
59.43%	672	177.31%	59.84%	700	188.68%	61.67%	765	219.20%
	65			65			67	
49.18%	35		53.85%	34		52.31%	34	
24.59%	14	40.00%	21.54%	15	44.12%	23.08%	15	44.12%
19.67%	16	45.71%	24.62%	14	41.18%	21.54%	17	50.00%
	60			59			54	
67.86%	41		68.33%	39		66.10%	35	
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
21.43%	14	34.15%	23.33%	14	35.90%	23.73%	14	40.00%
	53			60			62	
82.35%	41		77.36%	44		73.33%	46	
1.96%	2	4.88%	3.77%	3	6.82%	5.00%	3	6.52%
1.96%	1	2.44%	1.89%	4	9.09%	6.67%	5	10.87%
	20			24			26	
58.33%	12		60.00%	13		54.17%	14	
16.67%	3	25.00%	15.00%	3	23.08%	12.50%	3	21.43%
25.00%	5	41.67%	25.00%	7	53.85%	29.17%	9	64.29%
	48			48			48	
84.75%	48		100.00%	48		100.00%	48	
15.25%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
	2896			2924			2993	
61.44%	1768		61.05%	1780		60.88%	1717	
7.33%	216	12.22%	7.46%	217	12.19%	7.42%	215	12.52%
26.21%	772	43.67%	26.66%	805	45.22%	27.53%	878	51.14%

% of Total Faculty
90.16%
6.69%
2.36%
84.87%
11.18%
0.00%
73.33%
25.71%
0.00%
74.39%
24.39%
0.00%
46.97%
0.00%
51.52%
76.92%
12.82%
0.00%
74.04%
7.69%
17.31%
85.44%
12.03%
0.00%
70.27%
24.32%
0.00%
72.22%
16.67%
11.11%
76.19%
4.76%



4.76%
100.00%
83.33%
0.00%
16.67%
29.60%
0.25%
64.89%
50.75%
22.39%
25.37%
64.81%
0.00%
25.93%
74.19%
4.84%
8.06%
53.85%
11.54%
34.62%
100.00%
0.00%
0.00%
57.37%
7.18%
29.34%



# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 3/1/2023 4:17:53 PM

**Submitted by:** Urschel, Kristine L.

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Undergraduate Council

**Charge:** It shall consider all proposed new courses and changes in courses which may be used for credit toward an undergraduate degree and also consider all proposed new undergraduate programs, changes in undergraduate programs, including degree titles, from all colleges offering an undergraduate degree. Further, it shall consider all changes in the University requirements. The Undergraduate Council shall recommend on all of the above to the Senate Council. In addition, it shall review all undergraduate programs.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Council

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

[No Response Given]

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

Reviewing proposals

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

2

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

~80

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

Voted to approve two new partners for Dual Credit programs; We are working on a proposal to suggest changes to the Senate Regulations related to the GCCR (voted on a proposal at the 2/28/23 meeting), discussions about the Badge approval process, planning for transition to elected representatives

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

No

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

[No Response Given]

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**

Meeting Notes Attached

**Undergraduate Council Minutes**  
**February 14, 2023 | 3:00-5:00 pm | 103 Main**

**Members Present:**

Kristine Urschel (chair)  
Jim Lumpp  
Casey Shadix  
ZaDonna Slay  
Chris Swartz  
Melanie Goan  
Eric Welch  
Diane Loeffler  
Bryant Tandy  
Dima Strakovsky

Ray Archer  
Nathan Congleton  
Becky Davis  
Troy Cooper  
Joe Dvorak  
Chloe Wawrzyniak  
Olivia Davis  
Melinda Hines  
Justin Nichols

**Members Absent:**

Edison Shipley  
Cathy Catlett

**Meeting Agenda**

Welcome

Chair Urschel welcomed Diane Loeffler, previous UGC member, to the council to serve until the end of the spring semester 2023.

Approval of January 24, 2023 minutes

Motion was made to approve the minutes by O. Davis and seconded by Archer. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

Approval of agenda

Prior to a motion to approve the agenda, Chair Urschel asked for three courses to be added to the consent agenda – EDS 500, CPT 395 and EDS 546. Also added on the discussion agenda were MI 462 and SW 540.

Welch moved and Cooper seconded to approve the agendas with the additions. A vote was taken, with none opposed or abstained.

Proposal reviews

Consent agenda

**Archer, Nichols, Strakovsky**

[AFE 330](#)

**B. Davis, Lumpp, Slay**

[AIS 330](#)

[ANT 380](#)

**Goan, Nichols, Lumpp**

[ASC 420G](#)

**Cooper, Nichols, Urschel**

[ASC 250](#)

**Wawrzyniak, B. Davis, Catlett**  
[BAE 205](#)

**Lumpp, Slay, Dvorak**  
[BIO 155](#)

**Wawrzyniak, Nichols, B. Davis**  
[BME 440](#)

**Catlett, Nichols, O. Davis**  
[CLA 350](#)

**Strakovsky, Dvorak, Slay**  
[CPT 371](#)

**Wawrzyniak, Catlett, Swartz**  
[DHN 340](#)  
[DHN 403](#)

**Dvorak, Cooper, Slay**  
[EDS 505](#)

**B. Davis, Lumpp, O. Davis**  
[EDS 589](#)

**O. Davis, Welch, Archer**  
[ENG 507](#)

**Cooper, O. Davis, Nichols**  
[ENG 308](#)

**Cooper, Catlett, Welch**  
[FAM 473](#)  
[STA 425](#)

**Strakovsky, Goan, Dvorak**  
[ID 373](#)

**Nichols, Catlett, Strakovsky**  
[JOU 498](#)

**Dvorak, Cooper, O. Davis**  
[MA 323](#)

**Dvorak, Lumpp, Welch**  
[PS 381](#)  
[PS 383](#)

**Slay, Archer**  
[SOC 355](#)

## Discussion agenda

### **Slay, Nichols, O. Davis**

#### [AER 390 Aerospace Engineering Certificate Experience](#)

A brief discussion regarding the rigor of courses proposed for this certificate was led by Slay. It was decided that the courses were typical for an internship. A motion for approval was made by Slay and seconded by Nichols. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

### **Lumpp, Swartz, Urschel**

#### [BA Art Studio](#)

Lumpp explained that this proposal removed the studio core and was ready for approval. Motion was made by Lumpp and seconded by Cooper to approve the proposal. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

### **Swartz, Archer, Welch**

#### [BA – Culture & Business Practices](#)

Swartz presented two changes for this proposal regarding the correct number of credit hours and the lack of a letter of support from the Arts and Sciences dean for the changes needed. He will contact the proposer and will not request a vote of approval for the proposal today.

### **B. Davis, Welch, Strakovsky**

#### [BA/EDU](#)

B. Davis gave a brief overview of the proposal to close the program as no one has been enrolled in the program since 2020. Motion was made by B. Davis and seconded by Dvorak to approve closure of the program. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

### **Dvorak, Slay, Strakovsky**

#### [BA – Public Policy](#)

A brief discussion was led by Dvorak regarding the change in requirements and inclusion of a service requirement. Motion was made by Dvorak and seconded by Slay to approve the proposal. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

### **Lumpp, Cooper, Dvorak**

#### [BSCEFC – Consumer Econ & Family Financial Counseling](#)

Lumpp presented an overview of the changes included in the program update such as changing prefixes on several courses. Motion was made by Lumpp and seconded by Dvorak for approval of the proposal. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

### **Slay, Catlett, Swartz**

#### [BS/ EDU – Special Education](#)

Slay reported that the changes to the degree program outlined in the proposal were concentrated on updates to the curriculum with new courses. Motion was made by Slay to approve the proposal. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

**Archer, Slay, Lumpp**

Minor – Technical Systems

Archer reported that this proposal was designed to close the minor degree program in Arts and Sciences. Motion made by Archer and seconded by Strakovsky to approve the proposal. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

Discussion only:

**SW 540 – Strakovsky**

Strakovsky asked for direction regarding the language in the proposal for online attendance. After a brief discussion it was decided Strakovsky would contact the proposer of the proposal for further clarification. No vote was taken.

**MI 482 – Archer**

Archer led a discussion regarding the rationale for this proposal. Several ideas were offered by council members which he will discuss with the proposer. No vote was taken.

. Announcements/New Business

- Approval of dual credit proposal  
After a brief discussion a motion was made for the approval of a dual credit program at Menifee County High School by Goan and seconded by Cooper. Motion was also made for the approval of a dual credit program at Waggener High School by Goan and seconded by Cooper. A vote was taken for each motion and passed with none opposed or abstained.
- GCCR update  
Chair Urschel presented a brief overview of the history of UK's GCCR requirement. She asked for ideas from the council for a proposal revision and to include a curricular review process. This proposal will be presented to the Senate Council for inclusion in the fall semester of 2023.
- Comment box for Curriculog  
Chair Urschel reminded the council to continue to submit suggestions for edits to the Curriculog process.
- Chair Urschel mentioned the introduction of approvals for badge approval and the role of the UGC in that process. More information will follow in the future on this topic.
- Chair Urschel requested information from each council member regarding their participation as a member of the UGC during the 2023-2023 academic year.
- If a meeting is required on March 14, 2023, it will be using an electronic vote.

Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 4:33pm.

Minutes submitted by Ann B. Eads



# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 3/1/2023 4:39:47 PM

**Submitted by:** Tanaka, Keiko

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Senate UK Core Education Committee

**Charge:**

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Committee

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

Yes

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

Discussing issue(s)

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

6

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

6

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

1. UK Core Exception Procedures/criteria for education abroad courses. 2. UK Core Assessment Revised Process. 3. Course Substitution Requests by students with learning disabilities. 4. SUKCEC Composition. 5. Future of UK Core. 6. QEP/TEK

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

Yes

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

All except the item number (3) under Q8 are not assigned by the Senate Council.

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**

1. UK Core Assessment 2021-2022 Results and proposed revisions. 2. Proposed changes in the UK Core Exception Request procedures for EA courses. 3. Proposed changes in Course Substitution Request procedures for students with learning disabilities. 4. SUKCEC Composition. 5. Need for campus-wide discussion on the future of the UK Core program.

Meeting Notes Attached

## SUKCEC Agenda

February 22, 2023

11:00 – 12:00 am

Zoom

<https://uky.zoom.us/j/87353403323>

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of minutes from January 25, 2023**
3. **Approval of agenda**
4. **Consent Agenda: Course Reviews**
  - Global Dynamics (Kwon)
    - HJS 204. Study Abroad in Israel.
5. **Old Business**
  - UK Core Exception Appeal procedures/criteria for education abroad courses (Appendix A)
  - UK Core Assessment Revised Process
    - Revisions on the UK Core Assessment Plan, 2021-22 (Appendix B)
    - Pilot the new process in Spring 2022
  - Course Substitution Request by the Disability Resource Center (DRC) (Appendix C)
6. **New Business**
  - QEP/TEK by Susan Cantrell
  - UK Core Exception language on the website (Appendix D)
  - SUKCEC Composition (see Appendix E)
7. **Adjournment**

## SUKCEC Minutes

January 25, 2023

11:00 – 12:00 am

Zoom <https://uky.zoom.us/j/87353403323>

### 1. Call to Order/Welcome to Committee and guests

### 2. Approval of minutes from December 9, 2022

Motion to approve the minutes from December 9, 2022, was made by Wilhelm and seconded by Stein. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained.

### 3. Approval of agenda

Motion to approve the consent agenda was made by Bird-Pollan and seconded by Stein. A vote was taken, and the motion passed with none opposed or abstained

### 4. Consent Agenda: Course Reviews

Arts & Creativity (Voro)

- **WRD 152.** Writing About Food

Statistical Inference Reasoning (Gebert)

- **FOR 250.** Statistics & Measurements I

Social Science (Tanaka)

- **CEF 251.** Personal & Family Finance

### 5 Old Business

- UK Core Exception Appeal procedures/criteria for education abroad courses (Appendix A)  
Chair Tanaka briefly reviewed the December meeting discussion where there was a need for clarification of what materials were used and a general overall lack of details of syllabi from the universities where the student study while abroad.
- UK Core Assessment Results & Revised Process (see Appendices B and C)  
Chair Tanaka reviewed the discussion points from the December meeting regarding assessment. A working group will work with continued assessment for the proposal, misalignment of courses with current rubrics, and the need for a campus wide discussion of the role of core classes in the overall UK education program.

### 6. New Business

- Course Substitution Request by the Disability Resource Center (DRC) (See Appendix D)  
David Beach and Leisa Pickering from the DRC presented a short overview of the approval process for the course exceptions granted for students with documented disabilities. The courses allowed for use in an exception has not been reviewed in over ten years. Not only do the courses need to be reviewed but the process for approval as well.  
Chair Tanaka suggested forming a working group to review this process and report to the committee.
- Three Working Groups (see Appendix E)  
Chair Tanaka briefly reviewed the members of the three working groups.

- **SUKCEC Composition (see Appendix F)**  
Committee members were asked by Chair Tanaka to review the current language for SUKCEC Composition by the next meeting in February 2023.

## **7. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn was made by Voro and seconded by Kwon at 11:59am.

Members Absent: Scarduzio, Nguyen, Morgan, Bailey and Slicer.

Minutes submitted by Ann B. Eads

# Appendices

---

## *SUKCEC February 22, 2023*

- A. UK Core Exception Requests for Education Abroad (EA) Courses
- B. UK Core Assessment Revised Process
- C. Course Substitution Request by DRC for Quantitative Foundation (QF) and Statistical Inference Reasoning (SIR) Areas
- D. UK Core Exception language on the website
- E. Senate Rule 1.4.3.3 Senate UK Core Education Committee (SUKCEC)

# UK Core Exception Request for EA Courses

---

*Proposed Revisions on the Process*

*February 1, 2023*

1. The **Course Approval Form** will be revised to include a question (box) for each course whether the student plan to use to fulfill a UK Core requirement.
2. The UK Core Exception Request process will take in **two stages**:
  - a. **Pre-departure UK Core Exception Request**
    - This process will start when students check this box concerning UK Core requirement.
    - For the course(s) proposed to be used to fulfill UK Core requirement(s), students need to submit a copy of the preliminary course syllabus from the host university's website to the UK Core Exceptions Subcommittee (UKCES)
    - The UKCES will request an appropriate Core area expert to review the syllabus for the courses that have never been approved before to determine: "Approve," "Deny," or "Need More Information."
    - Students will be notified of the UKCEC's decision before their departure.
  - b. **Post-return UK Core Exception Request**
    - This process will start after students return.
    - The form used for the UK Core Exception Request needs to be revised to include the questions about the contents of the course to be used to fulfill the UK Core area.
    - Those questions will be a modified version of the UK Core questions on the Curriculog so that students will be able to describe course activities, including assignments.
    - If the assigned area expert still cannot decide, a copy of the major assignment
3. **Next Step** is to revise various documents associated with this process, including:
  - Course Approval Form
  - UK Core Exception Request Form (Qualtrics survey)
  - UK Core Exception Request instructions available for students on the UK Core and Education Abroad websites

UK CORE EDUCATION COMMITTEE



# UK CORE ASSESSMENT PLAN

Revised October 2021





## UK CORE ASSESSMENT PLAN ~~2023-2028~~

Deleted: 2021-2025

### Purpose

The purpose of this document is to outline the assessment process for the UK Core student learning outcomes from ~~2022-2023~~ to ~~2027-2028~~. Maintaining an effective assessment process for the Core is essential for its continued improvement and compliance with the Kentucky Council for Postsecondary Education and SACSCOC. The goal of the plan is to outline the process, timeline, and responsibility for assessment.

Deleted: 2021-22

Deleted: 2024-25

### Cycle

The Assessment Cycle will consists of a four step process: 1) Planning 2) Assessment 3) Reporting and 4) Implementing Improvements as shown in Appendix III: Assessment Cycle and Appendix IV: Assessment Cycle Schedule.

#### Planning.

Prior to the Assessment year (outlined below), OSPIE will collaborate with UKCEC, CELT, Core instructors, and program coordinators to ensure all instructors teaching UK CORE courses are aware of the program student learning outcomes, assessment rubrics, assessment process, previous assessment results, and are given support for developing assignments aligned to the program student learning outcomes.

#### Assessment.

Program-level UK Core Student Learning Outcomes will be assessed every two years as indicated below.

Deleted: .

2020-2021	Composition + Communication, Citizenship
2021-2022	Intellectual Inquiry, SIR, QF
2022-2023	Composition + Communication, SIR, QF, Citizenship
2023-2024	Intellectual Inquiry
2024-2025	Composition + Communication, SIR, QF, Citizenship
<del>2025-2026</del>	<del>Intellectual Inquiry</del>
<del>2026-2027</del>	<del>Composition + Communication, SIR, QF, Citizenship</del>
<del>2027-2028</del>	<del>Intellectual Inquiry</del>

#### Reporting.

OSPIE staff will analyze the data from assessment and share an aggregate report including all data with the UKCEC. In addition, OSPIE will prepare department-level reports with course-level data. These will be shared as appropriate with department chairs, school directors, and associate deans where UK Core courses are offered by academic units.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Moved (insertion) [2]

#### Improvement.

Department chairs and DUSs will receive a request from the UKCEC to complete a brief report on changes made to their Core courses in response to the departmental assessment reports they received. These reports, as well as an overall summary report on course- and departmental-changes, will be provided by OSPIE to the UKCEC for

Moved (insertion) [1]

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

review and action. The UKCEC will make appropriate recommendations for UK Core improvements to the Undergraduate Council and Senate Council for consideration.

### Communication

Communication outlining the areas scheduled for assessment and expectations for instructors will be provided from OSPIE to the Associate Deans at multiple time points throughout the year (see Appendix I: Timeline and Appendix II: Division of Responsibilities). Communication re-enforcing this information will also be disseminated from the UKCEC chair to the appropriate department chairs and directors of undergraduate studies (DUS). Departmental report availability will be provided by OSPIE to the department chairs, DUS, and other leaders, as appropriate.

### Assessment Methodology

#### Rubrics

Before each review cycle, UKCEC area experts will work with OSPIE staff to identify any issues with current rubrics. OSPIE staff will analyze interrater agreement data and collect feedback from evaluators to inform the revisions. Upon recommendation of the area expert, the UKCEC will consider revisions and approve rubrics for the assessment process.

#### Assignment Selection

Course instructors will identify assignments for assessment and map them to program-level student learning outcomes (adopted by the University Senate, 2008) in the Canvas Learning Management System. Instructors may provide a single assignment or multiple assignments that collectively address all of the learning outcomes. OSPIE will provide guidance to the UKCEC and instructors on artifacts that can be assessed using current assessment tools.

#### Sampling

OSPIE staff will pull artifacts from Canvas and provide a random sample of artifacts for evaluators. Artifacts will be extracted and scored annually, for the

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: and in AEFIS

Deleted: the types of files that are supported by AEFIS...

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Commented [R1]: We would like to pilot having instructors provide assessment within Canvas rather than pulling assignments out of Canvas and having an external evaluator.

Commented [R2R1]: If we implemented this process we would provide interrater reliability on a sample of courses.

Commented [R3R1]: Utilizing Canvas would allow instructors to align separate assignments to specific outcomes.

Deleted: /AEFIS

Formatted: Body Text, Right: 1.13", Space Before: 0.25 pt

Deleted: twice

Core areas scheduled for assessment based on the cycle. Artifacts will be drawn from fall courses and from spring courses. Data will be disaggregated by semester.

**Deleted:** The first set of a

**Commented [R4]:** Currently we have only been able to score annually but we are pulling artifacts and disaggregating the data by semester.

**Deleted:** ; the second set will be

**Deleted:** and summer.

**Deleted:** in AEFIS

Assignments and artifacts will be reviewed initially by OSPIE to determine whether file types are accessible, instructions are available, and there is alignment with the rubrics. Alignment issues will be communicated to the UKCEC area experts for recommendations on whether those assignments should be excluded from the sample. The emphasis of sampling will be at the course level in order to provide course- and department-level data to the departments and the UKCEC. At least 20 artifacts should be randomly sampled for each course scheduled for assessment in the areas of Intellectual Inquiry, Citizenship, Quantitative Foundations, and Statistical Inferential Reasoning. For Composition and Communication I and II, at least 50 artifacts should be sampled for each course. When multiple sections of a course are taught in a given semester, artifacts should be drawn randomly from across sections.

#### Scoring

Working with the UKCEC and appropriate area experts, OSPIE will identify individuals to undertake assessment, provide an orientation for those individuals, and facilitate the assessment process. Evaluators will be selected based on their familiarity with the UK Core area being assessed as well as their experience in teaching UK Core courses. Effort should be made to recruit evaluators that reflect the colleges and types of individuals responsible for teaching Core courses in each area being assessed.

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold

**Moved up [2]:** OSPIE staff will analyze the data from assessment and share an aggregate report including all data with the UKCEC. In addition, OSPIE will prepare department-level reports with course-level data. These will be shared as appropriate with department chairs, school directors, and associate deans where UK Core courses are offered by academic units.

**Deleted: Data Analysis and Reporting**

**Moved up [1]: Improvement**  
Department chairs and DUSs will receive a request from the UKCEC to complete a brief report on changes made to their Core courses in response to the departmental assessment reports they received. These reports, as well as an overall summary report on course- and departmental-changes, will be provided by OSPIE to the UKCEC for review and action. The UKCEC will make appropriate recommendations for UK Core improvements to the Undergraduate Council and Senate Council for consideration.

## Appendix I: Timeline

### Cycle A (Fall Courses)

By May 15 of previous year: Rubrics revised/approved  
By May 15 of previous year: overview/FYI communication about assessment  
By August 15: Communications to Assoc. Deans, DUS, Department Chairs, Instructors  
By October 1: Artifacts mapped by instructors in Canvas  
December: Artifacts extracted, cleaned, prepared for assessment  
By February 1: Evaluators recruited  
By February 15: Training for evaluators  
March: Evaluators undertake assessment  
April: Data analysis  
By May 15: Overview aggregate report to UKCEC with OSPIE recommendations  
By May 15: Disseminate department-level reports

### Cycle A (Spring Courses)

By May 15 of previous year: Rubrics revised/approved  
By December 15 of previous year: overview/FYI communication about assessment  
By January 15: Communications to Assoc. Deans, DUS, Department Chairs, Instructors  
By March 1: Artifacts mapped by instructors in Canvas  
By August 15: Artifacts extracted, cleaned, prepared for assessment  
By September 15: Evaluators recruited  
By September 30: Training for evaluators  
October: Evaluators undertake assessment  
November: Data analysis  
By December 15: Overview aggregate report (joint with summer) to UKCEC with OSPIE recommendations  
By December 15: Disseminate department-level reports (joint with summer)

### Cycle A (Summer Courses)

By May 15 of previous year: Rubrics revised/approved  
By April 15 of previous year: overview/FYI communication about assessment  
By May 15: Communications to Assoc. Deans, DUS, Department Chairs, Instructors  
By July 1: Artifacts mapped by instructors in Canvas  
By September 15: Artifacts extracted, cleaned, prepared for assessment  
By September 15: Evaluators recruited  
By September 30: Training for evaluators  
October: Evaluators undertake assessment  
November: Data analysis  
By December 15: Overview aggregate report (joint with spring) to UKCEC with OSPIE recommendations  
By December 15: Disseminate department-level reports (joint with spring)

Commented [R5]: Timeline needs to be revised to reflect current assessment practice.

Deleted: /AEFIS

Cycle A (Fall, Spring, and Summer Courses) [CLOSING THE LOOP PART]

By February 15: Department-level responses received on Cycle A data (all semesters)

March: Analyze department-level responses

By May 15: UKCEC considers suggestions from reports and makes recommendations, as appropriate, to Undergraduate Council and Senate Council

## Appendix II: Division of Responsibilities

Area of Responsibility	Responsible Party
Communication	
Communication to Associate Deans	OSPIE
Communication to Directors of Undergraduate Studies and/or Core instructors	UKCEC
Rubric Review, Development, and Revision	
Collect, analyze, and report interrater agreement (IRA) data	OSPIE
Gather feedback from evaluators on rubrics	OSPIE
Review IRA data and evaluator feedback to revise rubrics	UKCEC (OSPIE input)
Develop new rubrics, as needed, to align with changes to UK Core learning outcomes	UKCEC (OSPIE input)
Assessment Software Management	
Configure assessment management system to allow for import and scoring of student artifacts	OSPIE
Develop training videos for Core instructors and evaluators on how to utilize the software	OSPIE
Extract data, as needed, to allow for reporting in Tableau	OSPIE
Assignment and Artifact Review	
Review mapped assignments and artifacts to identify potential issues (e.g. unsupported file types, missing instructions, poor alignment with outcomes and rubrics, etc.)	OSPIE
Determine which assignments to exclude from sampling based on identified issues	UKCEC (OSPIE input)
Evaluators	
Develop training materials for evaluators	OSPIE (UKCEC input)
Schedule training and norming sessions	OSPIE (UKCEC input)
Recruit and select evaluators	OSPIE and UKCEC
Conduct norming sessions	OSPIE and UKCEC
Monitor evaluator progress, address questions, facilitate payment of stipends	OSPIE
Analysis and Reporting	
Analyze data and prepare reports	OSPIE
Dissemination of aggregate and departmental reports	OSPIE
Closing the Loop	
Disseminate reporting template to chairs/DUSs on actions taken based on assessment results	UKCEC
Analyze results and provide summary report from departmental closing the loop reports	OSPIE
Review aggregate and departmental results reports and departmental closing the loop reports to identify potential actions to further improve the Core	UKCEC (OSPIE input)

**Appendix III: Assessment Cycle**

**Formatted: Font: Bold**  
**Formatted: Font: Bold**  
**Formatted: Tab stops: 0.5", Left + 1", Left + 2", Left**



**Appendix IV: Assessment Cycle Schedule**

FIVE YEAR PLAN	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026	2026-2027	2027-2028
<b>PLANNING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composition + Communication</li> <li>• Citizenship</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intellectual Inquiry</li> <li>• SIR</li> <li>• QF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composition + Communication</li> <li>• SIR</li> <li>• QF</li> <li>• Citizenship</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intellectual Inquiry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composition + Communication</li> <li>• SIR</li> <li>• QF</li> <li>• Citizenship</li> </ul>
<b>ASSESSING</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composition + Communication</li> <li>• Citizenship</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intellectual Inquiry</li> <li>• SIR</li> <li>• QF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composition + Communication</li> <li>• SIR</li> <li>• QF</li> <li>• Citizenship</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intellectual Inquiry</li> </ul>
<b>REPORTING</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composition + Communication</li> <li>• Citizenship</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intellectual Inquiry</li> <li>• SIR</li> <li>• QF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composition + Communication</li> <li>• SIR</li> <li>• QF</li> <li>• Citizenship</li> </ul>
<b>IMPLEMENTING IMPROVEMENTS</b>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composition + Communication</li> <li>• Citizenship</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intellectual Inquiry</li> <li>• SIR</li> <li>• QF</li> </ul>

**Formatted: Font: Bold**

**Formatted: Font: Bold**

**Formatted: Tab stops: 3.63", Left + Not at 5.23"**

**Formatted: Tab stops: 5.23", Left**



# UK Core Substitution Request by DRC

*Discussion Summary & Proposal*

*February 17, 2023*

## DRC's Request

To allow students with documented math learning disabilities (MLD) to satisfy the Quantitative Foundations (QF) and Statistical Inference Reasoning (SIR) with one or more of the following courses:

- PHI 100. Introduction to Philosophy: Knowledge and Reality
- PHI 130. Introduction to Philosophy: Morality and Society
- FAM 251. Personal and Family Finance

## Working Group Participants

- Margaret Bausch, COE Special Education
- David Beach, DRC
- Stefan Bird-Pollan, Philosophy
- Sam Choo, COE Special Education
- Mark Gebert, Statistics (SUKCEC – Statistical Inference Reasoning area expert)
- Davy Jones, Toxicology & Cancer Biology (SDAC)
- Margaret Mohr-Schroeder, COE Math Education
- Shauna Morgan, CELT (SUKCEC – Teaching & Learning)
- Nick Nguyen, Mathematics (SUKCEC – Quantitative Foundations area expert)
- Leisa Pickering, DRC
- Keiko Tanaka, Community & Leadership Development (SUKCEC – Chair/Social Science area expert)
- Megan Wallace, Philosophy
- Ron Wilhelm, Astronomy & Physics (SUKCEC – Natural, Physical, and Mathematical Sciences area expert)

## Key Take-Away from Working Group Discussions on February 9 and 16

1. The process of requesting/approving course substitutions must be changed where faculty is the one making educational policy decisions.

### Current:

- As shown below, it is DRC, particularly Leisa Pickering, that recommends courses to be used for QF and SIR substitutions to the University Senate. I have never seen a request discussed in the SUKCEC after having served on this committee since 2018.
- There is no documentation of the course substitution policy on the Disability Resource Center's website.
- Since the elimination of the Associate Provost of Undergraduate Education (APUE), it is unclear who is responsible for approving course substitution requests.
  - The 3/9/2012 minutes of the Interim General Education Oversight Committee.
  - Undergraduate Council Responsibilities (undated)
- Degree Audit with the approved QF course substitution is recorded as:

**Quantitative Foundations (DRC).** Per Disability Resource Center (DRC) approval, this requirement can be satisfied by completing either PHI 100, PHI 130, or FAM 251.

**Questions to be Considered for Course Substitutions:**

- **Request Process:**
    - Who should request to whom?
    - What documentations should be required?
    - What is the role of DRC at this stage?
    - What is the role of faculty at this stage?
  - **Approval Process:**
    - How should the request be reviewed?
    - Who should approve the request?
    - What is the role of DRC at this stage?
    - What is the role of faculty at this stage?
2. There are no pedagogical justifications for why these three courses are being used to substitute QF and SIR Core areas.
- a. PHI 100 and PHI 130 are UK Core Intellectual Inquiry Humanities courses. They do not meet the UK Core Program's goal of:

**Students will demonstrate an understanding of and ability to employ methods of quantitative reasoning. [6 credit hours] – satisfied by QF and SIR courses**

**Outcomes and Assessment Framework:** Students will (a) demonstrate how fundamental elements of mathematical, logical and statistical knowledge are applied to solve real-world problems; and (b) explain the sense in which an important source of uncertainty in many everyday decisions is addressed by statistical science, and appraise the efficacy of statistical arguments that are reported for general consumption. Curricular Framework Students will take one 3-hour course on the application of mathematical, logical and statistical methods, and one 3-hour course devoted to a conceptual and practical understanding of statistical inferential reasoning.

- b. Other universities use Logic course offered by Philosophy Department as one of the approved courses to be used for this purpose. We have **PHI 120. The Art of Thinking: An Introduction to Logic** as an approved UK Core QF course.
3. QF and SIR substitutions need to be treated differently.
- a. One possibility to consider is to require MLB students to take one additional NPM course since they do not seem to have any problems with NPM courses.
- b. Another possibility is to engage Statistics Department about the design of STA 210.

# UK Core Exception Request Language

---

*Proposed Revisions*

*February 20, 2023*

## UK Core Website

[https://www.uky.edu/ukcore/Equivalencies\\_Transfer\\_Info](https://www.uky.edu/ukcore/Equivalencies_Transfer_Info)

### **A. Current**

The UK Core Education Committee (UKCEC) has established a subcommittee to process exception requests according to the policies found at this link: UK Core Exceptions Subcommittee.

If you have taken a course **at UK** or elsewhere that is not a designated UK Core you may petition the General Education Exceptions Committee to grant an exception to allow the course to satisfy a UK Core requirement by clicking here and completing the form.

### **B. Proposed**

The UK Core Education Committee (UKCEC) has established a subcommittee to process exception requests according to the policies found at this link: UK Core Exceptions Subcommittee.

If you have taken a course **at an institution other than UK which** is NOT a designated UK Core, you may petition the UK Core Exceptions Committee to grant an exception to allow the course to satisfy a UK Core requirement by clicking here and completing the form.

***Note that if they have not already been approved by the UK Core Education Committee of the University Senate, UK courses are rarely allowed to fulfill specific UK Core requirements.***

# UK Core Education Committee Composition

---

*Senate Rules 1.4.3.3*

*February 17, 2023*

## Current

### 1.4.3.3.1 Composition

[US: 11/13/2017; 2/10/2020; 5/2/2022]

The UK Core Education Committee of the University Senate shall be composed of twelve (12) voting members. The Chair shall be a tenured faculty member selected and appointed by the Senate Council. The Chair shall not have a vote except in cases of ties. “Program” refers to the UK Core (general education) program.

The University Faculty members on the UKCEC shall be appointed by the Senate Council who shall solicit nominations from the University Faculty prior to making appointments. Faculty members shall serve for staggered three-year terms. Each faculty member shall be eligible for reappointment for a second consecutive term, but ineligible for further reappointment until one year has elapsed. If a faculty member vacates a seat, and the Senate Council appoints a new member to complete the term, the partial term does not count toward the new member’s limit of two consecutive terms. Two student members shall be appointed annually by the Senate Council from names recommended by the President of the Student Government Association.

The composition of the appointed faculty membership of the UKCEC is as follows:

- One member from the College of Arts & Sciences for the area of Composition and Communication;
- One member from the College of Communication and Information for the area of Composition and Communication;
- One member from the area of Intellectual Inquiry – Arts & Creativity;
- One member from the area of Intellectual Inquiry – Humanities;
- One member from the area of Intellectual Inquiry – Natural/Physical/Mathematical Sciences;
- One member from the area of Intellectual Inquiry – Social Sciences;
- One member from the area of Citizenship – Community, Culture and Citizenship in the USA;
- One member from the area of Citizenship – Global Dynamics;
- One member from the area of Statistical Inferential Reasoning; and
- One member from the area of Quantitative Foundations.

The SUKCEC Chair shall invite **five ex-officio**, nonvoting members to join the committee, from the following areas:

- Office of Assessment
- Enrollment Management
- Student and Academic Life
- University Libraries
- Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching

## Discussion Items

The University Senate is updating both the language and composition of each Senate Committee. Frequent administration reorganization creates problems with the names of units from which ex-officio members are appointed.

### **Key Points**

- The University Senate also would like us to discuss which support units are essential to be included in this committee.
  - This committee needs to maintain what we consider as an appropriate balance between voting and non-voting members.
  - Each member should come from a distinctive area of service, e.g., *Enrollment Management* and *Student & Academic Life* are both under the VP for Student Success.
- Stacy Greenwell brought up an excellent proposal to change the position of a representative from the UK Libraries from a non-voting ex-officio to a voting member because: (a) The UK Libraries is considered as a college, and therefore a representative from the UK Libraries on this committee is a faculty member; and (b) “Information literacy” is a critical component in the UK Core Program.
- Instead of naming units since their official names change, we should describe the core service which these units provide. For example,
  - Unit performing UK Core assessment,
  - Unit maintaining the student records,
  - Unit supporting faculty to enhance their UK Core course instruction, and...
  - Unit ??? “Student & Academic Life”

# Activity Report (Senate Cmtes & Academic Councils)

Use this form to submit your committee's monthly activity report.

**Submitted on:** 3/2/2023 3:18:49 PM

**Submitted by:** Police, Sara

**1. Select the name of the committee or council you represent. (If it is an ad hoc committee, choose "Other" at the bottom of the list and type the name there.)**

Distance Learning and e-Learning

**Charge:** Responsible for identifying and monitoring issues related to distance learning (DL) and e-learning (e-L); responding to Senate concerning external regulations regarding DL and e-L; recommending strategies regarding DL and e-L; and collaborating on issues relating to DL & e-L.

**2. Are you the chair of a committee or a council?**

Committee

**3. Did the committee meet this past month?**

No

**4. In the past month, what generally did the committee/council spend its time on?**

[No Response Given]

**5. In the past month, how many items were completed? (If your committee/council has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**5. In the past month, how many items were reviewed but more discussion was needed prior to a vote? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**6. As of now, how many items still need to be reviewed? (If your committee has no pending agenda items, type "N/A.")**

[No Response Given]

**7. What issues (other than routine course and program proposals) are the committee discussing?**

[No Response Given]

**8. Is the committee discussing an issue or proposal that was not directly assigned by the Senate Council office?**

No

**9. What is the subject matter of that topic?**

[No Response Given]

**10. What information would you like to share with senators about the work of your committee or academic council?**

- SCDLeL is waiting on correspondence from administrators in UK Online to receive approval for spending time on a proposal related to the UK Core courses. - SCDLeL has reviewed 3 proposals for online delivery in February. Voting on 2 of these is underway at the time of this report; the 3rd is pending.

