

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE MEETING

OCTOBER 10, 2022

* * * * *

1 MS. COLLETT: I'm calling the meeting to order.
2 If you're here in person please
3 make sure that you sign in at the
4 back of the room. Welcome
5 everyone. Today for Poll
6 Everywhere we do not have any
7 votes planned for today's
8 meeting. So, hopefully you don't
9 need Poll Everywhere. If there
10 is any votes, any motions moved
11 we can take votes by show of
12 hands, that will be the senators
13 here raising their hands and the
14 senators on Zoom using the raise
15 hand function and keeping your
16 hands up until we have had you
17 all counted.

18 SPEAKER 1: How do we sign in for Zoom?

19 MS. COLLETT: You don't need to sign in for
20 Poll Everywhere, so.

21 SPEAKER 1: No, I mean normally we use Poll
22 Everywhere to sign into the
23 meeting.

24 MS. COLLETT: Oh, we got your attendance
25 counted and the folks here have
26 signed in at the back of the

1 room.

2 SPEAKER 1: Thanks.

3 MS. COLLETT: Yeah. We have a report that's
4 generated now by Zoom. Sorry
5 about that. Just a reminder that
6 the meeting is subject to Open
7 Meetings Laws and it's recorded
8 for note taking purposes. We
9 will use Robert's Rule of Order,
10 the newly revised version. No
11 voting by proxy, meaning you need
12 to be here, be present, in order
13 to vote. If you're not a member
14 you cannot vote and we will not
15 count you as voting. State your
16 name and affiliation prior to
17 speaking. Make sure you speak
18 loud enough to be heard and speak
19 clearly. This is a hybrid
20 meeting, so we want to make sure
21 everybody is having an inclusive
22 experience. Also, the Court
23 Reporter that we use in
24 transcription we need those names
25 and affiliations, so it's another
26 reason to just kind of keep

1 saying it every time that you
2 speak. Individuals will be
3 called up on at the Chair's
4 discretion. Priority will be
5 given to senate members and then
6 senators who have not spoken yet
7 about an issue those who can then
8 offer information to assist in
9 senate discussions, such as
10 proposals or guests and non-
11 members, if time or circumstances
12 permit. Members of the senate
13 with first priority--will have
14 first priority speaking.
15 Civility, which I think we all
16 have, right? So, debate is about
17 expressing an opinion. We want
18 everyone to participate and also
19 report back to your faculty
20 constituents about what has
21 happened in the Senate Meeting
22 and anything that has occurred
23 here. So, keeping them informed
24 with communication is very, very
25 important, this can also be
26 through your college meetings,

1 which we've talked about before
2 and sometimes those college
3 meetings occur less frequently
4 like once a semester or so, but
5 some occur more often, like once
6 a month. So, finding ways to
7 communicate monthly is really
8 crucial, such as through
9 department meetings or through
10 your college Listservs. I'll
11 give you a little bit more
12 information as we go along today
13 concerning the Listservs that had
14 been created by the Senate Office
15 that will help you kind of
16 mitigate that sort of
17 communication and improve
18 transparency. All right. Well,
19 someone just asked me about this,
20 right? Attendance. So, it's
21 captured via Zoom report and in-
22 person sign-in sheets. Avoid
23 using the chat function, if you
24 can, the distractions--it
25 distracts from official
26 proceedings, instead raise your

1 hand to be called upon. There
2 may be times where we use the
3 chat function and mostly those
4 may be if we need to clarify a
5 motion like verbatim that needs
6 to--for folks on the Zoom to see
7 and hear as well. If you're
8 attending via Zoom keep your
9 cameras on as much as possible.
10 Open Meeting Laws, which you can
11 read right here, so we want to
12 try to remain visible. If you're
13 attending by Zoom use a good
14 quality headset with a
15 microphone. We will let you know
16 if it is not--or it gets worse
17 we'll probably send you a
18 separate email after the Senate
19 Meeting to say, "We had a lot of
20 trouble hearing you." And so,
21 really if you're attending by
22 Zoom just make sure you have a
23 good quality headset and we want
24 you to be able to hear on this
25 side as well. If you're a Senate
26 Member and you're on Zoom and

1 you're disconnected and you
2 cannot reconnect at all, please
3 send Sheila an email so she's
4 aware and we take note of that
5 within the minutes. Mute
6 yourself when you're not
7 speaking, you know, use the
8 customary mute button. If you're
9 in person the red light means
10 your mic is muted, no light means
11 you're on. So, don't talk about
12 me or anybody else with your no
13 light on because I'll hear you.
14 Let's see here. Must seek
15 permission from the Chair to
16 speak. Please do not speak out
17 of turn. Wait in order for you
18 to be called upon. After a
19 senator raises their hand a Chair
20 will call on you then. You know,
21 reasons why you would speak would
22 include various things, so you
23 want to--point of order or
24 information, something is not
25 cleared about what's been
26 discussed or why, make or second

1 a motion, questions of fact or
2 debate--and we will kind of do
3 something a little different when
4 it comes to questions or fact or
5 debate, we're going to put them
6 kind of combined. Call to
7 question and to ask to speak for
8 any reason if you're on Zoom
9 please just raise your hand
10 button at the bottom of the
11 screen, in person raise your hand
12 so that we can take note of you
13 and we will do our best to
14 stay--keep everybody in order of
15 who raised their hand first and
16 so forth. Okay. Moving onto our
17 Senate Agenda. We have
18 announcements first, quite a few.
19 We have vacancies in the
20 Undergraduate Council still. We
21 have two from Arts and Sciences
22 and one from Design. So, the
23 Undergraduate Council already is
24 asking for more members to assist
25 with their heavy workload.
26 You'll see in the cover pages and

1 on the agenda that we have--on
2 the consent agenda we have
3 several activity reports, which
4 we'll go over in just a second,
5 which will be on your consent
6 agenda, but the UC is very active
7 and a very busy council. Senate
8 approved--Senate Council approved
9 adding one additional voting
10 member to the 2022-2023 semester,
11 that's Olivia Davis. We
12 appreciate and thank her so much
13 for volunteering, she's out at
14 BNE, she's going to serve on the
15 UC. And I just want to remind
16 deans and senators, remember that
17 senate activities are effective
18 as the faculty serving on the
19 Academic Councils and the Senate
20 Committees, it's important and
21 it's in everybody's best interest
22 that there is enough faculty to
23 serve in these roles, so that
24 individual faculty are not unduly
25 burdened and so that proposals

1 can move effectively through the
2 proposal process. A shortage of
3 members does not speed up the
4 process. So, remember we're
5 going to be asking everybody to
6 send us folks, right, and great
7 folks, which we had no problem
8 with that really recently. We
9 have a new Parliamentarian and
10 this is Greg Renfro, so he is
11 sitting up front here today. We
12 appreciate his willingness to
13 serve in this role and we deeply
14 appreciate Clayton Kline's
15 service this past year. Greg has
16 also volunteered to come, and he
17 has been coming to our Senate
18 Council Meetings every week and
19 we're grateful for his assistance
20 in each of those meetings as
21 well. Let's see. Make sure you
22 have the ability to review agenda
23 items during the meeting, either
24 via personal device or you can
25 print them out ahead of time.

1 We're going to avoid putting
2 agenda items on the screen during
3 the meeting, because those on
4 Zoom cannot see them when we
5 bring them up as a separate
6 screen item. Office staff will
7 apply line numbers to the
8 proposals when possible to
9 facilitate a way of finding the
10 discussion. So, you'll see on
11 the different proposals today are
12 the discussion items for the
13 Senate Rules there are line
14 numbers, and so, we will refer to
15 those line numbers so everybody
16 can turn to that page or look
17 within their online documents and
18 go directly to it. It will help
19 us facilitate the discussion.
20 We're now receiving--Senate
21 Council is now receiving monthly
22 updates from the QEP, which is
23 the Quality Enhancement Plan,
24 it's for the SACSCOC Re-
25 accreditation activities. At the

1 top, Transdisciplinary
2 Educational Approaches to Advance
3 Kentucky or TEK. The QEP
4 Committee is co-chaired by Senate
5 Council Member Susan Cantrell,
6 out of Education and also Provost
7 DiPaola. Let's see here. Okay.
8 We sent out several things. So,
9 we have a Semi-Annual Course
10 Purge activity that's winding
11 down. All of those requests and
12 the deadline was this Monday to
13 be in. Many thanks to those who
14 submitted those requests, we had
15 a list of over 2500 courses to
16 purge and we received at least a
17 request for 400 of those courses
18 to stay. Calendar Committee, as
19 you know we have approved a--we
20 signed an ad hoc, it's a
21 permanent committee through
22 senate, so the Senator Calendar
23 Committee has already started its
24 work. They will be reviewing all
25 requests related to the

1 university calendar and recommend
2 to Senate Council, you know, what
3 their recommendation is coming
4 out of Senate--or out of the
5 Calendar Committee, so any
6 deviations, exceptions, etcetera,
7 any proposal related to a
8 calendar will go through the
9 Calendar Committee. It's
10 important to know that it's
11 unlikely that the Calendar
12 Committee will actually recommend
13 any outright waivers of
14 university of academic holidays.
15 And remember that Senate Council
16 gives authority about Senate
17 Rules to approve waivers for
18 calendars, with such approval
19 that those approvals must be
20 reported to Senate. And we
21 likely will no longer be
22 approving non-standard calendars
23 in perpetuity. Academic
24 Councils, are using course and
25 program checklists for all

1 proposals, you can also see those
2 checklists on the website.
3 Proposers can check their course
4 and program proposals against the
5 checklist prior to submission.
6 We urge you to make sure that you
7 do this so that it doesn't hold
8 up your proposal through the
9 process. We've also invited Vice
10 President of Student Success
11 Kirsten Turner to present
12 information to the Senate
13 regarding the recent admissions
14 policies. We've had some
15 questions around the acceptance
16 rate, what--that kind of has
17 potentially brought up some
18 discussions and also with UK
19 Invest, so we have asked her if
20 she would come and present on
21 both to the Senate and the plan
22 now is likely in November or
23 December, with most likely
24 November being the Senate Meeting
25 that she comes. Activities

1 related to Senate Council
2 elections are beginning. You
3 will receive communication that
4 will come through the Senate
5 Council Listserv through the
6 Chair of the Election
7 Subcommittee. Senators submit
8 nominations and then vote for
9 Senate Council members. Only
10 elected faculty members are
11 eligible to be nominated. You'll
12 get a list that has the eligible
13 members who can be elected into
14 Senate Council. Remember when
15 you're doing this, think of
16 someone who could potentially
17 serve as the elected chair of the
18 Senate Council. Those folks that
19 are on Senate Council that is how
20 you get your Senate Council chair
21 reelect from those members out of
22 that body. And so, somebody who
23 can serve in this role that I'm
24 currently serving in and the past
25 role that Aaron has currently

1 served or has served in. So,
2 when you're putting these folks
3 forward I really want you to do
4 your due diligence and think
5 about who can serve best in these
6 roles and could be a potentially
7 Senate Council chair. So,
8 Consent Agenda, we have two items
9 that consist of the minutes from
10 the prior meeting and activity
11 reports from each of the Academic
12 Councils and the committees. So,
13 items on Consent Agenda are
14 considered adopted unless a
15 member asks to remove an item for
16 discussion later in the meeting
17 and it's upon the chair to decide
18 whether it will be discussed in
19 the meeting agenda. You can
20 ask--any senator can ask for an
21 item to be removed from that
22 Consent Agenda and ask that it be
23 put later down on the agenda or
24 they can ask before or they can
25 ask at the time. So, currently

1 now, at the time if we can remove
2 an item off. So, I'm going to
3 wait a second and tell you that
4 the minutes from September 12th
5 were approved with some--were not
6 approved, but have been updated
7 with just some slight clerical
8 edits. I think there was a name
9 change or a spelling, something
10 around there and then the
11 Activity Report from the Academic
12 Council and the committee. Are
13 there any requests at this time
14 to remove anything that should be
15 discussed later? Okay. Hearing
16 no objections the Senate Agenda
17 for October 10th is adopted.
18 Officer reports, so Senate
19 Council has approved an ad hoc
20 committee to look into non-credit
21 bearing educational activities,
22 this is similar to the issue
23 resolved last year concerning
24 courses without faculty
25 oversight. We had a subcommittee

1 that worked about eight months to
2 develop a standard, sort of
3 template to help with faculty
4 bodies, the process, the
5 entire--resolving the entire
6 issue. The committee, this
7 current committee, will survey
8 the current landscape of non-
9 credit bearing activities and if
10 warranted will make
11 recommendations to the Senate
12 Council. Last year, past Chair
13 Aaron Cramer expressed some
14 concerns to the president--to
15 President Capilouto and Provost
16 DiPaola about the Regulation
17 Review Committee not having met
18 for over a year. We have
19 requested presentations to the
20 Senate Council and Senate this
21 year on a number of reg changes,
22 but thus far those have been
23 unsuccessful. We've asked for
24 some presentations on AR316 and
25 AR1.4, but the invitation at this

1 time was declined. I'm not
2 saying that was declined because
3 they're not going to come. It
4 could be more or less declined
5 just the time period and they
6 could not make it, you know,
7 during the Senate Council
8 meeting. Currently I can tell
9 you we have an AR410 that's being
10 vetted at the Regs and Review
11 Committee. The Regulation and
12 Review Committee is comprised of
13 three campus constituents, so
14 it's faculty, staff and students
15 and a few other people. And just
16 a little background on the Regs
17 Review Committee it serves as a
18 Regulation Advisory Group to the
19 President, the Provost and
20 Executive Vice Presidents and
21 Vice Presidents. It reviews new
22 and existing regulations for
23 practicality, clarity and the
24 impact of regulations on the
25 university. The RRC eliminates

1 conflict between the university
2 regulations and ensures the
3 regulations are consistent with
4 laws, other external requirements
5 and the university mission. So,
6 in the past usually when we--our
7 RRC constituent feedback was
8 traditionally done in a two-prong
9 sort of approach. So, because
10 they have staff and faculty
11 representatives the members from
12 that community usually engage in
13 discussion about changing policy
14 or what best language to use and
15 if the Senate--if the Staff
16 Senate or University Senate Rep
17 ask the regs was usually placed
18 on a meeting agenda and someone
19 from legal counsel presented the
20 proposed changes to this body and
21 also to Senate Council. The
22 process now that has been
23 described is the Regs Review
24 Committee Chair will email
25 members with the file, track

1 changes and request some edits.
2 A representative body, as of such
3 so far hasn't been asked for some
4 feedback, so currently the RRC
5 members do not have a mechanism
6 to request that a change be
7 presented to the body that they
8 represent. So, for instance, I
9 am on that committee and I would
10 like to bring a change--I would
11 like to have discussion at the
12 larger Senate body, that has not
13 kind of happened yet. So, we
14 received a recent notice about
15 scheduling future RRC meetings.
16 There was some questions about,
17 obviously I said before, that we
18 hadn't met in like a year, now it
19 seems to be a more regular
20 meeting time is being scheduled,
21 which is good and promising. So,
22 we're trying to figure out a
23 better mechanism and hopefully
24 we'll get this resolved where we
25 can really actively participate

1 in some shared governance. I may
2 be your elected, you know, Senate
3 Council Chair, but when there are
4 rules and regulations that are
5 changed at the broader sense, for
6 me and I think for--and everybody
7 would likely agree that the whole
8 body should weigh in and give
9 feedback in a consultative way,
10 you know, to administration. So,
11 in the spring of 2022 Senate
12 Council asked the Senate Advisory
13 Committee on Disability and
14 Accommodation and Compliance, boy
15 that's a mouth full, to look into
16 issues related to concerns from
17 faculty about reasonable
18 accommodations. Senate Council
19 became aware of some concerns
20 from some faculty that reasonable
21 accommodations were not
22 determined through an interactive
23 process with the faculty member,
24 so as a result of the faculty
25 member may not agree that the

1 accommodation is reasonable or
2 pedagogically appropriate. So,
3 Senate Council was interested in
4 learning more about reasonable
5 accommodations in general. So,
6 how are reasonable accommodations
7 are expected or intended to be
8 established if an accommodation
9 may violate an academic policy of
10 the Senate and how a faculty
11 member can request a modification
12 to the accommodations they do not
13 believe may be reasonable. So,
14 we received a report from Justin
15 Lang who was the SACDAC Chair in
16 September and after much
17 discussion on the report we
18 requested further work from
19 SACDAC, so we've asked them to
20 benchmark some practices other
21 educational institutions are
22 currently doing, to review some
23 ADA laws and look into
24 accommodations not covered by
25 such laws and develop a more

1 transparent website for UK's
2 Disability Resource Center. I
3 urge you to look at Oregon State
4 Disability Resource Accommodation
5 Website, it's amazing. It's
6 transparent and it communicates
7 so much information I was pretty
8 envious after looking at it and
9 it actually gives a lot of
10 information that would even help
11 faculty members here, it's very
12 resourceful. We also are
13 evaluating if the current SACDAC
14 Composition satisfies the
15 committee's charge and have asked
16 for feedback on that as well.
17 Senate Council discussed finals
18 week and SR language. Currently,
19 the SRs do not explicitly say it
20 prohibits homework being made due
21 during finals week. Go figure.
22 So, we brought this to Senate
23 Council. There was a lot of
24 discussion and some were really
25 related to disciplinary areas of

1 folks within Senate Council and
2 because we could not necessarily
3 come to an agreement we felt like
4 this should go onto a committee
5 for deliberation and further
6 recommendations. So, this is
7 going to go to SAASC and we will
8 report back once we get a report
9 from them. The college, as I
10 said earlier about communication,
11 the office has finished preparing
12 college specific Listservs. We
13 will use one email address that
14 will reach many participants, so
15 you can see this kind of below,
16 it will be set up for a one-way
17 communication. So, replies--if
18 the Senators are going to be
19 using this Listserv, if someone
20 replies it will not go to
21 everyone on the Listserv, it will
22 only go to those one, two, three,
23 four, five, however many senators
24 that you have in your college, it
25 will only go back to those that

1 are listed on the Senate
2 Listserv. We are actually going
3 to be providing some guidelines
4 on what should go on the Listserv
5 and what should not go on the
6 Listserv. So, we don't want to
7 bombard folks with a bunch of
8 emails, but we do think it's
9 important that communication is
10 getting out to your faculty
11 members within your college and
12 that's any Senate Meeting,
13 anything that may come up in
14 between Senate meetings. If
15 there's anything that you need to
16 communicate on related to Senate
17 activities you would use this
18 Listserv. So, we'll pre-load the
19 recipients into this created
20 Listserv. Like I said, it's all
21 faculty within the college, so it
22 will have all ranks, all titles,
23 full time, part time, adjunct,
24 volunteer. While only certain
25 faculty members have voting

1 rights, elected faculty senators
2 represent all faculty in the
3 college, not just those who have
4 voting rights. So, colleges with
5 more than one senator should
6 collaborate on timing of the
7 message. My suggestion is that
8 if you have more than one senator
9 to take turns each month in
10 reporting to the faculty body, so
11 it's not the same person trying
12 to write up a summary, but you
13 know, each of you say, "Okay.
14 I'll take, you know, November,"
15 or, "I'll take October. I'll
16 take December," and just rotate
17 it through, it spreads the work a
18 little bit. And you're going to
19 be encouraged to use these
20 Listservs. Colleges, you will
21 email Sheila when you're ready to
22 begin using your Listserv and
23 then she will give you guidance
24 and guidelines on the use of
25 Listserv and also your Listserv

1 information. Bob?

2 MR. GRIFF: Bob Griff with Chemistry A and S.
3 I was just wondering what do you
4 do if you have 17 representatives
5 of your college.

6 MS. COLLETT: Yeah, I know you all have quite a
7 bit. We're going to work with
8 Arts and Science on the best way
9 to do that.

10 MR. GRIFF: Thank you.

11 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. Is
12 the work of the Regulation
13 Committee like the proposal on
14 student conduct, is that public?
15 Can I access it and look at it as
16 a Senator?

17 MS. COLLETT: I don't think you can let--in my
18 knowledge you can access it while
19 it's still in draft form. What
20 you access in interim is passed
21 and put up or a final is put up.
22 Now, I know that the GRs state
23 that any of those changes are
24 supposed to be sent out to the
25 university community wide and

1 also posted. The President works
2 with marketing and it's supposed
3 to be also posted on the website
4 so that you know of any changes
5 that have gone through, but I
6 don't think the website is
7 currently updated, so.

8 MR. TAGAVI: Is that considered under Open
9 Meeting Rules that an agenda
10 should be published and available
11 to the university community?

12 MS. COLLETT: I think because they are an
13 advisory group and they do not
14 make final it would not be open.
15 Okay. I don't see any hands.
16 Any--

17 SPEAKER 2: I just want to just let everybody
18 know too that I attend all, if
19 not all, unless I'm out of town
20 or something all the Senate
21 Council Meetings and it's always
22 an opportunity, myself being
23 there representing the President,
24 to your point about communicating
25 with administration if there's

1 input from Senate Council or
2 Senate regarding the Ars.

3 MS. COLLETT: And that's true. So, I have
4 actually been in constant
5 communication here recently with
6 the Provost concerning some of
7 those ARs and my concerns, in
8 general, with the feedback from
9 this body and back to the Provost
10 and the President. Leslie
11 Vincent, our Vice Chair, do you
12 have any reports today?

13 MS. VINCENT: No report today.

14 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Our Parliamentarian
15 Greg, do you have--

16 MR. GREG: No.

17 MS. COLLETT: He has no reports today.
18 Trustees Hollie Swanson and Aaron
19 Cramer.

20 MR. CRAMER: Good afternoon. For the Trustee
21 Report, the Board of Trustees met
22 last month on September 15th and
23 16th, prior to that the new
24 members of the board, myself, SGA
25 President Andrew Laws, Todd Case,

1 Tom Abel, Brenda Gosney and Lance
2 Lucas participated in a new
3 member orientation that was
4 organized by the President, it
5 included relevant aspects of
6 athletics compliance, overviews
7 of areas like UK Healthcare,
8 audit and compliance, research,
9 academics, students success,
10 institutional diversity and
11 finance and a presentation by the
12 General Council on legal issues
13 related to the service on the
14 board. The board meeting, which
15 consisted of meetings of the
16 board's committees followed by
17 the main meeting, included a
18 discussion of the board's
19 evaluation of the President and
20 its own self-evaluation, the
21 current status of UK internal
22 audit, resources for faculty and
23 staff dealing with workplace
24 concerns, student recruitment,
25 SGA, the Office for Faculty

1 Advancement, student well being
2 programs, diverse faculty
3 success, UK Healthcare,
4 athletics, an educational session
5 on UK's endowment and UK Invest,
6 which was described as a new
7 educational program oriented
8 towards the financial education
9 of our students. The board
10 approved a number of items,
11 including the appointment of the
12 Dean of Nursing, Rosalie Mainous.
13 The naming of the Jim Greene
14 Indoor Track and Field Center and
15 the Alumni Commons project on
16 Rose Street, appointments to
17 boards of affiliated
18 corporations, some gifts, real
19 estate and capital projects and
20 the creation of an affiliated
21 corporation for future community
22 medical practice activities. The
23 following week a number of
24 trustees, including the new
25 trustees, participated in the

1 Council on Post-Secondary
2 Education Kentucky Trusteeship
3 Conference in Louisville. This
4 conference served to provide the
5 orientation that SP is required
6 under state law to provide to
7 board members. The Executive
8 Committee of the board actually
9 met this morning to accept the
10 university's audit and financial
11 statements. This is somewhat
12 unusual, but was made necessary
13 due to a timing issue with our
14 Reaffirmation Report to SACSCOC.
15 The board will meet again next
16 week on the 20th and 21st for its
17 annual retreat which will focus
18 on the inspiring ingenuity
19 principal and strategic plan.
20 We've also been told that the
21 faculty evaluation of the
22 President will be presented to
23 the board's Executive Committee
24 by Chair Collett during this
25 meeting and we'll also be voting

1 for officers and members of the
2 Executive Committee of the board.

3 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Now, we will welcome our
4 Ombud Alice Turkington.

5 MS. TURKINGTON: Good afternoon, Chair Collett and
6 Senators. Thank you for the
7 opportunity to present the
8 Academic Ombud Report for the
9 2022 Academic Year. It's my
10 pleasure to provide you a summary
11 of our activities. First, I want
12 to thank the Associate Academic
13 Ombud Laura Anschel for her
14 continued outstanding work in the
15 office. I think she's there in
16 the second row. Ms. Anschel
17 manages the office, triages
18 cases, provides information to
19 campus community on academic
20 rules and procedures, among many
21 other duties and she provides an
22 excellent service to students and
23 faculty. Secondly, our cases
24 overlap with a lot of offices on
25 campus, including, for example,

1 the Disability Resource Center,
2 the Registrars Office, the Office
3 of Institutional Equity and Equal
4 Opportunity, UK Legal Counsel,
5 the Center for Support and
6 Intervention, the Dean of
7 Students Office and some others.
8 So, I would like to thank them
9 for their assistance. And
10 finally, I would like to thank
11 all of the College Associate
12 Deans of Academic Affairs for
13 they are the real heros and
14 problem solvers. I think I've
15 worked with almost all of them.
16 They have helped me resolve some
17 complex issues in a timely and
18 compassionate manner. We've
19 included in this annual report a
20 statistical summary of the cases
21 in the Academic Office last year,
22 which will be included in the
23 minutes for your reference. This
24 summary provides information on
25 the total number of academic

1 issues we addressed, the academic
2 offense cases we processed and
3 the cases forwarded to the
4 University Appeals Board.
5 Generally, the Academic Ombud
6 handles two types of cases,
7 academic offenses and academic
8 issues arising between students
9 and faculty. Our office
10 maintains a record of all
11 academic offenses and for
12 students who wish to appeal we
13 help prepare their case and
14 summarize it for the University
15 Appeals Board. If students have
16 other academic issues we aim to
17 empower them with the tools to
18 solve them or we mediate between
19 them and faculty or
20 administration to find a
21 resolution. In the event that
22 the issue requires a formal
23 appeal to the University Appeals
24 Board we facilitate that process.
25 The number of academic issues

1 addressed in the Academic Ombud
2 Office was approximately 3,300
3 and that has risen compared with
4 previous years. However,
5 relative to the large size of
6 this university with 33,000
7 students this total number is
8 relatively very small and attest
9 to the excellent education and
10 training provided by faculty
11 instructors at UK. The academic
12 offense cases we received in the
13 2022 Academic Year were
14 overwhelmingly first offenses,
15 many of which received the
16 minimum penalty. All were
17 associated with work submitted
18 online and the types of offense
19 were predominantly plagiarism,
20 copying from online resources or
21 collaborating with other
22 students. There were a range of
23 websites represented where
24 students could find answer keys
25 or a solution to assessment

1 materials or where they can
2 purchase original papers. A few
3 offenses were discovered using
4 online proctoring, many were
5 discovered using Turnitin. While
6 the total number of academic
7 offense cases is relatively small
8 the number is comparable with the
9 past five years. This does not
10 capture the total number of
11 offenses on campus, however, as
12 there are situations where
13 instructors choose not to pursue
14 a formal determination of an
15 offense, but rather judge the
16 situation as an error or resolve
17 the issue within the course. Of
18 the 102 academic offense cases we
19 received only eight of those
20 students decided to proceed with
21 an appeal, three were upheld. We
22 also resolved 273 cases that
23 pertained to claims of violations
24 of student's academic rights
25 across a broad range of

1 educational settings, these cases
2 addressed a wide range of issues
3 and most were resolved through
4 mediation and discussion with
5 relevant parties on campus. From
6 these cases 27 appeals were
7 forwarded to the University
8 Appeals Board, 18 were upheld.
9 The most substantial cases come
10 from students in the Graduate
11 School or Professional Colleges.
12 Graduate students in particular
13 occur a precarious position when
14 academic issues do arise and I
15 would like to encouraged earlier
16 intervention in graduate student
17 cases before a situation becomes
18 a crisis. To that end, I offer
19 outreach and education to the
20 campus community about the
21 services offered by the Academic
22 Ombud Office as well as issues
23 regarding academic integrity.
24 Last year as Academic Ombud I've
25 given presentations to teaching

1 assistants, departmental groups
2 and classes to university
3 advisors, to student government
4 and graduate student
5 representatives and to faculty
6 groups. Dr. Collett, thank you
7 for the opportunity to present
8 this report and for the
9 opportunity to serve as Academic
10 Ombud.

11 MS. COLLETT: Are there any questions?

12 MS. SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, College of
13 Medicine. So, I'm just curious,
14 when you look at the offense by
15 the graduate students do they
16 differ in substance versus the
17 undergraduates? You know, you've
18 got your different categories,
19 plagiarism, etcetera.

20 MS. TURKINGTON: Not entirely. I think
21 graduate--there's a much smaller
22 number of graduate student
23 offenses, it's really just a
24 handful, they do include
25 plagiarism, but there are other

1 types of offenses that aren't
2 really apparent in the
3 undergraduate level like
4 falsification of records or, you
5 know, larger--larger offenses as
6 well. The end number is very
7 small for graduate students
8 though.

9 MS. SWANSON: Okay. Thank you.

10 MS. COLLETT: Eric.

11 MR. BLALOCK: Hi. Eric Blalock, College of
12 Medicine. Just sort of a comment
13 and a question on that. For
14 several graduate students inside
15 of the College of Medicine that
16 have come from overseas there's
17 an additional rider that any
18 finding of something like
19 plagiarism could result in the
20 loss of their ability to stay at
21 the university, so the stakes
22 typically can be much, much
23 higher for students in the post-
24 graduate system inside of COM
25 than maybe they are for

1 undergrads. Is there any
2 consideration given for that kind
3 of issue that may be part of why
4 there's lower reporting of those
5 kinds of issues?

6 MS. TURKINGTON: Yeah, thank you. I totally
7 agree. I think that
8 international students perceive
9 any discussion with the Academic
10 Ombud as very risky and anything
11 that might upset their student
12 status, obviously has high
13 implications for potentially
14 loosing their Visa. So, I--my
15 office is right in the
16 International Center and I have
17 worked with Sue Roberts to
18 discuss that issue a little bit
19 as to how to encourage them to
20 seek help and understand the
21 protections in place for them.

22 MR. BLALOCK: Thanks.

23 MR. GARVEY: Aaron Garvey, Gatton College.
24 And I just wanted to--so, I was
25 actually involved in one of those

1 academic misconducts where the
2 students were all--actually, I
3 wasn't directly involved but I
4 had students that were later
5 found guilty of very severe
6 academic misconduct and I learned
7 quite a bit in the process. Part
8 of that being that being a first
9 offender is--carries with it, I
10 guess, kind of a different
11 connotation than if it's repeat.
12 But those students were in my
13 class whereas I did not bring
14 them up on academic misconduct
15 charges because I didn't have
16 sufficient evidence at the time.
17 The probability was about 95
18 percent that there was academic
19 misconduct going on. Has the
20 Ombud ever considered any kind of
21 a watch list, a warning list,
22 something like that there's high
23 probability that this student is
24 engaging in academic misconduct
25 and if something pops in the

1 future where there is evidence
2 there's a record that there's
3 been some questionable behavior
4 in the past?

5 MS. TURKINGTON: That's an interesting point.
6 Thank you. That's not something
7 that's on our radar because
8 typically that's dealt within the
9 court and between the instructor
10 and the student and that's a part
11 of the academic record of the
12 student that doesn't kind of be
13 shared. Unless it's a formal
14 determination of an academic
15 offense we wouldn't keep a record
16 of that. If the instructor
17 discusses something with us we
18 wouldn't share the name of the
19 student, but that's an
20 interesting perspective that
21 maybe something like that could
22 be considered.

23 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S. You said
24 several times 28--there's about
25 28 appeals and 17 upheld. It

1 wasn't clear to me whether the 17
2 were upholding the penalty or
3 were they upholding the appeal.

4 MS. TURKINGTON: Sure. I meant that the appeal
5 was upheld in that case.

6 MR. GROSSMAN: The appeal was upheld?

7 MS. TURKINGTON: Yeah.

8 MS. COLLETT: Sandra.

9 MS. BASTIN: Sandra Bastin, College of
10 Agriculture Food and Enviroment.
11 Could you just clarify for me how
12 much time do faculty actually
13 spend in these appeals? Do you
14 keep track of that?

15 MS. TURKINGTON: That's a good question. It
16 depends on the type of the
17 appeal. The faculty member would
18 be asked to provide the evidence
19 in an academic offense case and
20 then if they choose to do so they
21 could attend the University
22 Appeals Board Hearing on the
23 offense. If the appeal is
24 related to another academic issue
25 the faculty member would be asked

1 to respond and provide
2 documentation and then again
3 attend the Appeals Board. So,
4 there would be a number of hours,
5 just a few hours, I think, in
6 total of work. It kind of
7 depends on the appeal.

8 MS. BASTIN: Thank you.

9 MS. COLLETT: Okay. I don't see any more
10 questions. Thank you Ombud
11 Turkington for your time and
12 effort and your report. So, it's
13 the UAB Report for 2021 to '22.
14 Former UAB Chair Joe Fink and the
15 current UAB Chair Julia Costich
16 will give us a report now.

17 MR. FINK: Thank you. This is Joe Fink. As
18 you can see from the first slide
19 in the set, I am now a Professor
20 Emeritus. I retired at the end
21 of June, but this report that
22 I'll be giving today covers the
23 2021-2022 fiscal year in terms of
24 activities of the University
25 Appeals Board. Next slide,

1 please. What's the jurisdiction
2 of the University Appeals Board?
3 The Appeals Board deals with two
4 kinds of matter, Academic Appeals
5 that come through the Officer of
6 the Academic Ombud and Conduct
7 Appeals that come through the
8 Office of the Dean of Students.
9 They have different pathways.
10 They reach us in different ways.
11 And we can talk a little more
12 about that in a minute. The
13 jurisdiction is very clearly
14 labeled when a case goes to the
15 Appeals Board to tell the members
16 of the board whether what's being
17 appealed is an academic matter or
18 a conduct matter. Next slide,
19 please. The appeal
20 process--let's first talk about
21 academic matters. The appeal is
22 referred by the Office of the
23 Academic Ombud. The Ombud makes
24 a determination, does the matter
25 have merit? If so, it will be

1 passed onto the University
2 Appeals Board. If the Academic
3 Ombud concludes that the matter
4 lacks merit the student will be
5 so notified and the student has
6 the opportunity to appeal that
7 determination within 30 days.
8 And at that point in the process
9 the sole question on the table
10 is, did the Ombud error in
11 determining that the matter lacks
12 merit. I'd say in the 23 years
13 I've been doing this about 90
14 plus percent of the time the
15 Ombud's determination that it
16 lacked merit is upheld. It's a
17 very rare occasion where a
18 different determination is
19 reached by the Appeals Board, but
20 it does occur, it does occur.
21 Okay. If the Ombud has
22 determined that the matter does
23 have merit at that point steps
24 are taken to identify a hearing
25 panel to hear the matter. A

1 student is kept in the process.
2 The faculty members are
3 communicated with as scheduling
4 and other matters unfold.
5 Both--when the time slot is
6 identified for the hearing both
7 are invited to attend. We have
8 no ability to compel attendance.
9 We're not a court. We can't
10 issue a subpoena. We invite the
11 student. We invite the faculty
12 members. We've had increasing
13 attendance by faculty in recent
14 years. There was a period about
15 five/seven years ago where
16 faculty members were not showing
17 up, but now that has changed and
18 restored to where it should be.
19 A Conduct Appeal comes up through
20 the Office of Dean of Students
21 where there has already been a
22 hearing by a three-person panel
23 convened by the Office of the
24 Dean of Students and then what
25 the student is appealing is the

1 decision of that panel, and so,
2 the appeal is very different. An
3 Academic Appeal is heard by eight
4 members of the Appeals Board,
5 whereas a Conduct Appeal is heard
6 by two members of the Appeals
7 Board, plus the Appeals Board
8 Chair. So, it's a very different
9 process, Academic Appeal versus
10 Conduct Appeal. Next slide,
11 please. Composition of the
12 University Appeals Board. There
13 are 30 people who are appointed
14 to the University Appeals Board,
15 18 of those 30 are faculty
16 members with a broad range of
17 disciplines and academic units
18 represented. Faculty members are
19 appointed for a three-year term.
20 Student members, of which there
21 are 12, are appointed following a
22 recommendation by the President
23 of Student Government to the
24 President of the University and
25 the President of the University

1 appoints the student members just
2 as the President appoints the
3 faculty members who serve on the
4 Appeals Board. Faculty serve a
5 three-year term. Students serve
6 a one-year term. However,
7 students can be reappointed. I
8 think during the time I've been
9 doing it the longest tenure I've
10 seen for a student is somebody
11 who started while they were an
12 undergrad and continued being
13 reappointed while they were in
14 law school for a total of five
15 years of service. That is the
16 longest string I think I've seen
17 with a student. Next slide,
18 please. What's a quorum? I talk
19 about this for an academic matter
20 eight members of the Appeals
21 Board plus the University Hearing
22 Officer, that's one of the titles
23 for the Appeals Board Chair and
24 then if there is a situation
25 where the case is arising say in

1 my college, the College of
2 Pharmacy, I contact the student
3 and say, "Are you comfortable
4 with me presiding or do you want
5 me to identify somebody else,
6 maybe a former Ombud or someone
7 who knows the process, somebody
8 who has been on the Appeals
9 Board, to share your session or
10 are you comfortable with me doing
11 it?" and then I go with whatever
12 the student decides. For a
13 Conduct Appeal it's two members
14 of the Appeals Board and the
15 Chairman of the Appeals Board.
16 As we'll talk about in a minute,
17 this past year was a rather
18 unusual year with regard to
19 Conduct Appeals and many of those
20 arose from the University's
21 expectations regarding student
22 behavior with regard to Covid
23 immunization or testing. And I
24 knew there were going to be quite
25 a few of those, so I contacted

1 two members of the Appeals Board
2 of whom I had a very high opinion
3 and asked if they would be
4 willing to be a consistent panel
5 with me to handle all Covid
6 related appeals and both agreed.
7 So, one was a student, a first-
8 year law student who had been an
9 undergrad here at UK and a member
10 of the Appeals Board as an
11 undergrad and then the other was
12 a faculty member. So, for those
13 Conduct Appeals that were Covid
14 related we had a panel of three,
15 one being a student, one being a
16 faculty member and me. Next
17 slide. There is a document that
18 we have put together over the
19 years that is available off the
20 website of the Academic Ombud
21 Office that is in a question and
22 an answer format. I found over
23 the years that it's difficult to
24 get students who are appealing to
25 come see me in advance so that I

1 can explain the process to them
2 and the flow of a hearing and who
3 sits where and all that stuff, so
4 they're comfortable on the day of
5 the proceeding. So, we put
6 together this question and answer
7 document and it's available off
8 the Ombud's Office. And when I
9 receive the packet from the Ombud
10 I, in my initial email to the
11 student copied to the faculty
12 member, I say, "I received the
13 packet. I'm going to work on
14 scheduling it. You may want to
15 look at--" and I give them this
16 link, "--the information in this
17 document that answers common
18 questions about how the Appeals
19 Board does what it does." And
20 so, I think that has been very
21 helpful. The next slide has a
22 lot of data about what has been
23 the pattern and recent history of
24 Appeals Board cases. You'll
25 notice that the year I focused on

1 today is over there on the right
2 and you'll see that we did a
3 total of 68 cases last year,
4 contrast that with the bottom
5 line for the prior years. Let's
6 see, one year we had 20, 14, 29,
7 19 and so forth. So, this past
8 year was a highly unusual year,
9 not only because of the Conduct
10 Appeals arising from the
11 University's Covid expectations,
12 but also look at the number of
13 appeals addressing a fair and a
14 just evaluation, that was a high
15 number as well. So, during the
16 just concluded fiscal year with
17 68 cases total, over the time
18 I've been doing that--when people
19 ask, "Well, gee whiz. I'm a
20 student and I have an appeal,
21 what are my chances of prevailing
22 during an appeal process?" and I
23 always tell them, "It's pretty
24 much 50/50, right down the
25 middle," and you'll see that the

1 numbers overall, for all
2 different categories, came out
3 just about 50/50 for last year.
4 Next slide. What are some
5 continuing challenges facing the
6 University Appeals Board?
7 Continuing challenges are having
8 people come to the meeting
9 prepared, not the members of the
10 Appeals Board, they come
11 prepared, they've received the
12 packet that the Ombud put
13 together giving the flow of the
14 issue, what exactly is the focus
15 of the hearing and so forth, but
16 rather having the students and
17 the faculty member come fully
18 prepared. We had one case that
19 sticks out in my memory, it was
20 probably about three years ago
21 now, where I opened the meeting
22 and I declared that there was
23 quorum present and I turned to
24 the student and say, "We've found
25 it's helpful to hear in your own

1 words what you're appealing and
2 why. This would supplement what
3 is in the packet. Would you
4 please tell the committee what
5 you're appealing and why?" the
6 young lady said two sentences and
7 that was it. And that was the
8 end of her statement about what
9 she was appealing and why and
10 we're all sitting around looking
11 at one another saying, "Okay.
12 What's the rest?" Well--so,
13 getting people to come prepared,
14 having put some thought into
15 their presentation, faculty
16 members bringing relevant graded
17 assignments, bring the grade
18 book, bring the syllabus and so
19 forth. Come prepared to the
20 hearings, that's some what of a
21 continuing challenge. I would
22 emphasize that my philosophy,
23 while I've been doing this, has
24 been to have as a goal having the
25 students treated as I would want

1 our sons treated or our grandkids
2 treated if they were to have an
3 appeal moving through the
4 process. And so, I have always
5 tried to treat the students with
6 respect just as I treat the
7 faculty with respect, I think
8 that helps arrive at the proper
9 decision on these matters. It's
10 worth emphasizing that the
11 Appeals Board Chair does not have
12 a vote on an Academic Appeal,
13 it's solely a majority of those
14 eight people who hear the case.
15 As I wrap up, I would like to
16 thank several people who have
17 been helpful over the years I
18 have been doing this. I've
19 looked at the list, I've worked
20 with nine different faculty
21 members who were Academic Ombuds
22 during the 23 years that I've
23 been doing it, they have all made
24 major sacrifices in order to work
25 with some really difficult cases,

1 you just heard from Dr.
2 Turkington, the numbers are
3 unbelievable and yet they balance
4 that they juggle all those things
5 that come through their office
6 and do it very well. Michelle
7 (Inaudible), who was there for
8 quiet a number of years, is now
9 retired and Laura Anshel, both
10 are above and beyond fantastic in
11 the way they deal with the
12 students. These students are in
13 very stressful situations,
14 they're challenging what their
15 faculty member has decided is the
16 appropriate thing. Michelle and
17 Laura were very good listeners,
18 they do triage, they say, "Okay,
19 yes you're--here's what you need
20 to do. You need to come back and
21 talk to the Ombud. You need to
22 bring this with you. You need to
23 bring this document. Bring this
24 piece of evidence with you," and
25 so forth, "so you can have a

1 fruitful discussion," and both of
2 them were really good. I am
3 passing the baton to Dr. Julia
4 Costich, who is from the College
5 of Public Health. I think Julia
6 is on here and she may have some
7 comments to make. Julia is a
8 former member of the University
9 Appeals Board, so she has
10 observed this firsthand in terms
11 of how the processes work, at
12 least while I've been involved
13 with it. So, Julia, I yield to
14 you any comments you would like
15 to make.

16 MS. COSTICH: Thank you. It's--can you hear
17 me?

18 MR. FINK: Yes.

19 MS. COSTICH: Good. It is an honor to serve in
20 this capacity. It will be really
21 tough to follow in Joe's
22 footsteps, but I will certainly
23 do my best, he has been extremely
24 generous with his time helping me
25 grasp, what to me at least, are

1 some fine points and I would also
2 like to echo Joe's solute to
3 Laura Anschel who has been
4 invaluable in helping me get
5 oriented. I am pleased to report
6 that the new class of Appeals
7 Board members has been appointed
8 and underwent orientation last
9 Friday. We have already held six
10 hearings since I was appointed on
11 the first of August. We have
12 nine pending matters at this
13 point and hope to give them
14 appropriate attention later this
15 month. These are matters that
16 need to get cleared up really
17 before we can launch into the
18 rest of the academic year. So,
19 if you remember the figures last
20 year being a complete aberration
21 from figures from previous years,
22 we already have 15 and it's
23 only--15 cases and it's only the
24 10th of October. So, let's hope
25 this is not a pace that we

1 continue on or I'm going to have
2 some cranky Appeals Board
3 panelists over time. So, my goal
4 with the panel is to make sure
5 that we don't lean excessively on
6 one person or another even though
7 some people's schedules are more
8 open than others. So, I will do
9 my best and help to uphold Joe's
10 legacy of fairness.

11 MR. FINK: I think either one of us will be
12 willing to take questions. Any
13 questions?

14 MS. BLASING: Molly Blasing, Arts and Sciences.
15 Thank you for your report and
16 your service. You suggested that
17 the rise in conduct cases can be
18 accounted for by the pandemic
19 situation and Covid related
20 violation. What in your mind
21 accounts for the rise, the
22 dramatic rise, in appeals related
23 to fair and just evaluation?

24 MR. FINK: I thought about that and I don't
25 have any clear cut cause and

1 effect relationship to identify
2 it, but I think it's remote
3 teaching, remote instruction, not
4 being able to look somebody in
5 the eye and talk to them face to
6 face to get an issue resolved.
7 I've got a lot of different
8 things that contributed to that.

9 MR. ROHR: Jurgen Rohr, College of Pharmacy.
10 I have a question.

11 MS. COLLETT: Hold on one second. You have to
12 be recognized by the Chair. Hold
13 on, please. I have hands over
14 here that need to go first, so
15 hold please.

16 MS. ASHWOOD: Hi, I'm Loka Ashwood, College of
17 Arts and Sciences. So, I was
18 hoping that you could also
19 reflect on the Student Code of
20 Conduct trends and numbers and
21 specifically if you could break
22 that down into what sorts of
23 violations of the Student Code of
24 Conduct that is, is it
25 discrimination between student to

1 student? Is it violent threats
2 against faculty? Could you talk
3 more on the increase that you're
4 seeing? And you kind of
5 mentioned that was Covid-19
6 related, but I would love to hear
7 you breakdown those a little bit
8 more. Thank you.

9 MR. FINK: I'd say at least two-thirds of
10 that number are Covid related,
11 either the students were not
12 reporting that they had been
13 immunized or they were not
14 complying with the University's
15 expectation of weekly testing if
16 they had not been immunized. And
17 some students had reasons they
18 thought were adequate in their
19 mind as to why they didn't have
20 to comply with that. And so, out
21 of the Conduct category for the
22 past year Covid related matters
23 two-thirds at least. Code of
24 Student conduct, other types of
25 things are usually student

1 behavior matters in terms of
2 disruptive behavior in class,
3 disruptive neighborhood or
4 residence hall behavior, things
5 like that.

6 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Dean Davis?

7 MS. DAVIS: Hi Joe and hello Julia. I just
8 wanted to say, Mary Davis,
9 College of Law, that your service
10 has been extraordinary.

11 MR. FINK: I'm sorry. I can't hear.

12 MS. COLLETT: Hold on one second.

13 MS. DAVIS: Hi Joe and Julia. This is Mary
14 Davis from the College of Law. I
15 just wanted to confirm the
16 extraordinary service that you
17 have provided this university.
18 Joe, it's really quite remarkable
19 to have done what you've done
20 over the years with such
21 integrity and fairness and I
22 thank you on all of our behalf,
23 but also personally for what
24 you've done. Julia, I know
25 you'll be fabulous. I have a

1 question about how the Appeals
2 Board reviews these cases. I'm
3 just curious what your standard
4 of review is. Are you trying
5 these cases de novo or anew or
6 are you applying some other
7 standard when you hear these
8 appeals?

9 MR. FINK: There are different standards
10 depending on the basis or cause
11 of the appeal, some it's de novo,
12 some it's an appellate review.
13 It's spelled out in the
14 University Senate Rules and the
15 ARs of the University. But the
16 one broad brush comment I can
17 make is that the members of the
18 Appeals Board take this service
19 extremely seriously and the
20 discussion they have in the
21 deliberation phase of a hearing,
22 after the parties have been
23 excused, is very rigorous, very
24 well thought out and very direct
25 and the University would be proud

1 of the level of discussion that
2 the members of the Appeals Board
3 have.

4 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Jorgen, would you like to
5 speak now?

6 MR. ROHR: Yes. Joe, I wonder--I would just
7 like to know because I'm kind of
8 nosey, how did the losing party
9 behave, were they always happy
10 with the result or never?

11 MR. FINK: It's hard for me to answer that
12 because I don't deliver the
13 decision in person. My practice
14 has been that I tell the student
15 before they leave the hearing,
16 and I also tell the faculty
17 member, that the decision will be
18 communicated to them later that
19 day through an email message and
20 then an official letter will
21 follow, usually I don't get to
22 that till the next day. But I'm
23 sure there's disappointment from
24 people whose appeals were not
25 successful, but I hope they go

1 away from the process thinking to
2 themselves, "Well, I had my shot.
3 No one cut me off. There weren't
4 any kind of Rules of Evidence
5 that were being presented that I
6 couldn't say this or do that or
7 whatever." So, I hope they go
8 away satisfied even if they don't
9 like the result, but I've not had
10 any students come back and say--I
11 did have one instance about four
12 years ago where a parent called
13 and said, "Okay. Who do we talk
14 to next?" and I said, "Well, if
15 you read the information in the
16 university publications about the
17 Appeals Board, the Appeals Board
18 is the end of the line and this
19 person said, "Well, I want to
20 talk to the President," and I
21 said, "2571701 is the phone
22 number over there, but I can tell
23 you what they're going to say,
24 they're going to say the Appeals
25 Board is the end of the line and

1 that's it." And so, I'm sure
2 there are students who are
3 disappointed, but at least they
4 get their say and they get their
5 opportunity to address the
6 issues.

7 MR. ROHR: Thank you, Joe.

8 MS. COLLETT: Any more questions? Thank you so
9 much, Dr. Fink. We are very
10 grateful to you and your service
11 and congratulations on your
12 retirement, for sure. And
13 welcome--

14 MR. FINK: Thank you.

15 MS. COLLETT: --Dr. Costich.

16 MR. FINK: Thank you.

17 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. We have one item here
18 that will be amended from the
19 agenda. So, we were going to
20 have (Inaudible) and the Director
21 of Planning and Accrediting Ryan
22 Pearson was going to go over
23 these, but she is unable to
24 attend now. Something just came
25 up. So, we will put that on the

1 next meeting agenda. So, moving
2 right along. Proposed changes to
3 SR1.3 and SR1.4. This is a
4 discussion item only, only. So,
5 this is about the councils of the
6 Senate and the structure of
7 University Senate Committees.
8 So, you have a cover page, as
9 we've been using, that describes
10 why--the rationale for the
11 proposal and the list of the
12 major changes that are included.
13 So, GR4, just to remind you,
14 outlines the Senate's
15 responsibility and the Senate
16 makes final discussions for
17 University on curricula courses,
18 certificates, diplomas, etcetera,
19 but we've made several updates,
20 and not necessarily a lot of
21 changes, about 75 percent of what
22 you're going to see on your track
23 change document is actually just
24 cut and paste and moved around
25 for better flow and clarity.

1 This was a discussion that I
2 think occurred before I became
3 Senate Council Chair and has just
4 now come to fruition where we're
5 bringing this forward. We've
6 discussed this in our Senate
7 Council Retreats and also in
8 Senate Council. So, there are
9 some clarifying languages or
10 clarifying SR language where it
11 deviates from the governing
12 regulations that you'll see, so
13 there are things in here that say
14 approval or past issues that
15 where it says approval and should
16 say recommendation. We've
17 updated text that describes out
18 dated processes, so committee
19 charges that were out of date and
20 standardized some language for
21 Academic Councils and Committees.
22 So, for instance, we had one
23 academic--we had HCCC had a
24 different term length than
25 Graduate Council and

1 Undergraduate Council, so we're
2 trying to standardize the terms
3 so that it's easier when people
4 are elected to know how long
5 they're on a council. And
6 impracticality, you know, it
7 didn't make sense for some of the
8 Senate Councils or Committees to
9 have--that may have a variety of
10 approval authorities and then
11 never ever come to Senate at all
12 for approval, so we would never
13 see them at this level. So,
14 those are the changes that you
15 will see where final decision
16 making authority has changed and
17 is in line with what the GRs say.
18 All right. So, one of the
19 proposed changes to SR1.3, the
20 Undergraduate Council membership
21 currently has appointed and
22 elected members and some colleges
23 share a single seat. So,
24 traditionally we would fill the
25 appointed seats with faculty from

1 colleges that were not
2 represented by an elected
3 position, so say if you were one
4 of the colleges in an elected
5 position, but we also needed a
6 seat from another College that
7 had an undergraduate program we
8 would fill that with the other
9 appointed seat. So, what this is
10 is we want every single college
11 that has an undergraduate program
12 to be represented on
13 Undergraduate Council. So, the
14 language is out of date, because
15 we have colleges now that have
16 undergraduate programs that years
17 ago maybe did not, for instance
18 the Martin School has--out of the
19 graduate school has undergraduate
20 programs and undergraduate
21 courses, they are not represented
22 in the Undergraduate Council.
23 So, in your notes you actually
24 won't see that one there, but
25 we've caught that one already, so

1 that's an update that we will be
2 putting in there. Public Health
3 has an undergraduate program that
4 they don't have a seat currently
5 on Undergraduate Council, so it's
6 really important that we have
7 this diverse, inclusive
8 Undergraduate Council and
9 representation. Proposed changes
10 gives a seat to every college
11 with an undergraduate program
12 with the exception one below,
13 Arts and Sciences will have one
14 seat with combined areas of
15 Humanities and Social Science
16 plus one seat for the combined
17 areas of Biological and Physical
18 Sciences, for a total of two
19 seats. Colleges will conduct
20 their own elections and that's
21 how it's been in the Senate
22 Rules, I'm not sure if it's
23 always been applied that way, but
24 the colleges will receive
25 information coming in the spring,

1 so when you hold your college
2 elections all of these things
3 will be included in the spring
4 election so that by the time the
5 senate starts in the fall we will
6 know who serves on each of these
7 councils and committees so that
8 we can hit the ground running and
9 get the work kind of done. So,
10 the Senate Council Office has
11 been collecting suggested edits,
12 we've already gotten several.
13 This has already been looked at
14 the first round, looked at
15 through Senate Council, it's been
16 sent over to SREC and they have
17 done a first round of just look
18 and edits. We have also been
19 receiving edits within the Senate
20 Council Officer particularly from
21 Academic Council where we've
22 asked them to complete their
23 submitted feedback to us by the
24 end of business today. Senators
25 can send suggestions to Sheila.

1 We will be accepting edits all
2 the way through Friday and this
3 is for the first go round. We
4 will then send it back to SREC to
5 prepare a final document for
6 Senate to review and approval.
7 Ensuring no unintended
8 consequences in that voting and
9 membership language is clear, we
10 will ask SREC to review the
11 entirety of the SRs and report on
12 any other language that needs to
13 be changed to comply with the new
14 Senate Rules. So, there is some
15 language about approval processes
16 and how the Academic Councils and
17 Committees function that's also
18 in SR3, and so, they will need to
19 be consistent across the board.
20 So, Senate will likely have to
21 approve more than just SR1 if
22 there are any changes in SR3 that
23 need to be consistent all the way
24 through. We expect to have a
25 final proposal of these changes

1 at the next senate meeting, so a
2 lot of work between now and then
3 and a lot of work on SREC they've
4 been working diligently to get
5 this done for us. So, again,
6 this is discussion only. We're
7 not voting on this today, just
8 discussion. My plan is to kind
9 of organize this discussion
10 around the layout of the SRs as
11 the are right now. Please, if
12 there are any clerical edits or
13 errors that you see
14 those--because of the sake of
15 time, we have an hour, send those
16 clerical errors to Sheila.
17 Today's discussion, please use
18 your Track Changes version as a
19 point of reference and remember
20 they are line item numbered, so
21 that everybody can look at the
22 place that you may be referring
23 to. Okay. So, first off, just
24 the overall structure of the
25 revised format. Discussion only.

1 Any questions, concerns,
2 thoughts? Just the overall
3 structure of how we structured
4 the sections. And I'm going to
5 pray this is not the first time
6 that you've looked at this.

7 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I'm
8 going to give you one example,
9 but it's only an example, but I
10 want to make an overall comment.

11 MS. COLLETT: Okay.

12 MR. TAGAVI: Usually, a proposal if you're
13 changing one word, maybe one
14 sentence, maybe a paragraph, this
15 is massive work and monumental
16 and makes me every nervous. I
17 have already saw maybe hundreds
18 of comments, but today I was
19 reading some more and I noticed
20 this--for example, on--I don't
21 have the page number, I was not
22 prepared for that, it's 14212.
23 If one of you could find the line
24 number then individual members
25 could look at that. I'm going to

1 read it to you, it says, "SREC,
2 which I happen to be on that
3 committee myself, "--shall also
4 evaluate and revise any section
5 of the rule when necessary to
6 eliminate inconsistency," that by
7 itself is an immense power,
8 because which way would you go,
9 if two things are inconsistent
10 the SREC has final authority to
11 decide between A and B. But then
12 there is a new section on every
13 committee and the section is
14 (Inaudible) it says, "Evaluating
15 and revising any section of the
16 rules where necessary the last
17 three words were dropped to
18 eliminate inconsistency." This
19 counter power of the SREC, which
20 I'm a member of and I kind of
21 appreciate this, but it means the
22 SREC on their own could change
23 any rule at any time if they find
24 it necessary. I am sure this was
25 innocent and it's an oversight,

1 but my point is--my hope is SREC
2 will be given time to look at
3 this line by line, not wholesale
4 approval of these changes. And
5 why I have everybody's ear I'd
6 like to mention one other thing,
7 it's kind of long. This
8 interpretation by Rules
9 Committee, some of them are 40
10 years old. They have never been
11 approved by the Senate Council or
12 voted by the Senate and I
13 personally disagree with some of
14 them, but perhaps I was on that
15 committee and I voted no and I
16 was out voted by the other
17 people. My point is that I think
18 these interpretations should
19 become part of their own within a
20 year, two years, with some of
21 relation in them that the Senate
22 would vote final say, "Okay. We
23 are going to now make this rule
24 interpretation, which is shown by
25 asterisks part of the rule." As

1 I said, there are some of them 20
2 years old and it might be out
3 dated, so I am just putting that
4 up to your attention so maybe we
5 will do this.

6 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Thank you. And you know
7 this is coming back to SREC, so.

8 MR. TAGAVI: I know that.

9 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Any other discussion
10 items? Okay. Moving onto
11 SR1.3.2, which is the University
12 Senate Academic Council. So, as
13 previously noted all the Academic
14 Councils and charges were cleaned
15 up to reflect that those bodies
16 send forward recommendations to
17 the Senate with a few exceptions,
18 which I already pointed out with
19 the SREC. Final decision making
20 body is the Senate, with some
21 activity being delegated to
22 Senate Council, but again that
23 must be reported to Senate. So,
24 if you look at SR1.3. I'm going
25 to turn to that as well, 1.3.2,

1 you will see that in general most
2 of the sections are laid out and
3 their sort of terms. We will
4 have membership terms, vacancies,
5 membership, and any additional
6 components that are required, so
7 meeting times or when they meet
8 and ex officio membership, that's
9 the first part that you will see.
10 You will also see this 1.3.2.2
11 that's kind of been moved up to
12 this general section that
13 proceeds all of the Academic
14 Councils instead of underneath
15 every single Academic Council.
16 So, not necessarily are we
17 shortening the Senate Rules, but
18 we're trying to make it flow
19 better and not just constantly
20 cut, paste and repeat some of the
21 information here. Also, the
22 subsections, the terms,
23 vacancies, ex officio
24 memberships, meetings, which I've
25 just said. Any questions,

1 thoughts, concerns? Okay. Next,
2 SR1.3.3 Graduate Council. How
3 the rest of the Councils are set
4 up in the Senate Rules this has
5 been changed for clarity and
6 consistency, for each of them
7 you're going to see a subsection
8 on the charge, responsibilities
9 together, the next session will
10 be--subsection will be
11 composition, then followed by
12 elections and then any other
13 aspect that was already included
14 in the original charge. Like I
15 said, 75 percent of this is all
16 the same, we just cut and paste
17 and moved it into subsections so
18 that it was clear and it was
19 consistent with every single
20 Council. Take a moment and look
21 at that. And again, even if
22 you're like, "Ah," you can still
23 email us during this time period,
24 if you want to take longer
25 tonight or, you know, your free

1 time that you're sitting at home
2 or carve out some time, you know,
3 in your day to just kind of look
4 through. Don't feel like you're
5 on the spot right now, you have
6 through Friday and you'll have
7 another chance as well to take
8 some time. Okay. The same is
9 for Undergraduate Council and for
10 Health Care Colleges. Again,
11 Undergraduate Council you'll see
12 that we did add that one seat for
13 Public Health in Graduate Council
14 and we removed pharmacy as they
15 don't yet have an undergraduate
16 degree. However, if they do have
17 an undergraduate degree they will
18 be added in here for a seat on
19 the Undergraduate Council.
20 Undergraduate Council, also
21 there's a difference with this
22 one, where I said some councils
23 and committees will have some
24 final authority, approval
25 authority or decision making

1 authority. UC has final decision
2 making authority regarding the
3 decision of new high school sites
4 that are in effect or senate
5 approved dual degree or dual
6 credit, I'm sorry, not degree,
7 dual credit arrangements.
8 Changes have also been made to
9 HCCC Charge it currently reflects
10 the senate's final approval
11 authority. So, again, by the GR,
12 which we have to follow, senate
13 has final authority, final
14 approval making authority.
15 Questions? Okay. Structure of
16 the University Senate Committees
17 that's SR1.4.1. You will also
18 see some green underlined text
19 and that indicates moving text
20 from one place to another. When
21 we did that on the council it got
22 lots of colors in there and lots
23 of underline, so we try to make
24 this more efficient, but I'm
25 sorry for those folks who may be

1 color blind and this is like not
2 a good thing for you to see. I
3 apologize being a mother of a
4 color blind child. So, structure
5 of the University Senate
6 Committees, these are--for each
7 of these the subsections will be
8 the type of Senate Committee.
9 So, we have a subsection for
10 standing, we have a different
11 section for advisory and then
12 special ad hoc committees,
13 subsection on vacancies and then
14 followed by procedures,
15 activities, subcommittees,
16 reporting to the senate and any
17 record keeping information. So,
18 SRS1.4.2 is your Standing
19 Committees. I'll go right to
20 that page here, that would be
21 Page 27. You'll see again, each
22 of these are going to be in the
23 same format. You have charge,
24 the extent of authority,
25 composition, description of

1 members and then on specific
2 committees there are going to be
3 again that composition, charge
4 and any other aspects. This is
5 where Kaveh has already noted
6 about the rule interpretation
7 with SREC, so this we'll take
8 note of. I'm going to give you a
9 moment to just take a look at
10 what we have and have any
11 questions. There are--so, I'll
12 give you the committees who
13 actually have some final approval
14 authority, especially the ones
15 that deal with individual or
16 person specific activities. So,
17 you have the SREC, but you also
18 have Reinstatement Committee, so
19 they have final decision making
20 authority regarding whether or
21 not to readmit a student who has
22 been academically suspended twice
23 from the university. That's
24 going to be on Page 31, that's
25 1.4.2.9.2. UK Core Committee,

1 1.4.2.14.3, Page 37, the UK Core
2 Committee has final decision
3 making authority regarding
4 individual student requests or
5 core course exceptions and/or
6 waivers and individual student
7 appeals if the core course
8 exception and/or waiver is
9 initially denied. The
10 Retroactive Review Committee, so
11 that's Page 40, 1.4.2.16.3, they
12 have final decision making
13 authority regarding all student
14 requests for retroactive
15 withdrawals. We can see why
16 those are in place there and
17 that's been delegated down from
18 the senate to those committees.
19 Questions? We're a quiet group
20 today, that means I'm going to
21 get a lot of emails. Okay.
22 Again, take some time with this
23 because it is--it's some changes
24 that, you know, you definitely
25 want to weigh in on but a lot of

1 at your Line 1620, which is on
2 Page 31, I just see that with
3 regard to the charge the new
4 language has been added in that
5 says, "Including suspension,"
6 well, the whole sentence says,
7 "Review and recommend Senate
8 action in all proposals for major
9 changes in organizational
10 structure of educational units,"
11 and then it says, "including
12 suspension of admissions and
13 closure of a degree or
14 certificate," and I understand
15 why that's being done, because
16 the language was never really
17 actually in our charge before.
18 Is it possible though for it to
19 state, "Including, but not
20 limited to suspension of
21 admissions and closure of a
22 degree or certificate," and I
23 guess SREC can figure out if
24 that's the right word that's
25 missing, but something to note

1 that inclusion is not a
2 limitation, it's just the two new
3 examples that have to be added
4 in?

5 MS. COLLETT: Yes, I like that. Thank you very
6 much.

7 MR. FARRELL: Thank you.

8 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Are there any items from
9 the floor, because there is time
10 permitted?

11 MR. CALVERT: Ken Calvert, College of
12 Engineering and Department of
13 Computer Science. So, I'm going
14 to ask this, I could just send an
15 email and I maybe should be able
16 to figure this out, but today and
17 also before the last Senate
18 meeting I got nine emails with
19 invitations attached to them and
20 I'm trying to figure out--I
21 couldn't discern any difference
22 between the--they all looked more
23 or less the same and I'm
24 wondering if that's because I'm
25 on nine different mailing lists

1 or does everybody get that or is
2 it just me?

3 MS. COLLETT: Everybody got it. So, Katie you
4 want to come up here. And I'm
5 going to give Katie the mic and
6 it's really just invitations for
7 each of the meetings.

8 MS. KATIE: So, this is a function of
9 Outlook. This is a recurring
10 meeting, however, these
11 recurrences don't happen on
12 exactly the second Monday of each
13 month. So, when you get this you
14 will see they're a recurring
15 invite and then the change that
16 got made to the recurring invite
17 to account for the third Monday
18 or whichever we need to switch
19 and Outlook seems to think we
20 need to send an extra email for
21 that, so.

22 MR. FARRELL: Well, I don't use Outlook, but
23 thank you.

24 MS. KATIE: Because UK and Microsoft. That's
25 the best explanation I can give.

1 MR. FARRELL: Thanks.

2 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Any other items from
3 the floor? So, remember the
4 items from the floor is just for
5 senators to raise issues that are
6 not on the agenda, which we've
7 just had. All right. Let's see
8 here. Yes.

9 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob Grossman, A and S. I brought
10 this up briefly with the Provost
11 several weeks, but I haven't
12 heard anything, but I thought
13 this might also be a good forum.
14 There was an article in the
15 newspaper about the term Ole
16 Miss, who I think--didn't we just
17 play them in football or--no that
18 was South Carolina last week.
19 Anyway, it's a term that derived
20 from plantation times and slavery
21 times. I think a lot of people
22 nowadays don't know that anymore,
23 but it seems to me to be
24 something we should avoid. I
25 mean we can just call them the

1 University of Mississippi. I
2 know we--you know, it's not
3 exactly an educational thing, but
4 I'm sure that it does--you know,
5 for people who are more sensitive
6 to these kinds of terminology
7 that descend from slavery days
8 it's probably, you know, not good
9 for us to be talking Ole Miss,
10 Ole Miss. So, I was just
11 wondering if there could be a
12 moratory on the use of that term
13 in official UK publications. We
14 can't obviously tell the
15 University of Mississippi what to
16 call themselves, what they should
17 call themselves, but at least we
18 could refuse to use the terms.

19 MS. COLLETT: Thank you for that, Bob. Provost
20 DiPaola and I can work together
21 in the future for that and make
22 sure that that's corrected. I
23 appreciate that. Any other items
24 from the floor? Okay. If there
25 are no objections the meeting

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

will now stand as adjourned by
unanimous consent. Thank you for
attending today and please report
back to your colleagues on the
senate related information from
today, especially the Senate
Rules changes. Thank you all.
Have a great afternoon and a
great and fantastic week.