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MS. COLLETT: I'm calling this meeting to order. So, if you are here in person please make sure that you use the sign-in sheet at the back of the room. Next, I'm going to ask Senators to just make sure, again like always, you are logged into Poll Everywhere. We have several things to vote on today, and so, I want to make sure that your voice is heard and your vote is taken correctly. As always, again, make sure you're into Poll Everywhere. You received an email as you do every Senate Meeting, right before every Senate Meeting, about directions and instructions on how to get into Poll Everywhere. Hopefully, you do not have any problems today as we've been going through Poll Everywhere for this entire academic year, however, it is a technology and I have no idea how well it will work on any given
day. So, the office recommends using your web browser, if you have that it tends to stay more up date and more reliable, however, you can still use the App or you can use the text message option. So, here are the options that you have, if you're voting by text use Senate789, voting by App or the web. So, welcome. Housekeeping things just to go over before the first agenda item. So, to make sure that your Poll Everywhere is working nicely, today is May $1^{\text {st }}$, the University Senate Meeting. You can ensure your voting is working properly by indicating, "Your favorite pet is?" One, a snake, two, a spider, three, literally any other animal. So, it looks unanimously, literally any other animal, besides a snake or a spider. Thank you. Practicalities. As always, this
meeting is subject to Open
Records Laws, it's recorded only for note taking proposes on this end. We do have a Court Reporter that does transcribe the entire meeting after the meeting is completed. We do follow

Robert's Rules of Order Newly
Revised. Remember that this is a hybrid meeting, so it's in person and Zoom and we want this to be an inclusive experience as we have all year long. No voting by proxies, so you cannot run away to dinner or do something else and have someone else vote for you. You have to vote for yourself and enter your own vote. Make sure that when you're speaking that you state your name and affiliation and saying your name, again, helps everyone know who you are, it identifies you as the speaker and it's easy to help us remember names, but
additionally the Court Reporter will also need those names since that person is not in person with us or doesn't see the recording. Remember to speak loudly, so that you can be heard as well. I'm just going to remind everyone, individuals are called upon at the Chair's discretion and usually in this order, because it seems like we forget during discussions that if you're not a Senator chances are I'm not going to call on you very much next, until all the Senators have spoken, because that is the priority. And so, the Senators are voting, so you have to be a member. So, Senate Members always have first priority. Senators who have not spoken yet about an issue, those who can offer information to assist the Senate discussion, so that's any proposer or guests, but I just
named two people in front of that. So, that's Senators have first priority to speak, and so, I just want everyone to know because I don't want people to get upset when I haven't called on you yet if $I$ have five more Senator's hands up. I have to go to those Senators first and then non-members if time or circumstances permit. Civility. Yes, debate is about expressing opinion. As always, we want everybody to participate and make sure that you're reporting back to your faculty constituents within your college about what's happening in the Senate. Attendance is captured via Zoom report and also the in-person sign-in sheets that we have. The chat function is disabled as it always is, because not everyone is on Zoom, so people who are in person cannot see the chat, and
so, we don't want any
distractions from official proceedings to happen. If you want to say something or you want the Chair to recognize you, please raise your hand to be called upon. Occasionally, it becomes apparent that some Senators attending via Zoom are not giving this meeting their full attention, so I ask that you make sure that your video is on and your present, because we have to do that by Open Records Laws as well. If for some reason or another you drop and you cannot get reconnected you need to email Sheila Brothers and let her know that you were dropped out of the meeting and could not attend. Other technicalities. If you're attending by Zoom, we say this each time, you know, it's the same as you're teaching by Zoom, use a good quality headset with a
microphone. Again, you'll email Sheila if you cannot reconnect. Remember to mute yourselves when you are not speaking. Katie will mute you if you're on Zoom and you just happen we hear you fussing at your dog we'll mute on this end and that has literally happened to me. So, red -- if you're in person now, the red light means your mic is off and no light means your mic is on. So, when your mic is on the lights off, the room camera will focus on you and the microphone and everyone on Zoom will be able to see who exactly is speaking. Again, I just said this, so just raise your hand if you -- use the raise hand function button on Zoom, if you're Zoom. In person raise your hand so I can see you. Again, you must seek permission from the Chair to speak. Reasons a Senator would like to speak
always include point of order or point of information, not clear on what maybe is being discussed or why, making or seconding a motion, questions of fact and/or debate or calling a question. Again, we'll try to call on people in order in which their hand was raised regardless of the modality. All right. Right into the agenda. We've got some announcements. Fair well to those departing Senators, whose terms will end August the $15^{\text {th }}$. We appreciate your service and everything that you have done. We thank you so, so much for all that you've done for the Senate and we do hope that you return back to us in some form or fashion. Remember that not all Senate Committees have to have 100 percent Senators. We have several committees that have folks that are from outside the

Senate who can serve, so please don't be a stranger to us.

Encourage your colleagues about participating in Senate elections and Senate as well as serving on one of Senate Academic Councils. Tell them how much fun you have had in Senate and how great it was and hopefully we can start convincing more and more people to be part of the Senate. I'm giving a special thanks to my Vice Chair Leslie Vincent, she is a Senior Lecturer in the Gatton College of Business in Economics. I appreciate everything that Leslie has done for me and in particularly the Senate Council. We appreciate all the roles that she has served in the Senate. She's been -- her Vice Chair role ends on May $30^{\text {th }}$ along with her Senate Council term, she's a Senator, Senate Council Member, Vice Chair, as I said, she's also
been Chair of the Senate Academic
Programs Committee, which I will
argue is one of the hardest
committees that we have. She's
also chaired the Ad Hoc Committee
on Educational Programs and this
year she served as Chair of the
Senate Admissions Academic
Standards Committee, so SAASC.
She's work tirelessly on
countless weighted topics
including Badges, Undergrad
Admissions, Test Optional Pilot
and Extension. She does return
to us serving as a Senator, but I
just want to thank her because I
think I would be lost without
her. So, thank you so much,
Leslie. Next, I sent an email
out on Monday, April $24^{\text {th }}$ about
information participating in the
survey sponsored by the Senate's
Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching
Evaluation. We got some
responses from folks or clarity,
and so, those have been going to our chair of that TCE Ad Hoc Committee Dr. Elizabeth Salt. If you still have questions or need some sort of clarification she's your person to email. Just remember the Committee's approach is to determine if there are colleges, course level or instructional demographic variables that predict our teaching course evaluation scores, which is our current primary metric of student evaluation of teaching and the second charge is to evaluate the instructor's perceived value of TCE. This committee will use these findings and inform their recommendations along with consideration of the work of Benchmark University's and Literature broadly to help inform us as we move forward. I have gotten some information today,
which we will work a little bit -- have some more discussions on and figure out which way we need to go, but I understand there was some issues with TCEs where they close early April $30^{\text {th }}$, I guess in the morning instead of at close to midnight when they're usually closed. And so, some of the TCEs have been extended within the finals week, which is usually a no-no on our end, because it's kind of at the point where we are actually assigning grades, and so, TCEs are done during the week prior to finals, not the week of finals. And so, we will move forward on how we need to approach this, you know, we definitely want the feedback and we want to hear from our students, but at some point the Teacher Course Evaluation feedback that come after the $30^{\text {th }}$ and into the week of finals week
is really invalid when we discuss it at this point of evaluating teachers. So, I will get with the Provost Office and we'll have some discussions around how to remedy this situation as we move forward. Consent Agenda. So, today's Consent Agenda consists of Senate minutes from March, some non-controversial -- I'm sorry, from April, not March, from April 10, some noncontroversial curricular proposals and activity reports and minutes from Academic Councils and Committees. So, again, items on the Consent Agenda are considered adopted unless a member asks to remove an item for discussion later within the meeting, they can be removed well before the meeting if you send me an email or such or reach out to me or just before the Consent Agenda is adopted. So,
no requests have been made prior to this to remove anything from today's Consent Agenda. Again, these are the minutes from April 10, 2023, it was -- actually, I won't say clerical, there were edits that we had. The minutes, Activity Reports from Academic Councils and Committees and you had some curricular proposals. We had one suspension and closure, one new USP Program and nine program changes. If there are no objections now -- any objections to this Consent Agenda? Seeing none, hearing no objections the Consent Agenda for May the $1^{\text {st }}$ is adopted. Thank you very much. Next, we have officer reports. So, remember the Senate rules give the Senate Council the authority to take some action on behalf Senate as long as they are reported at the Senate Meeting. We approved the
proposed Non-Standard Calendar for AESPLS320 for the foreseeable future, so this change was just to the start and the end dates, a 2-week timeframe that is ideal for agriculture field based courses as they are -- let's see, as they are in their field work and extension activities, so we adjusted the time for students to be able to attend that 2 -week course interval. And then we approved the proposed changes to the 2023-24 MD calendar really related to tuition refund dates, so during their web publication it was noticed by the Registrar that there were some dates that were incorrectly listed on the University Senate approved calendar documents and this appears to be a result of the College of Medicine using an older version of their calendar document that did not include the
corrected refund deadlines provided by the Office of University of the Registrar, so that was an update basically to that due date within their calendar. Other things that were approved, the Senate approved nine additions to the UK May and August 2023 Senate Council Degree Lists. Just so you know that this year the Board of Trustees Meeting was actually moved up closer at the end of April, so just last week instead of it actually being in May, and so, it kind of made the timeframe a little harder for us to get a tentative degree list and make any changes before the Board could actually confer those degrees. So, there obviously, as it is every year there's some folks that just an administrative error happens and someone doesn't get on a degree list that should
be on a degree list, but we usually catch these before they go to the Board of Trustees. So, you're going to see a couple today as well, but that's kind of what's happened there and those compressed timelines are kind of just -- causes this to happen a little bit sooner rather than later. Also, the faculty evaluation of the President has been extended, you know, we basically know that everybody is in finals and they're doing things and I think folks are tired right now. We're ready for the semester to end, some of us. And so, we extended it because we just really want to give you the opportunity to provide feedback and input and the President does look at these, he definitely takes these seriously, so I would ask that you all take some time to complete the survey and we
also like a great response rate.
All of our survey researchers here know how important that is to have good response rates or all our researchers know, so please make sure that you participate. We've extended it up to next week or this week, May the $3^{\text {rd }}$, so just a couple more days. Vice Chair Leslie Vincent, do you have any reports? No report today. Parliamentary Greg Rentfrow?

No.
Trustee Hollie Swanson and Trustee Kramer? So, Trustee Swanson and Trustee Kramer? Thank you, Chair Collette. The Board of Trustees met last week on Thursday and Friday. I think this degree list thing has only caused two business days of shift, normally the Board would have met on Monday and Tuesday of this week, so we would not be
here, instead you get the report. Thursday was spent on a refresh of the UK Healthcare Strategic Plan, the discussion was largely led by our Co-Acting EVPHA's

Acting Co -- all right, Acting Co-Executive Vice President for Health Affairs. It was emphasized several times that this was a refresh meant to build on the previous plan. The Board was encouraged to consider operating margins and the national landscape in particularly to move beyond two longstanding principles, We do it Best and We Must do it All. There were three major thematic areas, Advanced Subspecialty Care for Kentucky and Beyond, Taking Care of our People, Community and Talent and Academic Health System. Ultimately, the University Healthcare Committee reaffirmed the three key themes
of the Strategic Plan and
endorsed the five-year -- fiveyear Financial Plan. The Audit and Compliance Committee approved amendments to the Audit and Compliance Committee and UK internal audit charters. I think it'll be important for us to continue to monitor how the audit function continues to affect the educational mission of the University. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee approved several items previously considered by the Senate, including degree recipients, changes to educational unit names and new degree programs. The committee also heard reports from the Provost VPID, VPSS NSGA President. The Finance Committee approved numerous gift acceptances, capital projects, including several to support UK Healthcare Plans and other
financial items. The committee also heard reports from the EVPFA, VPR and Acting Vice President for Philanthropy and Alumni Engagement. The Board of Trustees approved the naming of the Stanley and Karen Pigman College of Engineering. It was approved -- it also approved an impressive slate of University Research Professorships, who we celebrated at a reception afterwards and appointments to the Board of Directors of the Gluck Equine Research Foundation. Commencement exercises are at the end of this week, this event is the clearest way in which we celebrate who we are as a University. You're the reason our students have been able to run the race, so it is only appropriate for you to be there to celebrate as they cross the finish line. We strongly
encourage faculty members to participate and hope to see as many of our colleagues there as possible. That concludes my report.

MS. COLLETTE:
All right. So, right into degree list, we have two that we must go over, honorary degrees and some late editions to the December 2022 Degree List. All right. So, Honorary Degree Recipients, Senators should have noticed that an email from Sheila had the -- a PowerPoint was attached that proposed the Honorary Degree recipient, you should have received that. I'd just like to remind everyone that's present here or on the Zoom that the information about the degree recipient, including the Honorary Degree recipient is confidential and embargoed until such time that is announced by the University. Interim Graduate

School Dean Associate Provost of Graduate and Professional

Programs Dr. Martha Peterson is here to present one candidate for an Honorary Degree.

Thank you, Chair Collette.
Thank you.
So, this is a report from the University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees who's composition is shown here for your information. If I could have the next slide, please. The principles of even having an Honorary Degree is to accomplish several purposes, to pay tribute to people whose life and work exemplify professional, intellectual or artistic achievement, recognize and appreciate those who have made significant contributions to society, the State and the University and highlight the diverse ways in which such
contributions can be made. It sends a message that principles, values and contributions are important. Well-chosen honorees affirm and dignify the University's own achievements and priorities. And Honorary Degrees may be confirmed upon those who have achieved distinction through outstanding intellectual or creative achievements or through outstanding leadership in education, business, public service or other appropriate sectors of society. May I have the next slide, please. The University Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees would like to recommend that John Rosenberg be considered as a nominee for a Degree of Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters. If I could have the next slide, please. So, John Rosenberg was born in Magdeburg, Germany in 1931. His family fled

Nazi Germany in 1938 and spent a year in a detention camp in the Netherlands, he was actually seven years old during the Kristallnacht event living next door to a Synagogue, so it was a very pivotal event in his young life. His family arrived in New York Harbor in February of 1940. He earned a Bachelor's Degree in Chemistry from Duke, he served in the Air Force and then earned his J.D. Degree from the University of North Carolina in 1962 and immediately following his graduation he joined the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Justice Department and later successfully tried the first case under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. He assisted in the prosecution of the molderers of Civil Rights Workers in Philadelphia, Mississippi in 1964, which was the subject of
the Mississippi Burning moving from a few years back. He and his wife Jean came to Eastern Kentucky in the early 1970s in service to the war on poverty and they've stayed ever since and raised their family there. Can I have the next slide, please. He helped to build and then direct for 28 years the Appalachian Research and Defense Fund, known as AppalReD, which is a free legal service that now has six offices throughout Eastern Kentucky and has served thousands of the regions poorest residents. He served as the founding member of the Kentucky Fair Tax Coalition, now known as Kentuckians for the Commonwealth. He founded the Appalachian Citizens Law Center in Whitesburg, Kentucky. He's been a key legal advisor to citizen's groups working to abolish the

Broad Form Deed and a frequent guest speaker on issues related to surface mining, mineral lights and black lung benefits. And in addition, he participates regularly in the UK JHF Holocaust Education Initiative and visits classrooms throughout Kentucky sharing his personal story of the Holocaust. Can I have the next slide, please. One of his letter endorsers was Ron Eller, UK Distinguished Professor of History Emeritus and he writes, "I've always considered John Rosenberg to be the epitome of an ideal civic leader in a democracy, someone who has never been elected to office, but who has left a permanent legacy of cultural and institutional change and who has empowered others to do the same." And the next slide. We recommend that John Rosenberg be considered for the

Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters and the Humane Letters Doctor recognizes extraordinary contributions to philanthropy, human development, education or societal well-being. And that concludes our report. Thank you, Dean Peterson. So, the elected faculty members of the Senate Council voted to recommend the Senate approve J.R. as a recipient of the Honorary Degree of Humane of Letters for submission through the President to the Board of the Trustees. So, there is a motion now for elected Faculty Senators to approve J.R. as a recipient of Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters for submission through the President to the Board of Trustees. The motion is now on the floor and the floor is open up to members for questions of fact and/or debate. Wonderful.

Seeing none it is time to vote. And remember this is elected Faculty Senators. And just remember this is embargoed until its announced by the University. All right. We have 76 approve and one abstain. So, that motion carries forward. Thank you. All right. Next, we have late editions to the December 2022 Degree List per Senate Rule 5.5.1.1.14 Late Editions to the Degree List, we have three students MA90, SMA38 and SZ80. So, this was just an administrative error where the students were actually just -- or the students -- not just, the students were added to the incorrect degree list and were supposed to be on the December 2022 Degree List. So, there is a motion for elected Faculty Senators to amend the December 2022 Degree List by adding the
three students in question and recommend through the Board or through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degrees be awarded effective December 2022. The motion is on the floor and the floor is open up for members for questions of fact and/or debate. Seeing none, it is time to vote. Again, the recommended motion is that elected Faculty Senators amend the December 2022 Degree List by adding the three students in question and recommend through the President to the Board of Trustees that the degree be awarded effective December 2022. Poll Everywhere is now open for votes. Seventy-eight approve and one abstain, again, for Faculty Senators to amend the December 2022 Degree List by adding the three students in question and recommend through the President
to the Board of Trustees the degree be awarded effective December 2022. Thank you. So, we have our first annual update on courses homed in the Office of the Provost. We have our Senior Associate Provost for Admission and Academic Affairs Dr. Katie Cardarelli is here. So, some Senators may remember that the Senate approved a proposal last May that created a faculty body oversight for a series of courses that were homed outside of a college. This approved proposal also provided guidance on the composition of faculty bodies and those all get approved through the Senate. The most logical places for courses that are outside of a college or to home them in the Chief Academic Officer's Office, so the Office of the Provost and that's where these courses are homed today.

So, today's report is the first opportunity to hear from our Senior Associate Provost Cardarelli about an update on the work that these faculty bodies have been doing and any information about the courses.

MS. CARDARELLI: Thank you. It's a great opportunity to talk with you all today about these courses. As Chair Collette indicated, this is my first annual presentation on this, and so, any feedback or suggestions that you all have about the kind of information that you would like to see would be helpful to me in future iterations. So, I presented a version of these slides to Senate Council and following that I've added quite a bit of additional information. So, this was originally presented to Senate Council at the end of March and I know you have a full agenda and I
will say that there is a lot of content on the slides I'm going to share with you all today, it's posted, so you can go through it. I'm not going to read everything on these slides to you, but I'll try to provide a highlight of what $I$ think are some of the more notable pieces here. So, these are the courses that are homed in the Office of the Provost and I'll go through each one of these and provide you with the update that I was asked to provide from Senate Council. I will also be sharing with you all that I've had the pleasure of meeting with most of these faculty bodies at this point over the course of the Spring Semester. So, I've learned a lot about the courses. I know I also have the Registrar here and Keiko and Katherine and others, so there might be some questions that you all have that

I'll call on others to help
answer. So, the first -- and I'm sorry, I know that's small, but the first course prefix is EXP, which is a course prefix for Experiential Education courses that are offered in the form of internships and field work from the Stuckert Career Center. So, this includes all of these different courses that are listed here. I will note that that first one there, the UK150 is actually going to be used for an education abroad first-gen career program this summer that a number of folks have been working on. I was specifically asked to present to you all information about each of the faculty bodies for these courses, and so, again, there's a great amount of detail on these slides that I will not read through. But the EXP Faculty Advisory Group I met with on

January $27^{\text {th }}$ and they have a pretty rigorous set of expectations and structure for that group. These are the individuals who currently sit on that Faculty Advisory Group, including faculty staff, a DEI representative and student representative. And I was also asked to present any changes in that group that were recent, so that information is also here in terms of who was added or who may have been switched out. The second group or course prefix is EAP and this is for our Education Abroad Program and this includes field work and study abroad through the International Center, they have several different courses that are offered with that prefix. The EAP course faculty is convened regularly by Sue Roberts, this is actually a subcommittee of the University's

International Advisory Council
and they meet three times a semester. They do not have any changes planned for this year. Of course, most of our UK core classes are homed in the colleges, but for those that have this prefix here, you know, this is available for our Gen Ed curriculum. This group actually is meeting tomorrow for our retreat, the faculty body for the UK course. I'm looking forward to being a party to that. Dr. Tanaka chairs that group and we will, as I said, have a half-day retreat, I think tomorrow, to start taking a look at the UK core and identify potential opportunities for improvement. UK101, this group -- the faculty body actually met recently on April the $25^{\text {th }}$ and explored some opportunities for improvement, which I think are on the next
slide, but of course UK101 is an Academic Orientation and 201 is the opportunity for that orientation for our transfer students. This is the course faculty and it says at the very bottom, this group that met last week actually approved a syllabus for Summer of 2023. The APP prefix stands for Academic Preparation and Placement Program and it's offered under UK110 and 125. UK110 most recently has been used under the title of College Readiness for Math. This group met April the $24^{\text {th }}$ and I got to be a part of that faculty meeting. Here's a little bit of information about how they structure their faculty body and their respective faculty meetings and this is the group that currently represents their faculty body, as I said, they met April the $24^{\text {th }}$. UK300 is the
course that our Chellgren Student Fellows take and I actually have had the pleasure of lecturing in the fall semester of this for two years now, very bright students. These are the course faculty, they are convened by Dr. Isabel Escobar who is the current Chellgren Chair and the Director of the Chellgren Center and the faculty, you see below her there, that says will be confirmed at the April meeting, but they'll actually be confirmed at the June meeting. This represents our next group of Chellgren faculty and they are appointed for threeyear terms and meet on a regular basis. Only two more, as I go through. The HMN courses are humanities classes and seminars that are offered through the Gaines Center, so there are several different courses here that are offered to the Gaines

Student Fellows. Here is the course faculty, they are convened by Melinda Price, who is currently the Gaines Center Director, they do meet monthly with the director, the second Monday of each month. I'm going to meet with this group later this week. This provides a little bit of additional information about how they structure their faculty body, how often they meet. And then the last one is TEK, which I'm sure everybody knows stands for Transdisciplinary Educational Approaches to Advance Kentucky. The two initial courses to be proposed under the TEK prefix are 200 and 300. This is the current faculty body, they are convened by Dr. Susan Cantrel and I had the pleasure of meeting with this group on April the $12^{\text {th }}$. As I said, they have a couple of
courses that will be coming through with that prefix.

Additional information about their faculty body. And I know I presented a lot in a short amount of time. I'm happy to answer any questions or punt the questions to the people that can answer them.

So, if anyone has any questions.
I have a hand raised. Dr.
(Zanos) (Sp?) I can't hear if you're speaking. Hand raised? Okay. Maybe not. Anybody else have any questions? Okay. Perfect. Thank you. Well, thank you, Dr. Cardarelli for giving us an update and you have the information there if you have any feedback or questions that you may have for her please email them to her and we will get right on it. Next, Committee Reports. We have the Senate Academic Organizational Structure

Committee -- we have several
Committee Reports, but they are first up. So, the first thing we have is the proposed name change for the Department of Engineering and Technology to the Fujio Cho Department of Engineering and Technology in the College of Engineering. Proposer is Dean Buchheit who is here today. Greg Rentfrow is the chair of this committee. Greg?

Thank you. So, as was said this is from the College of Engineering to change the name of the Department of Engineering and Technology to the Fujio Cho Department of Engineering and Technology. Mr. Cho is the inaugural Executive Director of Toyota Manufacturing here in Kentucky. Since 1988 Toyota has provided approximately \$14.4 million in support for engineering programs at UK. This
name change will honor Mr. Cho and what he has done for the College of Engineering. According to VC2 and AR8 a financial gift is required for this name change, however, this was waived by President Capilouto. The department actually voted on this, all five faculty members voted in favor. The college also had a vote as well, quorum was met, there was 59 in favor, eight opposed and three abstentions on that voting. This is a simple honorary name change. There is no changes to the faculty or curriculum or structure of the department.

MS. COLLETT:
So, this is a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to endorse a proposed name change from Department of Engineering Technology to the Fujio Chu Department of Engineering and Technology. Because the motion
comes from committee no second is required. The motion is now on the floor and the floor is open up to members for questions of fact and/or debate. Wonderful. Seeing no hands raised, it's time to vote. A reminder, Senate is voting to endorse the proposed name change from the Department of Engineering and Technology to the Fujio Cho Department of Engineering and Technology in the College of Engineering. The Poll

Everywhere is now open. All
right. That is 74 approved, two oppose, four abstain. That motion carries. Thank you very much. Next, we still have the Senate Academic Organization and Structure Committee. Greg Rentfrow is the chair, however, Committee Member Elizabeth Salt will be standing in for Greg since this is Greg's college that we are reporting on. There's a
proposed name change of the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment to the Edith Martin and Harry W. Gatton, Sr. College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. The dean of the college, Dean Nancy Cox is the proposer. Elizabeth?

Yes. So, as described the proposed change is a change from the name from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment to the Edith Martin and Harry W. Gatton, Sr. College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. The college would be referred to as the MartinGatton College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. This name change is a recognition of the gift from the Gatton -- the Bill Gatton Foundation and is in honor of Mr. Gatton's parents and the gift would fund the four pillars of the college, which include
student success, faculty
research, faculty infrastructure
and service through extension.
We did -- the SAOSC did meet with
Dean Cox and we did review the
agreement, there's not -- the
donor will not be involved or
advise on any student
scholarships, faculty
beneficiaries or research agenda
and there was a meeting amongst
the faculty to approve the name
change. All 188 faculty voted on
approval and the vote was
unanimous. Let's see here -- and
there were no negative comments
offered by the faculty. With the
gift there is the intention to
start an Animal Companion
Program. The faculty body will
be determined and they will
determine the curriculum, so
there weren't any issues
identified by the SAOSC regarding
that. So, the SAOSC voted
unanimously to approve the name change.

So, this is a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to endorse a proposed name change from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment to the Edith Martin and Harry W. Gatton, Sr. College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. Because the motion comes from committee no second is required. The motion is now on the floor and the floor open up to members for questions of fact and/or debate. Bob?

MR. GROSSMAN:
Bob Grossman, A and S. I support this change, but I just wanted to make sure that we're -- no Oxford comma is required after the word food here. I mean either way is fine, just there needs to be clarity about which it was, because otherwise we'd have to go back to the Board if the wrong one passed and they wanted to
redo it.

Dr. Dean Cox, I'll ask if there's an Oxford comma or not.

There was much debate over this topic. When the college changed it's name and right or wrong, there's no Oxford comma in the official name.

Thank you. Any other questions of fact and/or debate. Okay. Seeing none, it is time to vote. So, as a reminder Senate is voting to endorse the proposed name change from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment to the Edith Martin and Harry W. Gatton, Sr. College of Agriculture, Food and Environment. All right. You have 78 approve, four oppose and five abstain. That motion passes. Thank you very much. Next, we have the Senate Academic Programs Committee, SAPC. Sandra Bastin is Chair. First, we have
the proposed new BS in Statistics and Data Sciences. Proposer Professor Bill Raynes is from the Department of Statistics, is here. Sandra?

Thank you. This is a recommendation that the Senate approve the establishment of a new BS Program, BS Statistics and Data Science in the College of Arts and Sciences in the Department of Statistics. The ability to reason and communicate with data, skills that fall under the umbrella of data literacy is a key competency for those seeking employment in almost all professional sectors of the job market. Beyond this competency requirement, however, there is a sizeable and growing demand from employers for individuals with specialized training in statistics and data science. Employers are looking to hire
statisticians and data scientist who are able to collect and curate large volumes of data bringing statistical and machine learning methods to bear on new questions and create data pipelines and work flows that transform digital information into actionable insights. Perhaps most importantly, employers are looking for individuals who are equipped with the foundational training needed to ensure that young professionals they hire into these roles are readily able to learn and critically assess new tools as they become available.

All details for the program were in line with what's expected in Curriculog and as far as we know all people who are involved in the BS have been -- have had a chance to say something.

MS. COLLETT:
recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed new BS in Statistics and Data Science in the Department of Statistics in the College of Arts and Sciences. Because the motion comes from committee no second is required. There's a motion on the floor and the floor is now open up to members for questions of fact and/or debate. Seeing no hands raised, it is time to vote. So, again as a reminder, you're voting to approve the proposed new BS Statistics and Data Science in the Department of Statistics in the College of Arts and Science. All right. We have 81 approve, one oppose and three abstain. That motion carries. Next, we have the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Accounting and Analytics. Proposer is Professor Hong Xie from the Von Allmen School of

Accountancy. Please let me know if I did not pronounce your name right, Dr. Xie, because I'm big on pronouncing people's names right. So, please correct me. So, Sandra?

MS. BASTIN:
Thank you. This is a recommendation that Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate Accounting Analytics in the College of Business and Economics in the Department of Accountancy. The Graduate Certificate in Accounting Analytics will enable accounting and non-accounting professionals to master the analytical skills needed to analyze and solve accounting and auditing problems. The program also provides a practical path for students who need a 150 hours of academic credit to enable CPA eligibility. The program includes three courses, Data

Visualization, Data Management and Predictive Modeling, these classes are approved for online delivery, but an online certificate is not being sought at this time. The certificate focus is on accounting and finance relevant problems including fraud and forensics, compliance, complex accounting estimates, healthcare and
internal and external auditing
and attestations, accounting
systems and taxation. The
certificate responds to a demand
in the job market employees with
data and analytical skills, it
also can boost student's
employability both inside
Kentucky and out.

MS. COLLETT:
Perfect. Thank you very much.
So, there's a recommendation from
the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Accounting

Analytics in the Von Allmen School of Accountancy and the Gatton College of Business and Economics. Because the motion comes from committee no second is required. The motion is now on the floor and the floor is open up to members for questions of fact and/or debate. Seeing no hands raised, it is time to vote. So, again as a reminder, you're voting to approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Accounting and Analytics in the Von Allmen School of Accountancy in the Gatton College of Business and Economics. The voting poll is now open. All right. Eighyttwo have approved and two abstain. That motion carries and that's approved. Thank you. Next, we have Senate Admissions Academic Standards Committee, SAASC, Leslie Vincent is Chair.

First up we have a report on
homework during finals week.
Okay. So, this matter was brought up to Senate Council regarding homework during finals week. The Senate Rules are currently silent on homework as it relates to when it can be assigned or not assigned and there was a lot of discussion at Senate Council so this was sent to SAASC to review and our recommendation is that no homework assignments should be due during finals week. Part of the proposal is a change to the Senate Rules in Section 5.2.5.7.2 as proposed that it explicitly states that assignments during finals week and that instructors are not permitted to assign homework during finals week nor are they permitted to make any homework assignments due during finals week. However, instructors may collect make-up
work during the finals week if the student agrees to it. So, there's a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed changes within $\operatorname{SR~5.2.5.7~as~well~as~}$ insert in the glossary. Because the motion comes from committee no second is required. This motion is now on the floor and the floor is open up to members for questions of fact and/or debate. Richard?

Richard Charnigo from Public Health. I generally agree with the principle here, but there's one issue that I want to know if the committee considered it or if other senators consider the issue possibly sufficiently likely to arise to be of concern, which is what if there are occasionally some courses where there is not a final examination or not a project that essentially serves
as a final examination, would
there be any reason to write an exception into the Senate Rules to allow for a final homework to be due in that last week if in fact there is no final
examination or similar item with which it would compete. Thank you.

Yeah, great question. Our
committee did discuss that in particular this applied primarily for courses that do have a final exam or a final project that serve as a final exam in the class. I think our thought was, you know, that you could assign an assignment to act as the final exam, but you could not do both have a final exam and homework assignments due during the final exam week.

MS. COLLETT:
MS. SOULT:
Allison?

Allison Soult, A and S. Is there a definition of what homework is,
because I can imagine somebody saying, "Oh, we're not going to call it homework. I'm going to call it this," in a way to kind of skirt around the rules. I
mean we assume that's common sense, but -- well, you know what happens then.

We also discussed this at senate Council a little bit. And so, my understanding is in the Senate Rules these other things are explicitly already stated and discussed, the one area that is not is homework, and so, this is making sure that is clearly articulated, yes.

Kirsten Wise, Student Center for the College of Health Sciences. Was it discussed whether or not if you have a lab for your final, so let's say like a practical, if you have a worksheet or whatever for that practical if that would be considered homework or is that
the final?

We did not discuss like the specific elements associated with that in our discussion.

But that is detailed a little bit more in the Senate Rules if you have a lab practicum, that's already in there. Bob Grossman?

Bob Grossman, A and S. Just for clarity, the weekends, Saturday and Sunday between the reading days before finals start, do those count as part of the finals period?

MS. VINCENT: Yes.

MS. COLLETT: I think it's -- is it Monday
through -- what's the glossary say?

The glossary says Monday through Thursday.

MS. VINCENT: So, no.

MR. GROSSMAN: So, no what?

MS. COLLETT: So, no, those two days from

Saturday and Sunday are not
included, it's Monday through

Thursday, because Friday is a make-up day of finals week; right? Yes, please.

This is Bob Grossman, A and S, again. So, if they're not part of finals week that means you can assign them to be due on that Saturday or Sunday between the reading period and the final exam?

MS. VINCENT: Our discussion in the committee thought all assignments should be due by the Wednesday, the last day of classes. It goes against the spirit of reading days and finals week to have extra homework due during that timeframe. That was our discussion in our committee. But that's not what the proposal says, is it?

MS. VINCENT: I guess not. We can add that. You can amend it.

I'm not going to amend it, but someone else might want to.

I mean our discussion was that we felt like students -- all
homework assignments should be finished by the last day of class meetings.

Well, we do already have in the Senate Rule 5.2.5.7.1 that piece about, "The examination period shall include preceded by two study days," which is your reading days, "and a weekend during which no required interaction will be scheduled other than the final examination."

One extra thing. We did also discuss that if a student requests an extension to submit something during finals week or during that weekend that faculty could make the choice to give that extension and it wouldn't violate the policy. So, there are opportunities to be flexible, you know, to accommodate the
student.

MS. COLLETT

MR. TAGAVI:

MS. COLLETT.

MR. TAGAVI:
Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I'm sorry, my program doesn't allow me to raise my hand, so I physically raised my hand, thank you for noticing it. I just want to mention that time if fungible. Any time spent on homework on one course is a time that cannot be spent on preparation for final exam for other courses. It's best to leave the students -- I'm sorry?

I think somebody accidentally unmuted themselves.

Okay.
Go ahead, Kaveh.
It is best to leave students to have peace and quiet during the finals week and two/three days of reading I'm assuming no homework
would be due during reading days also. So, that's the comment I wanted to make.

Additional questions? Okay. Seeing none, it's time to vote. So, there is a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed changes within $S R$ 5.2.5.7 as well as the glossary. The voting is now open. All right. Seventy-one approve, nine oppose and seven abstain. That motion moves forward and is approved. Thank you. Next, we have proposed extension of the Test Option Admissions Pilot. So, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Christine Harper is the proposer. This proposal is to codify the Test Optional Undergraduate Admissions Pilot that is currently ongoing and set to expire with the entering class of 2024/25. It's important to
note that this pilot program is essentially a request from Enrollment Management to waive the portions of SR4 that pertain to undergraduate admissions decisions being tied to certain tests scores, such as ACT or SAT. So, the goal of this proposal is to propose an extension of the current Test Optional Pilot by four years, so up to 2028/29 continuing to waive the components of Senate Rule 4.2.1 regarding freshman admissions criteria related to test score requirements. SAASC was in favor of the Test Optional Pilot extension, you can see excerpts from the minutes that are included with the proposal. The version that went to SC did not explicitly state that faculty and the colleges and programs can decide to end participation in the pilot extension if this is
their desire, SAASC did not support the proposal without this language. So, just a clear understanding the proposal came through without the language, SAASC wanted it explicitly stated in the proposal. So, when it came to SC, Senate Council, we voted to amend that proposal to explicitly state that faculty in the colleges and programs can decide to end participation in the pilot extension and we also changed it to a positive recommendation because we amended it with that additional information and language. So, that's why I'm presenting it today because Senate Council amended the proposal. Leslie, do you have anything to add?

MS. VINCENT: No.
MS. COLLETT: Okay. So, the motion on the floor is from Senate Council, is for the Senate to approve the
revised proposal to extend the Test Optional Admissions Pilot so that the pilot will now end with the entering class of 2028/29. This will allow them to get more data, data gathering, data analysis before a final permanent decision is made, hopefully, before that entering class occurs. So, the motion is now -comes from -- now on the floor and the floor is open up to members for questions of fact and/or debate. Richard? Hi, DeShana. This is Richard Charnigo, College of Public Health. I wanted to seek clarification. In what you were just saying, DeShana, you mentioned that there was an amendment by Senate Council to allow for opt out based on preferences of individual colleges or programs. I am looking at the pdf that is posted
to the Senate Agenda website for today and it says that, "Faculty in each college may decide to end participation based on college faculty rules and the college will report the college faculty decision," it doesn't seem to refer to program level opt outs in that last part and I want to ask for clarification whether that's meant to be included here. Thank you.

Yes, Richard, that is meant to be included there as well. So, this is just continuing to honor what's in GR4 and GR7 that gives those College faculty that ability to do that currently already and then going through the Senate as currently -- as we currently do with all admissions policies and procedures. Additional questions? Okay. Seeing none, it is time to vote. MR. TAGAVI: Chair Collett.

MS. COLLETT: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, Kaveh? MR. TAGAVI: It's my problem. I totally understand. Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. You mentioned the proposal is somebody from admission, $I$ forgot the name. In fairness to them the amendment kind of changed the nature of the proposal drastically and if I remember correctly the original proposal was no longer enthusiastically for this version. I just want to mention that now that it has been amended maybe this is now the proposal is the Senate Council since we amended it.

MS. COLLETT:
Okay. We did amend the original proposal from what we got from the proposer. So, what Kaveh is saying now is maybe Senate Council is the actual proposer instead of the VP for Enrollment Management.

MR. TAGAVI: Correct.

MS. COLLETT: Any other thoughts on that or any additional questions? All right. I think it is time to vote. So as a reminder the motion on the floor is for the Senate to approve the revised proposal to extend the Test Optional

Admissions Pilot, so the pilot would now end with the entering class of 2028/29. Poll

Everywhere is now open. Seventyfive approve, six oppose and five abstain. That motion carries and the proposal carries. Thank you. Next, we have Senate Committee on Diversity and Inclusion, Kevin Pearson is our Chair, he's going to give us a report today. So, he's a Senator from the College of Medicine, he has chaired the Senate Committee on Diversity and Inclusion for this past year, but he's been on this Committee and I can think maybe back since like 2016 or something, because we
started like together. So, we are appreciative of his service to the Senate and his committee highlighting these important matters.

MR. PEARSON:
Thank you. And I forgot how much I enjoyed these Senate Meetings not being on here for a couple of years, so $I$ hope you all get a lot of effort to be on this committee to do this important work. So, the charge of the Senate Advisory Committee for Diversity and Inclusion is to increase diversity among Senators, in particularly representation of underrepresented minorities working with senior leadership to disseminate best practices for recruiting and retaining faculty of color and other underrepresented groups and addressing other issues around diversity and inclusion as they
arise. A bit of historical perspective, it was created in 2018 actually and Dr. Beth Guiton was the inaugural chair for two years. I see Dr. Buchheit is back there. Dean Buchheit was one of the original members as well and we worked really hard on a bunch of different issues in those early years. Then Dr. Cindy Young from the College of Education became chair for the following two years. And our current membership is listed at the bottom there and we have diverse representation from across campus. We also have student representatives and representatives that are nominated from the Office of Institutional Diversity and we all work together towards this common goal of improving and increasing diversity and inclusivity across campus. So,
our first task, again, was to increase the number of underrepresented Faculty Senators over time and if you look at this graph things don't look all that impressive. There are about 100 Senators overall, but if you zoom in just on the number of Faculty Senators that identify or come from underrepresented backgrounds we have actually doubled the number of Faculty Senators from underrepresented backgrounds over the past four years. So, I think this is a pretty awesome achievement for our University and I think they're -- like how did this happen? I have no idea. I think it was the tireless work of a lot of individuals, including Chair of Senate Rules and Elections Committee Roger Brown, who has worked in order to increase the distribution of effort that Senators get and make
sure that, you know, deans are aware of how much time and effort that you all put into the important work of the Senate. Also, Senate Council Chair Collett and Katie Silver and Sheila Brothers have worked together to improve the language that's included for nominations for Senators in those election emails. And again, we don't want to influence the deans too much because this is a faculty driven election, but we do want to make sure that people are aware that diverse perspectives are appreciated. And I think that that's the biggest thing, is just the change in campus that the appreciation of these things has occurred naturally over time. So, again, I think we have a lot to be proud of in our representation. So, what about faculty recruitment and
retention? We, as a committee, invited Dr. Sue Nokes the Acting

Associate Provost for Faculty
Advancement, Megan Lucy who works in her office and then Dr.

Vanessa Jackson the Acting
Associate Vice President and
Associate Provost for Diverse
Faculty of Success and they
attended our March meeting. They
presented a lot of slides, I'm
just showing you a quick
snapshot, but I did recommend for
Senate Council to followup with
them to get more of the details
about what is happening with our
faculty here at the University.
So, this slide, again, was
produced by the Office of Faculty
Advancement, it shows the number
of tenured and tenure eligible faculty. The blue line at the top is the number that do not identify from underrepresented backgrounds and the orange line
at the bottom is those that do and that is, again, total number of tenured and tenure eligible faculty. You can see from 2018 through the current fiscal year there is a small drop in the total number of faculty that don't identify as underrepresented minorities, but there is about an eight percent increase in the total number of faculty that do identify from underrepresented backgrounds. If you look at new faculty recruitment, again, this is the tenured and tenure eligible faculty lines, this is over the past decade or so and you can see that the numbers of underrepresented minority recruitments has remained relatively stable, but if you look at that compared to the total overall number of recruitment the percentages are
actually increased over the last few years and I think there are many reasons for this, including a commitment from the University, the Office of Institutional Diversity and also from the Provost Diversity Incentive Funds, I know that contributes a lot to our recruitment within the College of Medicine for these faculty. This shows faculty retention over time. There is a lot more movement in these lines in the orange, which again are the underrepresented background faculty to where four-year retention rates, so this is showing those folks that started in 2013 or started through 2018. There was obviously some concern in those earlier years, but recently we have really improved our retention rates in both the four-year retention and then also the seven-year retention rates
for underrepresented faculty. So, at our next faculty meeting or (Inaudible) meeting on May $17^{\text {th }}$ we actually have Dr. Albert who is going to come and meet with us and we asked her to present her swat analyses at the University level perspective on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats that we face and also establishing association versus affinity groups at the University level. Issues moving forward, we have made a lot of progress on the Diversity of Senate, but can we improve inclusiveness of how all Senator ideas are heard, appreciated and what the receptiveness is to those ideas? How do we increase Senate participation and leadership for Faculty Senators from diverse backgrounds? And I think you probably noticed from that slide
that we have relatively stable faculty hiring even with increased student enrollment. It's better for our underrepresented faculty, we have a higher percent of total faculty hiring in those areas and I think it is again because of highly useful programs like the Diversity Incentive Funds from the Provost Office. Also, the retention of our underrepresented faculty is highly variable, but it seems to be improving, this could be due to programs, again, that are supported by Vice President for Research and the Provost Office, such as the Research Scholars Program and also, I think the Unite Research Priority Area has improved that sense of belonging across campus. And unfortunately this year, while in the past we have had students that have participated
wholly across the entire year, this year we didn't quite have that, so we're hoping that next year that we get student nominees for the committee that engage and participate throughout the year because we do really appreciate the student perspective and they have driven a lot of our past success on the committee.

MS. COLLETT:

MS . BLASING:
Molly Blasing, College of Arts and Sciences. I noticed in one of the early slides that the number of Asian and Asian American represented on the Senate has been stagnant it looked like from your chart and I was wondering what strategies the committee has discussed to increase the number of Asian and Asian American Senators at the University?

MR. PEARSON: Yeah. We --

MS. BLASING: Back a little further.
MR. PEARSON: So, are you talking for the
Faculty Senate representation?

Yeah, that one.

So, these numbers can be broken out at the overall University
level as well and that question
did come up in Senate Council. I
think that's, again, a reason
that those data should be looked
at by Senate Council and within
that office. Of course that --
there are things that we can do.
We are trying to really increase,
I guess, the inclusiveness of
thinking diversely, which is a bunch of key buzz words, but I think we just -- we are trying to really open up everything within the Faculty Senate like who should be representing the colleges and then also within faculty recruitment itself. I think it's important to really
take an approach that's going to hire the best faculty members that are also from diverse backgrounds that are contributing again to that learning enviroment; right, because we know student learners learn better from individuals that are similar to themselves, so. Again, we have lots to do. We haven't kicked up our feet and toasted in celebration just yet, so we are going to hopefully work along with -- I guess when the new Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement is named, that recruitment, I guess, is taking place now or at least the interviews and things are taking place now, so we'll work together with that group.

MS. COLLETT:
Bob?

MR. GROSSMAN:
Bob Grossman, A and S. In your second to last slide you said something about associations
versus affinity groups and I didn't understand, first of all, what's the difference in this context and second of all, is there a versus here? Why would it have to be versus one another?

Yeah, I don't -- I don't think they're competing against each other. I think it just has to do with the levels of commitment from the University for that area. We have an individual on the committee that's very interested in this, this isn't something that $I^{\prime}$ ve taken on personally, but I'm sure I can get you more information after the meeting.

MR. GROSSMAN: Sorry. But what do you mean by associations and affinity groups? What are they?

MS. COLLETT: So, they're a few different
things. So, the associations are at a totally different level in their involvement, so at other
universities, even our benchmark universities such as the

University of Louisville and some of those, they have associations and not affinity groups, and so, those associations aren't just, you know, employed -- they are employed, but they're employees, students, and it's actually a little bit more farther reaching, so I believe the VP of Diversity has thought about affinity groups and that's where we initially began was doing affinity groups, but there are individuals and pockets of folks that kind of want to move us even higher a level and not just affinity groups, but having representation at some of these national conferences where they actually
-- the universities have associations. So, that association comes with a lot of, you know, financial help as well
to get these associations off
their feet.
MR. GROSSMAN :
MS. COLLETT:
MR. BROWN:
Hi, Roger Brown, College of
Agriculture, Food and
Environment. I just wondered,
Kevin, did your group -- or has
it had any discussions or
acknowledgments about this past
year? All of the Senate meetings
have been available remotely for
people. I know in my college I
have at least one Senate
colleague who is -- lives out in
Princeton, Kentucky, so about
four hours away, and so, I know
it's very convenient for that
person to be able to interact and
participate in the Senate to do
it that way. And I'm also aware
that previously the Senate
Council Meetings were available
to at least observe and/or
participate, but that's no longer
available. I just wondered, is there any comments or reflections that the committees had about the accessibility of the Senate Meetings?

I'll let you answer.
That -- that has come up, I
wouldn't say in a formal way to where we've created any kind of action, but $I$ think it's certainly appreciated when there are hybrid formats especially when it's run -- I mean especially in a way like this one where you can actually hear and see individuals and everyone can interact because I mean there are lots of -- whether it's transportation or whether it's childcare needs or whether it's work/life balance and those types of things that offering these types of meetings. I know for our (Inaudible) meetings, for example, we've had them all via

Zoom and it's unfortunate we don't have that personal interaction where we sit together in a big room, but it's certainly opened up the ability of some important people to make it to meetings that maybe they wouldn't have been otherwise. So, I think we just need to think about how we can continue to do those things, but they need to be done well, where if there's poor audio or poor video and, you know, poor connections it makes it difficult to really have anything take place.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.
MS. COLLETT: Richard Charnigo?
MR. CHARNIGO:
Hi, Kevin. This is Richard Charnigo from the College of Public Health. In regards to the active participation and the Senate activities underrepresented minorities or really everyone, I think one
factor that ought to be considered is the allocation of distribution of effort. If a faculty member has a token distribution of effort, two percent for the Senate or one percent for this or that service opportunity the faculty member is really not being credited with what he or she may deserve for participating in Senate or service activities and that may disincentivize participation in Senate or service activities. So, I think one way to encourage underrepresented minorities, but people in general, to be able to fulfill their Senate and service roles it is to advocate for a proper allocation of distribution of effort. So, if that's something that your committee has considered or wants to consider I just point that out. Thank you.

MR. PEARSON:
agree and I think, you know,
Chair Brown has been working to
get that language put into the
emails for the dean for the
Senate. I know it came through
the College of Medicine's emails
this year about something around
the five percent number for
Senate and I mean I think that
that's part of it. I think we
lean on the same individuals a
lot, especially when we're
talking about maybe 10 to 12
percent of our faculty being
underrepresented here at the
University and we want those
individuals to do service in so
many different areas. We do
need to make sure that everyone
gets their fair share of
distribution of effort. I think
that's one part of it, but I mean
this is the first time I've ever
opened my mouth in Senate and I
was a Senator for three years.

So, I mean I think part of it is just how welcome do you feel to provide those ideas in a setting where there's what, 95 people online and another 30 in here. And, Rich, you know me very well and you know I'm not afraid to ever open my mouth, but I think it's just that level of intimidation and you come in and you really just don't feel like your equal to some of the ideas of others, but I don't know how we address that, other than just continuing that culture change. Richard, I will say I have been looking at the data around DOEs and service assignment and it's something that the Provost and I have on our agenda, we've had a short meeting about it, but we will definitely be having a more detailed meeting concerning those service requirements around the DOE.

MR. PEARSON: Can I just pop in there one more time too? I know the Provost was formally the Dean of the College of Medicine and under his watch we actually went through and realigned our distribution of effort for service and for education to try to make that more equitable across the college. And when I did my service DOE I was at 33 percent after the numbers that we had come up with, so I think I needed to realign my perspectives on what was important to me at UK. So, I don't know if you'll have some of those same discussions with the Provost, but I think it's -- it's been a great way for our college to go.

MS. COLLETT: Aaron Garvey?
MR. GARVEY: Hey, Aaron Garvey, Gatton College of Business. I just had a higher-level question about the population that's being used to
kind of determine adequate
representation for
underrepresented minorities. So,
I just was curious, is it the --
essentially for the Senate are we
looking at the faculty body as
the population, just overall U.S.
demographics, Kentucky State
demographics, just for
determining kind of what our
representation targets are?
MR. PEARSON:
Yeah, that's a fantastic question
and I'll answer that from my own
perspective. I've not discussed
this with the committee or with
any upper -- well, so if you want
someone higher up there are lots
of people than me. But from my
perspective I would say we've --
for the Faculty Senate we've
tried to align very closely with
what the University is at this
point or what our goals would be
for the further, so we're
actually probably slightly over
represented within the Faculty Senate compared to those total numbers of faculty that you saw in the tenured or tenure eligible lines. So, I don't know what we need to pump the brakes on what we're doing, but $I$ mean $I$ think we are achieving within the Senate some of the representation that we were looking for over the past four or five years within the committee. Molly?

Molly Blasing, Arts and Sciences. I had a question about the slide where you have the data on underrepresented minority faculty retention.

MS. PEARSON: Yeah, so if you have a very detailed question I'll probably point you to Dr. Nokes, but, yes. No -- well, I don't know if it's detailed. So, this is four year
-- four-year retention and it stops at 2018. I was wondering
detailed. So, this is four year
-- four-year retention and it
stops at 2018. I was wondering
if we have the data from 2018 to 2022 yet or when we might get a report on that.

I would think that should be coming soon. This is the -- I mean we just got this presentation about a month ago, so this is probably the most recent -- oh, yeah, and Dr.

Cardarelli who was previously in that office would like to -So, these are --

State your name.
Katie Cardarelli. I heard it coming. Katie Cardarelli, Office of the Provost. So, these data are cohort data, so meaning like if you look at four-year retention 2018 , we just now have for faculty who entered in 2018 a four-year retention rate from -are you asking about like 2023? Does that make sense.

MS. BLASING: (Inaudible, microphone off).
MS. CARDARELLI: Correct.

MS. BLASING: (Inaudible, microphone off).
MS. CARDARELLI: Correct. Those are cohort data. Yes, you are interpreting correctly now. So, similarly for the seven-year retention rate, you know, 2013 faculty who entered we have a seven-year retention rate. We do a snapshot every like November-ish to capture these data and then we can refresh the following year. Does that help? Yes.

Okay.
And again, you're talking somewhere between eight to 15 faculty member per year that were making up those lines, so that's why there's the fluctuation. Kaveh?

Kaveh Tagavi, College of Engineering. I'd like to go back to allocation of DOE. For Senators which are elected positions, which are
distinguished from serving on the Search Committee which is an appointed usually position and I have to admit I have changed my mind a little bit on this and I see the administration's point of view a little bit better.

However, since Senators are at the lowest level of college representing, they are not departmental representing maybe a Senate Council or the Senate Council Chair could encourage deans of collages to establish a philosophy or a procedure of how to handle when a person gets elected to represent their college since it's a college representation. That's my suggestion that I think Senate Council or Senate Council Chair should contact the deans and encourage them to make a position on that.

MS. COLLETT:
Okay. Thank you, Kaveh. Like I
said before, this is something
I'm already in talks with the
Provost about, who meets with the
deans every Tuesday, and so,
we're coming together and trying
to come to a standard place where
we have a good understanding of
what the DOE allocations should
be as far as trying to represent
the amount of work. As you can
tell, there's some people that
serve on different committees
that may not even meet but once a
month or once every two months
where we have other committees
who are meeting literally every
two weeks and some committees and
councils -- I mean one just off
the top of my head, Undergraduate
Council it's almost like nobody
on there should have less than 10
percent the amount of work that
they do. We have had a 55
percent increase in courses that
have been reviewed by that
committee since last year and that's not even over this date that we had last year. So, that just kind of let's you know -and there's several people on that committee with zero percent DOE service and they're still doing it. So, this allows our programs to happen, you know, us to also, you know, get revenue from those programs. So, you know, faculty are working to get this done and to get students here, so we do have to acknowledge that the work has to be done.

Can I mention an additional comment, please?

MS. COLLETT:
Hold on. Wait just a second. I'll have to come back to you, Kaveh, because I had another hand. Trustee Kramer and then I'll come back.

MR. KRAMER:
I just -- I'm not going to get too many more times to say past-
chair, so Aaron Kramer, Past-
Chair, but this is a comment, and you and I have talked about this a lot, I think we've had conversations along these lines with the Provost and the dean and DOE matters to different colleges, different amounts, people put different values on it, but I think that one of the things I tried to do too is encourage sort of a true respect for service as the Senator that these are potentially leaders within your college, these are people who can be partners in the college to help, you know, with the colleges admissions and so forth. And so, that's something I think -- DOE is nice, but respect is better and to the extent that, you know, there's opportunities to improve that'll also make service in the Senate and in the Senate's committees
more enticing as well.

Okay. Kaveh?
Yes, Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. And for a follow-up comment, as we all know President Capilouto is the President of the Senate, I'm sure he has an interest in a lively and participating Senate and it doesn't have to end at the level of the Provost. I think the President should facilitate elected members to be able to serve and to represent their colleges.

MS. COLLETT: Thank you. The Provost is here and I think he's heard that and would you like to comment Provost DiPaola?

MR. DIPAOLA: Yeah, I'll just say that as Chair Collett mentioned that Chair Collett and I are working through this as well and we are waiting on a permanent leader in the Office of Faculty Advancement, this will be a major charge of
that leader to go through this and look at this and we could just make sure that's done early in that individual's tenure.

MS. COLLETT: Trustee --
MS. SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, Faculty Trustee. I'd like to point out that there are some colleges that change how they view service, and so, for example, in the College of Medicine it's capped at 15 percent, and so, if you're reaching that cap and then you're asked to do this committee, lead a departmental this, that and everything. So, things start to get kind of silly and it also can impact things like the ability for people to be recipients of teaching research awards, salary.

MS. COLLETT: Yup. I think that goes back to that mutual respect Trustee Kramer mentioned. (Inaudible). MS. ?: College of Medicine. As Dr. Swanson and I are pointing out
that in the College of Medicine if you're spending time doing service you are at risk for not spending as much time doing research and teaching for which you are eligible for monetary awards. So, this is not just respect, but it's salary. So, there is in a sense a disincentive to be involved in service activities.

MS. SWANSON:
MS. COLLETT:
Thanks for the clarification.
I think I'll just add up and then we'll go onto the next item. That is definitely something we've talked about is that threelegged stool and everything being just as important and not -- it's not just teaching and research, but the service has to occur for this University to run, so it is changing a mind set that's kind of been there and changing the culture around, you know, respecting that service piece.

MS. ?
I mean this comes up with promotion and tenure committees as well.

Yes, correct. That's changing the mind set and the culture. So, again, this is more than -Yeah.
-- more than colleague respect, this is advancement and salary. Thank you. All right. Provost DiPaola wants to respond. No. I was just going to add that you actually said it as I was about to add it as well for promotion, I mean we've got to value not only respect, I agree with that totally, but value, career development of all of our faculty, and so, I think we do need to address that simultaneously meaning, how does this get considered in terms of the appointments and promotions process. We have encouraged it in Statements of Evidence and so
forth in colleges, but $I$ think that's something that should be part of that broad discussion, totally agree. I think you said it well.

Yup, thank you. All right. Next up, at 4:30 we have Agenda Item E, Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Credit Bearing Education inside and outside of colleges. Let's see here. So, this is an ad hoc committee, again, that Leslie Vincent -- I have thrown her own and she is chairing -- please mute yourself. Thank you. Okay. So, Leslie is here to give the final report and recommendations from the committee.

All right. Thank you. So, I
just wanted to give you kind of a very quick overview of the final report that our ad hoc Committee put together. If you remember, I think this is my second time up here to talk about the work of
this ad hoc Committee that was looking at non-credit bearing educational activities. And so, I know everyone has read this long report that was posted with the agenda, but just to remind you, our official charge that was given in October of last year was for this subcommittee to make recommendations related to the appropriate or suitable governance structures for educational activities that are not tied to a Senate approved course. Okay. So, these noncredit bearing activities beyond what we're doing and these course that Senate has approved. And so, this could include non-credit activities that are housed within a college as well as those that may occur outside of a college. And so, part of what we were tasked with is looking at what this governance structure should
look like for these types of things. So, the committee met quite a lot to evaluate what's going on at the University, create some definitions, do some data collection either by looking at websites and programs, the associate deans, other individuals across the University to try and create a recommendation that would fit really the very nature of a lot of the non-credit bearing educational activities that occur within our University. And so, our key recommendations are listed on the second page of the report. The first recommendation that the committee has is that individual non-credit bearing courses should continue to be delegated to the pedagogical supervision of the college faculties, so aligned with SR 3.2.3.3.1. The second
recommendation from the committee is that when these non-credit bearing courses culminate in some type of credential that could be described as a program these noncredit bearing credentials need to go through the same Senate procedures that are currently being used for our non-credit bearing badges. So, if you'll remember that was what we discussed last semester. We developed a process and policy around approval of non-credit bearing badges and our committee felt that any of these non-credit bearing courses that are put together that become a program where a certificate, a badge or some other credential like name that's given to this activity would go through those same procedures. So, there's a very long report. I'll draw your attention to Appendix B, which is
at the very end of the report, the last two pages, to really help clarify the last recommendation that we had, which is the process that can be used to determine, you know, what programs or non-credit bearing courses would in fact need to go through this Senate process. So, if you'll look at Appendix B, the first section identifies what makes up a course. Okay. So, we provide a definition of a course, we discuss the features associated with the course and that courses can be either credit bearing or non-credit bearing. Obviously, credit bearing courses that have a Senate approved prefix go through that Senate approval process. The key difference here between credit bearing and non-credit bearing as it relates to this is non-credit bearing courses are not recorded
on the academic transcript and they do not require Senate approval action when the courses are overseen by the college faculty of the responsible educational unit or some other Senate approved faculty body, which reinforces the report that we heard earlier from Dr. Cardarelli. Okay. And then the second piece of this appendix talks about programs, so again, a definition for program is provided, programs can be both credit bearing or non-credit bearing. And what I'll draw your attention to here from our perspective with this subcommittee is non-credit bearing programs. So, non-credit bearing programs are not reflected on the University's Registrar's academic transcript and they may or may not require Senate approval action. And so,
to determine if a non-credit bearing program requires Senate approval action there's some guidance that's been provided below. Okay. So, we have five different questions that are here. If you answer yes to any of these questions it would suggest that the activity does not need Senate review or oversight and approval. If you answer no to the five statements then the activity would need Senate review and approval. So, these activities include, is the activity required by a federal, state or local government agency? Okay. So, if there is oversight or mandate from these external entities it was the recommendation of the committee that extra governance in terms of going through the Senate approval process is not necessary. If the activity is overseen by an
accrediting body, which holds these programs accountable for meeting certain standards that are set by that accrediting body then it does not have to go through the Senate approval process. If the activity is a short or single event, so an afternoon workshop or training session, this would not need to go through the Senate oversight process. If the activity is directed to external community service learning, a lot of extension activities for example, those would not need to go through the Senate approval process for oversight. And if the activity is directed to someone in their capacity as a UK employee or research trainee this again, would not require Senate review oversight and approval. So, that is a very quick summary of the work and the
recommendations from our Ad Hoc Committee.

MS. COLLETT:
Thank you, Vice Chair Vincent. So, this is a recommendation from a committee to approve the Recommendations and the Final Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Credit Bearing Education Inside and Outside of College -whoa, that's a long committee name. The motion comes from Committee, so there's no second. Actually, $I$ think that one needs a motion. Don't you think that needs a motion and then a second? So, I will entertain a motion to accept or to approve the Recommendations and the Final Report. So, I'll need a motion and a second. Right. All right. Alison motions and Maryland Seconds. Okay. So, that motion is now on the floor and the floor is open up to members for questions of fact and/or debate.

Okay. Kaveh and -- it says two participants, who else?

MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, College of
Engineering. Will you please clarify for us, if we approve
these recommendations do they become Senate Rules?

It doesn't look like there's a Senate Rule included in this proposal. This is more internal processes that will happen within the Senate Council Office or the Senate Office.

But are we binded to follow this
if the Senate approves this or is it just a recommendation that different entities could either follow it or not follow it?

MS. COLLETT: From my understanding, and you want to followup on that?

It was our thought that this would go into effect for any noncredit bearing program to follow the recommendations of the committee.

MS. COLLETT: So, very similar to the same process that we used in May of last year --

MS. VINCENT:
MS. COLLETT:
Yes.
-- for faculty bodies and noncredit bearing/credit bearing courses where those -- we have a faculty body formed now, it's not in the Senate Rules, but it is a process that's formally vetted and approved through Senate to use. So, it's the same process and procedure. Scott Yost and then Bob, because he had his hand up.

Yeah, Scott -- Chair Collette, thank you. Quick question, maybe for Leslie, to clarify. And I have to admit I did not read in detail all of whatever pages on this document 15 pages, but I did skim some of them. But I'm curious specifically at the end of Appendix B where they talk about the courses and programs
and I get this thing where it says, "Non-credit bearing courses are not recorded on the

University Registrar's academic transcript and do not require Senate approval," you know, we have zero credit or non-credit bearing courses at the University offered by programs right now, does that mean that current zero credit classes, which are noncredit bearing are they no longer going to be showing up on the student's transcripts or am I just missing a connection here?

MS. VINCENT: That's a good question. So, any course that has the Senate prefix would not meet the definition, I guess, of how we treated these non-credit bearing courses. So, we do have zero credit hour Senate prefix courses and that is not what we are referring to with the recommendation, yeah.

MR. YOST: Okay. Thanks for the
clarification.
MS. VINCENT.
MS. COLLETT:
MR. GROSSMAN:
Sure.
Bob and then Roger.
I was actually going to point out that there are a few places in Appendix B where there's specific language recommended for the Senate Rules, the definitions, which says, "The Senate shall define program as follows," I think that's -- could easily be put into the Senate Rules and should be. Normally, after we pass anything in the Senate it goes to the SREC for codification and perhaps some wording here and there, changes that might be needed. And so, my assumption was that that's what would happen to this, it would go to the Senate Committee. We always appreciate if someone provides language of the rule that they would like to see, rather than giving us policies that we then
have to encode, but if we have to do it I'm sure we will.

That's correct, Bob, and we said that in the Senate Council Meeting as well, this would be assigned to the appropriate committee which is SREC to codify, you're correct. Roger?

Roger Brown, College of Ag, SREC Chair. I was going to say the same thing. So, I think we're all on the same page that this should go to SREC for any potential codification.

Thank you. We keep each other in check and I like it. All right. Any further questions? Wonderful. All right. So -okay. I'm sorry. Bob?

MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to make a comment -MS. COLLETT: Who are you?

MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, who am I? Your worst nightmare. I'm Bob Grossman, A and S. I was just going to say that parts of the rules that you
quoted were -- I remember I was involved in that maybe six or 10 years ago and it was originally prompted by the MOOC craze that we had about six to 10 years ago, I don't remember anymore, but there was a lot of concern on how to handle faculty creating MOOCs and millions of people signing on thinking they were going to get a UK degree out of those MOOCs. MOOCs are no long -they've dissipated, they're still there, but not -- it's not in anyone's consciousness, it's not like an article in the New York Times every week like it was at the time. So, anyway just a little historical thing there.

MS. COLLETT:
All right. So, we have no more questions. I believe it's time to vote. Remember this is a recommendation -- this is a motion to approve the Recommendations and the Final

Report provided to us from the AD Hoc Committee on Non-Credit Bearing Education Inside and Outside of Colleges. The poll is open and voting is now ready. All right. Seventy-four approve, seven abstain. That motion carries and is approved. Next, we have items from the floor, time permitting. So, remember that this is -- there's no further business to conduct, so this is an opportunity for Senators to ask questions or suggest a topic for discussion if you have any. I'm ignoring a hand raise -- no, I'm not doing that. Okay. Trustee Kramer? Aaron Kramer, Engineering. From my view, your job is not an easy one and yet I think that you've handled the job very well this year, and so, I would move that the University Senate commend Senate Council Chair DeShana

Collette for a job well done this year, if there's a second. There's a second.

Thank you. It's been fun. I appreciate that. This is -- I appreciate all of you, honestly. This Senate, it takes -- it takes a village to keep us going and I've had so many people step up and do things even when it's been over top of their DOE because of their love for this University and the love for the students and the faculty and staff. So, I thank you all for everything that you've done for sure. It's time to move to adjournment, but I want to remind you about the date for the next Senate Meeting, okay, it is going to be September the 11, 2023. From now till, you know, the beginning of August you'll probably still going to receive some emails particularly around your committee preferences
and some of those things, especially our new Senators and you'll get more information. Please don't be a stranger if you need something. Otherwise, I will move to adjourn, if there are no objections. But I would ask that you all make sure that you are well rested this summer, that you use your vacation time and use it wisely, it's vacation, so that means turn off your email, turn off your phone for things that are not -- or that are employment related. Just as side note, because I just remember this today, that some of your vacation will cycle over up until December, I think 2024 is what the Human Resource benefit thing says. So, the President had extended that vacation rollover again this year. So, I just found that out. So, just a side note, so that you know that

```
you do have some time if you
    can't use it all in the next week
    or two you'll still have it. So,
    have a wonderful end of the
    semester and see you all in the
    fall. We are adjourned.
```

