

Senate Council

Monday, May 15, 2023

The Senate Council met for a Senate Council retreat at 9:00 AM on Monday, May 15, 2023, at ArtsPlace in Lexington, KY. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken by hand unless otherwise specified. Specific voting information can be requested from the Office of the Senate Council (SC).

Senate Council Chair DeShana Collett (HS) called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 9:02 AM. The Chair welcomed those present. She asked that all attendees state their name and affiliation prior to speaking, to ensure everyone knew who was speaking. The Chair asked SC members to keep in mind that aside from degree lists and committee compositions, big topics would be discussed. The Chair noted that she would do her best to keep discussion focused on how SC planned to manage such issues moving forward in order to spend less time debating the details of such issues. The Chair stated that at the end of the retreat, she wanted SC to have clear plans on how to move forward with issues discussed today.

The Chair asked everyone to introduce themselves.

1. Minutes from April 17 and April 24, 2023 and Announcements

The Chair informed SC members that edits were received to the April 24, 2023 minutes. There being **no objections**, the minutes from April 17 and April 24, 2023 were **approved as amended by unanimous consent**.

The Chair provided a brief update to SC members regarding the University Senate website.

2. Late Additions to May 2023 and August 2023 Degree Lists

The Chair informed SC members that the SC office was still being informed about students who needed to be added to the May 2023 and August 2023 degree lists. The Chair provided a list of additions to the May 2023 and August 2023 degree lists.

Marilyn Duncan (ME) **moved** that the elected faculty members of SC approve, on behalf of Senate, the additions to the May 2023 and August 2023 degree lists, for submission to the President to the Board of Trustees. Bob Grossman (AS) **seconded**. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

3. Committee Nominations

a. Campuswide Committees

The Chair reminded SC members that they were asked to provide nominations to Sheila Brothers (SC office) as there were not enough nominations received via the call for nominations sent previously to campus. The Chair stated that next year, nominations would be solicited from campus in the fall so that sufficient time would be provided to the Senate Nominating Committee (SNC) to engage in the process. When the Office of Legal Counsel asks for nominees next February, the SC office staff will then conduct a final review of nominations and vacancies to provide the information to the SC for a vote. The Chair asked that members review the nominees and committees and hold one vote after reviewing. The Chair asked SC members to review the nominees and committees.

SC members asked questions about some of the technical details included with the information provided. SC office staff explained the process from a technical standpoint and answered questions. SC members also discussed the academic rank requirements for some of the committees. The Chair noted that area committees required a full professor academic rank. SC members offered the following comments:

- Associate Professors may not be comfortable in roles on committees like the University Senate Hearing Panel (USHP) and the Senate Advisory Committee for Promotion and Tenure (SACPT) due to the nature of the work
- It was important for members of the University Appeals Board (UAB) to be judicious, exercise discretion, and adhere to University policy
- It would be unfair to not consider Associate Professors for roles on committees where the *Senate Rules* did not specifically prohibit Associate Professors, but if SC agreed a Professor was preferred, a *Senate Rule* change should be made to include such a preference

SC Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) **moved** to approve the nominations, allowing the SC Chair to fill any vacancies. Senate Bastin (AG) **seconded**. The Chair opened the floor for questions of fact and debate.

SC members briefly discussed the importance of diversity in title series among the nominees. Sheila Brothers (SC office) asked SC members to email her any additional nominations that were not already on the list. The Chair commented that the SC office would review diversity in titles series.

A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

b. Senate Committees

The Chair noted that in the fall, SC office staff would remind colleges that elections should be completed earlier in the spring semester so that the SC office could begin compiling committee compositions sooner for SC review.

i. Nominees

The Chair asked SC members to review all nominees and committees and hold a single vote at the end. SC members reviewed the committee nominees and offered the following comments:

- Whether subcommittees needed to be formally approved by the SC Chair
- Non-senators chairing a subcommittee on a committee that required a senator to chair the committee was concerning
- The Senate Committee for Diversity and Inclusion (SCDI) needed a more diverse college representation
- The Senate Nominating Committee (SNC) needed more members from different colleges
- More members from a humanities background for the Senate Library Committee (SLC) was desirable
- SLC needed a more diverse college representation

SC members offered recommendations for other members and potential chairs to serve on Senate Committees. A question was asked about student representation on Senate Committees. Katie Silver (SC office) explained that student members were solicited from the Student Government Association (SGA) President at the beginning of the fall semester but welcomed any recommendations. Silver noted that committee expectations and time commitments for the committees requiring student representation would also be communicated before student members were solicited.

Leslie Vincent (BE) **moved** to approve the nominees as presented, allowing the Chair to fill any vacancies and identify chairs as needed. Sandra Bastin (AG) **seconded**.

A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

ii. *Titles and Participation of Ex Officio Members*

The Chair explained that this item pertained to both Senate membership and committee membership. The Chair stated that she would first like SC members to discuss the phrase in *Senate Rule (SR) 1.2.2.5* regarding nonvoting membership. The Chair explained that *Governing Regulation (GR) IV (part A)* delegated to Senate the right to identify ex officio nonvoting members. The Chair explained that the current SR language was not sufficiently clear to express functional intent. The Chair noted that the SC office would like clarified language, explaining that many of the titles listed in the SR did not exist, and that different chairs had interpreted this SR differently in the past.

SC members discussed the following:

- If designating voting rights of ex officio members should be at the discretion of the Chair
- The possibility of simplifying voting rights by making all ex officio members nonvoting
- The importance of upholding shared governance
- Issues with power differentials between ex officio members and ex officio supervisors serving in ex officio roles on the same committee
- Removing the titles and allowing for administration to appoint ex officio nonvoting
- Asking the President to identify which Vice Presidents should serve as ex officio nonvoting members of the Senate, as the President was also the Chair of the Senate

Bob Grossman (AS) **moved** for SC members to ask the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) to remove from the SRs the specific titles mentioned for ex officio members of Senate committees, add language that directs the president to nominate individuals who have certain specific responsibilities (i.e. “job description”), and change all ex officio members of Senate committees to being nonvoting , with the SREC’s suggestions to be presented to the SC in October. Kaveh Tagavi (EN) **seconded**. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members briefly discussed other issues associated with ex officio nonvoting membership on Senate in general and power differential issues in committees. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

SC members took a brief break at 10:30 AM and reconvened at 10:47 AM to briefly discuss power differentials in committees.

The Chair explained there were Senate committees with an administrative member that also had members supervised by that administrative member. SC members discussed the following:

- Removing Vice President membership from committees with staff members that reported to the Vice President
- Protecting faculty members on committees where an administrative member of the committee would have input on a faculty member’s distribution of effort (DOE) or promotion and tenure
- Helping committee chairs learn how to create minutes that do not specifically name each member who speaks
- Adjusting ex officio membership to prevent an ex officio member from serving on a committee that also includes someone they supervise or otherwise have administrative authority over
- The need for a faculty and staff Ombud for situations like the ones discussed

- Providing guidance to committee chairs for how minutes were reported in the interest of protecting individual members

iii. *Change Senate Admissions Advisory Committee (SAAC) to be a permanent subcommittee of the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SAASC)*

The Chair explained that SAASC needed more engaged members and that SAAC had not recently held regular meetings. The Chair noted that the SAAC had an important role to play, especially with recent Senate activity around test-optional admissions and *SR 4* changes. The Chair suggested that if these committees were combined, SAAC would benefit from SAASC's familiarity with proposal reviews and high-volume activity and could act as a subcommittee that would make recommendations to SAASC. The Chair ask SC members for their thoughts.

SC members discussed the following:

- Potential changes to the charge for SAAC, which could include evaluating UK's capacity for undergraduate students in light of regular increases in enrollment
- Certain items in the charge for SAAC gave SAAC final authority, but the *SRs* stated that Senate had final authority
- The importance of collecting data about capacity to admit students while providing quality education
- The lack of membership from an enrollment management representative on SAASC
- Combining the two committees will facilitate faculty-led discussions on topics before actual proposals are submitted
- Whether the changes to *SR 4* approved by Senate offered a tangible way in which the administrative office for enrollment was required to follow academic policies on admissions
- How to ensure Senate's authority over admissions processes despite faculty not being involved in the practical application of Senate's policies related to admissions
- What efforts could be made to make SAAC more effective
- The efficiency gained by making SAAC a subcommittee of SAASC, so that it is partnered with a committee that has a regular stream of work
- Different colleges have different needs
- Adding clear language to the charge for SAAC to actively generate reporting for admissions

After additional discussion, the Chair indicated that she understood SC wanted to move forward in the following ways: combine the two committees and update the charge to include matters related to faculty-to-student ratios.

Kaveh Tagavi (EN) **moved** to make SAAC a subcommittee of SAASC and revise the charges of the committees. Marilyn Duncan (ME) **seconded**. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

Doug Michael (LA) suggested there be two subcommittees, one for admissions and one for academic standards. There were no objections to adding this aspect to the motion. The Chair stated the SC office would work on revised language for the *SRs* and send to SREC for review. A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

4. Outcomes from Last Year's Retreat

a. Standardized SR Language for Academic Councils and Committees

The Chair reminded SC members of the changes made to *SR 1* that Senate approved in December. The update standardized most of the policies related to academic councils and committees. There were no comments.

b. Relationship Between Disability Resource Center (DRC) and Faculty and Accommodation Process

The Chair explained that SC members had received the report from the Senate Committee for Disability Accommodation and Compliance (SCDAC). The Chair noted that the report was very thorough and did a fantastic job of documenting how the work they were doing. Because the accommodation process was discussed at length at the prior year's retreat, she wanted SC members to see the report before it was formally presented to SC and Senate in the fall.

Kaveh Tagavi (EN) asked if the DRC has an advisory or executive body. Members present suggested that was not the case. The Chair commented that schools in UK's judicial district (6th Circuit) have executive-type bodies affiliated with their disability/accommodation offices. Tagavi **moved** for SC members to request that the Chair ask the DRC to allow a SC liaison to attend leadership or policy-making meetings, as a nonvoting representative, so that SC could be informed; if such a body does not exist, the Chair should ask about the possibility of creating one Molly Blasing (AS) **seconded**. The Chair opened the floor to members for questions of fact and debate.

SC members briefly discussed that if DRC was not holding such meetings, the Chair should discuss that with the DRC and their leadership representative.

A **vote** was taken, and the motion **passed** with none opposed or abstained.

SC members took a break for lunch at 11:45 AM and reconvened at 1:00 PM.

c. University Senate Leadership and Culture

The Chair explained the topics that SC raised in this area at last year's retreat, including the following suggestions:

- More direct guidance to senators about expectations for meetings and 10-day posts
- Changes to new senator orientation
- Holding SC meetings in-person as much as possible and the technical limitations of 103 Main Building
- Holding Senate meetings in a hybrid format
- Balancing resources and improvements
- Providing ways to surface and standardize activities of Senate committees, including templates for agendas, minutes, and reports
- Assisting senators in communicating with constituents

The Chair described many of the actions of the SC office staff in response to these topics. The Chair then asked SC members to provide feedback on the past year's initiatives. SC members offered the following sentiments:

- The current hybrid modality for Senate meetings was working well and the use of *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* ensured that hybrid meetings were equitable
- The materials prepared by SC office staff, such as cover pages, were very helpful for guiding senators through the material

- The in-person location for hybrid Senate meetings in the Gatton College of Business and Economics was a significant improvement over the previous in-person Senate meeting location
- If allowing members to continue attending remotely could lead to less engagement
- It would be best to find a way for remote members to see in-person members during SC meetings more clearly
- The SC meeting space needs to be updated so that attendees can see all the people in the room.
- Hybrid modality was more accessible and inclusive
- Members should be able to use their discretion when choosing how to attend a Senate meeting
- The handbooks and other materials produced by the SC office were appreciated
- It should be safe to assume that senators have reviewed meeting materials, but often that is not the case
- The consent agenda has been a good way to focus Senate time on deeper discussions of heavier topics
- SC should be mindful of the effect of a project/initiative on the SC office
- Begin sending informal welcome notes to new senators, which could include expectations (such as reviewing agenda items in detail)
- It is often clear that many senators have not reviewed agenda items prior to the meeting, including items in Curriculog. The lack of engagement puts the onus on committee chairs to read reports, so that there can be some sort of discussion.
- Excusing committees with high workloads from having to submit activity reports
- Removing the requirement for documenting numbers of items reviewed, pending, etc. in the activity reports
- It would be beneficial to ask senators on Zoom to join early to ensure they were able to log in to and use Poll Everywhere
- Items should be sent back to committees from Senate only if accompanied by tangible suggested outcomes, to avoid slowing down committee productivity

d. Priorities for 2022-2023

i. *Using SC Voice as a Deliberative Body*

The Chair asked SC members if they felt SC was effectively speaking with one voice with meeting with senior administrators. SC members expressed the following thoughts:

- The importance of talking with each other prior to meeting with administration to ensure everyone was up to date on information and engaged
- Use of the listserv for communication with one another prior to meetings
- Many questions could be answered ahead of time through use of listservs

ii. *Communication and Safety*

The Chair noted that while COVID-19 was a less prevalent concern than the prior year, Senate had discussions on mental health as well as student-to-employee safety. SC members expressed the following thoughts:

- SC members should use the listserv to provide opportunities for discussion and education prior to an in-depth discussion at SC. This is particularly true for complex or large proposals.
- If discussing items in advance, there is a greater risk of the possibility that one group would dominate the discussion.

- Advocating for faculty should continue to be a priority, especially with concerns around employee burnout
- Safety when dealing with challenging students should remain a significant priority for Senate and updates from administration should be requested regularly
- It was still unclear who was responsible for facility safety and there were numerous issues throughout facilities on campus, especially for faculty in colleges that provide classroom space for other colleges
- There is still a lack of communication and lack of clarity regarding communication of safety and related
- A faculty and staff Ombud should be considered, especially once a new Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement is identified
- There were numerous concerns regarding general feelings of safety and security on campus (indoor and outdoor spaces), as well as basic maintenance issues related to water pressure, lack of potable water, and stairwell doors that are difficult to open
- What the process was for each college for reporting facilities issues
- Surveying the landscape for facilities issues and accountability could be charged to the Senate Academic Facilities Committee (SAFC), but interpersonal safety was a separate issue that could be charged to the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (SFAC)
- It may be beneficial to call a special session and invite the appropriate administrative offices that should be handling such issues
- It is difficult to balance city and community issues, such as homelessness, with safety concerns from employees and students who are worried about strangers in the building
- If the Senate has raised issues in the past that have not been addressed, SC can create ad hoc committees to look into them
- The administrative offices responsible for the areas of concern should be handling such issues
- For certain issues, the University Senate could participate with the Staff Senate and Student Government Association (SGA).

iii. Senate Culture and Increasing Senate Relevance

The Chair noted that much of this item was already previously discussed when SC members discussed University Senate Leadership and Culture.

iv. Oversight of Online Education

The Chair explained that currently, the oversight of online education fell under UK Online Director (and Dean) Jay Miller (SW). The Chair asked if more work needed to be done in the online area, or if Senate should focus on maintaining its authority and oversight.

Faculty Trustee Hollie Swanson (ME) suggested the SC to invite the UK Online Director to report regularly to Senate. Leslie Vincent (BE) supported the suggestion and there were no objections to doing so

The Chair commented that Senate regularly requested such reports from others in similar capacities. Bastin suggested that regular engagement with senior administrators was a good way to develop collaborations. SC members briefly discussed some of the benefits to receiving a report from the UK Online Director. Also, the responsibility for teacher course evaluations (TCEs) were now under the oversight of the UK Online Director, which provided even more reasoning for a report to be provided to Senate. Serious concerns were raised about students having been allowed to submit

TCEs during finals week when grades were known. Senate's clear intention has always been to close the TCE window prior to finals week. There were additional comments about ensuring administrators are aware of Senate's role and its authority. Grossman (AS) suggested that the person to hold accountable if college administrators do not follow Senate Rules is the college dean.

e. Concerns about the Faculty Trustee Election Process

The Chair explained that a year ago, there was a faculty trustee election with excellent turnout from one particular college, all in support of a candidate from within. While such engagement is usually applauded, the Chair explained that it was the "worst-kept secret" on campus that many believed there was a concerted effort among the college's leadership to advocate for that college's candidate. The Chair stated that the SREC makes it clear that the only advocating that can be done in department meetings, on listservs, or elsewhere is to promote overall participation, not to suggest support for one candidate or another. The Chair noted that at the prior year's retreat, concerns were raised, but no official action or recommendations were made. The Chair stated that since there would not be a trustee election next year, 2023-2024 was an opportune time to work on the issue if SC felt inclined to.

SC members discussed the following:

- The Student Government Association (SGA) has strong and specific election rules.
- Changing the nomination process to add a requirement that a certain percentage be from outside the candidate's college, to ensure a potential trustee has a view beyond their own college
- Increase the number of required signatures for trustee candidates
- The election prohibitions on use of University time and technology to advocate for a particular candidate are rife with loopholes
- Lecturers and instructors cannot vote in trustee elections
- The solution for challenging speech is usually more of it, and more involvement, not more rules
- Overseeing elections takes a tremendous amount of time, especially for one person

The Chair summarized that so far, she was hearing that the SREC should be charged with reevaluating campaigning rules, suggesting SR language to require more signatures on the nomination petition, and also require some percentage of signatures to be from other colleges.

SC members continued offering suggestions.

- Open forums for faculty trustee candidates would be beneficial
- Senate could provide each candidate time to speak to Senate during the final round of the faculty trustee election process
- SC should be mindful that if the Senate sponsors such a forum, if any of the candidates are members of Senate, they will have an automatic (unfair) advantage
- Education about the role of faculty trustees and scope of Board decision-making would be helpful
- The changes to the *Administrative Regulations (ARs)* that were being discussed about moving lecturers into a teaching-professor line to allow for voting in the faculty trustee election that *KRS* currently prohibited
- The issues in healthcare colleges for non-tenured faculty or non-teaching clinical faculty who may feel compelled to vote the way that their department chair or dean suggest

- The inability for lecturers to vote meant that the Honors College was entirely unable to vote

5. Faculty Evaluation of the President

a. Mode of Dissemination

The Chair explained that in one of her monthly meetings with President Capilouto, the President suggested that SC consider using the University's executive administrator evaluation tool. The Chair noted that even if SC opted to not use such a tool, another tool besides REDCap could be used. The Chair asked SC Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) to share her thoughts, given her role on the committee evaluating the president. Vincent commented that the committee had not discussed the use of any particular tool or software, but that one of the biggest issues the committee discussed was the number of faculty who communicated that they were unsure how to evaluate the President's performance because they did not interact with the President. Vincent noted that the data would be much more valuable if a self-assessment could be provided to faculty members when evaluating the President's performance, similar to self-assessments completed for faculty performance reviews.

Grossman (AS) noted that the Board of Trustees uses a self-evaluation written by the president, so the SC could use that, too. The SC's evaluation is currently done in April, but SC could change its timeline to match that of the Board (fall evaluation for prior year) and include that self-evaluation with the survey to all faculty. There was additional discussion about the purpose of the survey and how it is used.

b. Questions

The Chair stated that SC members have traditionally kept the same questions, although a few had been added. SC members agreed that keeping questions the same was important for maintaining a high value for trending data changes.

c. Analyses

The Chair asked if there was any feedback regarding analyses of the data collected for the faculty evaluation of the President. Vincent noted some changes had been made to reporting in the last year, to use qualitative data to help explain some of the quantitative data, but that further analysis will not be feasible unless they use subgroups.

The Chair stated that other than looking into changing the timing of the survey (as suggested by Grossman), SC did not see the need to make any changes to the survey's software or questions. Members concurred with her evaluation.

6. Artificial Intelligence

a. Joint Ad Hoc Committee with Administrative Leadership

b. Representation/Membership

c. Charge

d. Timing/Phases

e. Topics

The Chair explained that she was asked about the possibility of the SC partnering with senior administrators for an ad hoc committee on artificial intelligence, noting that there are several other areas on campus with interests in these areas. SC members provided the following feedback:

- The timing associated with a joint committee versus a Senate-managed committee
- If the Center for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching still utilizes existing faculty learning groups and if that group could be leveraged

- The Senate ad hoc committee should be the committee making the recommendation for academic integrity and should steer the academic discussions
- Before classes resume in the fall, both the academic policy for artificial intelligence and pedagogical best practices are needed
- The Senate ad hoc committee should work with the existing faculty learning group to collect any information or data to avoid duplicate work
- There are a lot of ways to use artificial intelligence and care should be taken to be explicit about what is and is not permitted, and in what contexts
- Whether specific artificial intelligence tools should be prohibited needed to be addressed first
- The charge for a Senate ad hoc committee could be “identify best pedagogical practices for student learning with respect to artificial intelligence
- Ask faculty learning committees in CELT to suggest policies, etc.
- There should be a clear definition of “artificial intelligence” so there is no question about what students are and are not permitted to use/do
- The SC’s ad hoc committee should steer all academic instructions and members of the faculty learning committee should be invited to participate as members.
- The grey area between explicitly forbidding and explicitly permitting has to be addressed.
- This ad hoc committee may end up being a standing committee

The Chair stated that she would use the feedback provided by SC members to compile a charge and identify potential members for the ad hoc committee and would transmit the information over the SC listserv.

7. Items from the Floor

The Chair welcomed items from the floor.

Kaveh Tagavi (EN) stated that over the last few days, SC members had received calendar invitations for holds for interviews for the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement candidates. Tagavi commented that he did not see the value in prohibiting SC members from knowing the details of the candidates until 24 hours prior to the interview, especially for internal candidates. SC members discussed the following:

- SC should suggest that it be given much more than 20 minutes’ advance notice about a candidate’s name, etc.
- Forty-eight hours prior would be an acceptable compromise and may improve attendance
- Because SC members are asking for more information, they will also have to honor requests that information be kept silent if shared with them
- Consideration should be given that some faculty members with a 9-month contract are off contract while some of these interviews are being conducted
- There are holds on members’ calendars to meet with a candidate tomorrow morning, but members have not received any specific information
- SC members appreciate the adjustments that Provost DiPaola has made to the interviewing process
- The surveys after candidate interviews were closing too soon; they should all remain open until 48 hours after the last candidate
- SC should be given updates about search progressions, even if a search has failed

SC Vice Chair Leslie Vincent (BE) asked the Chair to reach out to the Registrar about such very early emails about the early grading window, noting that many emails were sent before classes had even ended. Vincent noted that additional emails for faculty who had not yet posted final grades were acceptable, but that there were currently too many reminders, too early.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:26 PM with **no objections**.

Respectfully submitted by,
DeShana Collett

Prepared by Katie Silver on Thursday, May 18, 2023

SC Members Present: Bastin, Blasing, Collett, Cramer, Davis, Duncan, Grossman, Michael, Salt, Swanson, Tagavi, Takenaka, Vincent, White

Invited Guests Present: Sheila Brothers, Katie Silver