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MS. COLLETT: Welcome, everybody. It is 3:00 o'clock, so we're going to call this meeting to order. If you're in person please make sure that you go to the back of the room and sign in. All those who are all on Zoom we will catch your attendance via Zoom. I've already said this, but at this moment I would like for you to at least make sure that you are starting to log into your Poll Everywhere. We do have a number of items that we will be voting on today. Common housekeeping items, that $I$ go over at every Senate Meeting just in case we've forgotten, it's just a reminder. You should have received an email already last week from Sheila with your Poll Everywhere instructions, instructions about how to get to the Zoom and your agenda items for today. As always we're going to do a test
vote to make sure everybody's
Zoom Everywhere is -- or not Zoom Everywhere, but their Poll

Everywhere is working
efficiently. Remember there are
three ways that you can vote.
You can use the App, you can vote via the website or the text
feature, which is USenate789, the number is 223333 to join the session. If you're voting via text it's a little different as far as the approve, oppose and abstention. You're going to text

1 for approve, 2 for oppose, 3 for abstention, because you won't see those numbers on the text message, you'll only see that in the App or if you're using the web browser. All right. So, we have our poll open. This is a test vote. Select 1 if you pretend to vote in favor, 2 pretend to be opposed and 3 if you pretend to abstain. I still
see a lot of people connecting, so I know it's taking people a moment to log in. I'm going to give it like one more minute, because I at least have 45 on Zoom and I have -- or 46 or 7 and I have about the same amount voting, but I'm sure some of those are folks who are in person here, at least I counted 30 some odd in person. A couple more. We've got people coming on, so we'll go ahead and move forward. Alrighty. We've got at least 56 and I see people still joining, so we're going to move forward and give you some time to kind of get your Poll Everywhere up and running before we get to the actual votes that we need. Just a reminder the meeting is subject to Open Meetings Laws, it's recorded for note taking purposes. We actually have a Court Reporter that will do the
transcript. Just remember this is a hybrid meeting, and so, it's in person and on Zoom, because we want this to be an inclusive experience, as we've said all year and last year as well. There's no voting by proxy, so you need to be here, be present in order to vote. Remember to state your name and affiliation, so what college you're with and try to be very clear when you say this it helps the -- with the transcription and it also helps with folks who are in the room or on Zoom to know who you are and recognize you. So, please make sure you do that and make sure that you speak loudly enough and clearly enough for folks to hear you. Practicalities around priority of the Chair's discretion of who gets the floor or can request the floor. Anyone can request the floor, but

Senators get first priority. Senators who have not spoken yet about an issue will follow, so if you've already spoken and you have your hand up, but someone else has not, we're going to -I'm going to call on the person who has not. We want to make sure that all of the Senators have a chance to speak and a voice to be heard. Those who can offer information will be next up, so any proposers or any valuable individuals who are a resource for the Senate who can help offer any additional information and then non-members if time or circumstances permit that to happen. Civility. Remember debate is about expressing an opinion. As always please participate, make sure you are also reporting back to those faculty constituents who elected you to be here, we want them to
know what's going on, we want them to provide you with feedback and input, address any concerns with you and so that you can bring that back to the Senate and be their voice. So, we want to make sure that you are keeping them informed, as always we provide Distribution Lists if you should need them. We do have several colleges that are utilizing those, so we thank those Senators for doing such. Technicality. I've said this already a little bit, attendance is captured via Zoom and also at the sign-in sheet at the back of the room. The chat function should be disabled. I do see two things up there, so please do not use the chat function, it distracts from the official proceedings and instead if you have something to say everybody wants to hear it. So, we ask
that you raise your hand and ask for the floor. Again, if you're attending by Zoom please keep your camera on as much as possible, because of Open Meeting Laws we are conducting business and therefore you need your cameras on. I know this sometimes can be difficult for folks, because of internet instability, but if you are speaking and we are voting we need to have your face recorded. Let me see here -- okay. If you are in the Zoom room make sure you have your quality headset on, microphone, again, you're just going to be speaking loud and clearly and sometimes this is difficult, so I may have to stop you and just ask you to speak louder. If you're disconnected and you cannot get reconnected, please email Sheila Brothers or Dori Grady as well, just to let
us know that -- so that we have a record that you were disconnected. If you are not speaking, please, please, please mute yourself, if you forget we will on this end mute you if we see that. If you're in person remember that the red light that comes on means your mic is muted. If there is no light you are open and you've got a hot mic and you're ready to talk. So, just make sure that we remember that. And in this room the cameras will focus on you as your mic is turned on, so that folks on the Zoom can see who is talking and who they are engaging with. I've already spoke to this, for permission to speak you see that from the Chair. Reasons why would do that, point of order and point of information, some things not clear that's being discussed, make or second a motion, we'll
have several today that -- or we'll at least have one, I know that's a seconded motion, question of fact and/or debate as well as to call a question and we will use our Roberts Rules Newly Revised Order and Parliamentary Procedures to follow this sort of flow. So, next to our Senate Agenda. Because we had several things that were added to the agenda after you all received it, so the Senate Rules require all recommendations for Senate action to be available at least six days prior to the regular Senate Meetings not all items were available, there was the Senate retroactive withdrawals. Appeals Committee had a report, the Ombuds report and the President speaking today, as the Chair of the Senate, was not on the original agenda, and so -- or what was sent to you initially,
so actually have to waive this rule. So, I need a motion and a second to waive this aspect of the rule today to allow consideration of today's agenda items. Okay. Quickly, I have Leslie and Molly. So, we have a proposed motion to waive the requirement in $S R$ 1.2.3.3 for all items to be available six days in advance for the December $11^{\text {th }}$ Senate Meeting, which is today. This has to actually be voted on, so your Poll Everywhere is open and ready for votes. A couple more seconds. Okay. We have 72 approve and 1 abstention, so that passes and we will consider all the agenda items today. Next, our first thing up on our agenda today is President Eli Capilouto, University Senate Chair, he will be addressing the Senate today. Thank you, Chair Collett and thank all of you. I know you
have a busy agenda, but I wanted to come by today to first express my appreciation for lots of reasons, which I hope you'll notice and to mention some other matters that are certainly relevant on college campuses today. So, this Friday more than 1300 students will participate in the graduation ceremonies at Rupp Arena, some 2,000 have earned their degrees this semester and it's certainly a testament of their hard work, but I think it's a testament to you as well. A college education, we all know is life changing. One of the more powerful moments at graduation ceremonies, I've been doing now for 13 years, is when I ask, "If you are the first in your family to receive a degree please stand." So, you recognize then it's transformational for an entire family, for generations to
come. So, we offer those students the competencies we talk about in terms of their job skills, but we also provide them the context in this diverse and intellectually challenging environment to develop that moral and ethical compass, that's to me the soul of a meaning and purpose that I hope our students are going to know and be able to find after they leave here. So, against that backdrop, I'm going to ask you a big favor. If you're not already, I hope you'll attend one of those ceremonies at 10:00 o'clock or 3:00 o'clock. So, I'll give you something that may entice you, I'm not speaking; okay. I usually give a little short, you know, commencement remark, but I've asked a student to deliver the commencement address, it's Deidra White. Anybody know Deidra? Okay.

Deidra is now 45 years old, she's far from a traditional student, a single, black mother who at times in her life was homeless. She struggled to make ends meet. Her mother was a long time patient at the Markey Cancer Center before she succumbed to that insidious disease. At age 37 she returned to school, first at a community college and then at UK and this May she's going to earn her Master's of Fine Arts. In October we had asked her to give voice to her journey through her art and, wow, has she perfect it, it is a spoken-word poem that enthraled hundreds who heard it when we gathered in celebration of our success in the Kentucky Can $\$ 2.1$ billion capital campaign. The story is enormously powerful, it's beautiful, it's painful, it's heart rending and uplifting. As
a masterful conductor she puts together a symphony of words that paints for us the rich colors and hues, complexities and challenges, trials and triumphs of a promising life that this community helped make possible. The poem also reflects her incredible gratitude to this place and to those individuals, those faculty in particular Frank X. Walker, Crystal Wilkinson and DeMaris Hill who served as her teachers and mentors. Her remarkable journey is a tribute to her innate talent and certainly some undeniable gifts, but while we didn't necessarily plant those seeds, I think together this community helped her blossom. So, I encourage you, treat yourself, I promise you you'll go into the vocation gratified by what we do together. It'll be a delight. So, last
week I spent a few days in Washington, D.C. I met with almost all members of our congressional delegation as well as other elected and appointed officials. We have some of our faculty who are doing sabbaticals
there and I got to learn about their work. And we have students who participate in our Wildcats in Washington Internship Program, we've been doing that long enough that when you go into the congressional offices you see that our students are significant aids in those offices. So, that was all good to see. We had many faculty there learning about the agendas of those federal agencies that support our work. And so, what always amazes me is when I go into those congressional
offices for individual meetings is how much they know about what we're doing and the questions and
concerns they have, you know,
"How has restoration of that experiment farm in West Kentucky, Princeton. When are you going to be back on your feet so you can fully provide the research that helps our farmers make a living? Or, "Wow, this is the sixth year in a row --," I think I'm right, "-- that you've been the Number 1 Hospital in Kentucky," and, "Gee, so and so from my county went there for care that you couldn't get anywhere else," and, "Wow, we're now one of 60 some odd comprehensive cancer centers recognized by the National Cancer Institute." And they also know the difference we're making in terms of the transformational education that we can uniquely provide. When I arrived in Congressman Hal Rogers' office he started rattling off facts and figures, some of which I'd heard
before, he said, "Wow, 70 percent graduation rate, puts you in the top 20 percent of universities like yours. Record enrollment of 34,000 students. Record freshman class of 6500. 17 percent of your students are of color, nearly a quarter are either first generation or low income. The record number of graduates.

Record expenditures of research dollars," on those matters that, you know, negatively impact Kentucky usually and he knows about those because as the longest serving congressman in Kentucky's history he's certainly been an advocate for those agencies that support our funded research and he knew about the service in every corner of our state. He looked at me and said, "Well, how did you do that?" and I quickly corrected him, I told him, "We did that. It is the
power of we. No single unit, department, individual can make these remarkable things happen." I did remind him of his admonition to me 13 years ago when we first met. I hadn't been here but a few months, he leaned over and looked at me straight in the eye and said, "Just remember this, it is not the University of Lexington." So, I was able to tell him, "I'm proud to say because of our collective efforts we are the University of, for and with Kentucky." I also reminded him of what I asked him 13 years ago, because when you visit him in his offices in Eastern Kentucky and you see everything that he has underway, I said, "How do you do all this?" and he simply said, "Plan the work and work the plan," and asked me what were our next plans. I told him that our Board had convened in

October and as have they done since I arrived here they assessed where we are and gave us directions in which they think we should move to improve. I told him about the five workgroups we have focused around more educated Kentucians, more readiness, the willingness to look at general education, more parternships, the way we serve Kentucky and the things we have to do we cannot do alone, more recruitment and retention of our employees with a modern $21^{\text {st }}$ century benefit plan and then more responsiveness to look at the rules and regulations both internally and extenrally of how we operate so that we can be nimble and that group, that workgroup, is already taking a look at what was unanimously passed by the House and Senate known as Senate Joint Resolutoin 98, it was reported out on an
evening, the Counsel on PostSecondary Education approved it the next day, it's several hundred pages and that group will be looking at that because it looks at governance rules and regulations under which we'll operate. We reported to our Board last week the cofacilitators of those workgroups, including Dr. Collett reported and we will keep you informed as we move forward. I will reinstitute as we sort of did in Covid the meetings I have with the executive groups of the Senate, Staff Senate and our SGA to talk about certainly what the Board has asked us to do, but what is brewing in our legislature in Frankfort. So, I don't have to tell this group I certainly was walking the halls of Congress while presidents were testifying and, you know, that
the headlines and debates around the globe and even close to home and around the world focus on the work we do and much of it is in the context of contention and strife. The war in the Middle East has embroiled so many campuses in conflict and protests. Many on our campus with connections to the region or deep passions about what is happening are certainly impacted and we've reached out to provide support and continue to do so. And we have worked, as we always do, to create space whether in classrooms or a student center, on sidewalks or in the broader community so those who want to can make their voices heard. In hallways and hearing rooms, both in Washington and particularly recently in Frankfort there are calls in many quarters that universities like ours should
speak out as an institution on the violent war raging continents away. At the same time there are other cultural and political wars being waged on campuses like ours and in those same corridors of power over what's seen as a rigidly progressive orthodoxy becoming pervasive on college campuses. Some are questioning whether universities are enforcing one set of ideas ensuring free speech for some, but not for others. Aframing every argument not as a discussion of divergent points of view, but in fights between oppressed and oppressor or the privileged and the disenfranchised. The result these critics argue are institutions that selectively protect speech of their scholars, unevenly determine disciplinary actions and purposely chill
speech and the opportunity for a contrarian view. So,
legislatures in this state for example, recently decried a revision of a position statement by SACS, our accrediting body. I think Trustee Swanson asked me at lunch, "Gee, have you heard anything about SACS and the legislature?" I said, "No, I haven't heard anything," and before I sat down for the last meeting I got an email from both the House and Senate and a handful of legislatures in Frankfort who were monitoring a SACS discussion on a position statement on DEI. Think about that. People are watching. So, here's an example of the statements that were made,
"Kentucky's public colleges and universities should strive to hold all students attending our institutions of higher education
with intrinsic value in who they are without discrimination. Each public institution should be held accountable to provide equal opportunity in accordance with Kentucky's constitutional obligation to educate without regard to the immutable characteristics or qualities that naturally bring about diversity on our campuses." They went on to say, "Unfortunately, DEI is a misnomer that does not contribute to the equal opportunities and inclusive environments our postsecondary institutions need to create to have a $21^{\text {st }}$ century workforce. The DEI movement across our colleges and campuses is often not the force that ensures an inclusive environment or holds accountable those who discriminate in higher ed, but often fosters the exact opposite of what it's acronym stands for.

Students and faculty often find DEI initiatives to be thinly veiled ideological standards that stifle or stigmatize opposing ideas. SACS COC should instead remain focused on the intellectual rigor and academic success of the universities it accredits." It is a reminder that we expect to see legislation, beginning next month, which will seek to constrain how diversity efforts are managed and even taught on our campuses. It may be one of the several proposals that question the autonomy of our campus and how we do our work to meet our mission to advance this State. I believe all these issues as divisive and as discordant as they may be, how fraught and contentious as they may be, are connected in profoundly important ways.

Despite calls to do so. I have not issued a statement or signed statements on behalf of the university about the war in the Middle East and I think it would be counterproductive and for this campus contrary to what we aim to be as a community, a community of scholars. I believe there is wisdom to be gleaned and learned from the experiences of others in this space. In the late 60s, I'm old enough to have experienced all of this, in the midst of the Vietnam protest on college campuses, I graduated in '71, the University of Chicago assembled a group of faculty to examine the university's role on social and political action, it's referred to as the Kalven Report. I'm going to cite some of the things of that time because I think they're relevant to how we find guidance today, it said, "The
university is the home of critics, it is not itself the critic. Our mission is discovery, improvement and dissemination of knowledge, it cannot take collective action on the issues of the day without endangering the conditions for its existence and effectiveness. A collective position inhibits full freedom of descent it cannot insist that all members favor a given social policy." So, within that framework I view my responsiblity and I hope we can do this together to make certain we create space that we need on this campus, space that gives you the freedom to teach about war and peace, about politics and conflict, about ideology and perspectives. Space to ensure our students can learn and that if all of you want to engage in debate about any issue or any
topic vigorously, but certainly safely. We all know and have heard throughout our academic careers that we should be a community of ideas, ideas that are advanced and debated, perspectives that are altered and vetted. That process is inherently messy, we all know that, it includes disagreement, but it can never tolerate the incitement of violence or acts of discrimination and harassment. We lose our capacity to create that space and ensure that safety when we offer an institutional endorsement of one position over another one. So, similarly we have an obligation to listen even as we seek to inform and inspire. I believe we are best positioned to advance this State when we are as inclusive as possible in terms of people and perspectives and ideas. We have to accommodate
all of that in this community and such inclusion and especially a sense of belonging will help us ensure that healthier, wealthier and wiser Kentucky tomorrow that we pledge to work on. I have great confidence in you, $I$ believe in you to advance this State, but I'm convinced we also have to pause and listen with open hearts and minds to those individuals who have concerns about what we do and how we do it, it's only fair. So, with that I want to close with a deep thank you. The best times of the year for me, personally, are when we welcome students and then at our graduation ceremonies, I know that that couldn't happen without your deep commitment and dedication to this place. So, thank you very much and I'm happy to take some questions, Chair Collett, if time permits.

MS. COLLETT: Questions? It doesn't look like anybody has any questions. If I don't see your hand raised then I'm going to assume you don't have any.

Have a healthy, happy holiday, okay. Be safe.

All right. Thank you. Next up we have announcements. You should receive here soon an announcement for a 10-day web transmittal for posted calendars, and so, those would be for calendars of the academic year, I believe 2024-'25, '26-'27. Also, calendars for the professional programs, this was approved and recommended by the Senate Council to be approved, so those as always go on the 10-day web transmittal, so just be aware that those are going to be coming through email, so if you have any issues please let us know as the instructions say on those -- on
those emails. Consent Agenda, I believe the only thing that I have on the Consent Agenda today are the minutes from the prior meeting, the November 13, 2023 meeting. Just remember that items on the Consent Agenda are considered adopted unless a member asks to remove an item for discussion later in the meeting, you can ask for it to be removed before or even during the meeting. So, what we currently have are minutes from November $13^{\text {th }}$, some clerical edits were received. I have not received any other requests or requests to remove an item at all, so if I don't hear any now -- hearing no objections the Consent Agenda for December $11^{\text {th }}$ is adopted. Officer reports. First up, myself. So, first we had new officer elections that were held on December the $4^{\text {th }}$ at the Senate

Council Meeting. I'm happy to say you have a new Chair Elect and a Vice Chair Elect that will start on June $1^{\text {st }}$ of next year. Doug Michael has been elected chair -- Chair Elect of the Senate and Elizabeth Salt is Vice Chair of the Senate Council. I'd also like to just thank Aaron Kramer who has been a Senator, has been a Senate Council Member, Senate Council Chair, past Chair and also an Elected Faculty Trustee, we'd like to thank him for all he has done in his service. As you all know, you received an email telling you that he is taking a Chair position in his department, so we wish him the best of luck. I don't think that we will see the last of Aaron or hear -- you know, not hear from Aaron anymore. I told him today that we're just trading one Kramer for
the next Kramer, so we have a new Senator, Jennifer Kramer and she will be joining us on Senate Council as she was elected as a new incoming Senate Council

Member. We have three members who will be coming off of Senate Council, they are Marilyn Duncan and Bob Grossman and Sandra Bastin, she will serve out her Vice Chair role but she is one of the three that will come off. So, we want to thank them so much for their service as well and everything that they have done. I don't think that they will go away at all either, we hope to continue to hear from them as they are valuable members of this university. And so, coming on we have Jennifer Kramer, Justin Nichols and Leslie Vincent, we see Leslie back, we couldn't get rid of her so we must be doing something right. So, this will
-- they will start in the January session, the new Senate Council members and as I said the Chair Elect and the Vice Chair Elect will start in June leading up to that time the Chair Elect will actually start to meet with the current Senate Council Chair and attend various meetings as we move along to get them started, to get him started. Other things that we had at the last Senate Council Meeting and at the last Senate Meeting we had some fruitful discussion regarding the prerequisite proposal, I'm sure everybody remembers. And so, at the last -- or at the November $20^{\text {th }}$ Senate Council Meeting we actually discussed some language, some thoughts around -- brought in, a lot of discussion that came out of the Senate Meeting, things that potentially need to be changed and worked around,
providing some clarity and, I think, better knowledge -foundational knowledge around some of the issues that we saw with the proposal. So, during that time Senate Council has directed me to work on drafting up something that pretty much encompasses the consensus of this body and present it back to Senate Council and then presenting it to Senate. Other updates we received from Senior Associate Provost of Academic Affairs Katie Cardarelli on the organizational structure changes that will occur within the Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. Senate Council also has been engaging in some meaningful conversations related to trust, mutual respect and transparency and some issues that we have seen kind of that have been countered
to that, but more specifically
around the principles of shared
governance and how we can work
towards enchancing shared
governance more. So, the
Council's goal is to continue to
work with administration and
others towards developing
solutions from a collaborative
posture. As we move forward
particularly cultivating a more
inclusive and safe environment
for all. Some of the really
important work as you have
already heard are priorities
around the campus-wide
initiatives, some things around
the AI policy, revisions of the
ARs and GRs and just educational
programming content. So, those
are things that have recently
come across from Senate Council.
The next thing we have is officer
reports from Sandra Bastin who is
Vice Chair. Sandra, do you have
any reports?

MS. BASTIN: I do not have anything today.

Thank you.

Thank you. Next, is

Parliamentarian Greg Rentfrow, do you have any reports?

MR. RENTFROW: No report.
MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Officer reports.
Next up we have Faculty Trustee Hollie Swanson and Aaron Kramer. Good afternoon. Trustee Kramer is out of town today and $I$ think he might be joining us on Zoom. The December $4^{\text {th }}$ and $5^{\text {th }}$ meetings of the Board of Trustees began with the Audit and Compliance Committee here we received a quarterly report from Chief Accountability Officer and Audit Executive Joe Reed. He outlined the currently active and completed reviews of various academic and administrative units. Other reports included an audit of the University's 2023

Financial Statement, compliance of the intercollegiate athletics program with NCAA requirements, as well as an audit of the procedures performed by KMSF, that's the Kentucky Medical Services Foundation. The Investment Committee Meeting included an educational session on private equity and a review of UK's Investment Portfolio. A gain of 3.3 percent for this year to date was reported with gains in public equities, public real assets and diversifying strategies. The EVPFA and CoEVPHA Eric Monday provided updates in Workgroups 3 and 4. Workgroup 3, more partnerships, is headed by VPs Rod Edwards and Nancy Cox, it is tasked with expanding our impact through partnerships, acquisitions and new initiatives with schools, governments, non-profits,
industry and corporations.
Justin Nichols is the faculty representative on this group. Workgroup 4, more employment recruitment and retention, headed by VPs Katrice Albert and Melissa Frederick, it's tasked with maximizing recruitment and retention of the best and most inclusive (Inaudible) based while being responsive to employee needs. Karen Skaff is the faculty representative on this group. The Finance Committee approved the acceptance of a number of gifts, accepted a revision of the 2023/'24 budget to reflect an increase in revenue of nearly $\$ 86$ million, approved a 3.75 increase in rates for undergraduate student housing and university flats and a 3 percent increase in dining plans for the 2024/'25 academic year. The committee also approved
acquisitions of properties located on Press Avenue and authorized new residence housing, that's 644 new beds, to be located at the former site of the Kirwin-Blanding Complex. The research report presented by VP Cassis included updates in efforts to enhance industry partnerships and improve grants administration via Project Gateway. The University Healthcare Committee received a report on the Graduate Medical Education Program and an update on plans to update outpatient services in the October year-todate financial report which includes a net income of $\$ 140$ million. The Executive Committee reported on the Board's evaluation of President Capilouto the overall evaluation was very positive with many strengths outlined including record
enrollment and improved infrastructure. Opportunities for improvement included making progress to advance belonging and inclusion, strengthening faculty relationships and perceptions relating to shared governance as well as potential impacts on healthcare leadership. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee approved a candidate for Degree List and heard the report from Workgroup 1. This group lead by VP Turner, and Dean (Inaudible) with faculty representation by Kristine Urschel is tasked with educating more Kentuckians. Workgroup 2 is lead by Provost DiPaola and Senate Council Chair Collett with faculty representation by Olivia Davis, Molly Blasing and Keiko Tanaka, it is tasked with assessing and approving the UK Core. Finally, Workgroup 5 lead
by VP Cassis and Treasurer Penny Cox with faculty representation by Roger Brown is tasked with more responsiveness this includes a review of Senate Joint Resolution 98 and recommendations and a review of our governing and administration (Inaudible). Completion of the work of these committees is planned for June. Actions taken by the entire Board on Tuesday included name of the Health Education Building to the Michael D. Rankin Health Education Building as well as a resolution commending Trustee Kramer for his leadership and his service. Questions? Thank you.

MS. COLLETT:
Next up we have some old business. The Senate Ad-hoc Committee on Generative AI, Leslie Vincent and Molly Blasing are co-chairs they'll give us an interim report and also a discussion charge on the Ad-hoc
committee related to Attendance Policies.

Good afternoon. In our report today we will summarize key findings from an August survey of faculty related to AI and Academic Policies that our committee conducted and we'll report on our committee's proposed next steps for the coming semester. We conducted a survey of the faculty in August ahead of the start of classes in which we asked questions related to how Generative AI was affecting teaching, course design, faculty concerns and support needs as well as what policies respondents wish to see from the University Senate related to Generative AI. The summary of the results is in today's meeting agenda, so I'll just offer a brief overview and reserve time at the end for
questions. The response rate for the survey was quite low, we had just 28 respondents, but the responses captured well the range of sentiments that are colleagues in CELT have seen from faculty throughout the last year. Faculty are eager for guidance, best practices, workshops and models of productive AI use in teaching and learning and this is something that CELT has been doing throughout the year to good affect. Instructors are updating courses and assignments to account for Generative AI tools and in some cases to integrate them into aspects of the course assignments. However, a little more than half of the respondents expressed serious concern about unauthorized use of AI by students to complete assignments in their classes. The faculty respondents overwhelming reported
that the effort that is required on the part of faculty to monitor student use of Gen AI is moderate to high. A small number of respondents felt strongly that UK should ban the use of AI altogether because of the threat it poses to academic integrity and effective teaching and learning at the university. However, an equal number of respondents are what $I$ would call AI enthusiasts and requested institution wide licenses to Gen AI tools and access to LLMs that can be trained with custom data in their field, still others have requested a reliable AI detector which to this point we can report is still not available. Some respondents were eager to see the university create mechanisms that make it possible for instructors to forbid the use of AI in their courses and that a clear system
of reporting violations be developed. A request was made to account for AI in the Senate Rules that define cheating and plagiarism. We saw a concern as well about the use of Gen AI in graduate exams and dissertations. To conclude this summary I'd like to emphasize that there is an overarching sentiment across the survey that instructors must be allowed the flexibility to create policies that work for their individual courses and disciplinary needs. Many faculty are eager to integrate AI into their teaching in ways that preserve the integrity of the learning objectives while also teaching students to use these tools well for their professional research and workforce needs. Leslie now will tell you a little bit about our committee's plans for the coming semester.

MS. VINCENT: Thanks, Molly. So, given the feedback that we had from faculty our committee brainstormed on actions that we felt would be appropriate given the charge of the committee and the role that the Senate plays as a policy making body around these things. So, from that the three initiatives that we're going to work towards over the next
semester is first to formulate a
proposal for a revision of the
current SRs, primarily those
focused on plagiarism and
cheating, to update to reflect
sort of the changing nature that
Generative AI had brought into
the academic setting. The second
activity that we will work
through is the revision of the
suggested syllabi language that
was put out by this committee at
the beginning of the fall
semester. We received some
excellent feedback in this
faculty survey regarding the suggested language where AI is permitted, and so, we will be working through revisions to this syllabi language to send out to faculty as we're updating and thinking through these policies at a course level. The third focus that we will have is to develop a proposal to submit to Senate Council to amend the current syllabi requirements that are outlined in the regulations to include a statement regarding AI as a syllabus requirement moving forward. One thing that we discussed in great detail in the committee is that because of this flexibility that is desired regarding the use of AI students have to know what those expectations are for every course, and so, we felt that one way to provide that is to include
this as a component of the syllabus or a requirement that must be there. Additionally, we will be working in this next semester in collaboration with the advanced team to collect some additional feedback and data from faculty through focus groups, so there are multiple points where we feel that having this updated feedback now that we've been through a semester since, you know, everyone -- since we solicited feedback and people have been teaching in this environment. It would be very valuable to again check in again, conduct focus groups and try to capture the perspectives of both groups that Molly mentioned, the enthusiasts and then those that want it prohibited. And so, we'll be working with Trey and the advanced team as well to conduct those moving forward.

MS. COLLETT: Any questions? Okay. Thank you so much for your report. Next, we have discussion of the charge to the AD-Hoc Committee on attendance policies. As you all remember this has been something that was started here in the Senate and has been ongoing at least at Senate Council for the past three meetings. We've had some discussion around the Ad-hoc Committee on attendance policies. The Senate Council has come up with a charge that we feel is reflective of the sentiments we got here within the committee or within the Senate and feedback that we've received from faculty leading up to us formulating this charge. We also believe that it prioritizes the expectations of what we would like to see in the report as we move forward in a reasonable timeframe, so this hopefully committee will get
started in the new year and kind of get going with a lot of these issues that we have highlighted in the charge. So, as you see the charge on your agenda you'll see at least three things we have outlined providing a synopsis, a timeline, a history of the current Senate Rules on attendance, mechanics of attendance policy such as excused, unexcused absences, reasonable accommodation and the current 20 percent threshold for absences and three, a discussion on why attendance matters in the $21^{\text {st }}$ century university as it relates to student's mastery of course learning outcomes. And so, we've added some, you know, additional things in this charge considering academic integrity, learning outcomes, you know, Title IV and other federal regulations and we've asked in
this charge, "An interim report
must address attendance and
engagement as it relates to
student populations that differ
from a traditional residential
population, such as students who
are members of uniformed
services, athletic organizations
or student organizations as well
as changes brought about through
synchronous and asynchronous
distance learning." So, as you
all see the charge we'd just like
to get some feedback. Any
additional items or thoughts that
you may have or would like to see
in the report that comes out from
this committee and then the next
item that we'll talk about right
after that is just committee
composition. Who do you feel
really has to be a vital member
of this committee that, you know,
will provide that extra
information that we need or that
vital information that we need to progress the committee on? So, any thoughts around the charge? Additional items you'd like to see in the report or at least like to see the committee discuss? Okay. Well, that was easy. Membership, this is kind of like off the fly, so I'll give you some time to think about this, we actually have a link on the Senate website, so if you go to the Committees and Council page, scroll all the way down to the bottom and you will see it's Ad-hoc Committees content title and there's like three or four committees there, this committee is listed. You can click on that link and you can actually provide us with your nominee, who you really feel like should be on the committee and you can self nominate. We want folks to be ready to do the work and want
that work to be meaningful. We really are looking for faculty members who are actively engaging in teaching courses because this relates to what they have to deal with on a daily basis. So, we do want, you know, folks to be able to participate meaningfully during that. So, that link is open. We would like to have all your nominations submitted by January the $3^{\text {rd }}$, so you have now and until after we come back from the holiday break to submit some of those names and then Senate Council will meet and review those names and add additional people as we need to make sure we have a well put together composition of a committee. All right. Next, on our agenda we have request to waive Senate Rule 1.3.2.1.1.4 which is General Policies for Academic Council Terms. So, in your agenda you
should actually have a little bit of a detailed email that comes as a request from Bob Grossman who is asking to waive Senate Rule 1.3.2.1.1.4 terms for the College of Arts and Sciences for their Graduate Council Elections to permit them to elect two representatives to a two-year staggering term starting in the Spring of 2024 and the purpose is for that staggering term, so there is some continuity within the council and because it's setup a little different we have to ask for a waiver. And so, this motion actually came from -after this was approved by Senate Council came out of Council with no problems at all, everyone approved it at the Council. So, the motion comes from Bob Grossman. Can I get a second to put this motion on the floor? Elizabeth Salt. So, the motion
is now on the floor and the floor
is open up to members of questions of fact and/or debate.

Remember it's asking the Senate to waive Senate Rule 1.3.2.1.1.4
for the College of Arts and
Science for their Graduate
Council Election to permit them to elect two representatives to two-year terms in Spring 2024 for the purpose of staggering the terms. That was a mouth full. Questions of fact and/or debate? Seeing none, the Poll Everywhere is now open. As a reminder, as I just said, the Senate is voting to approve a waiver for Senate Rule 1.3.2.1.1.4 for College of Arts and Sciences for their Graduate Council Election to permit them to elect two representatives to a two-year term in Spring of 2024 for the purposes of staggering the terms. A couple more seconds. Okay. We
have 74 approve, 1 abstain and no oppose. So, that motion carries. Next, we have committee reports, the Senate Academic Programs Committee, Sandra Bastin is Chair. We'll have Senate Admissions Academic Standards Committee, SAASC Leslie Vincent is Chair and also Senate Retroactive Withdrawals Appeals Committee, SRWAC Amy Spriggs is the Chair. So, first on our list is our Senate Academics Program Committee, SAPC, Sandra Bastin. We have a proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Design Build. We have Jill Lechner and Bruce Swetnum from design who are the proposers. Sandra?

MS. BASTIN: Thank you, DeShana. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Undergraduate Certificate Design

Build in the School of
Architecture in the College of Design. Design and construction of buildings are a team effort combining architecture, engineering, construction marketing and other specialities. The School of Architecture has a long history of incorporating hands-on learning opportunities for students. This 15-hour certificate intends to strengthen existing faculty efforts and broaden student knowledge through transdisciplinary partnerships with allied units on campus, including civil engineering and business and economics. Courses will provide students with unique experiential learning opportunity that strengthens their value as they enter the profession. All appropriate courses and endorsements have been documented and approved and a decision to
approve by SAPC members was unanimous.

MS. COLLETT:
All right. So, there's a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the new Undergraduate Certificate in Design Build, 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.

MS. GRADY:
Martha Grady, College of engineering. So, to clarify, any of these engineering courses they are going to require engineering standing in order to take any of the civil engineering courses, including the lowest number 303, so any student in design has to have engineering standing, it's just -- it's going to affect the numbers.

MS. COLLETT: Do you want to -- is that question or are you just stating
a fact?

MS. GRADY: That is a statement of fact.

MS. COLLETT: Okay. Next?

MR. ARTHUR: Steven Arthur, Arts and Sciences. For the Graduate Certificate I was noticing something, this is just like probably a small thing, but looking at the required courses versus sort of assessing the learning objectives there seems to be a course that's in the major courses, BNE650, that doesn't seem to be on the --

MS. COLLETT:

MR. ARTHUR:

MS. COLLETT:
Okay. Well, that's not up just yet.

MR. ARTHUR: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. COLLETT: No, problem. No, problem.
MR. ARTHUR: Okay.

MS. COLLETT: Other questions of fact and/or debate?

MS. GRADY
MS. COLLETT:
MS. GRADY:
MS. COLLETT:
MS. GRADY:
MS. COLLETT:
MS. GRADY:

MS. COLLETT:

MR. SWETNUM:

MS. GRADY:
Well, I'm -- I'm guessing for a student who is going to have engineering standing and do the certificate that they're going to want to dual major or they're in engineering as well. They
probably aren't pursuing
engineering standing just to take the certificate.

That's correct. So --
MS. GRADY:
MR. SWETNUM:
-- the idea is that both business and economics and civil
engineering primarily can come and take studio courses with architecture students in the Design Build sequence, so they can achieve a certificate.

Okay. Thank you. Bobby Scroggins?

MR. SCROGGINS: Bobby Scroggins, College of Fine Arts. A question about admissions into that program from -- for students from other colleges, would that be possible? Proposers?

MR. SWETNUM:
Right now it's really designed to accommodate School of Architecture, civil engineering and business majors to achieve the certificate. There's a
possibility that it can be expanded in the future, but right now it's -- it's centered on those three.

Any other questions of fact and/or debate? Okay. Seeing none. As a reminder Senate is voting to approve the proposed new Undergraduate Certificate in Design Build. Just a couple more. Okay. We're closing. Sixty-seven approve, 4 oppose and 3 abstain. That passes. Thank you. Next, we have a proposed new Graduate Certificate in Design Build, the same proposers are here. Sandra?

Thank you. This is a recommendation that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new Graduate Certificate Design Build in the School of Architecture in the College of Design. The Design Build Graduate Certificate

Program at the University of Kentucky offers students an experiential learning opportunity that emphasizes research through fabrication and construction. The collaborative educational framework prepares students to critically address the complexity of building design while working across disciplines. Centered on a studio learning environment students will work in transdisciplinary teams on applied learning opportunities which range from building science and digital fabrication to community engaged design and construction challenges across the Commonwealth. The collaborative educational
framework prepares students to critically address the complexity of building design while working across disciplines as the 15-hour certificate serves architectural
engineering and business graduate students who have an interest in advanced building science. All appropriate courses and endorsements have been documented and approved and the decision to approve by SAPC members was unanimous.

MS. COLLETT:
So, there's a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Design Build, 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.

MR. ARTHUR:
So --

MS. COLLETT:
What's your name and --
MR. ARTHUR:
Steven Arthur, Arts and Sciences, sorry.

MS. COLLETT:
Okay.
MR. ARTHUR: So, this is just a small thing again, there seems to be a
discrepancy for the major courses that was submitted and then where that is on the assessment plan on the learning objectives, I think it's just probably an oversight, but the -- your BNE650, the Entrepreneurship Bootcamp Course it's pretty clear from this like which learning objective that would actually correspond to, it's just not on the form. So, I just wanted to make sure that someone knew that before it turned into a thing basically.

MS. COLLETT:

MS. BASTIN:

MS. COLLETT:

MS. LECHNER:

Sandra, do you want to speak to that at all?

No.
Okay. Proposers?
Hi. Jill Lechner. I think that we did not include that because we thought that the course would be assessed through the School of Business or through the Business School, so we didn't include it because we thought we wouldn't be
able to assess that course. I'm not sure -- yeah, possibly it needs to be done a different way, but --

MR. ARTHUR
Yeah, I have no idea if that's true or not.
-- you know what I mean.
I'll be totally honest with you. Like I thought like we could only assess it if it's an architectural course.

MR. ARTHUR:

MS. COLLETT:

MS. VINCENT:
Leslie Vincent, Gatton College of Business and Economics. I think that can be updated working with OSPI to make sure the assessment plan accurately captures the learning objectives.

MS. COLLETT: Bobby Scroggins?

MR. SCROGGINS: Thank you. Bobby Scroggins, College of Fine Arts. I have a similar question to the one that I had earlier. I could see where
someone, for example, who might be a sculpture major and their interested in doing public sculpture might benefit from that kind of course. Is there a possibility again for that to happen, for graduate students majoring in such a field might be able to participate in such a course?

MR. SWETNUM:
MS. COLLETT:
MR. SWETNUM:
My sense is -- my sense is -Hold on. Who are you? Oh, I'm sorry. Bruce Swetnum, College of Design. My sense is that we could certainly expand this in the future and make it even more cross disciplinary. So, I think that's a possibility, that's not where we're set up right now, I don't believe.

MS. COLLETT:
Thank you. Any other questions of fact and/or debate? Seeing none, it's time for a vote. As a reminder, Senate is voting to recommend Senate approve the
proposed new Graduate Certificate in Design Build. A couple more seconds. Okay. We have 68 approve, 2 oppose and 4 abstentions. That passes. Thank you. Next, we have the Senate Admissions and Academic Standards Committee, SAASC. Leslie Vincent is Chair. This is a proposed change to the Graduate Certificate in Diversity and Inclusion. Christia Brown is the proposer. Leslie?

MS. VINCENT: Thank you. This a recommendation to approve the proposed changes in the Graduate Certificate in Diversity and Inclusion. This proposal seeks to change the online Graduate Certificate in Diversity and Inclusion by first lowering the required credit hours from 12-credit hours to nine and then secondly adding in two new options for students to take as guided electives in
addition to the required Core course that's already a part of the certificate. The proposed changes do not change the learning outcomes associate with the certificate and the rationale for the change is to provide additional flexibility to students so that they can complete the certificate in a timely manner. Currently the courses that are included as guided electives are offered by many other departments and colleges within the university and there's been some unpredictability to when these courses might be offered which has slowed down the time to completion for students that have enrolled in this certificate program. In some cases, students have opted to stop working towards the certrificate because of the unavailibility of the
courses that were already approved. So, by adding in these two additional courses as approved electives that will be offered in a predictable way this will ensure that students are able to register for the courses they need to complete the requirements of the certification in a timeley manner. And the faculty of record voted in support of the proposed changes. So, there's a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed changes to the Graduate Certificate in Diversity and Inclusion, because the motion comes from committee no second is required. The motion is now open up to members for questions of fact and/or debate.

MR. CAPILOUTO:
MS. COLLETT:
Why -- why --

MR. CAPILOUTO:
President Capilouto?
Why wouldn't the courses be
available (Inaudible)? Why haven't they been available? Is Christia on?

Christia, are you on? The President --

MS. BROWN:
MR. CAPILOUTO:

MS. COLLETT:

MS. BROWN:
So, Christia Brown, College of
Arts and Sciences. President
Capilouto, simply because of resources within the college in terms of faculty needs to meet the teaching requirements for the department, so the departmental instructional needs means they're having to teach those classes and are not able to do these online courses which have primarily been really attracting students who are not traditional students, but are working professionals, and
so, they've been wanting to this
and our existing faculty are
really teaching the ones in
person, and so, it's really just
been not having enough degrees of freedom for all of the courses to be offered regularly.

Molly Blasing?
Molly Blasing, Arts and Sciences.
I wanted to ask the proposer,
could you -- could you say
something about how the courses
are going to be staffed and how
often they'll be offered, the two
new guided electives?
MS. COLLETT:

MS. BROWN:
Christia?
Because these courses are offered at the college level it means anyone kind of across the college would be able to teach them, these could be offered by, you know, some of our faculty of record in terms of advanced graduate students, post-teaching, post-docs, it allows us a lot
more options to see who's available to teach it. They're cross cutting courses as opposed to really specific within a department, so again it really allows us greater flexibility. I'll say the first -- one of the courses is going to be -- that we already have set is going to be offered by Rachel Farr who's in the Department of Psychology, so that will be the first one, but once it's created it will be avilable for others to teach as well.

MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Monica?
MS. UDVARDY: Monica Udvardy, College of Arts and Sciences. What is the rationale for reducing the credit hours from 12 to nine?

MS. COLLETT: Okay. Hold on, Christia, I have to --

MS. VINCENT: According to the Senate Rules around graduate credit or Graduate Certificates the minimum
requirement is nine-credit hours.
My understanding from the proposer, and you're welcome to chime in here, is that the target audience that ended up being attracted to this certificate is the non-traditional student, these are working professionals and you're able to accomplish the learning objectives with the three courses together, which made it very attractive to this -- this target audience, but if I've answered -- if you want to add to that feel free. Christia, proposer, do you have any additional information to add to that?

She -- Dr. Vincent summarized it exactly how I would have said it. Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

Any other questions of fact and/or debate? Okay. Seeing none. As a reminder, Senate is
voting to recommend to approve the proposed change to the Graduate Certificate in Diversity and Inclusion. Poll Everywhere is now open. Okay. We're close. We have 61 approved, 6 oppose and 6 abstentions. That passes. Thank you. Next, we have Senate Academic Organizational Structure Committee, SAOSC. The Chair is Greg Rentfrow. So, what we have up first is the proposed suspension and closure of the Graduate Certificate in Gerontology. John Watkins is the propser and should be here on Zoom with us today. Greg?

MR. RENTFROW: Yeah. Let's see. Thank you. Yeah, this is for the closure of a Graduate Certificate in Gerontology within the Department of Gerontology and the College of Public Health. The reason for this closure is due to the suspension and closure of the

Ph.D. Program in Genrontology. This was spurred on by three of the four Core faculty left in June of 2022 and due to lack of resources the faculty voted and recommend that the admissions for the Graduate Certificate be suspended and the certificate closed. The last student in this program graduated last spring. Although, this passed the committee unanimously there was one member who voiced a concern of losing such a program as President Capilouto has mentioned before about taking care of the elderly and the aging population of the Commonwealth.

So, there is a recommendation
from the committee for the Senate to approve the proposed suspension and closure of the Graduate Certificate in Gerontology, because the motion comes from committee no second is
required. The motion is now on the floor and floor is open up to members for questions of fact and/or debate.

Ann Stowe, College of Medicine. Are there any plans to hire faculty for this certificate and doctoral program and how hard is it to reinstate these programs if you remove them now?

MS. COLLETT: I'll let Greg respond.
MR. RENTFROW: John, are you out there to answer that question about the hiring of faculty, new faculty.

MR. WATKINS: Yes, I am. John Watkins, College of Public Health. Can everybody hear me, I guess?

MR. RENTFROW: Yes, we can hear you.
MR. WATKINS: To my knowledge, no, with a
departure of our Core faculty and some key affiliate faculty there has been no administrative
efforts or to my knowledge
interest in replacing those faculty in order to provide the
teaching support, not just for the certificate, but also for the Ph.D. in Gerontology. Having -having said that though, there is as always given that we are in Gerontology, strong support from all of us to continue in some form or fashion a Graduate Certificate at least and perhaps even an Undergraduate Certificate in Aging Studies, General Aging Studies.

Does that answer your question? Okay. Bob?

Bob Grossman, A and S. Could John Watkins explain to us the difference between Gerontology and Aging Studies, I would have thought they were the same?

John?
Yes, I'm happy to do that.
Gerontology and specifically the way we have designed it and maintained our philosophy towards it is truely an intergarated
holistic study of aging, which incorporates not just the individual and individual life spans, but also the aging of entire populations, such as we've seen in the United States since World War I and then World War II baby booms have entered later adulthood. So, it -- it empcompasses many disciplines from the social and behavioral
sciences through the biological
and medical sciences. Throughout
our curriculum in both Ph.D. and
the certificate we have sought to
provide exposure and an
integration across these many
disciplines. We can't offer any
kind of expertise naturally at
the certificate level, but what
we have done is to cater to any
number of majors and disciplinary
degrees across campus. Aging
Studies is probably the more
historical approach to this topic
and they are largely
disciplinary. So, we might find
Aging Studies in social work, sociology, anatomy and physiology, etcetera. Any additional questions of fact and/or debate? Seeing none. As a reminder, Senate is voting to recommend the suspension and closure of the Graduate Certificate in Gerontology. The awkward silence. Okay. We have 64 approve, 6 oppose and 4 abstain. That passes. Next, we have again the SAOSC Greg Rentfrow, so we have proposed suspension and closure of Minor and Technical Systems Management. Joseph Dvorak is the proposer. Greg?

MR. RENTFROW: Yes. So, like it was mentioned this is a closure and suspension of a Minor in Technical Systems Management within the Department of Biosystems and Agricultural

Engineering in the Martin Gatton College of Agriculture Food and Environment. Currently there are no students enrolled in this program and in the last three years only one student has been enrolled and graduated. There was concern whether or not the material covered in this Technical Systems Management would continue and the proposers have indicated that other programs will cover the same material that was covered in this program as well, although they did mention that Introduction to Technical Systems Management and Farm Safety Classes will be dropped as neither courses have been taught in several years. Although, this was passed unanimously by the committee there was a concern about farm safety and the importance of teaching farm safety and as the
proposers have indicated that the farm safety is taught in other classes as well.

So, this is a recommendation from the committee for the Senate to approve the suspension and closure and Minor in Technical Systems Management, because the motion comes from committee no second is required and that motion is on the floor and open up for members for questions of fact and/or debate. Seeing no hands raised, it is time to vote. Again, you're voting to recommend that the Senate approve the proposed suspension and closure of the Minor in Technical Systems and Management. All right. We have 74 approve, zero oppose and 1 abstention. That passes. Thank you. Next, we have Senate Retroactive Withdrawals Appeals Committee, RWA. So, Amy Spriggs is the Chair. Amy are you on?

MS. SPRIGGS: I am. I'm sorry I couldn't be there in person. I had another meeting.

That's perfectly fine. This is why we have this option. Amy, before we get started, she's going to give an Annual Report from 2022-2023, can you just
describe your committee's charge and maybe say a little bit about the work that your committee does?

So, we process retroactive withdrawals, so these are for students who have completed a semester, so they have to have a grade, it can't be incomplete, so they have to have received a grade and they have to have suffered a serious injury or illness, they have to have serious personal or family problems, a serious financial difficulty or they can have a disability that was diagnosed
after the semester in question and they have to have some kind of evidence to prove that during the semester in which they're asking to retroactively withdraw from that one of those things happened. And so, our committee they work with the dean, usually it's a dean that works with students in their college to get together an appeal, it consists of a personal statement, instructor verification forms, evidence, transcripts and then our committee looks over it and considers it. If we deny their appeal they have the right to come to the next meeting and we can ask them for more evidence, we can ask them questions for clarification. And that's kind of it.

MS. COLLETT:
So, is your committee final or does the student have another option of appeal? Maybe you can
clarify that.

MS. SPRIGGS: Our committee is final. They can appeal it with the University Appeals Board. They can do a partial withdrawal, meaning that they can ask for a withdrawal for one to a few classes when they're not asking for a full withdrawal for the semsester, those are really hard to get. They have to make a case that whatever the reason that they're asking for the withdrawal from impacted one or two or three classes and not the whole semseter. So, an example of that might be, "I have a seizure disorder that was diagnosed that semester and I had a morning class and my seizures impacted my mornings, but not my afternoons," and they have a doctor's note to supoprt that we would probably grant a partial withdrawal. It's very hard for a student to get that. If we deny
the partial they can apply for a full. So, a partial is not a final decision, they can -- if we deny a partial they can apply for a full. If we deny a full they can't apply -- they can't come back to our committee for reconsideration, but they can -they can appeal it with the University Appeals Board.

MS. COLLETT:

MS. SPRIGSS:
Thank you. I'll go ahead and let you start your report.

Okay. So, our appeals seem to look very similar across like the past four years, the biggest difference this past year we had a lot more serious injury or illness appeals than the year before. So, in 2020/2021 our serious injury, illness and personal family problems were about even and this past year we had 104 serious injury illness compared to 27 personal or family problems and I think that that
was because the two-year rule for Covid was coming up, so it actually wasn't that surprising. We had a lot of Covid cases last year where our students were having Covid issues that either caused them to be in their dorms and not leaving and then that resulted in some mental health issues or they were just having long-lasting effects from Covid and not being able to go to class. We approve more cases than we deny and I really do attribute that to the deans that they're working with. Most of our deans don't actually send forward cases that aren't ready to be heard, if they do they -- a lot of them will write like, "I don't suport this. I've told the student that their evidence isn't sufficient, I've asked for more. The student doesn't have more. They want me to go ahead and
submit it." Sometimes the deans do support it and the evidence still isn't matching, but really our deans are doing a fantastic job at helping the students put together a really thorough file. And so, it seems that our job is actually getting easier because the deans are helping our students put together really solid appeals, they're doing a nice job with that. We're also getting a lot less -- we used to get a lot of inappropriate files that were really meant more for the Ombud. So, like an instructor refused to give an excused absence so there was an excuse -- a documented excuse and the instructor said, "I don't give excused absences," our committee used to see those files and before I was the Chair they would vote on those. That is not our charge, so I don't see those
files, and so, I send those to the Ombud. We are actually no longer getting many of those, so the deans are now redirecting that to the Ombud, which is a appropriate. So, we aren't getting as many of those files either. So, we are actually getting to spend more of our time on things like our -- our process for our students isn't very student friendly, the application, if any of you guys have ever seen it, is very time intensive. Our students write pages and pages and pages of a personal statement, so we're trying to give them guidance on what they should be writing and it could be very simple, it doesn't have to be pages and pages. We're trying to shorten the instructor feedback form, actually telling the instructors what the form is used for and the
information we actually would
like to see from the instructors that will be helpful for us. We don't need to know all of the grades that they received in the class, because we know they failed it. So, the information
that would be helpful is if they come to class. Did you know that there was a problem? So, we're spending a lot of our time trying to work on the form so it can be voted on by Senate to be more instructor friendly and more dean friendly and more student friendly.

Thank you. Any questions for Amy concerning the annual report?

Okay. Amy, thank you. No questions for you right now. MS. SPRIGGS: Thanks.

MS. COLLETT: Thank you so much. Next, we have the Ombud Report for 2022-'23, Alice Turkington.

MS. TURKINGTON: Thank you, Chair Collett. Thank
you for the opportunity to
present the report for the last
academic year. As I begin I want
to thank the Associate Academic
Ombud Laura Anschel who's up in
the back, for managing a large
workload and providing a great
service to faculty and students.
I'd like to also note that I'm a
member of large institutional
team. I really appreciate all of
the staff and officers across
campus and their willingness to
answer the phone when I call and
answer all my questions and of
course the Associate Deans for
Academic Affairs who are the real
problem solvers, thank you for
all your assistance throughout
the year. We have submitted a
summary of our statistics for the
year, you have that as a pdf
file. This is kind of the
summary of our work in 2023.
I'll start off first with
academic offenses, which I know is always of interest. Last year there were overwhelmingly -first offenses, right, so we had 169 offenses over 90 percent of those were first offenses almost all received a minimum penalty. So, there aren't too many repeat offenders. The majority of these were students copying from classmates, collaborating on assignments or plagiarism revealed by Turnitin. Students were also found to have cheated on test or homework using CHEGG or Course Hero or other websites like that, using group chats, obtaining work from online paper writing services or they were found to possess a cheat sheet or use a phone or other prohibited device in an examination. A small proportion of academic offenses involved the use of Generative AI tools, I think the
number was three. A similar proportion were found were students who were found to have self plagiarized. Of the 169 academic offenses 16 of those students decided to proceed with an appal to the University of Appeals Board and five were upheld. We also resolved 464 larger cases that were related to claims of violations of student's academic rights, across a broad range of educational settings. These cases addressed a wide range of issues and most were resolved through mediation and discussion with the parties and other relevant offices. The very substantial cases came from students in the Graduate School and professional colleges. Of all these cases 22 appeals were forwarded to the University Appeals Board and 11 were upheld. Okay. The sources of all the
academic issues we had last year were from staff, students, faculty and then some parents and other associates of the students.

So, you can see the distribution here. During the last academic year we had a surprise visit from Dr. Donald Dietrich who I've included here because he was a former Ombud 50 years ago, he served as Ombud in 1973 and just popped in for a visit on his 50 year anniversary to reminisce about the 160 cases that he had dealt with in 1973. It was a very pleasant visit. I don't know if any of you know him personally, he was certainly a pleasant guest. I hope serving as Ombud has the same impact on my longevity as it must have had on his. So, that prompted me to have a look at a little bit longer term data. I thought it might be of interest to share
with the Senate kind of the difference in the role of the Academic Ombud as it appears to be evolving a little bit. I looked back at data on our total number of academic issues over the last nine years. Nine years ago in the office we established an electronic database that has detailed records, prior to that data may or may not have been collected, it may have been collected in different forms, so the data is a little bit spotty before that, but over the nine years we have pretty good records. And you can see there's been a steady increase in the total number of academic issues brought to the Ombud Office and then in the last two years there's kind of been a rather rapid rise and a doubling of the total number of issues. Another proxy for kind of the workload
that comes through the office just to look at scheduled appointments these are not the quick phone calls that we have as we just ask quick questions of each other or these are not serendipitous meetings you might have outside your office, but scheduled on the calendar and you can see that has shown a remarkable increase over the last couple of years. Just to put this in perspective, the last academic year this number represents over the whole 12 months an average of about 20 per week by appointments that are going in that's kind of what it represents. And then finally the changing sources of these issues, which I know will be of interest to this body. There has been an increase in the total number of students coming through the office. There has been an
increase in the number of cases referred by other staff members, advisors or other staff, but you can see over the last few years there has been a quadrupling of the number of issues brought to us by faculty. So, clearly showing a slightly different role of this office recently as becoming a more and more important resource for faculty to use in all sorts of academic settings. I'd be happy to take your questions. Any questions or thoughts or comments? Molly?

Molly Blasing, Arts and Sciences. It's such an astounding number, like the increase is astounding and you are superhuman, but it seems to me that additional support would be warranted given these numbers. What kind of support would you like to see in the office to help manage this
tremendous increase in caseload?
MS. TURKINGTON: Thank you. That was a great question, Molly. We have seen some support from the Provost Office. There's been discussions about increasing the amount of my time that could be put in. Of course I appreciate the support from my colleagues to give me the time that I have in the office. We have one full-time staff member and I think we maximize our efficiencies pretty well so
right now I think that's good, if
this trend continues that might
have to be revisited.

MS. COLLETT: Loka?
MS. ASHWOOD: Hi, this is Loka Ashwood, College of Arts and Sciences. This is, as Molly mentioned, an astounding increase. And I wondered, could you comment on whether or not this is -- you see any differences between students taking classes online or in
person?
MS. TURKINGTON: Differences, how so?
MS. ASHWOOD: I mean in academic issues. Do you see any difference in association with in-person or online classes?

MS. TURKINGTON: I don't -- I don't really notice that. I think there's a broad range of issues brought to our office and we do see students from all sorts of online settings as well as in person. A lot of the issues overlap in the types of the themes that might be brought to us. I don't know if there's any significant differences.

MS. COLLETT: Doug?
MR. MICHAEL: Doug Michael, College of Law.
Thank you for this report, Dr. Turkington. I wondered, in addition to more resources if you
-- what accounts for that
meteoritic rise, this indicates that faculty have some
uncertainties and since we've helped write academic rules is there something that you can say, "Yeah, this is the problem. Faculty don't understand," or it's really unclear these two or three or four things?

Yeah, I totally agree. I've gone through this data every which way to try to figure that out and we do classify each of these issues coming in, I think there's like 10 different classifications, the numbers of each one of those remain the same they're just all bigger. So, there hasn't been one particular issue that has -or one area of campus that's driven -- or a question that's driven this, had there been we would have, you know, shared that information. I guess that makes sense given our (Inaudible) is to look at issues where the current policies and procedures can't
solve it or there aren't rules in place to deal with it. So, there hasn't really been any one particular area of -- you know, that's been an issue. I'd be interested in the insights of this body though, if anyone would like to share.

Hollie Swanson, College of Medicine. So, one thing that's popped in my head is whether or not it's fear, it's not that we don't know the rules, policies, regulations, but we're fearful of making the wrong move and an adverse outcome. Any thoughts on that?

I think that's possible. I'm not sure why that fear would have increased quite so much recently.

I do think the other offices on campus that serve with faculty and students are seeing similar rises in numbers, so in general it may reflect a change in
culture if faculty are finding themselves able to ask or being more overburdened and needing more help. I'm not quite sure. Molly?

Molly Blasing, Arts and Sciences. You said that there were only something like three Generative AI related cases. I wonder if you could characterize what it looks like for someone to bring a Gen AI case -- I can tell you sort of -- I could give you 15 examples of people I know who have had AI related plagiarism going on in their course but nothing rises to the level of approaching the Ombud or bringing a case. Like I was wondering if you could let us know what a case looks like, because I think there's a lot of uncertainty under the surface about how to approach and how to -- since we can't prove it in quite the same
way as traditional Turnitin. I think there's a lot of sort of under the surface hesitation about how to proceed around academic integrity and Generative AI. Do you have any thoughts on that?

Yeah, sure. So, the Turnitin score, the originality score that indicates Generative AI may have been used is obviously not something we can base a determination on. So, far the cases we've had would include evidence such as the sources cited in the piece are fictional, right, they're like hallucination of the Generative AI, the data is wrong, the text is kind of not answering the question anyway, and so, there are other pieces of evidence that can come along and then in the cases that were brought to the Ombud last year in the student interview with the
chair the student freely admitted that they had used it, which was good evidence in that case. Richard Charnigo? Hi, this is Richard Charnigo, College of Public Health. This is just a speculation $I$ don't think it can cause -- I don't think it can account for the magnitude of the rise in faculty initiated cases from 2021-'22 to `22 to `23, but it may be a contributing factor, we've had at UK in the past year or so a responsible conduct of research initiative where by now thousands of people have participated and I think one take-home message from that responsible conduct of research initiative with the inperson or Zoom trainings has been that if people do have uncertainties about what is good or permissible in a scholarly setting they're kind of
encouraged to reach out to resources on campus and the Ombud Office might be one of those. I don't think that accounts for all of it, but Dr. Turkington you were asking if the Senate had any insights or speculations, that's -- that's one possible contributor on my guess. Thank you.

MS. COLLETT:
Any other questions or comments? Thank you, Dr. Turkington. I really appreciate it. Next, on the agenda we have items from the floor, as you all know this is an opportunity for you all to raise any issues not on the agenda, ask any questions, suggest a topic for discussion, anything around that. Are there any items from the floor that anyone would like to bring to the floor?

Bob Grossman, A and S. I just want to remind everyone of the Trustee election coming up very
soon and if you have any questions about being a trustee I'm sure current or former trustees would be happy to answer your questions, but please consider whether you might want to run or whether -- to encourage your colleagues to run. Thank you. All right. So, if we have no other items from the floor, if there are no objections to this meeting standing adjourned. Any objections? None. All right. We are adjourned. Just a reminder, that the next Senate Meeting will be January the $22^{\text {nd }}$ oh, not 2023, but 2024 and I hope to see you there.

