

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE COUNCIL MEETING

FEBRUARY 12, 2024

* * * * *

1 MS. COLLETT: -- tends to be more reliable than
2 the App, but either way is fine.
3 Let's just make sure that we know
4 how to vote. So, make sure that
5 you just join the presentation,
6 enter your USenate789 code there,
7 it should take you right to the
8 voting and it's the same with
9 your App and with the text
10 message. So, this is just a test
11 vote that we have here. You're
12 going to select A if you approve,
13 B opposed, C abstain. Let's see
14 if we can make sure we've got
15 things working all right here.
16 I'll give that just a little bit
17 for you all to get done with.
18 Sixty-one. I know people are
19 probably still logging in, so
20 I'll give you a couple more
21 seconds here. We've got a nice
22 showing online, it looks like 73
23 of you, so that's good. All
24 right. I'd say people are
25 probably still logging in. We

1 have about 66 now. So, we have
2 66 folks that have logged in,
3 hopefully more are coming. So,
4 that's good. Practicalities.
5 The same always. It's an open
6 meeting. Remember we use
7 Robert's Rules of Order Newly
8 Revised. This is a hybrid
9 meeting, so it's in person and
10 Zoom and we want this to be an
11 inclusive experience. So,
12 there's no voting by proxy. You
13 have to be here, you have to be a
14 member, you have to be on -- in
15 person or on Zoom to vote.
16 Remember to say your name and
17 your affiliation prior to
18 speaking, if you forget I will
19 remind you. It's not to
20 disrespectful, but I'll interpret
21 you, because we have to do that
22 for court reporting and
23 transcription, plus everybody
24 needs to know who's speaking and
25 who you are. It's nice to know

1 each other, right? So, say your
2 name, it helps identify all of
3 these things for us. So, speak
4 loudly and speak loudly enough to
5 be heard, please. The
6 practicalities upon who can be --
7 who can talk within these
8 meetings, so priority is within
9 this order that we have. Senate
10 Members have first priority
11 always, Senators who have not
12 spoken yet about an issue, so
13 it's their first time and say you
14 may want to speak again I'll call
15 on someone who hasn't spoken yet
16 just so we can get a diverse
17 group of minds and thoughts into
18 this conversation, those who can
19 offer any assistance to the
20 Senate's discussion, so
21 proposers, guests, any of those
22 and then non-members if time or
23 circumstances permit. So, this
24 tends to be forgotten sometimes
25 within these discussions, but I

1 have to call on Senators, because
2 this is a meeting -- a business
3 meeting and we have to conduct
4 business and get through the
5 business. Civility. Always
6 debate is about expressing an
7 opinion. Sometimes we toggle
8 between debate and just healthy
9 discussion, it happens.
10 Remember, we want everybody to
11 participate and make sure you're
12 reporting back to your
13 constituents. We have
14 distribution lists, we have all
15 types of ways for you to
16 communicate, but please, please,
17 please make sure you're keeping
18 those folks within your college
19 up to date on things that are
20 going on within the Senate,
21 including proposals, anything
22 that, you know, may be of great
23 interest to them, things that you
24 may not be of interest -- you may
25 think is not interesting to them,

1 but it could be, so we just want
2 to make sure that we're keeping
3 them informed. Again, like I
4 said, attendance back of the
5 room, we capture also on the Zoom
6 recording. Do not -- please do
7 not use chat, it should be
8 enabled, if not we'll make sure
9 that it is during this
10 proceeding. We want everybody to
11 hear what you have to say, and
12 so, when you put it in the chat
13 it kind of just distracts from
14 what we're doing and we want to
15 hear you, right. Make sure you
16 also keep your cameras on if you
17 are on Zoom, because we are
18 required to remain visible during
19 any time business is conducted at
20 the Senate Meeting. If you're in
21 person here just remember that --
22 remember I will mute you if need
23 be. We want you to stay muted
24 until you are recognized to
25 speak. If you are in person

1 you're going to use -- if the red
2 light is on that means you are
3 muted. If the light is off that
4 means that you are on and it is a
5 hot mic for you to speak. Again,
6 we've already kind of just
7 touched on this, but just
8 permission to speak from the
9 chair you must obtain. So,
10 usually things like point or
11 order or information, point of
12 information, if you're making or
13 seconding a motion, questions of
14 fact and/or debate, calling a
15 question, which immediately goes
16 to -- it doesn't matter if
17 discussion is happening if we
18 have a vote to call the question
19 and that's seconded we
20 immediately go to vote and that
21 is it. Even though I know people
22 are like, "Well, I wanted to say
23 something," that's just Robert's
24 Rules and how it works. So, the
25 majority would vote and we would

1 call the question. Again, to ask
2 to speak for any reason, just
3 make sure that you raise -- use
4 your raise hand button on the
5 screen and if you're in person
6 just raise your hand. I've got
7 plenty of folks here that will
8 help me identify who was first,
9 second and third and if I do not
10 and I mix up the first and second
11 I apologize early on, because it
12 can happen. You can raise your
13 hand simultaneously and I just
14 see the first one, so I will get
15 to you as soon as possible. All
16 right. Several agenda items that
17 we have today. Announcements,
18 initially. Senate rules give the
19 Senate Council and the Chair the
20 authority to take some action on
21 behalf of the Senate as long as
22 it is reported. We have one
23 thing that needs to be reported
24 out to you all, which was a
25 request from the Registrar to add

1 an additional date to the
2 Academic Calendar for 2024/2025
3 and actually any subsequent
4 calendars, it's a request to add
5 an entry on the calendar that
6 says, "Change of major deadline
7 for spring semester with tuition
8 assessment reallocation." This
9 date basically coincides with the
10 -- so, this date coincides with
11 the last day to add a class for
12 each semester. The publication
13 of this date in the Academic
14 Calendar will alleviate questions
15 about the policy on tuition
16 assessment based on a student's
17 major, for example a student
18 switching from a fully online
19 major to a traditional major has
20 a financial impact. So, the
21 configuration for a change in
22 major is built to update the
23 tuition assessment through the
24 last day to add a class for each
25 semester, so that was -- that's

1 reported out to you all. The
2 next thing we have is Consent
3 Agenda, this consists of minutes
4 from the prior meeting, so
5 December 11, 2023 meeting
6 minutes. Reminder that items on
7 the Consent Agenda are considered
8 adopted unless a member asks for
9 it to be removed and discussed
10 later on in the meeting. Items
11 can be removed well before the
12 meeting, so you can contact me by
13 email or any of those things to
14 ask for something to be pulled
15 off the agenda or just before the
16 Consent Agenda. So, I have not
17 received any edits for the
18 minutes from December 11, 2023.
19 Unless I hear any now or a
20 Senator would like to remove
21 something off the Consent Agenda
22 for discussion later. If there
23 is no requests to remove anything
24 or a discussion around that,
25 hearing no objection the Consent

1 Agenda for February 12th is
2 adopted. Perfect. Next, we have
3 officer reports. So, just an
4 update on a couple of things. We
5 have new officer -- we had new
6 officer elections last December
7 and I reported out that you had a
8 new Chair Elect and a new Vice-
9 Chair Elect. The new Vice-Chair
10 Elect actually was unable to fill
11 that role, and so, we had to run
12 another election. So, I'm happy
13 to announce that your new Vice-
14 Chair Elect is Akiko Takenaka, so
15 she will start in June. Perfect.
16 So, we also had Senate nominees
17 for Academic Area Advisory
18 Committee for Humanities that
19 went forth and I actually just
20 emailed them to Dr. Tannock today
21 as well as nominees for the
22 Provost Search Committee for
23 Senior Associate Provost for
24 Academic Affairs. Those have
25 been updated. The President has

1 given some special sessions of
2 legislative briefings, I guess, a
3 couple of weeks ago or so that
4 went out to all the Senators and
5 then a smaller group that was
6 each of the like Staff Senate,
7 SGA and Senate Council for some
8 briefings on where we are in the
9 Legislative Session with the
10 proposals. I have spoken to the
11 President, he's unable to be here
12 this week to talk with Senate
13 today, but Senate Council had
14 requested for the President to
15 speak to a larger group of us
16 since the sessions were held on
17 days that are not normal Senate
18 days, and so, a lot of us were
19 out teaching or doing other
20 responsibilities and could not
21 make that Senate day briefing.
22 So, the President has told me
23 that he plans to speak at the
24 next March Senate Meeting with
25 Senators. And then just to

1 update on the 2023 Faculty
2 Evaluation of the President, this
3 is something that happens
4 annually, you'll be getting it
5 again in April. I presented the
6 -- it's the 2022 to 2023 Faculty
7 Evaluation, I presented those
8 findings to the Board of Trustees
9 in October and I think a week or
10 two ago to Senate Council. I
11 urge you, you know, to look at
12 those -- those reports each year.
13 This year was very similar to
14 previous years. The President
15 ranked very high in several areas
16 and the areas that were
17 considered weaknesses or not as
18 much as a strength for the
19 President still, I guess, were
20 related to faculty issues, so
21 putting faculty and decision
22 making, faculty being engaged in
23 shared governance, building
24 faculty moral and there's one
25 more. So, there were at least

1 four areas that dealt directly
2 with faculty that tend to
3 continue to trend on the lower
4 end or be considered not a
5 strength for the President. The
6 President gets this evaluation,
7 he also gets comments that are
8 directed directly to him that no
9 one else sees. Senate Council
10 also gets a set of comments that
11 we are able to review and kind of
12 just discuss around what that
13 means in a qualitative and
14 quantitative analysis aspect.
15 Vice Chair reports, Sandra
16 Bastin.

17 MS. BASTIN: Yes, I would like to bring
18 everyone's attention to the fact
19 that there are -- there is a vote
20 that is coming around and it
21 started today and I think you
22 have till the end of the week for
23 faculty representative for the
24 Board of Trustees. Usually, we
25 have small turnouts percentages,

1 there are -- most of our colleges
2 don't have high percentages of
3 voting. So, I would encourage
4 you all to encourage your other
5 faculty members, this is an
6 important part of faculty
7 governance and having our voice
8 heard at the Board of Trustees
9 Meetings. So, please encourage
10 everyone to vote during this
11 trustee -- for faculty
12 representative. Thank you.

13 MS. COLLETT: Next, our Parliamentarian Greg
14 Rentfrow.

15 MR. RENTFROW: (Inaudible).

16 MS. COLLETT: No report. Our Faculty Trustee
17 Hollie Swanson.

18 MS. SWANSON: This is the February report from
19 your lonely Faculty Trustee. We
20 don't have an itemized agenda
21 item for the upcoming Board of
22 Trustees Meeting that will happen
23 next week, so what I did is I
24 pulled a couple of items that I
25 thought would be of particular

1 importance to you. Reports that
2 will be heard during the upcoming
3 Board Meeting on February, Friday
4 the 23rd that are likely to be of
5 interest are as follows: At 8:00
6 o'clock a.m. the Executive
7 Committee will hear from
8 Workgroup Number Five, more
9 responsiveness, and this is lead
10 by Vice President Cassis and
11 Treasurer Penny Cox. Just a
12 reminder, this group is tasked
13 with reviewing the Senate Joint
14 Resolution 98 Study
15 recommendations as well as our
16 GRs and ARs. At 8:45 the Human
17 Resources and Student Affairs
18 Committee will hear from
19 Workgroup Number Four, more
20 employee recruitment and
21 retention, headed by VPs Patrice
22 Albert and Melissa Frederick.
23 This group is tasked with
24 maximizing reqcruitment and
25 retention of the best and most

1 inclusive employee base while
2 being responsive to employee
3 needs. At 9:45 the Academic and
4 Student Affairs Committee will
5 hear reports from Workgroups One
6 and Two. Workgroup One, lead by
7 Vice President Turner and Dean
8 Lephart is tasked with educating
9 more Kentuckians. Workgroup Two
10 is lead by Provost DiPaola and
11 Senate Council Chair Collett and
12 is tasked with assessing and
13 improving the UK Core. At 11:00
14 o'clock the Finance Committee
15 will hear updates on Workgroup
16 Three. Workgroup Three, more
17 partnerships, is headed by VPs
18 Rob Edwards and Nancy Cox and it
19 is tasked with expanding our
20 impact through partnerships,
21 acquisitions and new initiatives,
22 the school's government, non-
23 profit industry and corporations.
24 And just as a reminder, these
25 meetings are open and I encourage

1 you to attend and to be aware of
2 the conversation. Any questions?
3 Jennifer, you had a question?

4 MS. CAMPBELL: Hi, yeah. Jennifer Campbell,
5 College of Fine Arts. Two
6 questions, one has to do with
7 Sandra's report about the Faculty
8 Trustee election. Are we able to
9 send out to our constituents via
10 the ListServ and are those
11 ListSers current, meaning my
12 ListServ says 2022/2023? So, I
13 need to know if the Faculty
14 ListServ is current for my
15 College of Fine Arts. Second of
16 all, is that Board of Trustees
17 Meeting in person or will there
18 be a Zoom link for our
19 constituents to attend? Thank
20 you.

21 MS. SWANSON: There is a Zoom link that is
22 available only to Board of
23 Trustee Members who are not
24 present, so it would be in person
25 and it's at the Gatton Student

1 Center. Roger, would you mind
2 addressing that first question,
3 please?

4 MR. BROWN: Yeah. Roger Brown, SREC Chair.
5 So, there's a nice website that
6 goes over the details on the
7 election and the short answer is
8 that the policy is that faculty
9 and others cannot use university
10 provided ListServes or time in
11 business meetings, such as
12 departmental faculty meetings to
13 advocate for or against
14 individual candidates. You can
15 use those resources in order to
16 encourage voting. So, you could
17 use your departmental ListServ or
18 other ListServes just generally to
19 encourage voting, but not to
20 advocate for or against any
21 particular candidate.

22 MS. SWANSON: Other questions? Now, we can
23 have Jennifer Kramer.

24 MS. KRAMER: Another Jennifer. Jennifer
25 Kramer, Arts and Sciences. Just

1 could you really quickly say
2 those -- which group and which
3 meeting, just real quick again.
4 I'm looking now -- I'm looking at
5 the Board schedule.
6 MS. SWANSON: We start bright and early --
7 MS. KRAMER: Yes.
8 MS. SWANSON: -- at 8:00 o'clock. So, at 8:00
9 o'clock Workgroup Five. 8:45
10 Workgroup Four. 9:45 Workgroup
11 One and Two. 11:00 o'clock
12 Workgroup Three. We're good?
13 Thank you.
14 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Kaveh.
15 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. Can I
16 ask a question or make a comment
17 regarding your announcement
18 items? I kind of missed it.
19 MS. COLLETT: Is your mic on?
20 MR. TAGAVI: Can I?
21 MS. COLLETT: Yes. Is your mic on, is what I
22 asked you ?
23 MR. TAGAVI: It is on.
24 MS. COLLETT: Okay. I'm asking you to
25 (Inaudible).

1 MR. TAGAVI: Is UK University Senate going to
2 take a position on legislative
3 items, especially the one on
4 (Inaudible) tenure?

5 MS. COLLETT: So, right now the President has
6 met with Senate Council Members,
7 he's met with Senate, so he's
8 heard the feedback that everybody
9 has given him and he's asked that
10 we provide him with that
11 feedback, I don't know if I put
12 that in my newsletter or not, but
13 provide him with that feedback so
14 that when he is meeting with
15 these legislatures that he has a
16 story to tell where we're coming
17 from. If it comes to occur that
18 we need to respond as far as a
19 Senate, I think we will and we
20 are posed and ready to do that,
21 whether that is through a
22 resolution, whether that is
23 through any other means as we
24 move forward. So, we're keeping
25 a close eye on the proposals,

1 we're hearing from faculty
2 members and we're going to stream
3 and push forward. This is a long
4 session, but, man, it's going
5 quick and it's moving fast. So,
6 there have already been, as you
7 know on Senate Bill 6 changes
8 from divisive to discriminatory,
9 the language has changed some,
10 but it's still concerning as well
11 as House Bill 9. So, there are a
12 lot of discussions going on. The
13 President has asked us not to get
14 ahead of him, you know, while
15 he's trying to talk with these
16 legislatures as it moves forward,
17 but there is definitely, I think,
18 will be a time where Senate will
19 either -- if it's kind of going a
20 different way from where the
21 faculty, students and the staff
22 combined are feeling -- we'll
23 have that conversation with the
24 President and hope that that
25 doesn't result in us having to

1 write a resolution, but Senate is
2 well within its purview of doing
3 such proposals or resolutions or
4 anything going forward. So, it
5 is the body of this Senate and
6 the wishes of this Senate if we
7 are to do that you all will tell
8 us to do that. All right.

9 Committee recommendations. First
10 up, we have Senate Academic -- or
11 I'm sorry, Admissions and
12 Academic Standards Committee,
13 SAASC, Leslie Vincent is Chair.
14 The first thing that we have up
15 is the proposed changes to the MS
16 in Statistics. Associate
17 Professor Katherine Thompson is
18 the proposer and should be here.
19 Leslie?

20 MS. VINCENT: All right. This is a
21 recommendation to approve the
22 proposed changes to the MS in
23 Statistics. Does it have a
24 slide?

25 MS. COLLETT: Yes, ma'am.

1 MS. VINCENT: Okay.

2 MS. COLLETT: Of course it does.

3 MS. VINCENT: Okay. Sorry. I thought it did.

4 So, this proposal is the result

5 of a major review of the program

6 and includes changes to required

7 courses, elective courses,

8 criteria for admission,

9 progression, termination and a

10 change to a concentration.

11 Specifically, changes include

12 course work changes to both the

13 required and elective course

14 options to better reflect

15 statistics in the modern era,

16 which includes the addition of

17 new courses as well as updating

18 of topics and current courses. A

19 change to the program,

20 comprehensive exam to include

21 evaluation of two individual

22 parts of the exam, rather than

23 one single grade is also part of

24 the proposal. There's also a

25 change to the required courses

1 within each concentration given
2 the updating to the curriculum
3 mentioned before. Additionally,
4 the proposal changes the
5 admissions requirement to remove
6 Mastery of Math 471-G as well as
7 two semesters of calculus as part
8 of the proposal. These changes
9 align with the findings of the
10 self-study conducted with an
11 external review team as well as
12 bench marking that was conducted
13 by the Graduate Studies Committee
14 within the department. The SAASC
15 Committee voted unanimously to
16 approve the proposed changes to
17 the MS in statistics.

18 MS. COLLETT: All right. So, there's a
19 recommendation from the committee
20 for the Senate to approve the
21 proposed changes to the MS in
22 Statistics. Because the motion
23 comes from committee no second is
24 required. The motion is now on
25 the floor and the floor is opened

1 up to members for questions of
2 fact and/or debate. Seeing none,
3 no hands raised, a reminder
4 you're voting to -- Senate is
5 voting to approve the proposed
6 changes to the MS in Statistics.
7 Voting should be open. All
8 right. We have 79 approve, six
9 abstentions. That passes. Thank
10 you. The next thing we have up
11 is another report or
12 recommendation from SAASC. This
13 is proposed changes to the Ph.D.
14 in Statistics. Katherine
15 Thompson is the same proposer.
16 MS. VINCENT: So, this will sound similar.
17 This is a recommendation to
18 approve the proposed changes to
19 the Ph.D. in Statistics. This
20 proposal is the result of a major
21 review of the program and
22 includes changes to required
23 courses, elective courses,
24 criteria for admission,
25 progression, termination and a

1 change to a concentration.
2 Specifically, changes include
3 course work, updates to both the
4 required courses and elective
5 course options to better reflect
6 statistics in the modern era,
7 which includes the addition of
8 new courses as well as updating
9 of topics and current courses.
10 Due to this, the number of credit
11 hours has increased by four
12 credits, these come from a one-
13 credit hour course taken along
14 STA-700 and the three-credit hour
15 requirement now of STA-700. This
16 course has always been a
17 prerequisite for other courses
18 that are required in the program,
19 so even though it adds to the
20 number of credit hours it doesn't
21 reflect a practical change from
22 what's currently in the program.
23 Okay. So, because of these
24 changes the total credit hours
25 for the revised Ph.D. in

1 Statistics changes from 33 total
2 to 37-credit hours in order to
3 earn the degree. The proposal
4 also includes a change to the
5 program comprehensive exam, where
6 it will now include two
7 individual parts, rather one
8 single grade, as well as a change
9 to the required courses within
10 each concentration given the
11 update to the curriculum
12 mentioned before. In addition,
13 the proposal changes the timing
14 of when students typically will
15 sit for the written exam to
16 expedite research progress for
17 the Ph.D. students. The proposal
18 also changes the admissions
19 requirements to remove the
20 language related to Ph.D.
21 applicants and mastery of Math
22 471-G as well as two semesters of
23 calculus, it also removes the
24 language regarding direct
25 admittance to the Ph.D. program.

1 Again, these changes align with
2 the findings of the self-study
3 conducted with an external review
4 team and the bench marking that
5 was conducted by the Graduate
6 Studies Committee within the
7 department. The SAASC Committee
8 voted unanimously to approve the
9 proposed changes to the Ph.D. in
10 statistics.

11 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. So, this is a
12 recommendation from the committee
13 for the Senate to approve
14 proposed changes to the Ph.D. in
15 statistics. Because the motion
16 comes from committee no second is
17 required. The motion is now on
18 the floor and the floor is opened
19 up to members for questions of
20 fact and/or debate.

21 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I
22 admit I haven't looked at the
23 curriculum, because you know in
24 my opinion the structure of
25 curricular is so bad. So, I'd

1 it is. And if you could just
2 speak loudly. State your name.
3 State your name.
4 MS. THOMPSON: Katherine Thompson from the
5 College of Arts and Sciences in
6 the Dr. Bing Zhang, Department of
7 Statistics. Thank you, Solomon.
8 I appreciate that. So, yes,
9 absolutely. Thank you for the
10 excellent question. We had lots
11 of conversation about this within
12 our graduate faculty. So, it is
13 that if a student passes one part
14 and not the other the pass from
15 the first attempt carries through
16 and the student only needs to
17 repeat the second part. We
18 operated under the completely
19 pass or completely fail framework
20 since I've been at UK and what
21 was ending up happening in
22 practicality is that we had
23 students who mastered one exam
24 and then were having to restudy
25 and relearn that material, which

1 took time away from mastering the
2 second set of material. So, we
3 thought about this pretty
4 extensively within the graduate
5 faculty. Everybody voted
6 unanimously to have the two-part
7 structure and then they'll have a
8 chance to repeat the one part
9 that a student failed if they
10 failed one part.

11 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Kaveh?

12 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi. So, if a person
13 fails one part and passes the
14 other one and (Inaudible) six
15 months later take the other part
16 and they pass, would that whole
17 experience count as one failure
18 reported to grad school?

19 MS. THOMPSON: So, that's another great
20 question. Katie Thompson, Arts
21 and Sciences. So, in that case
22 when we report to the Graduate
23 School we report only at the
24 point at which both passes are
25 recorded. So, when we go to

1 report to the Graduate School we
2 have a pass for the written part
3 of the exam and then the student
4 would schedule the oral part of
5 their qualification exam. That
6 is the way that we've operated in
7 years past and it's worked pretty
8 well for us. I don't know of any
9 issues that we've had, but
10 certainly happy to reach out to
11 the Graduate School and make sure
12 that that process will work in
13 the future as well, but that's
14 what we've done before.

15 MR. TAGAVI: Will you allow me another
16 question?

17 MS. COLLETT: Okay, Kaveh.

18 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi. So, if a person
19 passes one, fails the other one,
20 how many more can they fail the
21 other one until you tell them no
22 more?

23 MS. THOMPSON: Katie Thompson, Arts and
24 Sciences. They have one chance
25 to repeat the written portion of

1 the exam, and so, the exam is
2 repeatable once and that's in our
3 graduate catalog as well as on
4 our website.

5 MR. TAGAVI: Thank you.

6 MS. COLLETT: Perfect. Thank you. All right.
7 Any further questions, fact
8 and/or debate? Okay. Seeing no
9 hands raised it is time for a
10 vote. Reminder, you are voting
11 on the proposed changes to the
12 Ph.D. in Statistics. Well, I had
13 89 last time. Alrighty. That's
14 80 approved, two oppose and four
15 abstentions. That passes. Thank
16 you. The next thing that we have
17 is proposed changes to the B.S.
18 in Computer Engineering
19 Technology, Associate Professor
20 Philip Lee is the proposer.
21 Leslie?

22 MS. VINCENT: So, you may remember that we have
23 two subcommittees now within
24 SAASC, so this proposal fell
25 under admissions, so I'm going to

1 ask if Scott Yost, who's chairing
2 the subcommittee, would present
3 this item. I think he's on Zoom.
4 Okay.

5 MR. YOST: Yeah.

6 MS. VINCENT: Scott?

7 MR. YOST: Scott Yost, College of
8 Engineering. Can you all hear me
9 okay?

10 MS. VINCENT: Yes.

11 MR. YOST: Yes. I'll take that as a distant
12 yes. So, this particular
13 proposal was ultimately a
14 proposal to clarify progression
15 standards for what I'm going to
16 call a, "new program," in
17 engineering technology.

18 Currently, UK has an engineering
19 technology joint program with the
20 UK campus here in Lexington and
21 BCTC and as it turns out UK also
22 has an extended campus. The
23 College of Engineering has an
24 extended campus down in Paducah
25 which has two engineering

1 programs. And what basically was
2 happening is they're going to
3 take the current structure of the
4 UK-Lexington Campus with BCTC
5 with a new MOU and make a
6 Lexington campus with Western
7 Kentucky Community and Technology
8 College housed in Paducah. So,
9 both of these programs are
10 engineering in technology,
11 they're feeder programs from
12 either the Lexington BCTC or from
13 this, "new program," over in
14 Western Kentucky Community
15 College System located in
16 Paducah, two years at the local
17 colleges and then they feed here
18 to UK to work on their
19 Engineering Technology in
20 Bachelor's and engineering
21 technology. So, they -- while
22 they meant it to be kind of a new
23 program it's really just an
24 extension based on an existing
25 program of all the exact same

1 requirements, the same
2 curriculum, same progression
3 standards, it's just now being
4 applied to an extended campus out
5 in Paducah which is all -- the
6 Paducah campus has been approved
7 by our OSPIE and -- so, that's it
8 in a nutshell.

9 MS. COLLETT: Okay. So, there's a
10 recommendation from the committee
11 for the Senate to approve
12 proposed changes to the B.S. CPT
13 or Computer Engineering
14 Technology. Because the motion
15 comes from committee no second is
16 required. The motion is now on
17 the floor and the floor is opened
18 up to members of questions of
19 fact and/or debate. Seeing none,
20 it is time to vote. As a
21 reminder, you're voting to
22 approve the proposed changes to
23 the B.S. CPT Computer Engineering
24 Technology Program. All right.
25 We have 83 approve, zero oppose

1 and four abstentions. I will
2 note after that presentation
3 there and recommendation there
4 are -- it did come up in the
5 Senate Council Meeting about MOUs
6 and who is keeping track of
7 these. The Senate Rules do
8 require the Office of the Provost
9 actually present a report to the
10 Senate or to the SAASC, so I've
11 communicated that today to the
12 Provost on that report, so we'll
13 get an update and I requested
14 back from 2018 to current, the
15 current MOUs, because they're
16 currently just no documentation
17 that we've had that report just
18 yet. So, I'm not sure anybody
19 has actually requested it, but it
20 did come up and it's come up more
21 often because we're seeing more
22 MOUs, you know, being requested
23 through the Senate, so -- and the
24 Provost just gave me a thumbs up,
25 so he's received it. He said he

1 just got it, just got it. All
2 right. So, the next thing on our
3 agenda here is another one from
4 Leslie, her committee has busy as
5 you can see. We have proposed
6 changes to the B.S. CHEM, so
7 Chemical Engineering. Barbara
8 Knutson is the proposer and she's
9 also the DUS. Leslie?

10 MS. VINCENT:

11 Thanks. So, this is a
12 recommendation to approve the
13 proposed changes to the B.S. in
14 Chemical Engineering Program.
15 The proposed changes include
16 changes to the required courses
17 and the total number of credit
18 hours for the degree. The
19 program seeks to remove CHE 446-G
20 Physical Chemistry for Engineers
21 from the required curriculum as
22 the content is redundant and
23 overlaps with other courses that
24 students are already required to
25 take. Additionally, two courses
are being updated to add one

1 credit hour to each to account
2 for updates and content that
3 they're adding to those
4 particular courses. Due to these
5 changes the total credit hours
6 for the program will change from
7 128 total credit hours to 127-
8 credit hours. While the majority
9 of undergraduate programs in the
10 College of Engineering do require
11 128-credit hours there are other
12 engineering programs that are
13 127-credit hour programs, so
14 aerospace engineering and
15 mechanical engineering, for
16 example. So, the reduction of
17 the credit hours in this program
18 leaves the program within the
19 expected engineering credit hours
20 and continues to meet the
21 guidelines of the engineering
22 accreditation through ABET. The
23 SAASC Committee voted unanimously
24 to approve the proposed changes.
25 MS. COLLETT: So, again, you have a

1 recommendation from the committee
2 for the Senate to approve
3 proposed changes to the B.S. in
4 Chemical Engineering. Because
5 the motion comes from committee
6 no seconds required. The motion
7 is now on the floor and the floor
8 is opened up to members for
9 questions of fact and/or debate.
10 Seeing no hands raised it is time
11 to vote. Remember, you're voting
12 to approve the proposed changes
13 to the B.S. in Chemical
14 Engineering. All right. You
15 have 82 approve and four
16 abstentions. That passes. Thank
17 you. The next thing we have is
18 Leslie Vincent again, we have the
19 proposed changes to RN to BSN
20 Nursing track. Associated Dean
21 Karen Butler from the College of
22 Nursing is the proposer and the
23 RN to BSN track Coordinator Angie
24 Hensley, she's actually here and
25 on Zoom to answer any questions.

1 Leslie?

2 MS. VINCENT: Okay. So, this is a
3 recommendation to approve the
4 proposed changes to the RN to BSN
5 Nursing track. The proposal
6 seeks to change the admissions
7 requirements for the program.
8 Currently, the program has the
9 existing criteria that a verified
10 clear and unencumbered licensure
11 will be required before the last
12 class that requires 40 clinical
13 hours or the Capstone can be
14 taken. However, with the
15 proposal this would now become a
16 requirement for admission to the
17 program. So, essentially adding
18 that an unencumbered RN License
19 needs to be there at the time of
20 the application. Currently,
21 students need to have this
22 requirement before graduation,
23 and so, what we're hoping to do
24 by adding it as an admissions
25 requirement is make sure that

1 voting is open. Well, my screen
2 went blank, so I'm not sure. So,
3 it's 86 approve, one oppose and
4 one abstention. So, that passes.
5 Okay. The next thing that we
6 have up, if I can get -- well,
7 let's see. I just turned off the
8 TV. That -- that was it. That's
9 all I did, touched the wrong
10 button. Okay. Leslie saved me.
11 Senate Academic Organizational
12 Structure Committee, SAOSC, Greg
13 Rentfrow is the Chair of this
14 committee. This is a proposed --
15 a proposal for a closure of a
16 Graduate Certificate in Inclusive
17 Education. Acting Chair Melinda
18 Ault is the proposer. Greg?
19 MR. RENTFROW: Sorry, I just had surgery on
20 Thursday, so I'm slow and no
21 quick movements. This is a
22 proposal to close a Graduate
23 Certificate in Inclusive
24 Education within the Department
25 of Early Childhood, Special

1 Education and Counselor Education
2 within the College of Education.
3 The reason for closing this
4 certificate program is the
5 faculty member that directed the
6 program has left the university.
7 The department can no longer
8 support this position, therefore,
9 the faculty voted to close the
10 program. There are no current
11 students in the program right now
12 and they have not had a student
13 since 2018. The SAOSC Committee
14 voted unanimously for this
15 proposal.

16 MS. COLLETT: So, there's a recommendation from
17 the committee for the Senate to
18 approve the proposed closure of
19 the Graduate Certificate in
20 Inclusive Education. Because the
21 motion comes from committee no
22 second is required. The motion
23 is now on the floor and the floor
24 is opened up to members for
25 questions of fact and/or debate.

1 pedagogical inconsistency
2 regarding the prep days as they
3 fell during the summer. The
4 current plan and what's in the
5 Senate Rules currently calls for
6 three prep days at the end of
7 summer session, but what if a
8 student had a four-week course
9 early in the summer session,
10 there are no prep days. What if
11 a student had the same four-week
12 course at the end of the summer
13 session and got three prep days?
14 Well, there's a disparity there
15 and in the latter case three prep
16 days is cutting out quite a bit
17 -- carving out quite a bit of
18 time from the four-week course
19 that occurs at the end of the
20 summer session. So, the SREC
21 brought forward this issue,
22 Senate Council referred it to the
23 Calendar Committee. The Calendar
24 Committee talked about it and
25 there were basically three ways

1 that the Calendar Committee
2 discussed regarding how to
3 possibly move forward. One way,
4 of course, is to just leave in
5 place the status quo, which has
6 the aforementioned pedagogical
7 inconsistency but which leaves
8 prep days as a property of the
9 term rather than of individual
10 courses. A second possibility
11 and the one which the Senate
12 Calendar Committee ultimately
13 recommended was that prep days
14 for so-called compressed courses
15 could be aligned with the course
16 rather than the term. So, for a
17 compressed course, so a course
18 that has a length that is less
19 than a full fall semester or less
20 than a spring -- full spring
21 semester, so this could be --
22 this could be a part of term
23 course in fall, a part of term
24 course in spring, but this also
25 would include winter intersession

1 and summer session. Winter
2 intersession and summer session
3 would be included here. The
4 recommendation of the Calendar
5 Committee by a vote of 7-0-0 was
6 to grant a single prep day, a
7 single prep day, for any
8 compressed course that would be
9 the last day of class for that
10 course preceding its final
11 examination. This has the
12 advantage of resolving the
13 pedagogical inconsistency
14 aforementioned, it has the
15 potential disadvantage that there
16 are not uniform prep days for all
17 compressed courses, so the prep
18 day becomes a property here of
19 the course rather than of the
20 term. Yet, the committee was
21 willing to recommend this option
22 to allow the students some prep
23 time to remove the pedagogical
24 inconsistency and because a very
25 simple rule of thumb one prep day

1 did not seem overwhelmingly
2 complicated or likely to result
3 in undue confusion. The third
4 option, of course, would be to
5 not have any prep days or reading
6 days for compressed courses at
7 all and that would get rid of the
8 pedagogical inconsistency, that
9 would leave prep days proper to a
10 term rather than to a course, but
11 that would be less friendly to
12 students. It's understood that
13 there could be different opinions
14 on this issue, I expect that
15 we'll hear some presently,
16 because I was given a heads up by
17 someone, but the Calendar
18 Committee's proposal was the
19 second one, again, by a vote of
20 7-0-0 that any compressed course
21 in particular any winter
22 intersession course and any
23 summer course should have a
24 single prep day, not a reading
25 day, but a single prep day on the

1 last day of class preceding its
2 final. So, with that, thank you,
3 DeShana.

4 MS. COLLETT: All right. So, there's a
5 recommendation from the committee
6 for the Senate to approve the
7 proposed changes to the
8 SR5.2.5.6.1. Prep Days Policy for
9 Compressed Courses. Because the
10 motion comes from committee no
11 second is required. The motion
12 is now on the floor and the floor
13 is opened up to members for
14 questions of fact and/or debate.
15 Jennifer?

16 MS. KRAMER: Jennifer Kramer, Arts and
17 Sciences. The Senate Council was
18 made aware of a potential other
19 way of understanding those prep
20 days and I wanted to relate that
21 comment to you, although I'm not
22 sure if the commentor wanted
23 their name shared or not, I'm
24 waiting to hear about that. But
25 what was said was, "The concept

1 of prep days and reading days
2 seems most logically the feature
3 of a term where students are
4 typically taking multiple courses
5 that all have a big final exam at
6 the same time. In this way, prep
7 days and reading days are
8 designed to satisfy what students
9 need. In the proposal on the
10 agenda today it looks like prep
11 days are a feature of a course.
12 Though a student might want or
13 even benefit from a prep day
14 associated with a summer, winter
15 or compressed course it seems
16 like students don't need those
17 days since students who take
18 those courses do not typically
19 have multiple courses with big
20 final exams at the same time.
21 For this reason, it would seem --
22 it seems like it would make more
23 sense to me if there were no prep
24 days or reading days associated
25 with summer, winter or compressed

1 courses. If an individual
2 instructor thought that students
3 in a course needed additional
4 prep time that individual
5 instructor has the freedom to
6 adjust the course schedule to
7 allow for that. As presented the
8 current proposal forces
9 instructors to create prep time
10 whether the instructor thinks the
11 students need that or not."

12 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Bobby and then Jennifer --
13 or Bobby, I think. I think
14 you're still muted.

15 MR. SCROGGINS: Yeah, I would agree with that.
16 One other thing that I was going
17 to -- wanted to ask about was
18 that it seems like the prep days
19 are developed to address the
20 academic models of final exams
21 and papers and there are some
22 modes of analysis that --
23 particularly in fine arts for
24 example that don't have those
25 kind of issues, and so, students

1 would -- in the summer situation
2 would actually benefit from no
3 prep days and just be able to --
4 because the prep days actually
5 limit faculty from being able to
6 have contact with students when
7 they really need that type of
8 thing to prepare for their -- for
9 their final critics.

10 MS. COLLET: Any other questions? Keiko.

11 MS. TANAKA: Keiko Tanaka, Arts and Sciences.
12 So, this proposal is combining
13 the summer and winter courses and
14 compressed courses that take
15 place during fall and spring and
16 I think for the purpose of
17 thinking through this we should
18 separate the two, because
19 compressed courses during fall
20 and spring semesters often start
21 mid semester and end the same
22 time as all of the other courses,
23 which means that students taking
24 these compressed courses would
25 have to prepare for final exams

1 for all of the courses that they
2 are taking. So, I think these
3 fall into two separate
4 categories.

5 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Any other thoughts on
6 that? Questions of fact and/or
7 debate? All right. Seeing none,
8 it is time for a vote. So, as a
9 reminder, Senate is voting to
10 approve the proposed changes to
11 SR5.2.5.6.1. Prep Days Policy for
12 Compressed Courses. A couple
13 more seconds. We have 48
14 approve, 22 oppose and 14
15 abstentions. So, that actually
16 passes. A margin, but it passes.
17 All right. Thank you, Richard.
18 This actually will go to SREC
19 after this just to make the
20 necessary changes in the SR that
21 may cause a ripple effect after
22 this revised SR, so anything in
23 the glossary or anywhere else
24 within the SRs. Alrighty. Next,
25 we have a request for waiver of

1 SR5.1.7.5.1 Retroactive
2 Withdrawal Requirements. So,
3 this is a request waiver --
4 request for a waiver of 5.1.7.5.1
5 for a College of Arts and Science
6 Student AE-99. This request
7 comes from the Arts and Science
8 Dean Franco -- and that's spelled
9 wrong, it's got a C, Franco-
10 Watkins, she is on today. Dr. --
11 or Dean Franco-Watkins, would you
12 like to say anything?

13 MS. WATKINS: Sorry, I'm traveling, so excuse
14 the hotel room. This is a
15 student who had a extraordinary
16 circumstances and I just ask you
17 to consider how important this is
18 for the student to continue on
19 with his life and not be held by
20 something that happened when he
21 had these extenuating
22 circumstances. I can't get into
23 the details of them, but I had a
24 communication with Senate Chair
25 Collett as well as the Senate

1 Council regarding the student.
2 So, we wouldn't bring anything to
3 you all unless it was indeed an
4 extenuating circumstance, because
5 we take these seriously. Thank
6 you.

7 MS. COLLETT: And just a reminder, the PDF
8 gives you the rationale for
9 everybody to read prior to coming
10 to Senate Council or read right
11 now. So, there's a recommendation
12 from the Senate Council for the
13 Senate to approve the waiver of
14 the two-year limit in the
15 SR5.1.7.5.1 for ANS Student AE-99
16 to allow submission past the two-
17 year deadline. So, this gets
18 submitted to -- this allows for
19 the student to be able to ask RWA
20 for a waiver, just so that's
21 clear. Because the motion comes
22 from Senate Council no second is
23 required. The motion is now on
24 the floor and the floor is opened
25 up to members of questions of

1 fact and/or debate. Kaveh?
2 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. Every
3 time a question like this come I
4 really struggle with my academic
5 conscience. We should take
6 waiver of rules very seriously.
7 There is no specific reference in
8 the SR that says, "This rule
9 could be asked to be waived by
10 the student." I know that we
11 have this general idea that any
12 rule could be asked to be waived
13 and we have the authority to
14 waive our own rules, but to be
15 fair we could add to the part of
16 the rule for all students to see
17 that we say, "students may
18 petition to waive the two-year
19 limits (Inaudible)." This
20 reminds me of there is a
21 phenomenon in car repair called
22 the Hidden Warrant. If you
23 complain about your busted
24 transmission the company pays for
25 it, that's what the Hidden

1 Warrant is, but if you don't
2 complain you have to pay yourself
3 and you will pay yourself. It's
4 fundamentally unfair, especially
5 when we could add this in there.
6 On top of that, we should be
7 serious about waiving our rules.
8 These rules were approved by the
9 majority of the Senate and we
10 should only approve if we have --
11 if it's a considered (Inaudible)
12 we don't -- we don't know the
13 merit of the proposal, we only
14 know that the dean thinks that
15 it's merited, but we don't know
16 that it's merited. So, let me
17 ask you rhetorical request. We
18 cannot be Senate Council Member
19 two terms in a row, we have to
20 stay up and what if I put a
21 petition to you guys and say,
22 "Right now I'm Senate Council, if
23 I'm not able to be on Senate
24 council again it severely would
25 affect my mental health and I'm

1 asking you to waive it." Would
2 you waive it? Of course, you
3 shouldn't. On top of that, from
4 being an Ombud I know different
5 colleges have very different
6 attitude towards -- leniency
7 towards students or sticking to
8 the rules. How is that fair that
9 we would not have uniformity
10 within colleges? And there is a
11 very simple solution for this,
12 there is the committee called
13 RWA, they are expert in hearing
14 the confidential information and
15 make a decision. This decision
16 to waive the rule could be
17 dedicated to RWA right now, right
18 here by us so that they would
19 hear all the details and they
20 would make an informed decision
21 rather than us voting based on
22 not knowing the merit.

23 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Any further discussion on
24 that or any thoughts? Henry and
25 then Scott Yost.

1 MR. DIETZ: Yeah, so just looking at the
2 paperwork that accompanies that,
3 the PDF, it says that, "However,
4 it is possible that the request
5 was misplaced due to the
6 University's reliance on paper
7 based documents during the time
8 the request was placed." So, I
9 don't think that this is as much
10 asking for an exception as it is
11 acknowledging a potential screw
12 up that happened in the handling
13 of the documents. So, I don't
14 think that this is really the
15 same concern that Kaveh is
16 worried about.

17 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Scott.

18 MR. YOST: Scott Yost, College of
19 Engineering. I was actually
20 going to bring up the same
21 question or the same issue that I
22 think it looks like there may be
23 some administrative short
24 comings, shall we say. To the
25 proposal, was there -- you know,

1 students that we have in Arts and
2 Sciences. So, I can't confirm
3 that. I know there is
4 extenuating circumstances, you
5 know, it's not just about mental
6 health and we take things very
7 seriously, but if there's a
8 chance that it could have been
9 administratively mishandled we
10 have to also take that into
11 consideration.

12 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Okay. Seeing no more
13 hands raised it's time for a
14 vote. As a reminder, Senate is
15 voting to approve a waiver of the
16 two-year limit on SR5.1.7.5.1 for
17 ANS Student AE-99 to allow
18 submission past the two-year
19 deadline. Okay. We have 65
20 approve, nine oppose and 12
21 abstentions. That passes. So,
22 the student will now be able to
23 submit this to RWA. The next
24 request is similar, so it's
25 another request of waiver of

1 5.1.7.5.1. This student is a
2 College of Arts and Sciences
3 Student TJ-06. The request is
4 coming from Dean Franco-Watkins.
5 This particular student -- there
6 were several things that
7 contributed to this student's
8 request including suffering a
9 mental health issues during the
10 requested semester and the
11 student juggling full-time course
12 work, full-time job and military
13 service. Dean Franco-Watkins,
14 you may want to elaborate a
15 little bit more on that one.

16 MS. WATKINS: Thank you. And it's very common
17 for someone to put a K instead of
18 a C, it's really Franco, but we
19 say Franco in American language.
20 So, yes, my name is spelled
21 incorrectly. So, this is a
22 similar situation of a student
23 basically not having good advice
24 or some misscommunication with
25 the advisor at a time that they

1 were having mental health issues
2 compiled with just a lot of
3 pressures and work and they're
4 currently serving our country
5 overseas and basically this is a
6 request so that they can then
7 move forward to not only
8 graduate, but also continue to
9 serve and be eligible for a
10 promotion. So, this may
11 potentially stop the student from
12 something he didn't seek mental
13 health resources at that time,
14 but we have additional
15 documentation that was required.
16 So, again, he just missed the
17 window of applying for the two-
18 year rule.

19 MS. COLLETT: Yeah. Thank you. I should have
20 said your name was misspelled
21 again, it was misspelled on the
22 last one too, but I pronounced it
23 right. Scott Yost?

24 MR. YOST: Scott Yost, College of
25 Engineering. Not -- we have two

1 cases here and I can say that
2 they don't seem to be on the same
3 level of what I would consider
4 along some of the concerns that
5 Dr. Kaveh Tagavi had mentioned.
6 You know, I wish, if you could,
7 explain a little bit more,
8 because in this particular one
9 until you said that there may be
10 some miscommunication between the
11 student and an advisor this one
12 had no evidence of something
13 happening on the university side
14 of the things. What I see is
15 that while mental health issues
16 are real I also see someone who
17 is not living life like they
18 should have when it comes to -- I
19 mean full-time job, full-time
20 course work, military, it's
21 almost like outside of the mental
22 health issues some of this seems
23 like it could be self-inflicted,
24 and so -- as far as just based on
25 bad decisions and how they're

1 operating in life. And without,
2 what I would consider, a little
3 bit more concrete evidence of the
4 university making some mistake
5 I'm not inclined to actually vote
6 for this one. And so, could you
7 give us any more concrete
8 evidence of what might have
9 happened from our side where we
10 let the student down.

11 MS. WATKINS: This would be purely speculation
12 on my part since I was not
13 present and joined the
14 institution after this occurred.
15 We've had some struggles with
16 advising within my college and
17 when I did the Strategic Plan we
18 received input from faculty,
19 staff and students. One of the
20 major issues was sort of the
21 advising part. So, I don't know
22 exactly what happened and we
23 don't have enough details since
24 advising notes weren't as
25 strongly inputted as they are now

1 and we've taken some concerted
2 efforts to make some changes, but
3 again it's very probable that
4 this occurred. And I understand,
5 you know, people's concerns about
6 being cautious about waiving said
7 request for students and we don't
8 really want to make this a
9 continuous precedent. Again, we
10 thought that these were two
11 extenuating circumstances that
12 we'd bring forth and we're taking
13 steps to ensure that we're not
14 going to continuously be bringing
15 these forth in the College of
16 Arts and Sciences. We're really
17 working hard to serve our
18 students as well as our faculty
19 and staff in the best way
20 possible.

21 MS. COLLETT:

Thank you. Kaveh Tagavi?

22 MR. TAGAVI:

Kaveh Tagavi, Engineering. I'm
23 not going to repeat. You'll be
24 happy to hear that I'm not going
25 to repeat everything that I said

1 about the other one, except I'm
2 imploring you to please add a
3 sentence where it says, "Two-year
4 limit," saying that, "This limit
5 may be waived or lifted by the
6 Senate upon the petition of a
7 student," so it wouldn't be like
8 if you are in the know you would
9 get this privilege, but if you
10 are -- you take everything on the
11 chin then you don't have this
12 privilege, it's just
13 fundamentally unfair.

14 MS. COLLETT: And I just want to remind you, I
15 urge you if you want to add
16 things, change the Senate Rules,
17 any -- we will accept any
18 proposal. So, a proposal from
19 you to put whatever you want to
20 put in the Senate Rules to come
21 through Senate Council we will
22 absolutely invite and accept
23 that. Yes.

24 MR. TAGAVI: What I'd rather --

25 MS. COLLETT: Who are you?

1 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi. I'd rather not
2 debate with my chair, which I
3 have a high esteem and I also
4 think that is fundamentally
5 unfair to debate with the chair
6 of the Senate, but so could you.

7 MS. COLLETT: But I don't want to, so I'm not
8 bringing forth a proposal.

9 MR. TAGAVI: But we are still debating?

10 MS. COLLETT: Yeah. If you call it debate.
11 I'm just giving you facts. Facts
12 is anybody can bring forth a
13 proposal and what I'm telling you
14 is you can bring forth a
15 proposal, but that is not what
16 we're debating here. So, that is
17 a question and a answer of fact.
18 Okay. Any more questions?
19 Perfect. Bobby.

20 MR. SCROGGINS: Bobby Scroggins, College of Fine
21 Arts, School of Art and Visual
22 Studies. Now, I want to get this
23 clear, this was a person who
24 chose to take full -- a full load
25 academically while working a

1 full-time job and serving in the
2 military full time, right?

3 MS. COLLETT: Yes, correct.

4 MR. SCROGGINS: So, how -- how are we addressing
5 this in terms of taking
6 responsibility for these choices
7 and saying that there was
8 something about -- there was
9 something wrong with advising?

10 MS. WATKINS: Sorry, to clarify, the advising
11 part was the -- when the student
12 thought that they had
13 academically withdrawn and they
14 hadn't. There was a
15 misscommunication, so that has
16 nothing to do -- you're right
17 about what the student did. But
18 in one sense, I think we need to
19 work more generally in helping
20 students realize their limits. I
21 agree with you, taking a full
22 course load and a full-time job
23 is not ideal, however, some
24 students have to do it because
25 they can't financially go to

1 school and -- but that's a bigger
2 picture and a bigger issue than
3 what is on the floor at the
4 moment. I don't think it's poor
5 decision making on the student's
6 part to take on a lot of things,
7 because at that time they thought
8 that they could possibly do so
9 and didn't realize the mental
10 health issues coupled on top of
11 that. I think we just need to
12 better serve our students and
13 help them figure out what is
14 possible for them to actually be
15 successful.

16 MS. COLLETT:

Thank you. Sandra Bastin?

17 MS. BASTIN:

18 I would like to remind everyone
19 that these are -- these
20 extenuating circumstances that we
21 don't have details about are
22 determined by the college
23 themselves and then all we're
24 voting on is whether we can put
25 these forward to -- we have to
waive this two-year limit to be

1 able to put it forth to the next
2 committee who will have all the
3 details and who will be able to
4 make those decisions. Thank you.

5 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Any more questions of
6 fact and/or debate. Okay. Thank
7 you. Seeing none, as a reminder
8 Senate is voting to approve the
9 waiver of the two-year limit in
10 SR1. -- oh, no. I got one.
11 Kiersten White.

12 MS. WHITE: Hi, Kiersten White, Student
13 Government Association. Based
14 off of what I've heard simply
15 just on this case and not knowing
16 anything about how this process
17 works it seems like we are
18 penalizing a student for having
19 to work a full-time job, for
20 potentially serving for the
21 benefits most of the time
22 military will pay for a portion
23 of their degree, so it just seems
24 like we're penalizing the student
25 for having to do these things or

1 maybe there is the situation
2 where they took too much, but you
3 can't just quite a full-time job
4 if you're under salary. So, this
5 just seems, based of off
6 everything I have heard so far,
7 that we're penalizing a student
8 for something that they either
9 didn't know or couldn't get out
10 of. And correct me if I'm wrong.
11 That's just what I've heard.

12 MS. COLLETT:

Thank you. Kaveh?

13 MR. TAGAVI:

Let me correct then. If any -- I
14 don't call this penalizing, if a
15 rule is not waived the person who
16 requested for the waiver is not
17 being penalized, we just simply
18 do not waive that rule. But if
19 there is penalization it's
20 because the student isn't doing
21 it within two year, not because
22 she -- the student, she or he,
23 was working, of course that's not
24 the case. The penalty, if any,
25 is because the student didn't do

1 it within two years like any
2 other student who doesn't do it
3 within two years and they don't
4 get to do it after.

5 MS. COLLETT: Brady?

6 MR. BRADY: Christian Brady, Lewis Honors
7 College. I think there is
8 reasonable philosophical debate
9 over when and how we do waivers,
10 but we're following the process
11 and the question here is on this
12 particular case, and so, I think
13 the merit stand and we should
14 vote.

15 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Seeing no additional
16 hands raised it's time to vote.
17 So, Senate is voting to approve
18 the waiver of the two-year limit
19 in 5.1.7.5.1 for ANS Student TJ-
20 06 to allow submission past the
21 two-year deadline. We have 60
22 approve, 16 oppose, 12 abstain.
23 That passes. Thank you, Dean
24 Franco-Watkins. The next thing
25 we have on our agenda is proposed

1 changes to SR3 and this was a
2 lengthy document, so I hope you
3 have it pulled it and did not
4 kill many trees to get it here.
5 Section 3 of the Senate Rules
6 needed to have some updates to
7 the established new policies for
8 suspension of admissions and
9 closures, so really bringing it
10 in line with what we currently do
11 within the Senate Office, as well
12 as reflecting some changes that
13 we needed to be in line with
14 SACSCOC, so our regional
15 accreditor. This will provide --
16 these changes will provide Senate
17 Council Office and OSPIE with
18 early alerts for suspension and
19 closure, so that we can follow
20 along the process over the five-
21 year sort of timeline when people
22 suspend admissions and many times
23 we've already heard people come
24 in with proposals that want to
25 suspend admissions and close,

1 because they had already
2 suspended admissions for like
3 five years, but you know it
4 wasn't tracked appropriately
5 because we didn't know within the
6 Senate Council Office or OSPIE
7 wasn't informed early on. So,
8 the work on SR3 was also done in
9 a shared governance fashion, as
10 always. So, we -- when Sheila
11 was here, and I think Sheila may
12 be on the Zoom as well, she
13 worked with RaeAnne and out of
14 OSPIE's Office to help with this
15 and give our feedback on any of
16 the SR changes. So, you have
17 before you the SR3 changes that
18 were approved at Senate Council,
19 so it comes from Senate Council
20 and no second motion is required.
21 So, the motion is now on the
22 floor to approve the changes for
23 SR3. The motion is open for
24 questions of fact and/or debate.
25 I have Scott Yost.

1 MR. YOST: Yeah, I'm -- a couple of
2 questions or couple of comments,
3 I think, for clarification. So,
4 if I'm understanding we now have
5 three classifications for a
6 program change, there is a minor
7 change, a regular program change
8 and then a significant program
9 change.

10 MS. COLLETT: Uh-Huh.

11 MR. YOST: And I'm reading that correctly,
12 and if so, can you -- can someone
13 just kind of tell me the
14 difference between the three,
15 because before I thought we just
16 had either significant or minor
17 and I'm just wondering why
18 there's now three, if I'm reading
19 it right.

20 MS. COLLETT: Yes. So, we actually had
21 significant and major and it was
22 causing a lot of confusion with
23 people going, "Okay, what -- if
24 it's major then it has to be
25 significant," and so -- so, to

1 clean up the wording for what we
2 really actually do and try to
3 clean it up we pulled out what
4 those changes were. Let me just
5 -- I'm pulling up my document
6 here, so I can pull it out. Now,
7 minor changes are already
8 delineated on what those are.
9 Let's see here. So, you have on
10 Page, I guess, 17 maybe, Line
11 Item 825, which are the minor
12 program changes and then the new
13 piece that you have here with
14 regular program changes,
15 basically are all those things
16 that kind of fall in between, so
17 they're neither minor, but
18 they're not significant, okay.
19 So, these are just required
20 course -- like changing
21 electives, changing graduate
22 composition, communication
23 requirements, changes to badges
24 would fall in this, change to
25 just -- you're changing the name,

1 not the content within some of
2 those courses or, you know,
3 specialized tracks. So, that
4 brought it out to make it just a
5 little bit more clear to folks
6 what is minor, you know, as
7 opposed -- so, a lot of things
8 you'll see in minor changes --
9 and it occurs in the same thing
10 with minor courses is, "I just
11 want to change the prerequisite,"
12 no change in content or, "I need
13 to update the actual bulletin or
14 catalog description." Those are
15 minor things that go through the
16 Senate Council Office and are
17 placed on the 10-day web
18 transmittal. So, this breaks
19 this down what minor, what
20 regular program changes are and
21 what significant are. And what
22 you can see where significant is
23 those new degrees, that's not a
24 minor change that could affect
25 many people along campus. New

1 certificates, which is we
2 consider that a program, a
3 certificate is considered a
4 program, so that's even updated
5 in the definition. Addition of
6 online components and changes to
7 admissions, progression
8 requirements, which is what we
9 already do and we send those
10 through to your committee SAASC.
11 MR. YOST: Right.
12 MS. COLLETT: There is --
13 MR. YOST: Can I ask for --
14 MR. COLLETT: Yes.
15 MR. YOST: Can I ask for just a quick
16 clarification? I kind of sense
17 what you're going with. Where
18 does changing of a credit hour
19 for a program fall? Because I
20 mean I was looking for some
21 examples relative to credit hours
22 because I know in the past we
23 have had conversations about,
24 "Does any credit hour change?
25 Does like a one-credit hour

1 change or a five?" and I don't
2 see any reference as an example
3 for instance of a credit hour
4 change. So, where would that
5 fall -- would that be -- it
6 wouldn't be minor, but would it
7 be regular or significant?

8 MS. COLLETT: Yeah. So, the way we do it
9 currently that would be a
10 significant change, because
11 you're changing that credit hour,
12 so that changes the program
13 delivery, what we're delivering.
14 So, if it goes from 27 to 29
15 hours then that is something we
16 got to also like let OSPIE know
17 this is a change in the entire
18 program and how it's delivered,
19 so that would be -- and, Sheila,
20 you may want to add anything to
21 that. Sheila is on. Hi, Sheila.
22 I think I spoke that right,
23 Sheila, unless I said something
24 wrong there you can add in.

25 MS. BROTHERS: Yeah, that's right. Generally,

1 the significant items are things
2 that require committee review and
3 any change to the Senate Rules is
4 considered significant. So,
5 DeShana is correct. Minor
6 program changes are very low bar.
7 Program changes are the majority
8 of the things that go through on
9 a 10-day post and the significant
10 changes are the things that are
11 big enough that warrant committee
12 review.

13 MS. COLLETT:

Dean Brady.

14 MR. BRADY:

Christian Brady, Lewis Honors
15 College. Sections -- well, Line
16 Numbers 1861 to 1887 strike out,
17 "Proposals being initiated by the
18 Department Chair/School Director,
19 Dean, Provost, Vice President for
20 Research or President," and yet,
21 Sections 1838 through 1845 those
22 lines make it clear that, "A
23 recommendation to create,
24 consolidate, transfer, close,
25 abolish or significantly reduce

1 an academic program or
2 educational unit may be made by
3 the program faculty, Department
4 Chair/School Director, Dean,
5 Provost or President." So, we're
6 in conflict -- the document is in
7 conflict with itself. Is there a
8 resolution to this?

9 MS. COLLETT: So, when we looked at 1855 there
10 it -- when we took away Line 61
11 all the way down, I guess to 1887
12 it was because it just was a
13 redundancy. Now, I have spoken
14 with several Senate Council
15 Members and I since then felt
16 like there could be an easy fix
17 of how this reads, so I will let
18 those people maybe speak on that
19 or bring forth any sort of motion
20 on that. Akiko?

21 MS. TAKENAKA: Akiko Takenaka, Senate Council --
22 wait, Arts and Sciences. I would
23 like to propose an amendment to
24 3.3.2.1.1 and the amendment is
25 going to be in two parts and part

1 two is going to have three
2 components, so please bear with
3 me. So, the first part of the
4 amendment is the -- the header
5 language. Instead of, "Proposals
6 initiated by program/unit
7 faculty," I would like to propose
8 this to be changed to,
9 "initiation of proposals," and
10 that is to just match the
11 language used in Line 787,
12 SR3.1.5.1.1 which defines all of
13 these proposals. So, that's the
14 first part. Part two, I would
15 like to propose bringing back the
16 first struck out portion with
17 some changes. So, the struck out
18 portion, "Initiated by the
19 faculty of the academic program
20 or educational unit," bringing
21 that back by adding, "other
22 academic administrators," so, it
23 would read as, "Proposals
24 initiated by the faculty or other
25 academic administrators of the

1 academic program or educational
2 unit," just for clarity sake.
3 Component two, end of Line 1857,
4 "those established by that unit,"
5 I would propose to add,
6 "educational," in front of the
7 unit so, "Shall follow the
8 procedures established in the
9 University Senate Rules and those
10 established by that educational
11 unit." And -- sorry. Right, "by
12 the educational unit and those
13 established by the college."
14 After that sentence I would like
15 to add some components from the
16 scratched out parts of the next
17 few, what do you call it,
18 3.3.2.1.2 and 3.3.2.1.3 to sort
19 of add some clarity. And so, I
20 would like to propose to add,
21 "Proposals are required to
22 include evidence of compliance
23 with existing unit procedures for
24 (a) faculty approval or proposals
25 for significant reduction to or

1 closure of an academic program or
2 for (b) faculty advisement on
3 proposed changes to academic
4 organization," and you will see
5 if you look at, you know, the
6 block below I lifted most of the
7 language from the scratched out
8 part just to add clarity and I
9 hope I was clear.

10 MS. COLLETT: Okay. So, I'm going to repeat
11 what this is. So, for 3.3.2.1.1
12 this would strike out, "The
13 proposals initiated by program
14 unit faculty," and say,
15 "Initiation of proposals," that's
16 what this will say here, because
17 I can't -- I don't think I can
18 edit it on this slide here.

19 MS. VINCENT: Do you want to type it in?

20 MS COLLETT: Sure.

21 MS. VINCENT: Do you want me to (Inaudible).

22 MS. COLLETT: I think the chats disabled, maybe
23 it's not, well, it's supposed to
24 be disabled. Can you cut -- can
25 you cut and paste the change in

1 the chat?

2 MS. VINCENT: (Inaudible).

3 MS. COLLETT: Okay. I'm going to have Leslie
4 cut and paste the change or one
5 of you all in the chat, it
6 doesn't matter, if you have it up
7 on your email. So, it'll say,
8 "Proposals initiated," and then,
9 let's see, then it will say,
10 "Proposals initiated by the
11 faculty or other academic
12 administrators of the academic
13 program or educational unit," so,
14 that's here and this will change
15 this. So, bring this back and
16 add, "administrators of the
17 academic program or unit," so
18 that it's clear that we're taking
19 -- that this is still all the
20 same. So, there was some lack of
21 clarity around, well, if we're
22 taking out 3.2.1.2 all the way
23 down to 3.3.2.1.4 were we losing
24 this where the deans or
25 department chairs or other folks,

1 the provost, the president could
2 initiate and we were not taking
3 that out to eliminate any of
4 that. So, to make it consistent
5 we pulled that back up -- hold
6 on, let me finish with the edits
7 here. And -- what was the other
8 piece? And then actually bring
9 back the, A and B here, so where
10 it says, "Proposals are required
11 to provide evidence," let's see,
12 this piece right here, provide --
13 include evidence, so it starts
14 here, bringing that back and, "As
15 proposer required to include
16 evidence with compliance existing
17 unit procedures for --" and A and
18 B are reinstated there to make it
19 clear. I have that correct?
20 Okay. Does that make sense?
21 Dean Brady?

22 MR. BRADY: Thank you. Christian Brady,
23 Lewis Honors College. So, to be
24 clear, and I'm going to skip up
25 beyond what you're editing here,

1 this is, "The role -- under the
2 role of the University Senate
3 3.3.1 a recommendation to create
4 etcetera will still remain as a
5 possibility for Department Chair/
6 School Director, Dean, Provost or
7 President." The sections below,
8 as enumerated, and thank you
9 Akiko, this is hard to try and do
10 this all verbally and orally,
11 those were the processes by which
12 -- the procedure by which these
13 things would happen. So, the
14 authority opportunity is still
15 there for everybody outlined
16 above, you're just trying to
17 reduce the amount of verbiage in
18 here and just say the procedure
19 is going to be the same
20 regardless who initiates it?

21 MS. COLLETT: Uh-huh.

22 MR. BRADY: Okay.

23 MS. COLLETT: Yes.

24 MR. BRADY: That's helpful for me, if that's
25 exactly what's happening.

1 MS. COLLETT: That's exactly what's happening.

2 MR. BRADY: Okay. Thank you.

3 MS. COLLETT: I need a second for that
4 amendment, sorry. Leslie, are
5 you seconding?

6 MS. VINCENT: I'm seconding.

7 MS. COLLETT: Oh, okay. Sorry. Okay. Further
8 discussion on that amendment?
9 Okay. So, let's see -- oh, Scott
10 Yost. Scott?

11 MR. YOST: I'm not -- Scott Yost, College of
12 Engineering. I'm not sure
13 exactly if I could make a
14 friendly amendment to the
15 amendment, but I want to ask a
16 question before I do. And the
17 question there underlying on the
18 current thing that you have on
19 the screen under 18 Line 1858 you
20 say, "The proposal must be
21 submitted to the Senate within 12
22 months of when the faculty of
23 record approved the proposal,"
24 what happens if they don't?

25 MS. COLLETT: Okay. So, what happens, they

1 would resubmit their proposal.
2 So, what has happened in the past
3 is a proposal goes in and I think
4 I've talked to you all about this
5 where we had proposals that were
6 sitting in the Curriculog for
7 like four years, and so, the
8 faculty has changed, the chair of
9 the department has changed, a new
10 dean has come in and then when
11 they're tried to push through at
12 that point so much has changed
13 that it needs to go back now to
14 the faculty to say, "Is this
15 still exactly what you all want,"
16 because that faculty of record
17 currently isn't the same faculty
18 of record who actually approved
19 the proposal. So, that's the
20 only reason why it's really in
21 there, at 12 months. We assume
22 once you put that into Curriculog
23 and the faculty have approved it
24 that you're ready to go. We're
25 ready to move that on through to

1 the Curriculog system and get
2 you, you know, your proposal
3 approved.

4 MR. BRADY: Okay. So, does somewhere in this
5 document it state that it has to
6 be started over again, because if
7 it doesn't my friendly amendment
8 to the amendment, since we're
9 making an amendment here at this
10 3.2, sorry, 3.3.2.1.1 is at the
11 front of that, "The proposal must
12 be submitted," would it be
13 possible or fine to say, "To be
14 considered, the proposal shall be
15 submitted," so in other words you
16 put the little tagline ahead of
17 time to just say, "To be
18 considered," so people know it's
19 not going to be considered if
20 it's after 12 months.

21 MS. COLLETT: Akiko seconded that. So, it
22 would read, "The proposal, to be
23 considered, must be submitted to
24 the Senate within 12 months of
25 when faculty of record approve

1 the proposal."

2 MR. BRADY: And I would -- I would use, I
3 guess my non-legal side, I would
4 use the word, "shall," rather
5 than, "must," but that's --
6 that's just me.

7 MS. COLLETT: Okay. Any other --

8 MR. KENNEY: Padraic Kenney, Graduate School.
9 These are probably pretty stupid
10 questions that which will reflect
11 my lack of knowledge of the
12 current system, but two things
13 about 1856 puzzle me. One is,
14 "The faculty and other academic
15 administrators," does that mean
16 that the faculty are academic
17 administrators? I -- that's an
18 unfamiliar way of putting things,
19 if that's the case then great,
20 but it does seem an odd way to
21 frame it. And the other question
22 is, is the campus or the
23 university as whole an
24 educational unit?

25 MS: ???: (Inaudible).

1 MR. KENNY: Okay. So, the President and the
2 Provost are also academic
3 administrators of the educational
4 unit?

5 MS. COLLETT: Uh-huh.

6 MR. KENNEY: Okay. So, that's -- that's good
7 to know, but my first question
8 still stands. Are faculty
9 academic administrators?

10 MS. COLLETT: They can be, but in this instance
11 we're talking about faculty of
12 record so it's, "initiated by
13 faculty or other academic
14 administrators," and the reason
15 we put that was because we're
16 eliminating those three that
17 picked up department chairs,
18 "initiated by the Dean and
19 initiated by the Provost, Vice
20 Provost of Research or the
21 President," instead of naming all
22 of those.

23 MR. KENNY: No, that's fine. I just didn't
24 understand the other there that
25 suggest faculty are

1 administrators.

2 MS. COLLETT: No, this is --

3 MR. KENNY: If they are.

4 MS. COLLETT: -- for these three. Dean Brady.

5 MR. BRADY: Christian Brady, Lewis Honors

6 College. For clarity, you might

7 want to then put a comma after,

8 "faculty," and then again after,

9 "administrators," "Proposals

10 initiated by the faculty, or

11 other academic administrators,

12 --" well, that doesn't work, but

13 -- Padraic, I see your concern.

14 I'll leave word smithing to

15 somebody else, but --

16 MS. COLLETT: We can do -- SREC can word smith

17 it, they know our intent here is

18 what this is supposed to be, we

19 can do that. Hold on, Scott,

20 because you're a Senator.

21 MR. JONES: Hi, Joseph Jones, Engineering. I

22 think if we just take the word,

23 "other," out and it makes perfect

24 sense.

25 MS. COLLETT: Perfect. Is there any objection

1 to that -- I need -- I guess I
2 need a second to that friendly
3 amendment. Akiko, you -- okay.
4 So, it would read, okay,
5 "Proposal initiated by the
6 faculty, --" right? "-- academic
7 administrator." Is that what you
8 said? Is that what I have? Or
9 comma, "or academic
10 administrator." Just take out,
11 "other," and just say -- okay.
12 Okay. And the rest is fine?
13 MR. DIPAOLA: I was just going to ask, do you
14 really even --
15 MS COLLETT: Provost DiPaola.
16 MR. DIPAOLA: Oh, Provost DiPaola, sorry about
17 that. But in terms of -- so,
18 "The academic program educational
19 unit," I think that leaves a
20 little bit of less clarity in
21 terms of -- I guess, people can
22 always ask, but what's the
23 academic program, academic unit?
24 What's the administrator or the
25 academic unit? You were just

1 saying that it is the Chair or
2 the Dean or the Provost or the
3 President, so do you need even
4 that -- the rest of that, "the
5 academic program or educational
6 unit"?

7 MS. COLLETT: Uh-huh. Yeah, we need academic,
8 because this is talking about
9 programs and unit area, so if I
10 didn't have, "educational," in
11 front of it I think that would
12 cause a lot more confusion. So,
13 saying, "educational unit," for
14 instance the game center that
15 would fall under Provost Office,
16 right, so it would be -- I'm
17 sorry. Chris Haynes? Oh, okay.
18 That was an accident. So, that
19 way it's pulling in those
20 educational units we know that
21 fall outside of a college as
22 well.

23 MR. DIPAOLO: But if it's -- so, I guess, my
24 question -- well, to be specific
25 as an example, so if it's an

1 educational program --

2 MS. COLLETT: Uh-huh.

3 MR. DIPAOLOLA: -- within a particular college,
4 but there's not say the budget or
5 something more centrally that's
6 helping support that that can be
7 initiated by the Chair, the Dean,
8 the Provost -- okay.

9 MS. COLLETT: The way it's already written --
10 it's already written to be
11 initiated by anybody.

12 MR. DIPAOLOLA: All right.

13 MS. COLLETT: We just took out those three
14 paragraphs to try to --

15 MR. DIPAOLOLA: The procedure.

16 MS. COLLETT: Yes. It's just -- it's like
17 repeating it over and over and
18 over again, so what we did was
19 try to clean it up, and so, the
20 proposed amendment with the
21 friendly amendments basically
22 brings back that A and B, it just
23 cleans it up some and says --
24 basically, instead of us writing
25 Director, School Chair, Dean, all

1 these people's names out, it's
2 just saying administrators.

3 MR. DIPAOLA: Just making it simple.

4 MS. COLLETT: Because they are -- every single
5 one of these folks in this -- in
6 these paragraphs are
7 administrators.

8 MR. DIPAOLA: Alright. Thank you.

9 MS. COLLETT: Jane.

10 MS. JENSEN: Yes, Jane McEldowney-Jensen,
11 College of Education. I just
12 wanted to clarify since it was
13 raised the second half of this
14 relative to unit that, "shall
15 follow the procedures established
16 in the Senate Rules and those
17 established by that educational
18 unit," if the program that is
19 under discussion is something
20 like GCCR or UK Core what -- what
21 educational unit would be setting
22 the procedures established by
23 that educational unit? Would
24 that revert to the Senate or to
25 Senate Council? Who would be in

1 charge of the procedures in that
2 case?

3 MS. COLLETT: What do you mean, for GCCR that
4 are within --

5 MS. JENSEN: Go with UK Core, because that's a
6 program that does not have a
7 department or a college that
8 would have unit procedures and
9 it's not the game center, nor
10 Lewis or any other educational
11 unit.

12 MS. COLLETT: So, UK Core by default over those
13 core courses would be those
14 faculty of record, so those
15 faculty that are over those
16 courses and we also have several
17 units that are outside of a
18 college that we've had to
19 establish. You may remember this
20 last year, I believe, early part
21 of last year, we went through the
22 Senate Rules that we establish a
23 faculty of record form and how
24 you establish those faculty
25 records with parameters was

1 actually my committee, so it was
2 like 50 percent have to be
3 faculty members, you could have
4 additional people on there, you
5 had to have a student on there.
6 So, we laid out all of these
7 parameters and so you'll see as
8 different proposals come along if
9 they're outside of a college, but
10 still an educational unit. I'll
11 give an example, I don't pick on
12 TECH, but TECH is one and we have
13 the same with International
14 Studies with Sue Roberts where
15 they have a defined faculty body
16 and we have it -- like a contract
17 document agreement of how long
18 they stay on, who will be the
19 faculty body, how often do you
20 fill a vacancy, the turnover, so
21 it's very specific and then that
22 actually has to get approved by
23 Senate. The faculty body is just
24 not something that we take and
25 then say, "Oh, this is great,"

1 you all have to actually approve
2 any of those faculty body. Any
3 other questions? Okay. So, we
4 have SR3 -- okay, let me look.
5 Let's see here. Okay. Hold on
6 we have a revised SR3. We're
7 voting on the amendment that
8 Akiko just brought up with -- can
9 I put the friendly amendments in
10 there, with those friendly
11 amendments. So, this is the
12 amendment that Akiko just brought
13 up that was second that we
14 discussed and the two friendly
15 amendments that were mentioned,
16 so that is taking out the,
17 "other," on academic
18 administrators and changing the
19 proposal, "to be considered,
20 shall be submitted." Okay. Does
21 everybody -- is everybody clear
22 on what you are voting on? Okay.
23 So, now we have a proposal all up
24 for Senate to vote on. Did you
25 change it or do I need to? And

1 it's revised. So, approve the
2 proposal changes for SR3 as
3 revised and direct SREC to make
4 revisions as needed if other
5 areas of the Senate Rules need to
6 be updated to reflect the SR3
7 changes. There definitely are
8 going to need to be some updates
9 just on numbering, so we'll let
10 SREC do that to make sure that it
11 flows correctly and directly.
12 We're voting. Hold on. You have
13 to wait. I thought it was
14 changed. Okay. So, hold -- hold
15 on I'm going to clear these
16 responses, because I don't have a
17 -- did you put another one at the
18 bottom of -- okay. Hold on.
19 This was -- I need to go to the
20 blank slide at the end, so bear
21 with me, because it's not worded
22 right and we need to vote on the
23 amendment. Okay. So, we're
24 voting on the amended --

25 (CROSS TALKING)

1 -- changes to SR3. People are
2 voting and I don't even have it
3 up yet, you all are ready. Okay.
4 This is approve the amended
5 changes to SR3, is what you're
6 voting on right now. Richard, is
7 that what you were going to tell
8 me, because your hand went up and
9 then it went down, I just want to
10 make sure?

11 MR. CHARNIGO: Yes, DeShana.

12 MS. COLLETT: Thank you, Richard. You all keep
13 me on my toes. I'll wait a
14 couple more seconds. Okay.
15 We're ready. Okay. All right.
16 You have 64 approve, two oppose
17 and seven abstain. So, the
18 amended changes to SR3 have been
19 approved. Now, we will vote on
20 the overall -- the main motion
21 with the amendments, so let's get
22 back up here. So, does this need
23 to say something different? So,
24 now we're voting on the main
25 amended changes to SR3 in the

1 original proposal, right, or the
2 revised proposal, I should say.
3 Now, I know at least we have 73.
4 Oh, 75 -- 76. Okay. All right.
5 We have 69 approve, one oppose
6 and seven abstentions. So, that
7 passes. And we'll make those
8 updates and it will go to SREC.
9 Thank you all. The next thing we
10 have is items from the floor.
11 This is an opportunity for
12 Senators to raise issues not on
13 the agenda. I do just want to
14 follow up really quickly with
15 Kaveh's question about the
16 legislative proposals. Please,
17 make sure that you reach out to
18 your Senate Council Members,
19 Senate Council Chair, anyone, if
20 there are things that you are
21 hearing from your constituents,
22 because we do want to hear as
23 Senate Council engages in these
24 conversations, we need to know
25 that we are speaking for the

1 voice of the Senate as a whole.
2 So, please make sure that you are
3 communicating, the SGA President
4 with staff -- I don't have any
5 Staff Senate in here, but I've
6 spoken with the Staff Senate
7 President or Chair and as well as
8 the Senators here making sure
9 that you reach out to your Senate
10 Council Members, because that
11 March meeting that we have will
12 be very close to the end of the
13 legislative session and I assume
14 there will be lots of things that
15 will occur between now and then,
16 and so, we need to hear from you
17 so that we know the direction
18 that we need to move in as a
19 Senate. Now, if there's anything
20 that Senators would like to raise
21 that are not on the agenda. So,
22 there's no further business that
23 we're conducting, but it's an
24 opportunity to ask questions,
25 suggest topics or discussions.

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

Akiko?

MS. TAKENAKA:

Akiko Takenaka, Arts and Sciences. I am chairing the Senate Academic Facilities Committee and we are trying to make sure that the two-year renovation of the Whitehall classroom building doesn't negatively affect course scheduling and students traveling from classrooms to classrooms and we have requested feedback from chairs of the colleges that will be most affected, which are Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Communication and Information. However, we suspect -- we met this morning and had a lively conversation and one of the things that came up was that maybe it's not just the three colleges that regularly use the classroom building that will be affected. And so, if any of you from other colleges or even these

1 three colleges hear or notice
2 something about, you know, the
3 renovation affecting, especially
4 for now, course scheduling for
5 fall 2024, please send any kind
6 of feedback my way. Thank you.

7 MS. COLLETT: Thank you. Davy?

8 MR. JONES: Yes. Thank you. Early --
9 earlier on at the beginning --

10 MS. COLLETT: Davy Jones? You gotta say your
11 name.

12 MR. JONES: Davy Jones, College of Medicine.
13 Earlier on there was described
14 the five workgroups that are
15 currently active in relation to
16 the Board CR1 and it was --
17 there's also been recent
18 information that a company
19 Deloitte is interviewing
20 stakeholders who are associated
21 with each of the five workgroups,
22 but what I can't find is
23 information -- what's the
24 relationship of the workgroup,
25 say Workgroup Five, for example

1 to the interviews being conducted
2 by Deloitte with stakeholders?
3 Could we get some clarification
4 on that? Thank you.

5 MS. COLLETT: Yes, I can only speak for my
6 group, we are not in interviews
7 with those stakeholders, we're
8 not part of that. We will get
9 that information and that data
10 from those interviews and the
11 thematic analysis will come to
12 the group as a whole. As far as
13 other groups, I have no clue what
14 is happening in other groups and
15 I'm not sure. Provost DiPaola,
16 can you speak to that as far as
17 how interviews are being
18 conducted with stakeholders and
19 other groups?

20 MR. DIPAOLA: Yeah. No, just as Chair
21 Collette, you know, just
22 mentioned -- in terms of Group
23 Two, you know, Deloitte is going
24 out to stakeholders gathering
25 data. They're going to supply

1 the data to the committee. The
2 committee is going to get the
3 opportunity to decide and make
4 recommendations based on the
5 data. So, they're really
6 helping, you know, kind of as a
7 workforce to help with the data.
8 My understanding is that's the
9 case across the -- in other
10 areas, I'm not sure exactly which
11 areas, but I can tell you that,
12 you know, the President is going
13 to continue to update on CR1
14 monthly, you know, to the -- all
15 the chair governance groups as
16 you pointed out a little bit
17 earlier today. I do know that in
18 addition he's planning to attend
19 the March meeting as you also
20 pointed out as well. So, yeah,
21 that would be my understanding.

22 MS. COLLETT: And we can followup on that more
23 as well, Davy, around the other
24 -- how the interviews are being
25 conducted and who's part of those

1 interviews. Did that answer your
2 question? Okay. Bobby?

3 MR. SCROGGINS: Bobby Scroggins, College of Fine
4 Arts. This is a question
5 directed to you, DeShana. This
6 is about the faculty election
7 coming up. Would your -- would
8 -- if you were elected would this
9 mean that you would have to
10 vacate your present post or can
11 you -- can you do those
12 simultaneously?

13 MS. COLLETT: Since I am not over that
14 committee, I am going to have
15 Roger answer as the Chair of the
16 Rules and Election Committee.

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you. This is Roger, SREC
18 Chair. The -- there does not
19 appear to be any conflict of
20 interest in that for a person who
21 is occupying the role of Senate
22 Council Chair to also occupy the
23 role of Trustee, Faculty Trustee.
24 So, in the past, for instance,
25 we've rendered that those people

1 are eligible to vote and serve in
2 the past, so this is one of the
3 cases where the same person is in
4 the role or pursuing the role.

5 MS. COLLETT: Does that answer your question?

6 MR. SCROGGINS: Yes.

7 MS. COLLETT: Hollie?

8 MS. SWANSON: Hollie Swanson, Faculty Trustee,
9 College of Medicine. As a
10 followup that there are some
11 universities, like the University
12 of Louisville, where the elected
13 chair is also the trustee.

14 MS. COLLETT: Any other questions? Okay. So,
15 our next Senate Meeting is March
16 18, 2024 that's because we have
17 spring break in between that
18 time, and so, we know people
19 won't be here and we definitely
20 know our students hopefully will
21 be taking some time off during
22 that time, so we want them
23 engaged, so it's a week later.
24 If there are no objections this
25 meeting is adjourned. Thank you

1

all so much. Have a good day and

2

stay warm, because I think it's

3

supposed to snow.